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#### Abstract

Average and principal magnetic susceptibilities of $\left[\mathrm{Co}(\mathrm{py})_{4} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right],\left[\mathrm{Co}(\mathrm{py})_{4} \mathrm{Br}_{2} \text { ], and [Co(acetylacetone) }\right)_{2}(\mathrm{py})_{2}$ ] in the temperature range $80-300 \mathrm{~K}$ are reported. Interpretation within the low-symmetry angular overlap model, described recently, are characterized by fits describing an approximately linear relationship between the $\pi$-bonding parameters. The indeterminacy of absolute $e_{\pi}$ parameter values is a consequence of the high symmetry in these molecules, actual or effective. The relative contributions of $\pi$-bonding between different ligands and with respect to different directions all appear compatible with otherwise establish ed chemical criteria.


We have recently reported ${ }^{\mathbf{1}}$ studies of the magnetic anisotropies of trans- $\left[\mathrm{M}(\mathrm{py})_{4}(\mathrm{NCS})_{2}\right]\left(\mathrm{M}=\mathrm{Co}^{\mathrm{II}}\right.$ or $\left.\mathrm{Ni}^{\mathrm{II}}\right)$ in which experimental data were fitted to an angular overlap based model in which no restriction to axial or higher symmetry is required. These complexes were considered at the outset of the work to be less than ideal in that the anisotropy associated with the thiocyanate groups introduced an extra parameter whose magnitude might not be checked easily against expectation. The general orientations of the magnetic ellipsoids in those molecules derived partly from this anisotropic $\pi$-bonding, removing as it does the molecular two-fold symmetry otherwise established by the pyridine ligands. It therefore seemed worthwhile to make similar studies on corresponding molecules not complicated by this feature. Of particular interest is the question of whether higher molecular symmetry helps or hinders the definition of angular overlap parameters. The present study concerns the magnetic properties of $\left[\mathrm{Co}(\mathrm{py})_{4} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right]$ and $\left[\mathrm{Co}(\mathrm{py})_{4} \mathrm{Br}_{2}\right]$. The role of molecular tetragonality emerges as an important feature in this work and our inclusion of a similar study of [Co(acetylacetone) $\left.)_{2}(\mathrm{py})_{2}\right]$ bears on the subject of approximations to such high molecular symmetry.

## EXPERIMENTAL

The chlorine and bromine complexes were prepared by dissolving the cobalt halides in a mixture of acetone and an excess of pyridine to yield dark blue solutions. Water was removed from the solutions using 2,2-dimethoxypropane. When set aside the solutions yielded rose and rose-violet crystals of $\left[\mathrm{Co}(\mathrm{py})_{4} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right]$ and $\left[\mathrm{Co}(\mathrm{py})_{4} \mathrm{Br}_{2}\right]$, respectively. The complex $\left[\mathrm{Co}(\text { acetylacetone })_{2}(\mathrm{py})_{2}\right]$ was prepared similarly, but using stoicheiometric amounts of pyridine, since a mixture of adducts with the general formula $\left.\left[\mathrm{Co}_{x} \text { (acetylacetone }\right)_{y}(\mathrm{py})_{z}\right]$ are known ${ }^{2}$ to form with an excess of pyridine. The solution yielded orange crystals of $\left[\mathrm{Co}(\text { acetylacetone })_{2}(\mathrm{py})_{2}\right]$. Satisfactory $\mathrm{C}, \mathrm{N}$, and H analyses were obtained for all three complexes.

The complex $\left[\mathrm{Co}(\mathrm{py})_{4} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right]$ crystallizes in the tetragonal crystal class. ${ }^{3}$ Rose-coloured needles were obtained, elongated parallel to the unique $c$ axis, as checked by $X$-ray oscillation photography. The crystal magnetic anisotropy $\Delta \chi=\chi_{\perp}-\chi_{i l}$ was measured in the temperature range $300-80 \mathrm{~K}$ by Krishnan's critical torque technique for

[^0]crystals mounted perpendicular to the needle axis. Powder susceptibilities were measured by the Gouy method in the same temperature range. The results are listed in interpolated form in Table 1.

