



Fig. 1. Pressure dependence of the Curie temperature in Fe_2P and $\text{Fe}_2\text{P}_{0.9}\text{As}_{0.1}$.

using a gas generator with a vibrating-coil magnetometer, as described previously.⁴ The Curie-temperatures T_C were obtained at low (100 Oe) fields, and plots of T_C vs hydrostatic pressure P are shown in Fig. 1. The points are experimental, and the solid lines are the analytic functions (with P in kbar and ΔT_C in $^\circ\text{C}$)

$$P = -0.252(\Delta T_C) - 0.0012(\Delta T_C)^2 \text{ for } \text{Fe}_2\text{P} \quad (1)$$

$$P = -0.71(\Delta T_C) - 0.0017(\Delta T_C)^2 \text{ for } \text{Fe}_2\text{P}_{0.9}\text{As}_{0.1} \quad (2)$$

Extrapolation of eq. (1) to the extremum defined by $\partial P/\partial(\Delta T_C) = 0$ gives a critical pressure $P_C = 13.3$ kbar above which the ground state of Fe_2P should no longer be ferromagnetic.

Surprisingly, there was no significant change with pressure in the magnetization per molecule, μ , at 58K. Examination of μ vs the applied field H at $T = 58\text{K}$ showed no appreciable change on passing from 1 atm to 10 kbar pressure. However, measurement of μ vs T/T_C for Fe_2P gave strikingly different results for 1 atm and 10 kbar. At $H = 10$ kOe, the inflection in μ vs T occurs at $T \approx 1.07 T_C$ at $P = 1$ atm, but at $T \approx 1.15 T_C$ at $P = 10$ kbar. Furthermore, an extraordinarily large exchange enhancement of the susceptibility, which extends to temperatures well above T_C , is markedly greater at 10 kbar than at 1 atm. At $P = 10$ kbar and $T = 1.02 T_C$, a plot of μ vs H is extremely nonlinear, resembling the initial magnetization curve of a ferromagnet at $T < T_C$.

DISCUSSION

If the moment of Fe_2P were reduced from $\mu_0 = 3.0\mu_B$ because of conduction-band overlap of E_F , pressure should change z_d , and hence μ_0 ,

more dramatically than T_C . Therefore, we conclude that the moment of Fe_2P is reduced because the molecular fields are not strong enough to empty all the antibonding states of antiparallel spin.

The existence of antiparallel-spin electrons in the ground state would create a ferromagnetic spin-density wave in the magnetically ordered phase (antiparallel-spin excited electrons create spin waves), and a spin-density wave reflects a long-range antiferromagnetic component to the interatomic-exchange interactions. Since longer M-M separations decrease the width of the 3d bands, the relative importance of this antiferromagnetic component must decrease with increasing As concentration x , which would account for the sharp rise with x in T_C (from 221 to 443K)² over the interval $0 \leq x \leq 0.33$. On the other hand, pressure would increase the antiferromagnetic component, and the critical pressure P_C presumably marks a transition from a ferromagnetic spin-density wave to a metamagnetic state.

The remarkable susceptibility above T_C in Fe_2P , and its enhancement by pressure, would seem to indicate that T_C is suppressed by pressure more rapidly than is the paramagnetic Curie temperature θ . Suppression of T_C relative to θ by weak, long-range antiferromagnetic interactions has been observed⁵ in the metamagnetic thiospinel $Zn[Cr_2]S_4$, which contains localized 3d electrons. In Fe_2P , the ferromagnetic short-range order above T_C must be exceptional and appears to extend well above T_C , although the magnetic interactions are three-dimensional. This behavior is quite different from that found in $CoS_{2-x}Se_x$, where the ferromagnetic moment is also reduced because the bandwidth is too large.⁶ The $CoS_{2-x}Se_x$ 3d bands are broadened with x , and the ferromagnetic-to-metamagnetic transition is marked by a reduction in θ that makes $\theta < T_C$.⁷

Within the molecular-field approximation, the paramagnetic Curie temperature θ is given by

$$\theta = (2/3k)S(S+1) \sum_v z_{uv} J_{uv} \quad (3)$$

where z_{uv} is the number of v atoms near-neighbor to a u atom. If the interatomic exchange energy falls off more rapidly than linearly with decreasing atomic separation, then

$$J_{uv} \approx \sum_{\ell} J_{uv\ell}^0 \sum_j \left[1 + \beta_{uv}^j \epsilon_j - \frac{1}{2} (\gamma_{uv}^j \epsilon_j)^2 + \dots \right] \quad (4)$$

The $J_{uv\ell}^0$ are components of the uv exchange interaction in the unstrained sample ($P = 0$) and $\beta_{uv}^j > 0$ because an $\epsilon_j < 0$ increases the 3d bandwidth, thereby lowering J_{uv} . The strain at equilibrium is given by⁴

$$\epsilon_j = \sum_i K_{ji} \left[\sum_{u,v} (\partial J_{uv} / \partial \epsilon_i) \vec{S}_u \cdot \vec{S}_v - P + T \sum_k \alpha_k c_{ki} \right] \quad (5)$$

where $K_{ji} = \text{cofactor } c_{ij} / (\text{determinant } c_{ij})$, \vec{S}_u and \vec{S}_v are the thermodynamic expectation values of the spins at sites u and v , α_k is a thermal-expansion coefficient, and the c_{ki} are elastic constants. Since μ_0 appears to be