

BULLETIN OF THE CHEMICAL SOCIETY OF JAPAN, VOL. 45, 2956—2957 (1972)

 ^{119}Sn Mössbauer Quadrupole Splittings in Compounds with Sn-Mn Bonds

B. V. LIENGME, J. R. SAMS*†, and J. C. SCOTT*

*Department of Chemistry, St. Francis Xavier University, Antigonish, N.S., Canada***Department of Chemistry, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, B.C., Canada*

(Received October 12, 1971)

Onaka, Sasaki, and Sano¹⁾ have recently reported ^{119}Sn Mössbauer data for the four series of compounds $(\text{CO})_5\text{MnSnR}_{3-n}\text{X}_n$, where $\text{R}=\text{Me}$, Ph , and $\text{X}=\text{Cl}$, Br . The quadrupole splitting values (Δ) for $n=1, 2$ are always higher than those for $n=0, 3$, rather than showing a monotonic change as n increases, but no explanation was offered for this unexpected order. We have recently suggested²⁾ that a similar trend in Δ for the compounds $(\pi\text{-C}_5\text{H}_5)\text{Fe}(\text{CO})_2\text{SnPh}_{3-n}\text{Cl}_n$ is due to a change in sign of the quadrupole coupling constant, which can be explained on the basis of point-charge calculation. We wish to show that the results of Onaka, *et al.*¹⁾ are susceptible to a like explanation.

The point-charge model assumes that the electric field gradient (EFG) is an additive quantity,³⁾ so that the quadrupole splitting can be evaluated from partial quadrupole splitting (PQS) values, $[\text{L}]$, for the various ligands. Since the EFG at tin is largely due to an imbalance in the polarity of the tin-ligand σ -bonds, $[\text{L}]$ values are related to this polarity and can be correlated with the Taft inductive constants for the ligands.⁴⁾ The model has been discussed in detail by Parish and Platt,⁴⁾ who also derived a number of PQS values from data for pentacoordinate tin compounds. It has been suggested that these PQS values should not be applied to compounds in which the tin atom has a different coordination number.⁵⁾ For the

† To whom correspondence should be addressed.

1) S. Onaka, Y. Sasaki, and H. Sano, *This Bulletin*, **44**, 726 (1971).2) B. V. Liengme, M. J. Newlands, and J. R. Sams, *Inorg. Nucl. Chem. Lett.*, **7**, 1223 (1971).3) M. G. Clark, *Mol. Phys.*, **20**, 257 (1971).4) R. V. Parish and R. H. Platt, *Inorg. Chim. Acta*, **4**, 65 (1970).5) A. G. Maddock and R. H. Platt, *J. Chem. Soc., A*, **1971**, 1191.

present tetracoordinate derivatives we have therefore derived a self-consistent set of PQS values. If we assume an arbitrary value for [Cl], then point-charge expressions for molecules of the types SnAB_3 and SnA_2B_2 ⁴⁾ with experimental Δ values²⁾ for $(\text{CO})_5\text{MnSnCl}_3$, $(\text{CO})_5\text{MnSnMe}_3$, and $[(\text{CO})_5\text{Mn}]_2\text{SnPh}_2$ yields PQS values for $(\text{CO})_5\text{Mn}$, Me, and Ph, respectively.²⁾ A value for [Br] is obtained from the measured¹⁾ splitting in $(\text{CO})_5\text{MnSnBr}_3$. These [L] values are given in footnote (a) to Table 1. It should be noted that our results are independent of the value chosen for [Cl].²⁾ These PQS values are used to compute the EFG tensor elements, assuming tetrahedral bond angles.⁶⁾ After diagonalising the tensor, the nonvanishing elements are ordered such that $|V_{zz}| \geq |V_{yy}| \geq |V_{xx}|$, then the asymmetry parameter $\eta = (V_{yy} - V_{xx})/V_{zz}$ and

$$\Delta = \frac{1}{2} eQV_{zz} \left(1 + \frac{\eta^2}{3} \right)^{1/2}$$

are calculated. The results for a number of compounds with Sn-Mn bonds are presented in Table 1, along with experimental Δ values.

TABLE 1. MEASURED AND PREDICTED QUADRUPOLE SPLITTINGS FOR SOME COMPOUNDS WITH Sn-Mn BONDS^{a)}

Compound	$\Delta_{obs}^b)$ (mm sec ⁻¹)	Δ_{pred} (mm sec ⁻¹)	η_{pred}
$(\text{CO})_5\text{MnSnCl}_3$	1.57	+	0
$(\text{CO})_5\text{MnSnMeCl}_2$	2.62	+2.37	0.85
$(\text{CO})_5\text{MnSnMe}_2\text{Cl}$	2.66	-2.24	0.48
$(\text{CO})_5\text{MnSnMe}_3$	0.61	—	0
$(\text{CO})_5\text{MnSnPhCl}_2$	2.36	+2.13	0.93
$(\text{CO})_5\text{MnSnPh}_2\text{Cl}$	2.49	-1.95	0.34
$(\text{CO})_5\text{MnSnPh}_3$	0 ^{c)}	-0.50	0
$(\text{CO})_5\text{MnSnBr}_3$	1.41	+	0
$(\text{CO})_5\text{MnSnMeBr}_2$	2.51	+2.22	0.83
$(\text{CO})_5\text{MnSnMe}_2\text{Br}$	2.54	-2.11	0.51
$(\text{CO})_5\text{MnSnPhBr}_2$	2.63	+1.97	0.92
$(\text{CO})_5\text{MnSnPh}_2\text{Br}$	2.28	-1.82	0.36
$[(\text{CO})_5\text{Mn}]_3\text{SnCl}$	1.55 ^{d)}	-1.56	0
$(\text{CO})_5\text{MnSn}(\text{Cl})$	2.02 ^{e)}	-1.73	0.18
$[(\pi\text{-C}_5\text{H}_5)\text{Fe}(\text{CO})_2]_2$			

a) PQS values used in the calculations are (in mm sec⁻¹): [Cl] = +0.63, [Br] = +0.56, [Me] = -0.56, [Ph] = -0.40, $[(\text{CO})_5\text{Mn}] = -0.15$.

b) Experimental values from Ref. 1) except as noted.

c) Splitting not resolved.

d) Reference 15.

e) Reference 16.

