Electron paramagnetic resonance measurements near the tricritical point in BaTiO₃
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We report electron paramagnetic resonance measurements on BaTiO₃, containing a dilute impurity of Fe³⁺, in its ferroelectric phase over a range of pressure and temperature near the paraelectric-ferroelectric phase transition line. We have developed an algorithm to analyze the data, allowing us to determine the values of the crystal field parameters and their temperature and pressure dependence required to reproduce the measured spectra. Then, using the Landau free energy expansion to sixth order in the order parameter and noting that the tetragonal distortion field D is proportional to the square of the order parameter, we determine the Landau parameters and get a value for the tricritical point for BaTiO₃.
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I. INTRODUCTION

The series of phase changes in the ABO₃ family of perovskites ranks among the most extensively studied of all structural phase transitions. BaTiO₃, a member of this family, is a prototype ferroelectric and has widespread applications in nonlinear optics and electro-optics. Its transition from the cubic-paraelectric state to the tetragonal-ferroelectric state results from a tetragonal distortion below the transition temperature Tc. As discussed by Samara,¹ this first-order, cubic-to-tetragonal, transition in BaTiO₃ changes to second order above a certain pressure. The point on the phase line where the order of the transition changes is called a tricritical point.² This transition, originally believed to be purely displacive, may have some order-disorder characteristics also.³

A displacive phase transition involves a shift of some atoms by small amounts from their symmetry positions in the higher-symmetry phase. The new positions change the symmetry and thus create a new crystal structure. Order-disorder transitions involve a disordered state, in the high-symmetry phase, in which the atoms are dynamically distributed uniformly over a set of equivalent sites which average to a symmetry position in the higher-symmetry phase, and at the transition the distribution changes to favor a subset of the equivalent sites which results in a new crystal symmetry.⁴

One can associate an order parameter with a change in an ion’s position relative to the unit cell for a displacive transition or the occupation of the various equivalent sites for an order-disorder transition. In the ferroelectric phase of BaTiO₃ the Ti⁴⁺ ion and its cage of O²⁻ ions are displaced relative to each other such as to create an electric dipole moment in each unit cell. This displacement can be used as the order parameter of the transition. Thus the order parameter is zero in the cubic phase, but in the ferroelectric phase the electric polarization vector, which is proportional to this displacement, can be used as the order parameter. A phase transition is considered first order if the order parameter changes discontinuously at the transition.

It appears to be a general property of second-order structural phase transitions to involve a lowering in the frequency of some vibrational mode, a “softening,” as Tc is approached. As the mode frequency decreases, the amplitude of vibration becomes larger and the anharmonic terms in the interatomic potential become more important near Tc. The structure of the new phase is determined by the eigenvector of the soft mode and the parent phase. The eigenvector of the mode is the array of atomic displacements relative to the lattice sites and is equivalent to the order parameter of the transition.

In a pressure- (P-) temperature (T) thermodynamic phase diagram, a critical point marks the end of a line of coexistence where two distinct coexisting phases become identical. If one considers a system with three thermodynamic variables, i.e., an electric field E in addition to P and T, then a critical point in P-T E space will become a continuous line of critical points in the P-T E space. These are lines of continuous phase transitions. Landau argued that a second-order continuous coexistence line separating two phases of different symmetry cannot end in a point and proposed that such a line would have to terminate by changing into a first-order transition line. This point is called a tricritical point.⁵ When viewed in a space of suitable thermodynamic variables, a tricritical point may be defined as the end point of a line of triple points at which three coexisting phases simultaneously become identical. Indeed, the term “tricritical point” was originally introduced by Griffith to indicate the confluence of three lines of ordinary critical points.⁶

At atmospheric pressure Tc is about 136 °C for pure barium titanate but is lowered by impurities such as iron in the lattice. Below Tc, at room temperature, the c axis is elongated about 0.6% and the a axes are shortened by about 0.3%, changing the symmetry from cubic to tetragonal. The tetragonal distortion alone does not produce the electric polarization but rather the rearrangement of the ions within the new unit cell. The Ti⁴⁺ ion, which was in the center of an oxygen cage, is displaced along the new c axis in a direction opposite to the displacement of the oxygen cage, thus creating a permanent electric dipole moment.⁷ There is strong evidence that the transition is associated with the instability of one of the optical phonon modes of the lattice. As the frequency of the relevant mode decreases and finally becomes unstable at the transition, the crystal transforms to the tetragonal phase. Whether the transition is purely displacive or partly order-disorder has not been answered definitively.

