

THE INFLUENCE OF GEOMETRY AND DONOR-ATOM SET ON THE SPIN STATE OF FIVE-COORDINATE COBALT (II) AND NICKEL (II) COMPLEXES [★]

LUIGI SACCONI

Istituto di Chimica Generale e Inorganica, Università di Firenze, Laboratorio CNR, 39 Via J. Nardi, 50132 Florence (Italy)

(Received February 15th, 1972)

CONTENTS

A Introduction	351
B Spin-state of the complexes and overall electronegativity and nucleophilicity of donor atoms	352
C Axial elongation in square pyramidal complexes	357
D Tetrahedral distortion in trigonal bipyramidal complexes	361
E Conclusions	364
Acknowledgement	364
References	364

A INTRODUCTION

The nature of the donor atoms in five-coordinate complexes of cobalt(II) and nickel(II) has been shown to be an important factor in determining whether the metal atom is in a high- or low-spin state ¹. In fact the magnetic cross-over point for five-coordinate complexes does not depend only on the dipolar strength of the donor atoms, i.e. on $Dq = \mu B_4/6$ (ref. 2), but also on their nephelauxetic effects. A strong reduction of the interelectronic repulsion term, which can well be as large as 50%, brings the low-spin terms closer to the high-spin ground term, so that a lower Dq value is required to reach the cross-over point. Accordingly, some bromo and chloro complexes are found high-spin whereas the iodo analogues, with smaller Dq and β values, are found to be low spin ³. Both Dq and β ligand field parameters are related to the covalent and π -bond character of the metal donor bonds, as the antibonding character of the metal orbitals is a measure of Dq , at least for octahedral complexes. On the other hand the electron delocalization onto the ligands is believed ⁴ to determine the value of β . According to Basolo and Pearson ^{5a} the nucleophilic reactivity constant n° is strictly related to polarizability and to π -bonding properties of nucleophiles. Therefore the nucleophilicity n° as well as the electronegativity of

[★] Presented in part at the Symposium on Five-Coordinate Complexes at the 162nd American Chemical Society National Meeting, Washington, D C, September 1971.

the donor atoms have been suggested as parameters related to the spin state of the complexes¹, although the latter parameter does not take into account the type of hybridization of a given donor atom. Recently a correlation between the optical ligand electronegativity and the complex geometry has been treated by Hollebone^{5b}.

B SPIN STATE OF THE COMPLEXES AND OVERALL ELECTRONEGATIVITY AND NUCLEOPHILICITY OF DONOR ATOMS

If the donor atoms sets are placed in order according to the sum of individual χ and n° values, the complexes are clearly divided into the high- and low-spin categories, with a small region of overlap where both spin types may be found. Tables with the donor sets ordered in this way, which collect the values for magnetophores formed by tri- and tetradentate ligands, have been published¹. They have been found to be useful in predicting the spin state of a given magnetophore, in assigning its coordination number or in identifying the donor atoms where alternative possibilities would be expected to give different spin states.

The effects of stereochemistry on spin state have, by contrast, received little attention⁶. A sufficient number of X-ray crystallographic determinations has now been reported to permit a discussion of these effects⁷.

As it is well known, five equivalent donor atoms can be symmetrically arranged around a central metal ion in one of the two limit structures, C_{4v} and D_{3h} , which can be interconverted by means of simple angular distortions through geometries with C_{2v} symmetry (Fig. 1). From a general point of view one would expect that the spin state of the complexes may depend on the symmetry of the magnetophores. However a ligand field treatment of cobalt(II) and nickel(II) ions has shown that the energy difference between the lowest high- and low-spin levels is approximately equal for all the above dispositions of the five donor atoms⁸ (Fig. 1).

These results can be extended with some approximations to the five-coordinated magnetophores having non-equivalent donor atoms. All the magnetophores, then, can be ordered according to the electronegativity or nucleophilicity sum of the donor set independently of the ligand skeleton or stereochemistry of the complex, as illustrated in Table 1, which reports almost all the known donor sets of five-coordinated complexes of cobalt(II) and nickel(II).