Table 1
Interpolated susceptibilities $\left(\times 10^{-6} \mathrm{c}\right.$. g.s.u. $)$ for $\left[\mathrm{Co}(\mathrm{py})_{4} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right]$

| $T / K$ | $\bar{x}$ | $\chi_{\perp}-\chi_{\\|}$ | $\chi_{\perp}$ | $\chi_{\\|!}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: |
| 290 | 10810 | 2360 | 11600 | 9240 |
| 280 | 11170 | 2500 | 12000 | 9500 |
| 270 | 11530 | 2660 | 12420 | 9760 |
| 260 | 11900 | 2850 | 12850 | 10000 |
| 250 | 12310 | 3050 | 13320 | 10290 |
| 240 | 12790 | 3250 | 13870 | 10620 |
| 230 | 13970 | 3490 | 14430 | 10940 |
| 220 | 13810 | 3730 | 15050 | 11320 |
| 210 | 14420 | 3970 | 15740 | 11770 |
| 200 | 15080 | 4240 | 16490 | 12250 |
| 190 | 15730 | 4550 | 17250 | 12700 |
| 180 | 16580 | 4900 | 18210 | 13310 |
| 170 | 17240 | 5290 | 19000 | 13710 |
| 160 | 18200 | 5700 | 20100 | 14400 |
| 150 | 18780 | 6160 | 20830 | 14670 |
| 140 | 20300 | 6800 | 22570 | 15770 |
| 130 | 21440 | 7550 | 23960 | 16410 |
| 120 | 22890 | 8500 | 25720 | 17220 |
| 110 | 24570 | 9600 | 27770 | 18170 |
| 100 | 26550 | 10400 | 30020 | 19620 |
| 90 | 28950 | 12500 | 33120 | 20620 |

The complex $\left[\mathrm{Co}(\mathrm{py})_{4} \mathrm{Br}_{2}\right]$ belongs to the orthorhombic crystal class. ${ }^{4}$ Rose-violet hexagonal plates and blocks formed which on exposure to air deteriorated rapidly with loss of pyridine and the formation of a light blue powder. Gouy tubes were packed under a pyridine atmosphere and stoppered. For anisotropy work several coatings of shellac were found sufficient to prevent crystal decomposition. Difficulties associated with electrostatic adhesion of the crystals to the walls of the cryostat, however, necessitated the use both of fairly small crystals (ca. 1 mg ) and low magnetic fields with a consequent reduction in accuracy. Anisotropies were measured with crystals mounted parallel to $b$ and $c$ axes only. The anisotropy in the $b c$ plane was too small to measure under the conditions just mentioned: however, the small magnitude of $\Delta \chi_{a}$ is confirmed by the very close similarity in the magnitudes of $\Delta \chi_{b}$ and $\Delta \chi_{c}$. Results for powder susceptibilities and crystal anisotropies in the temperature range $300-80 \mathrm{~K}$ are collected in Table 2.

The complex [Co(acetylacetone) $\left.)_{2}(\mathrm{py})_{2}\right]$ crystallizes in both orthorhombic and monoclinic forms. ${ }^{2,5}$ In the orthorhombic form, the trans-pyridine groups are staggered.
${ }^{3}$ M. A. Porai-Koshits, Trudy Inst., Krist. Akad. Nauk, S.S.S.R., 1955, 19.

4 Structure Reports, 1958, 22, 782.
${ }^{5}$ J. T. Haskagen and J. P. Fadcher, jun., J. Amer. Chem. Soc., 1965, 87, 2821.

The monoclinic form is isomorphous with [ Ni (acetylacetone $\left.)_{2}(\mathrm{py})_{2}\right]$ in which the trans-pyridines are eclipsed. The isomorphism of the compound prepared here with the nickel compound was established by both $X$-ray powder