Several researchers have made measurements that have
hinted at a tricritical point in BaTiO$_3$. This was first suggested by Polandov et al.$^7$ who measured the effects of pressure to 10 kbar on the magnitude of the jump in the spontaneous polarization ($P_s$) at the ferroelectric transition. He discovered $\Delta P_s^2$ to decrease linearly with pressure and extrapolated it to go to zero at 17 kbar. This was the first estimate of the tricritical point. Samara$^1$ presented dielectric constant measurements to 19 kbar and noted that the transition still showed definite first-order behavior but a continuing trend toward becoming second order. From this he predicted the tricritical point to be in the range of 30–40 kbar. Clark and Benguigui$^8$ reported experimental measurements of a pressure-induced tricritical point at 34 kbar and 18 °C. Their results were probably affected by the sensitivity of this transition to nonhydrostatic stress. Decker and Zhao$^9$ made dielectric and polarization measurements in a hydrostatic medium to 38 kbar and reported that the phase transition appeared to go from first to second order near 35 kbar and $-40$ °C. They looked at both pure BaTiO$_3$ and butterfly crystals which have different phase lines and tricritical points because of their impurity content.

The object of this work was to use a more sensitive probe to observe the symmetry changes in the BaTiO$_3$ crystal structure. For this purpose we employed electron paramagnetic resonance (EPR), which is a good technique to study phase transitions because of its sensitivity to local symmetry changes in the crystal. This required the development of an apparatus which could make precision EPR measurements on single crystals in a hydrostatic environment over a region of pressures and temperatures never before accomplished. This study will contribute to a better understanding of the tetragonal-cubic phase transition and the tricritical point in BaTiO$_3$.

EPR is carried out by introducing into the lattice a paramagnetic probe ion in low concentration. Transition-metal ions such as Fe$^{3+}$ having a half-filled $d$ shell are particularly useful as probe ions. EPR studies of crystal symmetries and structural phase transitions have been pioneered by Müller and others in his laboratory.$^{10,11}$ Hornig et al.$^{12}$ made the first study of barium titanate. Since the ionic radius of Fe$^{3+}$ is 0.64 Å, which is close to that of the Ti$^{4+}$, 0.68 Å, it was assumed that Fe$^{3+}$ substitutes for Ti$^{4+}$ on the octahedral site. This assumption has been verified by Siegel and Müller$^{13}$ using Newmann superposition theory.

We introduce here the spin Hamiltonian $H$, in tetragonal symmetry, to facilitate further discussion of EPR results:

$$H = \beta \mathbf{B} \cdot \mathbf{g} \cdot \mathbf{S} + DS_z^2 + aS_x^2 + b(S_y^4 + S_z^4),$$  \hspace{1cm} (1)$$

where $\beta$ is the Bohr magneton, $\mathbf{B}$ is the magnetic field vector, and $\mathbf{S}$ is the spin operator with components $S_x, S_y, S_z$. The gyromagnetic ratio $\mathbf{g}$ is a $3 \times 3$ diagonal tensor which has two independent elements $g_\parallel$ and $g_\perp$ for the directions parallel and perpendicular to the $c$ axis. $D, a,$ and $b$ are crystal-field parameters. Because of the half filled $d$ shell in Fe$^{3+}$ the orbital angular momentum is quenched and this becomes an exact Hamiltonian.$^{14,15}$

Rimai and deMars$^{15}$ showed that $D$, measured with both Gd$^{3+}$ and Fe$^{3+}$ probes in BaTiO$_3$, was proportional to the lattice distortion and the square of the electric polarization in the ferroelectric phase. Sakudo$^{16}$ studied the effect of a dc electric field on the phase transitions in BaTiO$_3$. Müller and Berlinger$^{17}$ measured the pressure dependence of the cubic-crystalline field-splitting parameter $a$ to 3 kbar. [Note their $a$ is 6 times larger than that defined in Eq. (1).] They argued that the tetragonal-cubic transition in BaTiO$_3$ is more order-disorder in nature than displacive.