Both Σn° and $\Sigma \chi$ correlate well with the spin state, and this shows that the previous assumption that the spin state is independent of molecular geometry is fully justified. The cross-over ranges, which are quite narrow, are practically coincident for cobalt(II) and nickel(II). The positions of N_2S_3 and NS_4 donor sets can be considered undetermined because the n° values for sulphur in dialkyldithiophosphates and -phosphinates are not known^{5a}. In any case, the S donor atoms are unusual in strongly changing the relative σ and π contributions to the coordination bond depending on the ligand bond system.

We have excluded from Table 1 certain complexes that have "irregular" structure. Thus, while most metal-ligand bond lengths are close to a value which may be termed "standard",

* Ligand field calculations have been performed using the well known weak scheme inclusive of configuration interactions. The energy separation of the free ion term has been reduced by 25%

there are some compounds in which it is known that one metal–ligand bond is significantly longer than the “standard”, the difference may be as much as ca. 30% of the “standard” bond length in some cases^{65, 66, 73, 108} The donor atom in an elongated metal–ligand bond can be considered as partially coordinated to the metal so that the effective coordination number is somewhere between five and four.

TABLE I

Overall nucleophilicities and spin state for five-coordinate cobalt(II) and nickel(II) complexes^a

Set	Σn°	Co	Ref	Ni	Ref
O_5	12 00	H	8, 9, 10a, 11, 12	H	8a, 10, 11
O_3N_2	13 40	H	13	H	14, 15
$\text{O}_2\text{N}_2\text{Cl}$	14 04	H	16	H	16
O_2N_3	14 10	H	17, 18a	H	18b, 18c, 19, 20
ONCl_3	14 62			H	21a
ON_2Cl_2	14 68	H	22	H	22, 23
ON_3Cl	14 74	H	16	H	16
$\text{O}_2\text{N}_2\text{Br}$	15 18	H	16	H	16
Cl_5	15 20			H	24
N_2Cl_3	15 32			H	25
$\text{ON}_3(\text{NCS})$	15 35	H	16	H	16
N_3Cl_2	15 38	H	26–35	H	26a, 27a, 28, 29a, 30–32, 35, 36
N_4Cl	15 44	H	37–39	H	37, 39, 40
N_5	15 50			H	41
ON_3Br	15 88	H	16	H	16
$\text{ON}_2(\text{NCS})_2$	15 90	H	22		
$\text{N}_4(\text{NCS})$	16 05	H	42		
$\text{O}_2\text{N}_2\text{I}$	16 42	H	16	H	16
N_4Br	16 58	H	37–39, 40a, 43, 44	H	37, 39, 40a, 45
$\text{N}_3(\text{NCS})_2$	16 60	H	16, 31–33, 34a, 46, 47	H	16, 46, 48
ON_2Br_2	16 96	H	22	H	22, 23, 49
N_2SCl_2	17 01	H	50, 51	H	50, 52, 53
N_3SCl	17 07	H	16, 46	H	16, 46
ON_3I	17 12	H	16	H	16
N_3Br_2	17 66	H	26a, 28, 29a, 30–33, 34a, 35	H	26a, 28, 30, 31, 33, 35, 36, 54
$\text{N}_3\text{S}(\text{NCS})$	17 68	H	16, 46	H	16, 46
N_4I	17 82	H	37–39, 40a, 42	H	37, 39
N_3SBr	18 21	H	16, 46	H	16, 46
$\text{N}_2\text{S}(\text{NCS})_2$	18 23	H	50, 52, 53	H	50, 52
$\text{N}_2\text{S}_2\text{Cl}$	18 70	H	16, 46	H	16, 46
N_3AsCl	19 09	H	46, 55		
N_2SBr_2	19 29	H	50, 51	H	50, 52, 53
$\text{N}_2\text{S}_2(\text{NCS})$	19 31	H	16, 46	H	16, 46
N_3SI	19 45	H	16, 46	H	16, 46
$\text{N}_2\text{S}_2\text{Br}$	19 84	H	16, 46	H	16, 46
N_3I_2	20 14	H	26a, 30–32, 34a	H	26a, 28, 30, 31, 36
N_3AsBr	20 33	H	46, 55		
NS_3Cl	(Me) ^b 20 33	H	56		

