S_{42}

COVALENCY IN FLUORIDE PEROVSKITES

J. Eméry

Laboratoire de Spectroscopie du Solide, U.A. no 807, Université du Maine, 72017 Le Mans Cédex (France)

In ${[\text{MF}_c]}^{n-}$ complexes, F⁻ ions permit us to measure and calculate covalency parameters through the superhyperfine interaction. In octahedral complexes the superhyperfine parameters $A_{//}$ and A_{\parallel} are related to the transferred spin densities $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{s}}^{}\, \mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{p}}^{}\,$ by:

$$
A = 49.6 R^{-3} + 172 (f_{\sigma} - f_{\pi}) + 3.10^{3} f_{\text{s}}; A_{\bullet} = 24R^{-3} - 86(f_{\sigma} - f_{\pi}) + 3.10^{3} f_{\text{s}}
$$

The transferred spin densities are related to the covalency parameters

$$
f_{\pi} = \frac{1}{4} (N_{t2g} \lambda_{\pi})^2 f_{\sigma} = \frac{1}{3} (N_{eg} \lambda_{\sigma})^2 f_{s} = \frac{1}{3} (N_{eg} \lambda_{s})^2
$$

where $N_i\lambda_i$ are defined through the antibonding orbitals :

 $*_{t2g} = N_{t2g} (P_{t2g} - \lambda_{\pi} V_{2pr}) v_{eg} = H_{eg} (P_{eg} - \lambda_{\sigma} V_{2p\sigma} - \lambda_{s} V_{2s})$ associated to the valence electrons. φ_i are (3d) metal orbitals, and the index in holds for the symmetry ${\sf t}_{\rm 2g}$ or ${\sf e}_{\rm g}$. ${\sf v}_{\rm i}$ are linear combinations of 2s and 2p orbital In reference [l] one presents our model. In table 1 one gives general results about covalency for $(3d)^n$ metal ions : v^{2^+} , Cr^{3^+} , Ni^{2^+} , Mn^{2^+} , Fe^{3^+} .

In reference 2 the results for different metal ligand distances are given for v^{2^+} and Cr^{3^+} . The calculated value $f_{\sigma} - f_{\sigma}$ nearly varies as R^{-3} . We may notice that a law as R^{-3} permits us to calibrate R easily with the experimental anisotropic S.H.F. interaction since the dipole interaction varies as R^{-3} . For $(3d)^5$ ions, the more surprising result is the increase of f_{σ} and f_{π} with R, for $[FeF_{\theta}]^{3}$ complexes (Ref. 4), at such a rate that for R > 1.9 A the ionic approximation is not consistent with the calculated value of f_{σ} .

In KZnF₂, the impurity which has a larger ionic radius than Zn^{2+} nearly would act as an hard sphere and would repel the nearest ligand. Conversely in the compact RbCdF₃ lattice, the inward relaxation tends to a nearly compact

Conf.	Bond	۰.	7.	ť,	z	$I_{\rm d}$	z	ϵ_{σ}	z	x,	\mathbf{z}	٠.	۰,	Ref.
		Λ.	в	$\pmb{\Lambda}$	в	\mathbf{A}	$\,$	\mathbf{A}	\mathbf{B}	\mathbf{A}	\blacksquare	$\pmb{\Lambda}$	$\overline{}$	
$({\rm t}_{2{\rm g}})^3$	$\begin{array}{c} \sqrt{2} + 1 \\ 2.00 \ \lambda \end{array}$	o		-0.02	-0.1	c		-0.38	-0.3	2.6	2.8	-2.98	-3.1	$[5]$
(1, 2)	c_{r}^{3} $r_{1,9}^{-}$	$\mathbf 0$		-0.02		o		-0.3		4.4	4.	-4.52	-4.9	[6, 7]
				1				1		1, 2				
$(t_{2g})^6 (e_g)^2$ $\left N^{2+} r \right $ 0.3	2.00A		0.57	$\mathbf{0}$	o	3.61	3.72	\bullet	o	\bullet	o	3.81	3.72	[0, 9]
$[3]$				\bullet	\mathbf{u}	3		\pmb{v}	$\pmb{\mathsf{c}}$	$\pmb{\sigma}$	\bullet			
$(\epsilon_{2g})^3(\epsilon_{g})^2$ $\left \frac{m^{2+}}{2} r^2 \right $ 0.78			0.52			2.8				2.4		0.4	0.3	[10, 11, 12)
[4]	$\begin{array}{ccc} & 2.00 \text{ Å} \\ & 3+ & r \end{array}$	0.88	0.78			1.08				7.4		3.4	3.5	[12, 13]
	1.9A					4				4		151		

Table 1 . Experimental (B) and calculated values (A) of spin densities. f' , reveal polarization mechanism on F ions.

arrangement of the ligands around the small impurity. In $KZnF_n$: Fe³⁺ we have choosen $R = 1.9$ A, i.e. a rather strong inward relaxation favoured by the small ionic radius and the extra positive charge of Fe^{3+} . One finds a good agreement between theory and experiments.

1 .J. EMERY, J.C. FAYET, J. Physique, 4l_, 1980, 1327

2 J. EMERY, J.C. FAYET, Solid State Commuh, 37, (1981), 971

3 J. EMERY, unpublished

4 J. EMERY, J.C. FAYET, Solid State Commun, 42, n°9, (1982), 685

5 J.Y. BUZARE, J.C. FAYET, Phys. Stat. Solid, 67, 1975, 455

6 A. LEBLE, Thèse de 3ème cycle (1974) Université de Caen, unpublished

7 R.G. SHULMAN, K. KNOX, Phys. Rev. Neth, $\frac{4}{3}$, (1960), 603

8 J.Y. BUZARE, Thèse de 3ème cycle (1974) Université de Caen, unpublished

9 R.G. SHULMAN, s. SUGANO, Phys. Rev., 130, (1963), 306

lo R.G. SHULMAN, K. KNOX, Phys. Rev. 119, 1960, 94

11 M.B. WALKER, R.W.H. STEVENSON, Proc. Phys. Sot. 87. (1966). 35

12 J.J. ROUSSEAU, A. LEBLE, J.C. FAYET, J. Physique, 39, (1978), 1215

13 H.H. RINNEBERG, D.A. SHIRLEY, Phys. Rev. Lect., 30 (1973), 1147

14 J.J. ROUSSEAU, These d'Etat, Caen, unpublished

15 A.J. JACOBSON, L. MCBRIDE, B.E.F. FENCER, J. Phys. C7, 783 (1974)