Several years ago Ellwanger$^{18}$ made the first EPR measurements in a pressure apparatus on BaTiO$_3$ butterfly crystals. The resonance peaks were very broad and the results had large uncertainties. Part of this work was published.$^{19}$ Our measurements are the first precision high-pressure EPR studies on a good single crystal of this material.

II. EXPERIMENTAL MEASUREMENT

A detailed description of the apparatus is given in the dissertation by Huang$^{20}$ and has already been published.$^{21}$ Briefly, we directed $X$-band radiation from a klystron into a right-circular-cylinder single-crystal sapphire of dimensions such as to be resonant in the TM$_{110}$ mode at $\sim 9.3$ GHz. The sapphire also served as one anvil of a high-pressure press. The other anvil was of titanium carbide. Between the two anvils was an Inconel 718 gasket of 0.3 mm thickness containing a hole of 1.1 mm diameter into which the sample and a small ruby fragment were placed. This hole was filled with petroleum ether to serve as a hydrostatic pressure medium. The sapphire was enclosed in a thin-walled copper can with openings to provide for coupling the microwaves to the cav-
ity and optical access for directing an argon laser beam onto the ruby to measure the pressure in the cell.\textsuperscript{22}

Modulation coils modulated the magnetic field at 100 kHz, and the dc magnetic field supplied by an electromagnet was calibrated at the sample position with an NMR probe. The estimated field reproducibility was about \( \pm 0.4 \) G. The EPR spectrometer recorded the derivative signal on a data file which could then be analyzed by computer.

We employed a small single-crystal of BaTiO\textsubscript{3} doped with 0.03 at.\% Fe\textsubscript{2}O\textsubscript{3} which was grown by J. Albers using the top-seeded solution technique.\textsuperscript{23} After orienting the crystal we used a wire saw to cut off a thin plate such that an \( a \) axis was normal to the plate and thus the plane of the plate contained the \( c \) axis and the other \( a \) axis. It was polished to a final thickness of 0.1 mm, and circular disks of 0.9 mm diameter were cut from the plate using a rotating “cookie” cutter and 600-grit SiC abrasive. The disk when placed in the high-pressure cell was easily oriented such that the magnetic field could be pointed parallel to the \( a \) or \( c \) axis merely by rotating the magnet through 90°. The pressure cell was attached to the cold head of a Displex helium gas refrigerator, and the system was surrounded by a vacuum chamber contained between the pole faces of the magnet. In this manner it was possible to cool the entire cell to temperatures of the order of 40 K. We controlled the temperature by an Air Product temperature controller and a heating element attached to the cooling head of the refrigerator. Temperatures could be controlled and measured to an accuracy of \( \pm 0.3 \) K.

We made EPR measurements at several pressures and temperatures in the ferroelectric phase near the phase transition; see Fig. 1. We tried to stay below the tetragonal-cubic transition because after passing the crystal into the cubic phase it would usually return to the tetragonal phase in a multidomain state, especially as one approaches the tricritical point where there is very little difference between the domains. The points shown in Fig. 1 came from four different runs, each terminating after once crossing the phase line or when the sample was crushed by the deformation of the gasket under high pressure. Our measurements below \( -30^\circ \)C were also unusable because the surrounding fluid became nonhydrostatic and the strains would create multidomains in the sample. The results from the 30 sets of data, each set containing 1–5 resonances with the magnetic field along the \( c \) axis and 1–5 resonances with the field along the \( a \) axis, were collected on a computer and then analyzed as described in the following section. These data are noted in the figure, and the different symbols designate to which run each data point belonged.