TABLE 1 (continued)

Set		Σn°	Co	Ref	N ₁	Ref
NS ₃ Br	(<i>i</i> -Pr)	20.42	H	57	H	57
N ₂ OPCl		20.43	H	58		
ONAsBr ₂		20.61			H	3
N ₂ OP(NCS)		21.04	H	58		
N ₂ PCl ₂		21.07	H	57		
N ₂ S ₂ I		21.08	H	16, 46	H	16, 46
N ₃ PCl		21.13			H	46, 55
N ₂ SI ₂		21.17	H	51	H	52, 53
N ₂ AsBr ₂		21.31			H	3
N ₃ AsI		21.47	H	46, 55	H	46, 55
NS ₃ Br	(Me)	21.47	H	56		
N ₂ OPBr		21.57	H	58		
NS ₃ I	(<i>i</i> -Pr)	21.66	H	57	H	57
N ₃ PBr		22.27			H	46, 55, 59
N ₂ P(NCS) ₂		22.29	H	60		
ONPBr ₂		22.65			H	3
NS ₃ I	(Me)	22.71	H	56		
N ₂ SPCl		22.76	H	58		
N ₂ OPI		22.81	H	58		
SNAsBr ₂		22.94			H	3
ONAsI ₂		23.09			H	3
N ₂ PBr ₂		23.35	H	57	H	3
N ₂ SP(NCS)		23.37	H	58		
N ₂ S ₂ Cl		23.44			H	16, 46, 61
N ₂ AsI ₂		23.79			H	3
N ₂ SPBr		23.90	H	58		
PS ₂ Cl ₂		24.33			H	62
NAs ₂ Br ₂		24.96			H	63
SNPBr ₂		24.98			H	3
ONPI ₂		25.13			H	3
N ₂ SPI		25.14	H	58		
SNAsI ₂		25.42			H	3
N ₂ PI ₂		25.83	H	57	L	3
PS ₃ Cl		26.02			L	64
NOP ₂ Cl		26.12			L	65
As ₂ SBr		26.59			L	63
PS ₂ Br ₂		26.61			L	62
PS ₃ (NCS)		26.63			L	64a
NOP ₂ (NCS)		26.73	L+H	65	L	65, 66
NP ₂ Cl ₂		26.76	H	67-69	H+L	68-70
N ₂ P ₂ Cl		26.82	L	71	L	71
NOP ₂ Br		27.26			L	65
N ₂ P ₂ (NCS)		27.43			L	54
NAs ₂ I ₂		27.44			L	63
SNPI ₂		27.46			L	58
NAs ₃ Br		27.53			L	63, 72
N ₂ P ₂ Br		27.96	L	46, 55	L	46, 55, 71
PS ₃ I		28.40			L	64a
NOP ₂ I		28.50			L	65, 73
PSe ₃ Cl		28.51			L	74

TABLE 1 (continued)