Table 2
Interpolated susceptibilities ( $\times 10^{-6}$ c.g.s.u.) for

$$
\left[\mathrm{Co}(\mathrm{py})_{4} \mathrm{Br}_{2}\right]
$$

| T/K | $\bar{\chi}$ | $\chi_{\text {a }}-\chi_{c}$ | $\chi_{\mathrm{a}}$ - $\chi_{\text {b }}$ | $\chi$ a | $\chi^{\text {b }}$ | $\chi_{\text {c }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 290 | 10730 | 900 | 900 | 11330 | 10430 | 10430 |
| 280 | 11040 | 960 | 960 | 11680 | 10720 | 10720 |
| 270 | 11360 | 1030 | 1030 | 12050 | 11020 | 11020 |
| 260 | 11730 | 1100 | 1100 | 12460 | 11360 | 11370 |
| 250 | 12210 | 1170 | 1180 | 12990 | 11810 | 11820 |
| 240 | 12650 | 1260 | 1280 | 13500 | 12220 | 12230 |
| 230 | 13180 | 1360 | 1370 | 14090 | 12720 | 12730 |
| 220 | 13630 | 1460 | 1480 | 14610 | 13130 | 13180 |
| 210 | 14140 | 1580 | 1590 | 15200 | 13610 | 13620 |
| 200 | 14770 | 1700 | 1700 | 15910 | 14200 | 14200 |
| 190 | 15330 | 1860 | 1830 | 16560 | 14730 | 14700 |
| 180 | 15900 | 2020 | 1980 | 17230 | 15260 | 15210 |
| 170 | 16650 | 2180 | 2160 | 18100 | 15940 | 15910 |
| 160 | 17290 | 2360 | 2370 | 18870 | 16490 | 16510 |
| 150 | 18110 | 2570 | - 580 | 19830 | 17250 | 17260 |
| 140 | 18920 | 2800 | 2810 | 20790 | 17980 | 17960 |
| 130 | 20000 | 3070 | 3100 | 22060 | 18960 | 18990 |
| 120 | 21210 | 3410 | 3420 | 23490 | 20060 | 20080 |
| 110 | 22840 | 3790 | 3780 | 25360 | 21590 | 21570 |
| 100 | 24920 | 4220 | 4150 | 27710 | 23160 | 23490 |
| 90 | 26870 | 4710 | 4630 | 29980 | 25350 | 25280 |

photography and by oscillation and Weissenberg photography of single crystals. The habit adopted by the monoclinic cobalt crystal is shown in Figure 1.


Figure 1 Crystal habit for the monoclinic modification of [Co(acetylacetone $\left.)_{2}(\mathrm{py})_{2}\right]$

Crystal magnetic anisotropies from 300 to 80 K were determined in the $a c$ plane using crystals with $b$ mounted parallel to the torsion fibre using the Krishnan technique. The orientations of the principal crystal susceptibilities $\chi_{1}$ and $\chi_{2}$ in the ac plane were determined using the ' wheel ' technique described earlier and the results in Figure 2 define $\phi$ as $-13^{\circ}$. Subsequent crystal anisotropy measurements with $\chi_{1}$ and $\chi_{2}$ parallel to the torsion fibre were made from 300 to 80 K . Throughout this temperature range the cyclic sum of the three anisotropies $\Delta \chi_{1}, \Delta \chi_{2}$, and $\Delta \chi_{3}$ vanishes within experimental error, indicating little variation in $\phi$ with temperature. Powder susceptibilities were measured at similar temperatures by the Gouy method and interpolated results from all magnetic measurements are collected in Table 3.

Fitting Procedure for $\left[\mathrm{Co}(\mathrm{py})_{4} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right]$.-As in the earlier paper, ${ }^{1}$ susceptibilities are calculated using the general model described earlier ${ }^{6}$ within a basis of the free-ion spinquartet terms, ${ }^{4} P+{ }^{4} F$. We may anticipate some difficulty applying the model to the present system in that the molecules possess exact $C_{4}$ symmetry and are characterized by only two different principal susceptibilities, $\chi_{\| l}$ and $\chi_{\perp}$.

[^1]On the other hand, this decrease in experimental information is offset to some extent by the isotropic bonding nature of the trans-axial halide ligands: thus we take $e_{\pi x}(\mathrm{Cl})=e_{\pi y}(\mathrm{Cl})$, leaving a parameter set $B, \xi, e_{\sigma}(\mathrm{Cl})$, $e_{\sigma}(\mathrm{py}), e_{\pi}(\mathrm{Cl}), e_{\pi}(\mathrm{py}), k$ with definitions as set out previously. ${ }^{1}$


Figure 2 [Co(acetylacetone) $\left.)_{2}(\mathrm{py})_{2}\right]$ : angular variation of magnetic anisotropy in crystal ac plane; inset shows axis orientation with magnetic field horizontal in plane of paper