### III. ANALYSIS

The EPR spectral lines are derivatives of a Lorentzian-shaped signal, and ideally they should be represented by the expression below where \( R(B) \) is the resonance signal as a

\[
R(B) = \sum_{n=1}^{N} \frac{A_n}{B - B_n} + C
\]

where \( A_n \) are the line strengths, \( B_n \) are the resonance fields, and \( C \) is the baseline.
function of the magnetic field $B$:

$$R(B) = -Y_{pp}B_{pp}^3(B-B_c)/\left((B-B_c)^2 + \frac{3}{4}B_{pp}^2\right)^2,$$

where $Y_{pp}$ and $B_{pp}$ are the peak-to-peak signal height and peak-to-peak field width and $B_c$ is the center-field position of the resonance.

The measured resonance shapes are slightly unsymmetric and a nonlinear least-squares fitting of them to Eq. (2) revealed that each was a combination of two strongly overlapped Lorentzian derivatives. Fitting the resonance to two overlapped peaks each with the shape in Eq. (2) gave a $\chi^2$ value some 3–6 times smaller than for a single such line. In all of these double resonances one of the peaks had 3 ± 0.5 times the integrated intensity of the other. We chose the position of the resonance line as the weighted average position of the two individual resonances. Figure 2 shows two resonance spectra and the computer fit to the data. The superiority of the two-peak fit as compared to a one-peak fit is easily observed in the figure.

We are not as yet prepared to discuss the cause of the peak doubling. It may be due to the presence of vacancies causing different environments surrounding the Fe$^{3+}$ EPR probes or if the transition is order-disorder the Fe$^{3+}$ ions may not be in sites of exact tetragonal symmetry. We labeled the various resonances as $B_{ai}$ and $B_{ci}$ where the subscripts $a$ and $c$ mean the data was taken with the field $B$ along the $a$ or $c$ axis, respectively, and $i$ goes from 1 to 5 for the five principal transitions between the respective energy levels. We refer to the transitions between the spin eigenstates labeled by their dominant $z$ component of spin—i.e., $-\frac{1}{2}$ to $-\frac{1}{2}$, $-\frac{1}{2}$ to $-\frac{3}{2}$, $\frac{1}{2}$ to $-\frac{1}{2}$, $\frac{1}{2}$ to $\frac{1}{2}$, and $\frac{1}{2}$ to $\frac{3}{2}$, respectively, as shown in Fig. 3. The transitions resulted when the energy difference between the eigenvalues equaled the klystron frequency, and these are shown by the vertical lines in the figure. We labeled the different resonances 1–5 as shown in the figure.

The spin Hamiltonian of Eq. (1) can be written in matrix form using the standard representation of the spin-$5/2$ subspace as the basis vectors:

$$H = \begin{pmatrix}
5p + \xi & \sqrt{5}q & 0 & 0 & \sqrt{45}b & 0 \\
\sqrt{5}q^* & \frac{3}{2}p + \eta & \sqrt{8}q & 0 & 0 & \sqrt{45}b \\
0 & \sqrt{8}q^* & \frac{1}{2}p + \zeta & 3q & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 3q^* & \zeta - \frac{1}{2}p & \sqrt{8}q & 0 \\
\sqrt{45}b & 0 & 0 & \sqrt{8}q^* & \eta - \frac{3}{2}p & \sqrt{5}q \\
0 & \sqrt{45}b & 0 & 0 & \sqrt{5}q^* & \xi - \frac{5}{2}p
\end{pmatrix},$$

where

$$p = g_\parallel \beta B, \quad q = 0, \quad \text{for } B \parallel c \text{ axis},$$

$$p = 0, \quad q = \frac{1}{2} g_\parallel \beta B, \quad \text{for } B \parallel a \text{ axis},$$

$$\xi = 25D/4 + 625a/16 + 65b/8,$$

$$\eta = 9D/4 + 81a/16 + 241b/8,$$

$$\zeta = D/4 + a/16 + 401b/8.$$  

There will be six eigenvalues corresponding to the six spin states $m$ of the spin-$5/2$ manifold. The principal resonances result from the five dominant transitions between these eigenstates with $\Delta m = \pm 1$. The gyromagnetic ratio $g_\parallel$