Set	Σn°	Co	Ref	Ni	Ref
As_3Br_2	28 61			L	75
NAs_3I	28 77			L	63, 72
$\text{P}_4(\text{NCS})$	28 81	L	76		
NP_2Br_2	29.04	L+H	67-69, 77a	L	68-70, 77
As_2SI_2	29 07			L	63
PS_2I_2	29 09			L	62, 78
$\text{PSe}_3(\text{NCS})$	29.12			L	74
$\text{N}_2\text{P}_2\text{I}$	29 20	L	71	L	71
$\text{P}_2\text{S}_2\text{Cl}$ (PhEt)	29.38	L	79		
$\text{P}_2\text{S}_2\text{Cl}$ (Et)	29 50			L	80
PSe_3Br	29.65			L	74
As_4Cl (Ph)	30 04			L	81, 82
$\text{P}_2\text{S}_2\text{Br}$ (PhEt)	30 52	L	79	L	79
$\text{P}_2\text{S}_2\text{Br}$ (Et)	30 64			L	80
$\text{As}_4(\text{NCS})$ (Ph)	30 65			L	82
PSe_3I	30 89			L	74
As_3I_2	31 09			L	75
As_4Br (Ph)	31 18			L	82
$\text{P}_2\text{S}_2\text{Br}$ (PhMe)	31 22	L	83	L	62
NP_2I_2	31 52	L	67-69, 77a	L	68-70, 77a
As_4Cl (PhMe)	31 62			L	84
$\text{P}_2\text{S}_2\text{I}$ (PhEt)	31 76	L	79	L	79, 85
$\text{P}_2\text{S}_2\text{I}$ (Et)	31 88			L	80
$\text{As}_4(\text{NCS})$ (PhMe)	32 23			L	84
As_4I (Ph)	32 42			L	82
P_3Cl_2	32 45			L	86
NP_3Cl	32 51			L	72, 87
As_4Br (PhMe)	32 76			L	84
$\text{P}_2\text{Se}_2\text{Br}$ (PhMe)	32 88	L	83	L	62
$\text{NP}_3(\text{NCS})$	33 12	L	87	L	87
P_2SI_2	33 15	L	77	L	85
As_4Cl (Et)	33 20			L	88
NP_3Br	33.65			L	72, 87
$\text{As}_4(\text{CN})$ (Ph)	34.00			L	82
As_4I (PhMe)	34 00			L	89
As_4I (PhMe)	34.10			L	84
$\text{P}_2\text{As}_2\text{Cl}$ (Ph)	34 12	L	83	L	90
$\text{P}_2\text{As}_2\text{NO}_2$ (Ph)	34 30			L	90
As_4Br (Et)	34 34			L	88
PAs_3Cl (Et)	34 51			L	91
PAs_3NO_2 (Et)	34 69			L	91
P_3Br_2	34 73	L	92	L	86
$\text{P}_2\text{As}_2(\text{NCS})$	34 73			L	90
NP_3I	34 89	L	87, 93	L	72, 87, 94
$(\text{CN})_5$	35 00			L	95, 96
$\text{PAs}_3(\text{NCS})$ (Et)	35 12			L	91
$\text{P}_2\text{As}_2\text{Br}$ (Ph)	35 26	L	83	L	90
P_5	35 40			L	97
As_4I (Et)	35 58			L	88
PAs_3Br (Et)	35 65			L	91

TABLE 1 (continued)

Set	Σn°	Co	Ref	Ni	Ref
SbP ₃ Cl		36 06		L	98
NP ₃ (CN)		36 47 L	56		
P ₂ As ₂ I	(Ph)	36 50 L	83	L	90
PAs ₃ I	(Et)	36 89		L	91
P ₃ (CN) ₂		36 95		L	99-102
As ₄ (CN)	(Et)	37 16		L	88
P ₃ I ₂	(Ph)	37 21		L	86
As ₅		37 70		L	103
P ₄ Cl	(Ph)	38 20 L	76, 81, 104	L	82, 105
PAs ₃ (CN)	(Et)	38 47		L	91
P ₄ Br	(Ph)	39 34 L	76	L	105
P ₃ (CN) ₂		39 49		L	106
P ₃ (CN) ₂		40 43		L	107
P ₄ I	(Ph)	40 58 L	76		

^a The value of n° for isothiocyanate was taken as three units less than that of thiocyanate (R.G. Pearson, personal communication). This will not require any substantial change in the published order.