Table 3
Interpolated susceptibilities ( $\times 10^{-6}$ c.g.s.u.) for [Co(acetylacetone $\left.)_{2}(\mathrm{py})_{2}\right]$

| $T / \mathrm{K}$ | $\chi$ | $\chi_{2}-\chi_{3}$ | $\chi_{2}-\chi_{1}$ | $\chi_{1}{ }^{-} \chi_{3}$ | $\chi_{1}$ | $\chi_{2}$ | $\chi_{3}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 300 | 9760 | 3700 | 1900 | 1750 | 9710 | 11610 | 7960 |
| 290 | 10070 | 3800 | 2000 | 1800 | 10000 | 12000 | 8200 |
| 280 | 10350 | 4000 | 2120 | 1850 | 10260 | 12380 | 8410 |
| 270 | 10700 | 4220 | 2270 | 1900 | 10580 | 12850 | 8680 |
| 260 | 11160 | 4500 | 2430 | 1950 | 11000 | 13430 | 9050 |
| 250 | 11610 | 4720 | 2650 | 2000 | 11390 | 14040 | 9390 |
| 240 | 12120 | 5000 | 2870 | 2080 | 11860 | 14740 | 9780 |
| 230 | 12730 | 5320 | 3100 | 2200 | 12430 | 15530 | 10230 |
| 220 | 13230 | 5700 | 3350 | 2400 | 12910 | 16260 | 10510 |
| 210 | 13770 | 6100 | 3600 | 2600 | 13440 | 17040 | 10840 |
| 200 | 14420 | 6550 | 3900 | 2790 | 14050 | 17950 | 11260 |
| 190 | 15100 | 7000 | 4290 | 2900 | 14640 | 18930 | 11740 |
| 180 | 15870 | 7500 | 4650 | 3090 | 15340 | 20020 | 12250 |
| 170 | 16720 | 8200 | 5100 | 3300 | 16120 | 21220 | 12820 |
| 160 | 17610 | 8850 | 5580 | 3600 | 16950 | 22530 | 13350 |
| 150 | 18510 | 9700 | 6100 | 3900 | 17780 | 23880 | 13880 |
| 140 | 19640 | 10620 | 6780 | 4200 | 18780 | 25560 | 14580 |
| 130 | 20870 | 11800 | 7550 | 4650 | 19910 | 27460 | 15260 |
| 120 | 22320 | 13200 | 8420 | 5180 | 21240 | 29660 | 16060 |
| 110 | 24180 | 14900 | 9600 | 5800 | 22910 | 32510 | 17110 |
| 100 | 26260 | 16900 | 11000 | 6600 | 24790 | 35790 | 18190 |
| 90 | 28510 | 19400 | 12850 | 7400 | 27030 | 39880 | 19630 |
| 80 | 31060 | 22700 | 15000 | 8150 | 28780 | 43780 | 20630 |

Fitting of the principal susceptibilities of $\left[\mathrm{Co}(\mathrm{py})_{4} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right]$ begins in the same way chosen ${ }^{1}$ for $\left[\mathrm{Co}(\mathrm{py})_{4}(\mathrm{NCS})_{2}\right]$ and its iron(II) analogue. The situation is, perhaps, a little less clear in that, unlike the thiocyanate molecule, the present system involves different donor atoms rendering the assumption of approximately isotropic $\sigma$-bonding less
tenable. Further, $\pi$-bonding with the halogens in this molecule may be more significant than with thiocyanate. In all present multiparameter models simultaneous variation of all parameters is not practicable. We find in these


Figure 3 Resolution of pyridine $\pi$-bonding
tetragonal cobalt(II) systems a useful modus operandi in a preliminary consideration of the $\pi$-bonding rather than of the $\sigma$ as in the previous paper.

As before, we consider pyridine to $\pi$-bond only in a plane perpendicular to the ring plane. It proves convenient, however, to resolve this bonding into two orthogonal directions, parallel and perpendicular to the $\mathrm{Cl}-\mathrm{Co}-\mathrm{Cl}$ axis, as shown in Figure 3. The components $e_{\pi}^{\prime}(\mathrm{py})$ of $e_{\pi x}(\mathrm{py})$ are equal in the two directions because of the special orientation of the pyridine rings with respect to the plane containing the four nitrogens and the cobalt atom. So far as definition by ligand-field parameters is concerned, the molecular symmetry may be classified as $D_{4 h}$. Note that $e_{\pi}{ }^{\prime}(\mathrm{py})=\frac{1}{2} e_{\pi x}$ (py).