A. First approach to extracting the crystal-field parameters

With the field along the $c$ axis, where $q = 0$, the spin Hamiltonian can be diagonalized algebraically using MAPLE V to get the eigenenergies $E_i$. The subscript $i$ orders them by ascending energy at a large magnetic field, as a function of $g_\parallel, B, D, a, \text{ and } b$. Then we solve Eq. (5) shown below, for the resonance field, $B_{ci}$ where $h$ is Planck’s constant and $\nu_i$ is the klystron frequency at the $i$th resonance line:

$$E_{i+1} - E_i = h \nu_i.$$
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This gives us the field positions of the five principal resonances with the field along the $c$ axis. This equation for $i = 3$ can be solved for $g_\parallel$, i.e.,

$$g_\parallel = h \nu_3 / \beta B c_3.$$  \hfill (6)

The other equations for $i = 1, 2, 4, 5$ give fourth-order equations and are not readily solvable. We therefore substituted, into Eq. (5), $B_\alpha = B_\alpha + h_\alpha$, $D = D_0 + d$, $a = a_0 + \delta a$, and $b = b_0 + \delta b$, where $B_{\alpha i}$ is the measured value of the field at the resonance, and $D_0$, $a_0$, and $b_0$ are estimates for these crystal-field parameters for that particular data set. We then expanded Eq. (5) to lowest order in $h_\alpha$, $d$, $\delta a$, and $\delta b$ with $g_\parallel$ taken from Eq. (6) and $\nu_\parallel$ being the measured resonance frequency. Solving we get $h_\alpha$ as a function of $(d, \delta a, \delta b)$.

For the spectrum taken with the field along the $a$ axis one must take a different approach since the Hamiltonian matrix cannot be diagonalized analytically. We first block diagonalize the matrix into two $3 \times 3$ blocks using the unitary transformation which has $+ \sqrt{2}$ along the three top elements of the principal diagonal and all along the secondary diagonal and $- \sqrt{2}$ for the lower three elements of the principal diagonal to get

$$H = \begin{pmatrix}
\xi & \sqrt{5}(q+3b) & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\sqrt{5}(q+3b) & \eta & \sqrt{8}q & 0 & 0 \\
0 & \sqrt{8}q & \xi+3q & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & \xi-3q & \sqrt{8}q \\
0 & 0 & 0 & \sqrt{8}q & \eta & \sqrt{5}(q-3b)
\end{pmatrix},$$  \hfill (7)

with $q, \xi, \eta$, and $\zeta$ defined as functions of $B, D, a, b$, and $g_\parallel$ by Eq. (4).

One then chooses initial values for $D = D_0$, $a = a_0$, $b = b_0$, $g_\perp = g_\parallel = g_0$, where $g_\parallel$ is taken from the analysis along the $c$ axis; and $B_{\alpha i} = B_{\alpha i}$, the measured values of the resonance fields. This turns Eq. (7) into a numerical matrix $H_0$. $H_0$ is then diagonalized using the Jacobi method for each of its two blocks. Then we make the substitution $D = D_0 + d$, $a = a_0 + \delta a$, $b = b_0 + \delta b$, $g_\perp = g_\parallel + \gamma$, and $B_{\alpha i} = B_{\alpha i} + h_\alpha$, into the Hamiltonian matrix, Eq. (7), and proceed using the same transformation matrices that diagonalized $H_0$. We conclude with a second-order perturbation calculation to get the final eigenenergies. Putting these eigenenergies into Eq. (5) and expanding to lowest order in the parameters $d$, $\delta a$, $\delta b$, $\gamma$, and $h_\alpha$, we solve for the five principal transition fields $h_\alpha(d, \delta a, \delta b, \gamma)$.