^b Substituent at the peripheral donor atoms




Fig. 1. Lowest high- and low-spin levels for cobalt(II) (upper) and nickel(II) (lower) in D_{3h} , C_{4v} and intermediate C_{2v} symmetries $Dq = 1.2$ kK, $\beta = 0.80$




Fig 2 Axial elongation observed in some square pyramidal complexes

C AXIAL ELONGATION IN SQUARE PYRAMIDAL COMPLEXES

Square pyramidal complexes are susceptible to lengthening of the axial bond with simultaneous shortening of four basal bonds, which in the limit results in a square-planar four-coordinate complex (Fig. 2). Since square-planar cobalt(II) and nickel(II) complexes are invariably low spin, and a square-pyramidal complex may be high spin, the extent of apical bond lengthening is expected to have a decisive effect on the spin multiplicity in some cases

The apical angle α (Fig 2) has been found to be ca 100° in square pyramidal complexes with five "standard" bonds. The lengthening of the apical bond is then usually accompanied by a decrease in the apical angle towards 90°

The apical angle may be plotted against another measure of distortion, the ratio of axial "standard" bond lengths (axial elongation) as shown in Fig. 3. Most points on this plot lie close enough to a single curve to indicate that either axial elongation or apical angle may be used as a measure of distortion from a "regular" configuration.

Average standard five-coordinate bond lengths ($\text{\AA}$) were taken as follows. $\text{Ni}-\text{O} = \text{Co}-\text{O} = 2.0$, $\text{Co}-\text{O}^- = 1.94$ (LS), $\text{Ni}-\text{S} = 2.26$ (LS), 2.38 (HS), $\text{Ni}-\text{N}_{sp^2} = 2.04$ (HS), 1.92 (LS), $\text{Co}-\text{N}_{sp^2} = 2.12$ (HS), 1.94 (LS), $\text{Ni}-\text{N}_{sp^3} = 2.10$ (HS); $\text{Co}-\text{P} = 2.23$ (LS); $\text{Ni}-\text{As} = 2.29$ (LS); $\text{Ni}-\text{Cl} = \text{Co}-\text{Cl} = 2.31$ (HS), $\text{Ni}-\text{Br} = 2.40$ (LS), $\text{Co}-\text{Br} = 2.43$ (LS); $\text{Ni}-\text{NCS} = 1.96$ (HS)

The largest distortions are found for the magnetophores such as NiNOP_2I (ref. 73) or $\text{NiNOP}_2(\text{NCS})$ (ref. 66) in which the apical $\text{M}-\text{O}$ bond is 0.6 or 0.4 $\text{\AA}$ longer than the "standard"

If the energies of the high- and low-spin states are calculated by a ligand field treatment such as to fit the curve in Fig 3, using Ballhausen's method to calculate B_2 and B_4 as functions of bond length¹⁰⁹, it is found that the low-spin state is favoured by increasing axial distortion (Fig 4). Thus, the highly distorted complexes of C_{4v} symmetry may be low spin when they would be expected to be high spin on the basis of the Σn° or $\Sigma \chi$ criterion. The overall n° and χ values for complexes of cobalt(II) and nickel(II) whose structure has been ascertained by an X-ray crystallographic determination are given in Tables 2 and 3, including those omitted from Table 1.

The low-spin complexes with magnetophores placed by the Σn° criterion in the high-spin region are all grossly distorted from a regular configuration. For example, the com-




Fig. 3 Axial elongation vs the apical angle for square pyramidal complexes $\circ$, high-spin nickel, $\bullet$, low-spin nickel, $\square$, high-spin cobalt, $\blacksquare$, low-spin cobalt. Apical atoms underlined.




Fig. 4. Energy of the lowest high- and low-spin levels for cobalt(II) (lower) and nickel(II) (upper) plotted vs. α . The α values are related to the axial elongation through the plot of Fig. 3. Dq (basal) = 1.4 kK for nickel and 1.5 kK for cobalt, $\beta = 0.8$ and 0.7 for nickel and cobalt respectively.