The splitting of the free-ion terms ${ }^{4} P$ and ${ }^{4} F$ by the tetragonal field is represented in Figure 4. The magnetic properties of a $d^{7}$ ion in such a crystal field is dominated by the populated levels ${ }^{4} A_{2 g}$ and ${ }^{4} E_{g}$. The energy separation between the orbital singlet and orbital doublet terms is a factor of particular importance, representing the $\Delta$ factor of the earlier model used for an axially distorted octahedron


Figure 4 Spin-quartet terms arising in $d^{7}$ free ion, in $O_{h}$ and in $D_{\mathbf{4} h}$ crystal symmetries
by Figgis. ${ }^{7}$ Now the energy of the ${ }^{4} A_{2 g}$ term may be expressed in terms of the appropriate strong-field determinantal matrix element:

$$
\begin{align*}
E\left({ }^{4} A_{2 g}\right) & \left.=\langle | z^{2}, x^{2}-y^{2}, x y\left|V_{D_{42}}\right| z^{2}, x^{2}-y^{2}, x y\right\rangle \\
& =E\left(z^{2}\right)+E\left(x^{2}-y^{2}\right)+E(x y) \tag{1}
\end{align*}
$$

Similarly, for the ${ }^{4} E_{g}$ term:
$E\left({ }^{4} E_{g}\right)=a^{2} E(y z)+b^{2} E(x z)+\left(a^{2}+b^{2}\right) E(z)^{2}+$

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(a^{2}+b^{2}\right) E\left(x^{2}-y^{2}\right) \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $a^{2}+b^{2}=1$ and, in $D_{4 h}$ symmetry, $E(y z)=E(x z)$. Hence

$$
\begin{align*}
E\left({ }^{4} A_{2 g}\right)-E\left({ }^{4} E_{g}\right) & =2 e_{\pi}(\mathrm{Cl})+2 e_{\pi}^{\prime}(\mathrm{py})-4 e_{\pi}^{\prime}(\mathrm{py}) \\
& =2\left[e_{\pi}(\mathrm{Cl})-e_{\pi}^{\prime}(\mathrm{py})\right] \\
& =2 \Delta \pi, \text { say } \tag{3}
\end{align*}
$$

Thus, at this level of approximation and ignoring spinorbit coupling, we have the result that susceptibilities are affected strongly by the difference in axial and equatorial $\pi$-bonding $(\Delta \pi)$ rather than by their absolute values. We must not expect, therefore, to find a unique fit with respect to the $\pi$-bonding parameters but rather one that fits approximately to a linear relation between them.


Figure 5 Eigenvalues of spin-quartet terms in $D_{\Delta \lambda}$ symmetry as functions of $e_{\sigma}(\mathrm{Cl}): e_{\sigma}(\mathrm{py})=3700 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}, e_{\pi}(\mathrm{py})=100$ $\mathrm{cm}^{-1}, e_{\pi}(\mathrm{Cl})=300 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}, B=0.8 B_{0}, \zeta=0$

In order to test this and to begin to establish numerical values, however, it is still necessary to determine approximate values for the $\sigma$-bonding parameters even though, in common with $\left[\mathrm{Co}(\mathrm{py})_{4}(\mathrm{NCS})_{2}\right]$, susceptibilities should be relatively insensitive to them. The electronic spectra of $\left[\mathrm{Co}(\mathrm{py})_{4} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right]$ have been reported ${ }^{8}$ to comprise bands at 8700,16130 , and $19220 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$, assigned respectively to transition from the ground states to ${ }^{4} E_{g},{ }^{4} B_{1 g}$; to ${ }^{4} E_{g}\left({ }^{4} P\right)$; and to ${ }^{4} A_{2 g}\left({ }^{4} P\right),{ }^{4} B_{2 g}$. Let us take $e_{\sigma}$ and $e_{\pi}$ values for pyridine from the earlier study ${ }^{1}$ of $\left[\mathrm{Co}(\mathrm{py})_{4}(\mathrm{NCS})_{2}\right]$ of 3700 and $100 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$, together with a guessed value of $e_{\pi}(\mathrm{Cl})$ at $300 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$ (but see later): then the dependence of spin-quartet eigenvalues on $e_{\sigma}(\mathrm{Cl})$ in the range 2000 to $4000 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$ is as shown in Figure 5. A value of 3000 to $3500 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$ for $e_{\sigma}(\mathrm{Cl})$ appears to fit the spectrum satisfactorily, a figure close enough for the present purpose of determining the $e_{\pi}$ parameters. Later checks confirmed the insensitivity of principal susceptibilities to variations of $\pm 500 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$ in the $e_{\sigma}$ values, as was observed for the cobalt and iron thiocyanate complexes.

With these values of $e_{\sigma}$ for pyridine and chlorine, together
${ }^{7}$ B. N. Figgis, M. Gerloch, J. Lewis, F. E. Mabbs, and G. A. Webb, J. Chem. Soc. (A), 1968, 2086.