Since $h_\alpha$ and $h_\alpha$ are the differences between the calculated and measured resonance fields, we minimize $\Sigma[(h_\alpha / \delta B_{\alpha i})^2 + (h_\alpha / \delta B_{\alpha i})^2]$ by varying $d$, $\delta a$, $\delta b$, and $\gamma$, where $\delta B_{\alpha i}$ and $\delta B_{\alpha i}$ are the uncertainties in the measured resonance fields determined in the least-squares fitting to the line positions. This gives us a new set of values $D_0, a_0, b_0$, and $g_\parallel$ to start the iteration over again until convergence is attained.

In this manner we could determine a value of the crystal field parameters for 28 of the 30 sets of data which had greater than 5 measured resonances. These results are given in Huang’s dissertation.\textsuperscript{20} However, 3 of these sets had only 6 measured resonances and thus only 1 degree of freedom, and 9 had only 2 degrees of freedom, so there was considerable scatter or uncertainty in the results. It was also noted that plotting $a$ and $g_\parallel$ versus $D$ along isothersms showed systematic variations with temperature. Thus we decided upon a more sophisticated analysis to allow us to use all the data and remove most of the scatter.

B. More sophisticated analysis of the data

At this point we consider the following. The parameter $D$ varies as the square of the order parameter,\textsuperscript{15} jumping from zero in the cubic phase to a finite value in the tetragonal phase where the transition is first order or rising with an initial infinite slope upon entering the tetragonal phase where the transition is second order. In the cubic phase the crystal field parameters $a = b$, but they separate discontinuously or with an initial infinite slope upon entering the tetragonal phase, depending on the order of the transition. The same is true for $g_\parallel$ and $g_\perp$. Thus we assume that $g_\perp - g_\parallel$ and $b - a$ are both proportional to $D$ with the average value of $(a + 2b)/3$ and $(g_\parallel + 2g_\perp)/3$ being simple functions of pressure and temperature. According to the experimental results of Müller and Berlinger\textsuperscript{17} they may be taken as linear functions. We let

$$a_k = a_0 + p P_k + T_k - 2 n D_k,$$
$$b_k = a_0 + 3 n D_k,$$
$$g_\parallel k = g_\parallel 0 + \rho P_k + \tau T_k - 2 f D_k,$$
$$g_\perp k = g_\perp 0 + 3 f D_k.$$  \hfill (8)

$a_0$ and $g_0$ are the values of $\langle a \rangle$ and $\langle g \rangle$ at some chosen point in the $P$, $T$ plane. We choose this point to be the tricritical
point \((P_c, T_c)\). To start the fitting, we initially make an intelligent guess for \(P_c\) and \(T_c\). The \(k\)’s index each data set where \(P_k\) and \(T_k\) are its pressure and temperature relative to the tricritical point. We then did a least-squares fit to the entire set of the 220 resonance lines simultaneously with the 38 variable parameters \(a_0, p, \tau, n, g_0, \rho, \sigma, f,\) and \(D_k\) for each \(k\) from 1 to 30. This left 182 degrees of freedom.

This analysis was done by creating another MAPLE program in a manner similar to the algorithm explained above. Beginning with an initial set of values for the \(D_k\)’s and for \(a_0, p, \tau, n, g_0, \rho, \sigma, f,\) and \(f\), we again did the least-squares fitting of the spin Hamiltonians in both the \(a\) and \(c\) directions for all sets of resonance-field values. The least-squares fitting program also determined a statistical error for each of the variable parameters. There was one other correction that was made to the data. The resonances along the \(a\)-axis measurement seemed always to disagree slightly from those along the \(c\) axis. We therefore assumed that the process of rotating the magnet may give an offset to the field measurement. All the field calibrations were taken with the magnet aligned along the direction where we positioned the \(c\) axis of the crystal. We therefore subtracted a small amount from the resonance field values for the \(a\) axis measurements and varied the amount subtracted to give a minimum in the \(\chi^2\) of the fit discussed above. This amounted to a 2.3 G correction.