TABLE 2

X-ray structure and spin state of five-coordinate cobalt(II) complexes

Set	$\Sigma\chi$	Σn°	Square pyram	Elong ratio	Intermed	Trig bipy.	Axial angle	Ref.
O_5	17 50	12 00	H	1 04		H	$92^\circ, 93^\circ$	8b, 9b
O_3N_2	16 64	13 40	L	1 14		H		110, 13a
O_2N_3	16 21	14 10	H	1 00				18b, 18c, 111
			L	1.08				
N_3Cl_2	14.87	15 38	H	1 00, 1 01				26b, 27b, 29b, 34b
$\text{N}_2\text{O}(\text{NCS})_2$	15 71	15 90				H	$96 6^\circ$	57
N_4Br	15.02	16 58				H	$99^\circ, 91^\circ$	43, 44
$\text{N}_3(\text{NCS})_2$	15 35	16 60				H	$96 4^\circ$	47
N_3PCl	14.10	21 13				H	100°	57
$\text{N}_2\text{P}(\text{NCS})_2$	14 34	22 29			L + H 97°	H	98°	57
NOP_2Cl	13 52	26 12				H	103°	65
$\text{N}_2\text{P}_2\text{Br}$	13 00	27 96	L	1 04				57
$\text{N}_2\text{P}_2\text{I}$	12 47	29 20				H	103°	57
NS_4	12 83	31 50	L	1 03				112
NP_3Cl	12 08	32 51				H	$104 6^\circ$	113
NP_3Br	11 99	33 65				H	106°	57
P_3Br_2	11 66	34 73				L	90°	92b
NP_3I	11 46	34 89	L	1 00		H	106°	93
P_4Cl	11 07	38 20				L	94°	104

TABLE 3

X-ray structure and spin state of five-coordinate nickel(II) complexes

Set	$\Sigma\chi$	Σn°	Square pyram	Elong ratio	Intermed	Trig bipy.	Ref
O_5	17 50	12 00	H	1 0			10b
O_3N_2	16 64	13 40	H	1.0	H		14, 15
O_2N_3	16 21	14 10	H	1 0		H H H	18b, 18c, 19a, 20
ONCl_3	15 06	14 62				H	21b
Cl_5	14 15	15 20	H	1 0			24
N_2Cl_3	14 63	15 32	H	1 0			25
N_4Cl	15 11	15 44	H	1.09			40b
N_5	15.35	15.50	H	1 0			41b
$\text{N}_4(\text{NCS})$	15 35	16 05				H	57
N_4Br	15 02	16 58	L	1.16		H	45, 114
$\text{N}_3(\text{NCS})_2$	15 35	16 60	H				48
ON_2Br_2	15 12	16 96			H		49
N_3Br_2	14 69	17 66			H		54
$\text{N}_2\text{S}_2\text{Cl}$	13 85	23 44				H	61
PS_3Cl	12 21	26.02				L	64b
$\text{NOP}_2(\text{NCS})$	13 76	26 73	L	1 24			65b, 66


TABLE 3 (continued)

Set	$\Sigma\chi$	Σn°	Square pyram	Elong ratio	Intermed	Trig bipy.	Ref
N ₂ S ₃	13.46	27 50	H	1 00			115
N ₂ P ₂ Br	13.00	27 96	L	1 16			55b, 57
NOP ₂ I	12 90	28 50	L	1 30			73
As ₃ Br ₂	12 08	28 61	L	1.11			75b
NP ₂ Br ₂	12 67	29 04	L	1 11			77b
PS ₂ I ₂	11 36	29 09	L	1 25			78
N ₂ P ₂ I	12 47	29 90				L	57
NS ₄	12 83	31 50	H	1 03			116
NP ₃ Cl	12 08	32 51				L	57
NP ₃ I	11 46	34 89				L	94
(CN) ₅	12 50	35 00	L	1 14, 1 16		L	95b, 96
P ₅	10 30	35 40				L	97
S ₅	12 20	35 50	L	1 25			117
P ₃ (CN) ₂	11 18	36 95			L		102b
P ₃ I ₂	10 60	37 21				L	92b
As ₅	11 00	37 70	L	1 03			103b
PA ₃ (CN)	11 16	38 47				L	91b
P ₃ (CN) ₂	11 18	39 49				L	106
P ₃ (CN) ₂	11 18	40 43	L			L L	107b, 107c