8 A. B. P. Lever, Co-ordination Chem. Rev., 1968, 8, 119.
with a nominal value for $\zeta$ of $400 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$, the dependence of simultaneously acceptable fits to experimental values of $\chi_{\|!}$and $\chi_{\perp}$ were calculated as functions of the $\pi$-bonding with


Figure $6\left[\mathrm{Co}(\mathrm{py})_{4} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right]$ : linear relationship between $e_{\pi}(\mathrm{Cl})$ and $\varepsilon_{\pi}$ (py) for regions of acceptable fit (in hatched area). $e_{\sigma}(\mathrm{py})=$ $3700 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}, \quad e_{\sigma}(\mathrm{Cl})=3000 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}, \quad \zeta=400 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}, \quad k=1.0$, $B=0.8 B_{0}$
both ligands. Fitting spaces were constructed as described in the previous paper. ${ }^{1}$ The prediction of a linear relation between $e_{\pi}(\mathrm{Cl})$ and $e_{\pi}(\mathrm{py})$ for good fit over wide ranges of both parameters is confirmed in Figure 6. No satisfactory agreement with experiment was found outside the hatched area. Apart from investigations of the influence of variations in $\zeta$ and $k$, this figure summarizes all that may be determined about $\pi$-bonding from the present susceptibility data. However, if the model we have used throughout this and earlier papers is to have any chemical utility, we must surely expect a degree of transferability of parameters from one system to another. The molecules $\left[\mathrm{Co}(\mathrm{py})_{4}(\mathrm{NCS})_{2}\right]$ and $\left[\mathrm{Co}(\mathrm{py})_{4} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right]$ are closely related. In both cases the four pyridine ligands all lie in the equatorial plane and we may assume that they share common $\pi$-bonding parameters, at least approximately. The different orientations of the pyridine groups in the two molecules should have little bearing on this, a major purpose of the model being to factor out such purely geometrical features. A section of Figure 6 has been marked out, corresponding to the assumption that $e_{\pi}(\mathrm{py})$ in $\left[\mathrm{Co}(\mathrm{py})_{4} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right]$ takes a value close to $+100 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$, as in the thiocyanate compound. ${ }^{1}$ We now examine this region in more detail. We note that the $e_{\pi}(\mathrm{Cl})$ value of $c a .300 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$ following from this assumption corresponds with the 'guessed' value used in the earlier estimation of suitable $\sigma$-bonding parameters. In truth the actual exploration progressed via a circular path.

The functional dependence of the orbital reduction factor $k$ is shown in Figure 7, from which we note that broader areas of fit correspond to $k$ in the range $0.8-0.9$. However, lower values also appear possible and we can merely note the contrast with the behaviour in the thiocyanate molecule where $k$ values very close to unity are preferred. Similar tolerance in $\zeta$ values has been noted also, lower values yielding broader regions of fit in $e_{\pi}$ space for lower $k$ values. In that it might be appropriate to replace the orbital angular momentum operator $l$ in the spin-orbit coupling operator by $k l$, this correlation between the influence of $k$ and parameters is unexceptional. While little information about $k$ and $\zeta$ values is to be had from the present study, it is worth noting that the region of fit with respect to the $e_{\pi}$ parameters is scarcely affected by their variation.

Comparison with $\left[\mathrm{Co}(\mathrm{py})_{4} \mathrm{Br}_{2}\right]$.-The complex $\left[\mathrm{Co}(\mathrm{py})_{4} \mathrm{Br}_{2}\right]$
belongs to the orthorhombic crystal class although its magnetic behaviour is pseudo-tetragonal: $\chi_{a}>\chi_{b} \approx \chi_{c}$. The molecular geometries of the bromo- and chlorocomplexes are similar, the equatorial pyridine groups adopting a 'propeller' conformation inclined at $45^{\circ}$ to the $\mathrm{Co}-\mathrm{N}$ plane. The procedure for fitting the susceptibilities was much the same as for the chloro-compound, similar arguments being made to restrict the effective parameterization to $e_{\pi}(\mathrm{Br})$ and $e_{\pi}(\mathrm{py})$. Acceptable fits to all three principal susceptibilities again lie close to a linear relationship between axial and equatorial $e_{\pi}$ parameters, but in this case are bounded, in one direction at least, occurring for positive $e_{\pi}$ parameter values only. As indicated earlier the dependence of the susceptibilities upon $\Delta \pi$ is not complete, spin-orbit coupling serving to blur the simple relationship previously established. Figure 8 shows the relationship between the $\pi$-bonding parameters near the region $e_{\pi}(\mathrm{py}) \sim 100 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$. Best fits occur for $\hat{k}$ values in the region $0.8-0.9$, but neither $k$ nor $\zeta$ can be sensitively established. Once again, the relationship between $e_{\pi}$ (axial) and $e_{\pi}$ (equatorial) appears insensitive to either $k$ or $\zeta$ values. With $e_{\sigma}(\mathrm{py}) \sim 4000 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}, e_{\pi}(\mathrm{py}) \sim$ $200 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}, e_{\pi}(\mathrm{Br}) \sim 600 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$, eigenvalues of the complete