**IV. RESULTS**

The results of the analysis are given in Table I. With the high precision of the measurement and the method of analysis the values of \(D\), at each point, are accurate to \(\pm 0.006\) GHz (2\(\sigma\)), for all points except the point nearest the transition where \(D = 0.067(26)\) GHz. From the results in the table one can calculate \(a\) and \(b\), as well as \(g_1\) and \(g_2\), at any pressure and temperature where \(D\) is known using Eqs. (8). For example at room temperature and zero pressure where \(D = 2.7\) GHz, we calculate \(g_1 = 2.0070 \pm 0.0006\) and \(g_2 = 0.0096 \pm 0.0006\) which are in good agreement with Hornig et al.\(^{12}\) who reported \(g_1 = 2.00 \pm 0.01\).

We now turn to an analysis of the temperature and pressure dependence of \(D\). Since \(D\) is proportional to the square of the order parameter, we begin with the Landau expansion of the free energy near the phase transition in the tetragonal phase:

\[
G = G_0 + AP_s^2 + BP_s^4 + CP_s^6,
\]

where \(G_0\) is the Gibbs free energy of the cubic phase, and \(P_s\) is the polarization, which can be considered the order parameter. This is a mean-field analysis. The coefficient \(A\) must vary with temperature and pass zero at the phase transition. In a like manner it must also be a function of pressure. Huijbrugeste and Young\(^{24}\) showed a significant temperature dependence of \(B\) and we would include pressure dependence. The parameter \(C\) must be everywhere positive for stability.

The minima of \(G(P_s)\) define the physical states of the system. If the minimum is at \(P_s = 0\), then the cubic phase is the stable state, but if the minimum is at \(P_s \neq 0\), then the tetragonal-ferroelectric state is the stable state. There is a root of \(G' = dG/dP_s = 0\) at \(P_s = 0\) and other roots found from \(G'' = d^2G/dP_s^2 = 0\). Since \(G, G', G''\), and \(G''\) are all functions of \(P_s^2\), we define \(Q = P_s^2\). We now calculate the value of \(Q\) at the minimum of \(G\) to get the result

\[
Q = \frac{B}{3C} + \sqrt{\frac{B}{3C}^2 - \frac{A}{3C}}.
\]

As we mentioned above, \(D\) is proportional to the square of the order parameter; thus \(D\) is proportional to \(Q\). In the neighborhood of the tricritical point we let \(A\) and \(B\) be linear functions of pressure and temperature and \(C\) be a constant, so from Eq. (10)

\[
D = -\epsilon\left[T - T_c + s(P - P_c)\right] + \sqrt{\epsilon^2 [T - T_c + s(P - P_c)]^2 - \alpha[T - T_c + r(P - P_c)]},
\]

where \(\alpha, \epsilon, r,\) and \(s\) are constants while \(T_c\) and \(P_c\) are the temperature and pressure at the tricritical point.

To justify the above arguments we refer to a paper by Iniguez et al.\(^{25}\) They made a first-principles study of \(\text{BaTiO}_3\) and found that the sixth-order potential expansion properly accounts for the system over a large range of temperature, but the temperature dependence of the coefficients was not a trivial function. However, an examination of their figure showing the explicit temperature dependence of the coefficients from 0 to 350 K reveals that a linear dependence of \(A\) and \(B\) and a constant \(C\) is a very good approximation over the range of temperatures in this experiment.

The measured values for the tetragonal distortion \(D\) were fitted to Eq. (11) by least squares analysis with a \(c + c\) nonlinear least-squares program, with \(\alpha, \epsilon, T_c, P_c, s,\) and \(r\) as variable parameters to get the following results:

\[
\alpha = 0.04002(46), \quad \epsilon = 0.00312(23), \quad T_c = -32.6(5.8) \ ^\circ C, \quad P_c = 36.8(1.6) \ \text{kbar},
\]

\[
r = 3.684(41) \ \text{K/kbar}, \quad s = 8.09(60) \ \text{K/kbar}.
\]