plexes [Ni(mac)Br]⁺ (ref. 114) and Cosal-en (ref. 110) have an elongated square pyramidal structure and are low spin whereas the complexes [Ni(Me₆tren)Br]⁺ (ref. 45) and Cosal-Me (ref. 13b), which have the same magnetophores NiN₄Br and CoN₂O₃ respectively, are trigonal-bipyramidal in structure, and are high spin ^{*}.

More examples of distorted square-pyramidal nickel complexes will be found in the Tables than of distorted square-pyramidal cobalt complexes. This can be understood by considering the effect of elongation of the axial bond (*z* axis) upon the *d* electrons, the main result of which is to decrease the antibonding character of the electrons in the *d*_{z² orbital. Low-spin nickel(II) complexes which have two electrons in this orbital therefore gain more energy as a result of axial elongation than do cobalt(II) complexes which have only one electron in the *d*_{z² orbital. In agreement with this hypothesis, the complex of nickel with the open-chain ligand *N,N'*-bis(2-diphenylphosphinoethyl)-*N,N'*-dimethylethylenediamine (Ph₂P•CH₂CH₂•N(CH₃)•CH₂•CH₂•N(CH₃)•CH₂•CH₂•PPh₂, PNNP) having the formula ^{57, 71} [Ni(PNNP)Br] Y (Y = Br, PF₆), is markedly distorted (elongation ratio 1 15, α 94°) whereas the cobalt analogue is almost regular (elongation ratio 1 04, α 97°)^{57, 71} (Fig. 5).}}

^{*} mac = 2, 12-dimethyl-3, 7, 11, 17-tetraazabicyclo [11, 3, 1] heptadeca-1 (17), 2, 11, 13, 15-pentaene; sal-en = *N,N'*-ethylene-bis(salicylaldimine), sal-Me = *N*-methyl(salicylaldimine), tren = tris(2-aminoethyl)-amine.

Fig 5. Structures of the $[\text{M}(\text{PNNP})]$ magnetophores

D. TETRAHEDRAL DISTORTION IN TRIGONAL BIPYRAMIDAL COMPLEXES

Turning to trigonal bipyramidal complexes of cobalt(II), a distortion is frequently found in which, as one of the apical bond distances increases, the configuration tends towards tetrahedral (Fig 6).

X-ray data show that the angle γ is often larger than 90° and correspondingly the distance between metal and apical atoms is greater than usual. The distortion may be so large⁷³ that γ may nearly reach $109^\circ 28'$, e.g., 106° , with an elongation ratio reaching ca. 1.3.

A plot of γ against M–N apical bond lengths in cobalt and nickel complexes is presented in Fig. 7. Most of the complexes in this figure have tetradentate tripod-like ligands with a nitrogen atom at the apex of the tripod in a state of sp^3 hybridization, i.e., N_3P , N_2P_2 , NOP_2 and NP_3 donor sets. The donor sets N_4P refer to the bis-isothiocyanate complexes with the tridentate ligand *N,N*-diethyl-*N'*-(2-diphenylphosphinoethyl) ethylenediamine