Figure $7 \quad\left[\mathrm{Co}(\mathrm{py})_{4} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right]$ : dependence of fits in $\pi$ parameter space on $k$
spin-quartet manifold are plotted with respect to $\boldsymbol{e}_{\sigma}(\mathrm{Br})$ ink Figure 9. Observed transitions, with their reported assignments, ${ }^{9}$ are indicated in the Figure, suggesting $e_{\sigma}(\mathrm{Br}) \sim$ $3000-3500 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$.

Taking approximately equal values for $e_{\sigma}(\mathrm{Cl})$ and $e_{\sigma}(\mathrm{Br})$ in the chloro- and bromo-molecules at ca. $3000 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$ and $e_{\pi}$ parameters of 250 and $600 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$ for the respective

[^2]halogens, the latter figures deriving from the assumption of approximately equal pyridine $\pi$-bonding in all three complexes $\left[\mathrm{Co}(\mathrm{py})_{4} \mathrm{X}_{2}\right](\mathrm{X}=\mathrm{NCS}, \mathrm{Cl}$, or Br$)$, may deduce 10 Dq values from the relation
\[

$$
\begin{equation*}
10 D q=3 e_{\sigma}-4 e_{\pi} \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

\]

finding $10 D q(\mathrm{Cl}) \sim 7800 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}, 10 D q(\mathrm{Br}) \sim 6600 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$. These values are clearly approximate, not only for the


Figure $8\left[\mathrm{Co}(\mathrm{py})_{4} \mathrm{Br}_{2}\right]$ : fitting region for all three crystal susceptibilities as function of $\pi$-parameters
reasons already stated, but also because of the averaging process implied in the use of (4) to define an 'axial' $D q$ value in a molecule of less than octahedral symmetry. However, the values serve as a guide. The processes by which they were obtained have been clearly stated and chosen without prejudice: the result we obtain seems sensible in terms of the spectrochemical series. The relative magnitudes of the $\sigma$-bonding in the chloro- and


Figure 9 Eigenvalues of spin-quartet terms in $D_{4 h}$ symmetry as functions of $e_{\sigma}(\mathrm{Br}): e_{\sigma}(\mathrm{py})=3700 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}, e_{\pi}(\mathrm{py})=100$ $\mathrm{cm}^{-1}, e_{\pi}(\mathrm{Br})=600 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}, B=0.8 B_{0}, \zeta=0$. Observed transitions and reported assignments are also shown
bromo-complexes are not satisfactorily defined by the susceptibility work, but it does seem clear that the contributions to the $\pi$-antibonding energies of the metal $d$
orbitals from the bromine ligands is two to three times more than from the chlorines.

Approximate Tetragonality in $\left[\mathrm{Co}(\text { acetylacetone })_{2}(\mathrm{py})_{2}\right] .-$ The molecules just discussed involved four pyridine ligands in the equatorial plane of a distorted octahedron. In $\left[\mathrm{Co}(\text { acetylacetone })_{2}(\mathrm{py})_{2}\right]$, two pyridine groups occupy the axial sites instead. The molecular geometry of [Ni(acetylacetone $\left.)_{2}(\mathrm{py})_{2}\right]$ with which the present modification of the cobalt complex is isomorphous is shown in Figure 10. The equatorial sites are now occupied by two coplanar acetylacetone chelate ligands, the donor atoms of which conform closely to a square. $\pi$-Bonding orbitals on the donor oxygen atoms may be defined along the directions shown and it is worth pointing out that, under the assumption of these atoms occupying the corners of a square, the crystal field in this plane is isotropic. That is, in this approximation, no electronic property of the metal $d$ orbital recognizes the chelating nature of the acetylacetone ligands. Thus it appears that the major lowering of the molecular symmetry from tetragonal is the $\pi$-bonding of the axial pyridine groups. This effect would be removed also if these groups were staggered as reported for the orthorhombic modification. At this stage, therefore, and