The calculated Δ values are in only moderately good numerical agreement with the measured¹⁾ ones. The lack of better agreement between Δ_{pred} and Δ_{obs} may be due largely to distortions from tetrahedral symmetry. Although insufficient structural data are available to allow a quantitative estimate of such effects, X-ray data for related compounds⁷⁻¹¹⁾ suggest that

the distortions are likely to be such as to increase the calculated $|V_{zz}|$ values.^{6,12)} Another possible source of discrepancy is a variation in the σ -character of the tin-halogen bonds as the number of halogens bonded to tin changes. Such an effect has been suggested¹³⁾ for the compounds RSnCl_3 and R_2SnCl_2 ($\text{R} = n\text{-Bu}$, Ph) on the basis of ³⁵Cl NQR data.

More important than the actual numerical agreement is the fact that in all four series $(\text{CO})_5\text{MnSnR}_{3-n}\text{X}_n$ the magnitude of Δ is predicted to be greater for $n=1$ and 2 than for $n=0$ and 3, as observed experimentally. The sign of Δ_{pred} is the sign of the quadrupole coupling constant, eQV_{zz} . This sign has recently been shown to be positive for both $(\text{CO})_5\text{MnSnCl}_3$ and $(\text{CO})_5\text{MnSnCl}_2\text{Me}$,¹⁴⁾ but the signs of eQV_{zz} for the remaining derivatives in Table 1 have not yet been reported. The positive eQV_{zz} for $(\text{CO})_5\text{MnSnCl}_3$ shows that the charge distribution about tin is prolate, i.e., there is greater electron density near the tin atom along the z -(Sn-Mn bond) direction than in the xy -plane, as expected from the greater electronegativity of Cl. The increase in Δ upon replacing one halogen by an organic group is due in part to the non-zero η , but the largest contribution comes from a reorientation of the z -axis of the EFG and a concomitant increase in $|V_{zz}|$. When there are two or three organic groups attached to tin, our calculations predict a negative eQV_{zz} (oblate charge distribution). We hope to verify these predictions in the near future. It is relevant to note that eQV_{zz} for tin is positive in YSnCl_3 and negative in YSnBu_3 ($\text{Y} = (\pi\text{-C}_5\text{H}_5)\text{Fe}(\text{CO})_2$ ¹⁴⁾ as predicted by the point-charge model.²⁾

The small (or zero) observed splittings for $(\text{CO})_5\text{MnSnR}_3$ ¹⁾ and $[(\text{CO})_5\text{Mn}]_2\text{SnPh}_2$ ²⁾ suggest that the σ -bonding characteristics of the $(\text{CO})_5\text{Mn}$ group and Me or Ph are quite similar. This presumably accounts for the fact that the predicted value of η is less than ~ 0.5 for the cases $(\text{CO})_5\text{MnSnR}_2\text{X}$, and greater than ~ 0.8 for $(\text{CO})_5\text{MnSnRX}_2$. The former molecules approximate to the stoichiometry SnA_3B (for which $\eta=0$), whilst the latter approximate to SnA_2B_2 (for which $\eta=1$ if tetrahedral bond angles are assumed).

Finally, it should be noted that our calculations give an adequate estimate of $|\Delta|$ for $(\text{CO})_5\text{MnSn}(\text{Cl})[(\pi\text{-C}_5\text{H}_5)\text{Fe}(\text{CO})_2]_2$, in which the tin atom is bonded to two different transition metals.

We wish to thank the National Research Council of Canada for financial support, and Dr. G. M. Bancroft for a preprint of his paper.

10) H. P. Weber and R. F. Bryan, *Acta Crystallogr.*, **22**, 822 (1967).

11) R. F. Bryan, *J. Chem. Soc., A*, **1968**, 696.

12) J. R. Sams and J. C. Scott, unpublished results.

13) E. D. Swiger and J. D. Graybeal, *J. Amer. Chem. Soc.*, **87**, 1464 (1965).

14) B. A. Goodman, R. Greatrex, and N. N. Greenwood, *J. Chem. Soc., A*, **1971**, 1868.

15) A. N. Karasev, N. E. Kolobova, L. S. Polak, V. S. Shpinel, and K. A. Anisimov, *Teor. Eksp. Khim.*, **2**, 126 (1966).

16) V. I. Gol'danskii, B. V. Borshagovskii, E. F. Makarov, R. A. Stukan, K. A. Anisimov, N. E. Kolobova, and V. V. Skripkin, *Teor. Eksp. Khim.*, **3**, 478 (1967).

6) G. N. Bancroft, K. D. Butler, and A. T. Rake, *J. Organometal. Chem.*, **34**, 137 (1972).

7) R. F. Bryan, *J. Chem. Soc., A*, **1967**, 172, 192.

8) J. E. O'Connor and E. R. Corey, *Inorg. Chem.*, **6**, 968 (1967).

9) P. T. Greene and R. F. Bryan, *J. Chem. Soc., A*, **1970**, 1696, 2261.