These results of the fitting are shown in Fig. 4 where we compare the values of \(D\) measured along isotherms versus
the results calculated from Eq. (11) using the values of $\alpha$, $\epsilon$, $T_c$, $P_c$, $r$, and $s$ shown above. We show in Fig. 5 the $P$, $T$ phase plane of the region near the ferroelectric-paraelectric transition. Shown in this figure are the calculated lines where the Landau parameters $A = 0$ and $B = 0$, and the transition line where the Gibbs free energies of the cubic and tetragonal phases are equal. The point where both $A$ and $B$ are zero is the tricritical point. The transition extrapolates to $109 \pm (6)$ °C at atmospheric pressure which is reasonable for a sample with iron impurities. There is a strong correlation between $T_c$ and $P_c$ in the fitting so the minimum of $\chi^2$ lies along a trough as shown in the figure.

V. CONCLUSIONS

We have presented a unique analysis of high-precision EPR data which allows a precise study of the pressure and temperature dependence of the crystal-field parameters in $\text{BaTiO}_3$. The analyses of former EPR measurements on $\text{BaTiO}_3$ have approximated the spin Hamiltonian by assuming $D > a, b, a = b$, and $g_\parallel = g_\perp$. The only former results with narrow enough resonance lines to get precision measurements are those by Müller and Berlinger. It is important to use single crystals with the smallest amount of strain possible to achieve sufficiently narrow resonance lines to determine the line positions accurately. We have shown that it is possible to determine individually $a$ and $b$ as well as $g_\parallel$ and $g_\perp$ using such a $\text{BaTiO}_3$ crystal, with careful calibration of the magnetic field and precision measurements of the klystron frequency. In this manner we were able to determine the crystal-field parameters by fitting the resonance measurements to the exact spin Hamiltonian without approximating the eigenvalues or ignoring differences between small terms. The average value of $a$ and $b$ is $\langle a \rangle = (a + 2b)/3$ and of $g_\parallel$ and $g_\perp$ is $\langle g \rangle = (g_\parallel + 2g_\perp)/3$. Then by making a linear approximation for the temperature and pressure dependence of these average values along with the proposition that the differences $b - a$ and $g_\perp - g_\parallel$ are proportional to $D$, we are able to analyze all the data simultaneously. The assumption of $b - a$ being proportional to $D$ seems reasonable since $b - a$ and $D$ both depend upon symmetry breaking from the cubic phase. The dependence of $g_\perp - g_\parallel$ on $D$ was also assumed to be linear, but the measured resonances could be fitted equally well if the dependence was quadratic.

The temperature and pressure dependence of $\langle a \rangle$ does not agree with the results of Müller and Berlinger, but in order to compare with the values given in that paper we must recognize that the term which they label $a$ is 6 times larger than the parameter which we labeled $a$. However, even after dividing their values by 6 to compare with our results, their results are still a factor of 2–3 times larger than ours. Their pressure range, however, was so small that the discrepancy could be within their scatter, but their temperature range was much larger, and we do not know why their results differ so much from ours. Their values of $a$ were measured in the cubic phase and gave nearly zero-temperature dependence. They refer to the value...
of a given by Hornig et al.\textsuperscript{12} at room temperature in the tetragonal phase. This value agrees well with the result we would have at room temperature and atmospheric pressure but Müller and Berlinger’s a versus temperature measurements do not extrapolate to that value.

Using Eqs. (8) we calculate $a = 0.0461 \text{ GHz}$, $b = 0.0509 \text{ GHz}$, and $\langle a \rangle = 0.0493 \pm 0.0005 \text{ GHz}$. Hornig et al. reported the value at room temperature of $12a + 9b = 0.95 \pm 0.21 \text{ GHz}$. We get $1.011 \pm 0.010 \text{ GHz}$, which is in very good agreement.

Müller and Berlinger used their large values of the temperature and pressure derivatives of a for BaTiO$_3$ as compared to those measured for other cubic oxides to argue for an enhanced anharmonicity of the Ti ion in BaTiO$_3$ and argue that it “confirms the substantial order-disorder character in BaTiO$_3$.” Our results negate those conclusions. We also conclude that there is a tricritical point in BaTiO$_3$ which is near $-33^\circ \text{ C}$ and 37 kbar.
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