Eu$_2$CuO$_4$: An anisotropic Van Vleck paramagnet
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Magnetic susceptibility measurements have shown anisotropic Van Vleck paramagnetism in Eu$_2$CuO$_4$, single crystals. This behavior is associated with the singlet ground state ($^1F_0$) of Eu$^{3+}$ ions, and the measured anisotropy is related to a crystal-field splitting of the excited multiplets ($^1F_J$). From the experimental data at low temperatures ($T \leq 50$ K) a crystal-field parameter $A_e^2(r^2) = -93(5)$ cm$^{-1}$ and a spin-orbit coupling constant $\xi = 303(15)$ cm$^{-1}$ have been estimated. The temperature dependence of the magnetic susceptibility is predicted in terms of the Boltzmann population of the excited multiplets, and a comparison with experimental data up to 350 K is made. The possibility of a magnetic contribution arising from the Cu ions is discussed in connection with some discrepancies observed between the experimental and calculated magnetic susceptibilities.

The discovery of high-$T_c$ superconductivity in a series of copper oxides, e.g., (LaSr)$_2$CuO$_4$, YBa$_2$Cu$_3$O$_7$, Bi$_2$(Ca,Sr)$_2$Cu$_2$O$_{10}$,TL$_2$Ca$_2$Cu$_3$O$_{10}$, etc.,$^{1-4}$ has led to a large amount of experimental and theoretical work in these and other related compounds. All these materials commonly share layered structures with almost square planar Cu-O arrangement. Some of them are, as mentioned, high-$T_c$ superconductors, while other related compounds have been found to order antiferromagnetically.$^5,6$ such as La$_2$CuO$_4$ and YBa$_2$Cu$_3$O$_7$. Another series of compounds, the $(R)_2$CuO$_4$ family with $R$ = Pr, Nd, Sm, Eu, Gd, form also in a layered tetragonal structure$^7$ related to the orthorhombic structure of La$_2$CuO$_4$ but with a somewhat larger lattice spacing in the planes. These materials are not superconducting or even metallic, and for this reason it is important to study in detail their magnetic properties in order to obtain more experimental evidence on the interplay of magnetic ordering and superconductivity in these layered copper oxides.

Single crystals of Eu$_2$CuO$_4$ were grown from a PbO-based flux. The crystal structure is tetragonal$^8$ with lattice constants $a = 3.910(1)$ Å and $c = 11.925(3)$ Å.

The magnetic susceptibility was determined from the magnetization measured in fields up to 5 T, and the results are shown in Fig. 1. The temperature dependence of the magnetic susceptibility corresponds to a Van Vleck paramagnet,$^9$ as expected for Eu$^{3+}$ ions having a singlet ground state ($^1F_0$), and the first excited multiplet ($^1F_{1/2}$). Our results show a dependence similar to that previously found in polycrystalline material.$^7$ At the lowest temperatures only the ground state is thermally populated and the susceptibility becomes temperature independent. The magnetic moment observed is induced by the external magnetic field through the admixture of the excited levels into the ground state. The magnetic susceptibility for such a case is given by

$$X_{uv} = N_A \sum_k \frac{|\langle \Psi_0|H_Z|\Psi_{1,k}\rangle|^2}{\Delta_{1,k}},$$

where $N_A$ is Avogadro's number, $H_Z$ is the Zeeman Hamiltonian, $\Psi_0$ and $\Psi_{1,k}$ are the eigenfunctions of the ground state $^1F_0$ and the first excited multiplet $^1F_1$, respectively; and $\Delta_{1,k}$ are the corresponding energies measured from the ground state. A scheme of the energy levels is given in Fig. 2.

In the presence of crystal-field interactions the eigenfunctions are not pure $^1F_0$ states but contain components from other multiplets, thus affecting the matrix elements in Eq. (1). Besides, as a result of crystal-field effects, the
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**FIG. 1.** Magnetic susceptibility vs temperature of Eu$_2$CuO$_4$, measured with external magnetic field (0.4 T) parallel and perpendicular to the c-axis. Continuous lines correspond to the calculated Van Vleck susceptibility.
energy splitting of the $^7F_1$ multiplet changes the relative weight of the terms in Eq. (1), giving rise to an anisotropic Van Vleck susceptibility.

Eu ions occupy sites of tetragonal symmetry ($C_{4v}$) in the Eu$_2$CuO$_4$ lattice, and we have thus considered a crystal-field Hamiltonian with the appropriate symmetry:

$$H = \mu_B (L + 2S) \cdot H + \alpha V^2_0 O^2(L) + \cdots,$$

where the ellipsis represents fourth- and sixth-order terms, $O^2(L)$ is a Stevens operator, $V^2_0 \equiv A^2_0 \langle r^2 \rangle$, and $\alpha = 2/45$ is the Stevens multiplicative factor for the $^7F$ term. This Hamiltonian splits the $^7F_1$ triplet into a singlet ($A_1$) and a doublet ($E$). The $^7F_1$ multiplet is split into three singlets ($A_1$, $B_1$, and $B_2$) and one doublet ($E$), although two of the singlets ($B_1$ and $B_2$) are accidentally degenerate when we limit Eq. (2) to second-order operators. The different levels are shown in Fig. 2. Although fourth- and sixth-order operators are symmetry allowed, we have not included them into our calculation because (i) the crystal-field splitting of the $^7F_1$ multiplet is determined in first-order perturbation theory only by the second-order term of Eq (2); and (ii) even though the neglected higher order terms contribute to the splitting of the $^7F_2$ levels, we are only interested in their admixture into the ground state and this can be well approximated by using the average energy separation that results from the spin-orbit interaction. In such a case the expressions for the low-temperature limit of the susceptibility reduce to