Figure 10 Molecular co-ordination geometry of [Co(acetylacetone $\left.)_{2}(\mathrm{py})_{2}\right]$ and definition of $\pi$-bonding directions for the acetylacetone ligands
depending upon the $\pi$-bonding contribution of the axial pyridines, the overall symmetry in $\left[\operatorname{Co}(\text { acetylacetone })_{2}(\mathrm{py})_{2}\right]$ appears to be both actually and effectively rhombic and we might anticipate fitting of magnetic susceptibilities to resemble the case of $\left[\mathrm{Co}(\mathrm{py})_{4}(\mathrm{NCS})_{2}\right]$.

For the purpose of testing this prediction, nominal $e_{\sigma}$ values of $3500 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$ were assumed and the simultaneous fitting of all three principal crystal susceptibilities was studied as a function of the three $\pi$-bonding parameters $e_{\pi}(\mathrm{py}), e_{\pi x}(\mathrm{acac}), e_{\pi y}(\mathrm{acac})$. For a given value of $e_{\pi}(\mathrm{py})$, satisfactory fits were found with respect to a linear relationship between the two $\pi$-bonding parameters for acetylacetone rather like the situation for the tetragonal chloroand bromo-complexes and unlike that for the thiocyanate molecules. The linear relationship varied little with the value chosen for $e_{\pi}$ (py), fits being disposed about a twodimensional sheet in the $\pi$-parameter space shown in Figure 11. The sheet is bounded in the $e_{\pi}(\mathrm{py})$ co-ordinate in that no fits outside the range for $e_{\pi}$ (py) of -200 to $+400 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$ were possible. These limiting values concur with the previous finding of a small $\pi$-bonding participation
by pyridine ligands. Modification of (3) to allow anisotropic in-plane $\pi$-bonding leads to the expression

$$
\begin{align*}
& \cdot E\left({ }^{4} A_{2 g}\right)-E\left({ }^{4} E_{g}\right) \\
&=E(x y)-E(y z)  \tag{5}\\
&=4 e_{\pi y}(\mathrm{acac})-2 e_{\pi x}(\mathrm{acac})- \\
& 2 e_{\pi}^{\prime}(\mathrm{py})
\end{align*}
$$

so that for a constant, and particularly small, value of $e_{\pi}$ (py), the linear fitting region with respect to the $\pi$-bonding


Figure $11 \quad\left[\mathrm{Co}(\text { acetylacetone })_{2}(\mathrm{py})_{2}\right]$ : fitting region in $\pi$-parameter space (see text)
parameters of acetylacetone can be rationalized. The relevance of this relationship does, however, depend upon the degree of tetragonality shown in the molecule as a
whole and so to some extent the occurrence of the linear fit in Figure 11 implies that, despite the eclipsed conformation of the axial pyridines, the overall electronic symmetry in the ground states closely approximates a tetragonal description. This may result from the nominally reversed sense of tetragonality of the acetylacetone molecule compared with the $\left[\mathrm{Co}(\mathrm{py})_{4} \mathrm{X}_{2}\right]$ systems, so relegating the anisotropic $\pi$-bonding of the pyridine ligands here to a secondorder role.

Finally, we have superimposed on the fits in Figure 11, the region which gives satisfactory agreement between calculated and observed $\phi$ values. This restricts possible $e_{\pi}$ values further and at least gives the qualitative prediction that $e_{\pi x}(\mathrm{acac})>e_{\pi y}(\mathrm{acac})$. This result is again readily acceptable in terms of the $\pi_{x}$-bonding being associated with the $\pi$-bond delocalized over the $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{O}$ skeleton of the acetylacetone ligand.

Overall we conclude that the angular overlap model furnishes a very useful parameterization scheme for the analysis of magnetic susceptibilities, its particular advantage being the apparent and correlatable relationship with established chemical-bonding concepts. Based admittedly on a small number of cases studied so far, we also have the provocative generalization that the quality and uniqueness of fits to magnetic susceptibilities appear to be optimized in the lower symmetry systems-a situation not expected at the outset of this programme to investigate the feasibility of interpreting the magnetic properties of unsymmetrical molecules.
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