$$\chi_{\parallel} = 2(2 - \sqrt{3} \gamma) \mu_B^2 / \Delta_1,$$

$$\chi_{\perp} = 2(2 + \sqrt{3} \gamma / 2) \mu_B^2 / \Delta_1,$$

where $\chi_{\parallel}$ and $\chi_{\perp}$ correspond to the magnetic susceptibility measured with the applied field parallel and perpendicular to the $c$ axis, respectively. The parameter $\gamma = (4\sqrt{3}/15)V_0^2/\Delta_2$ takes into account the crystal-field admixture of the $^7F_2$ multiplet into the ground state. $\Delta_1$, $\Delta_2$, and $\Delta_3$ are the appropriate energy differences given by

$$\Delta_1 = \langle \epsilon(J = 1, A_2) - \epsilon(J = 0) \rangle,$$

$$\Delta_2 = \langle \epsilon(J = 1, E) - \epsilon(J = 0) \rangle,$$

and

$$\Delta_3 = \langle \epsilon(J = 2) \rangle - \epsilon(J = 0),$$

where $\langle \epsilon(J = 2) \rangle$ is the average energy of the $^7F_2$ level.

In order to separate the contribution of Eu ions to the magnetic susceptibility, it is necessary to introduce corrections for core diamagnetism and for the contribution arising from the Cu-O planes. Since we do not know what the magnetic behavior of the Cu planes is in this material, we have used as total a correction, $\chi_0 = 0.06 \times 10^{-3} \text{ emu/mol Eu}$, equal to the measured susceptibility $^{10}$ for La$_2$CuO$_4$, averaged over the temperature range of our measurements. From the measured values at low temperatures, $\chi_1 = 8.6(4) \times 10^{-3} \text{ emu/mol Eu}$ and $\chi_2 = 6.3(3) \times 10^{-3} \text{ emu/mol Eu}$, we have determined $V_0^2 = -93.5 \text{ cm}^{-1}$ and $\Delta = 303(15) \text{ cm}^{-1}$.

The value obtained for the crystal-field parameter can be compared with the predictions of a simple point charge model. For $^{3+}$ ions are surrounded by a distorted cube of oxygen ions whose contribution to the crystal field is estimated to be $A_0^2 \langle r^2 \rangle = +43 \text{ cm}^{-1}$, assuming a shielding factor $^{11}$ of $1 - \sigma = 0.20$. The order of magnitude is correct, but the opposite sign is obtained. Only minor changes are observed if semiempirical parameters are considered for the $^{3+}\cdot\cdot\cdot^2\text{O}$ interaction. This result is not unexpected, since second-order crystal-field parameters usually have significant contributions from distant ions and also from dipolar or quadrupolar polarization of the ions of the lattice. In fact, we have observed that including neighbors up to a distance of 5 Å reverses the sign of the calculated parameter.

At higher temperatures the excited levels become thermally populated and, in the absence of a crystal field, the susceptibility is given by Van Vleck's formula

$$\chi_{\text{av}} = \sum_j (2J + 1)(\alpha_j + C_j / k_B T) \exp[-(\epsilon(J)/k_B T)] / \sum_j (2J + 1) \exp[-(\epsilon(J)/k_B T)],$$

where $\alpha_j$ and $C_j$ are the Van Vleck and Curie constants for each multiplet $^7F_J$. For the free ions $\alpha_0 = 8 N A \mu_B^2 / \zeta$ and $\alpha_1 = -\alpha_0 / 48$. The Curie constants are given by

$$C_j = g_j^2 \mu_B^2 J(J + 1) / 3k_B ,$$

where $g_j = 3/2$ for all the excited multiplets. When there is a crystal-field interaction present, proper eigenvalues and eigenfunctions should be used to evaluate $\alpha_j$ and $C_j$. Crystal-field effects for $\alpha_0$ have already been considered in Eq. (3). The values of $C_j$, when corrected for the pres-
准磁性体の特性は、以下の式で表される。

\[ C^g_1 = C_1 (1 + \frac{2}{5} P_2^0 / k_B T) \]

と

\[ C^s_1 = C_1 (1 - \frac{1}{5} P_2^0 / k_B T) \]

で第一励起多重級、同じ表現は他の励起レベルを導くことができる。ボルツマニン因子も上記の式を変更して、多重级の分離を導くことができる。

これらの場合、計算結果はFig. 2と同様な線で示される。これも計算値は測定値に大きく依存して、第四と第六項の項を無視した計算値より小さい。

物理温度の温度依存性は、磁気性によるエネルギーの差が互いの状態と、触媒状態のCuイオンである。不確定な、この視点からの影響を考慮する必要がある。

異なる実験値を考慮した計算値は、2×10^{-4} emu/mol Eu であり、これらの温度では、磁気性の変化に大きな影響がある。これにより、温度に対する磁気性の変化が考えられる。

結論として、Eu2CuO4はVan Vleck パラマグネットであるが、磁気異方性はその特性に関連する。実験結果を考慮し、これらが示すそれぞれの温度において、より良いフィットを示す。
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