Fig 6 Tetrahedral distortion of trigonal bipyramidal cobalt(II) complexes

($\text{Et}_2\text{N} \cdot \text{CH}_2 \cdot \text{CH}_2 \cdot \text{NH} \cdot \text{CH}_2\text{CH}_2 \cdot \text{PPh}_2$, HNNP) and its *N'*-methyl analogue (MeNNP) (refs. 57, 60). The set N_4O refers to *N,N*-diethyl-*N'*-(2-diphenylphosphineoxide-ethyl)-ethylenediamine ($\text{Et}_2\text{N} \cdot \text{CH}_2 \cdot \text{CH}_2 \cdot \text{NH} \cdot \text{CH}_2 \cdot \text{CH}_2 \cdot \text{POPh}_2$) (ref. 57). As can be seen from Fig. 7, the M–N bond length increases in parallel with the extent of distortion towards a tetrahedral configuration. This kind of distortion is limited in practice to complexes of cobalt(II).

Since tetrahedral complexes of cobalt(II) can be only high spin, distortion towards a tetrahedral configuration should favour the high-spin state. Ligand field calculations show that the separation of the 4A_2 and 2E levels increases steadily as γ tends to $109^\circ 28'$, as illustrated in Fig. 8. For a practical example of this, compare the two complexes $\text{Co}(\text{HNNP})(\text{NCS})_2$ and $\text{Co}(\text{MeNNP})(\text{NCS})_2$. The difference between the two complexes,




Fig. 7. M-N apical bond lengths vs γ angle in tetrahedrally distorted trigonal bipyramidal magnetophores





Fig. 8. Energy of the lowest high- and low-spin levels for cobalt(II) complexes vs γ values which are related to the tetrahedral distortion through the plot of Fig 6 $Dq = 1.2$ kK, $\beta = 0.8$

which have a N_4P donor set, consists in an *N*-H group in the former in place of an *N*-CH₃ in the latter. The former complex is trigonal-bipyramidal with a small distortion and exhibits a spin equilibrium ($\mu_{\text{eff}} = 2.16$ B.M. at 77°K, 4.32 B.M. at 418°K). The latter compound is severely distorted, with a cobalt-apical nitrogen bond length ca. 0.3 Å longer than in the former complex, and exists only in the high-spin state ($\mu_{\text{eff}} = 4.47$ B.M. at 294°K)^{57, 60} (Fig. 9).

Fig. 9 Structures of the $\text{Co}(\text{HNNP})(\text{NCS})_2$ and $\text{Co}(\text{MeNNP})(\text{NCS})_2$ complexes

The square-pyramidal iodo complex of cobalt(II) with the tripod ligand tris (2-diphenylphosphinoethyl) amine, $[\text{Co}(\text{NP}_3)\text{I}]^+$, has a "standard" geometry with $\alpha = 100^\circ$ and is low spin^{87,93}. In contrast, the other form of the same complex cation, which has a distorted trigonal bipyramidal structure, $\gamma = 106^\circ$, is high spin^{57,87}. The cobalt(II) magnetophores with NP_3Cl , NP_3Br , NOP_2Cl and $\text{N}_2\text{P}_2\text{I}$ donor sets derived from tripod ligands are also high spin. These are strongly distorted towards tetrahedral with γ between 100° and 106° , as shown in Fig 10. It appears that, starting from the tripod ligand with donor set N_4 ($\gamma = 99^\circ$), both γ and the apical distance increase with the number of equatorial phosphorus atoms. Clearly, the Σn° or $\Sigma \chi$ criteria may fail when this type of distortion is present.

The particular way in which complexes of nickel tend to adopt an elongated square pyramidal configuration while complexes of cobalt tend to take a distorted tetrahedral structure is well illustrated by the X-ray structures of the two "umbrella-shaped" complexes $[\text{M}(\text{N}_2\text{P}_2)\text{I}]\text{I}$ (Fig 11). The nickel complex is diamagnetic, the cobalt complex is high-spin. The cations of both complexes are distorted trigonal-bipyramidal. The cobalt complex undergoes distortion towards tetrahedral when the cobalt atom lies ca. 0.5 Å




Fig. 10 Structures of tetrahedrally distorted trigonal-bipyramidal cobalt(II) complexes




Fig. 11. Structures of $[\text{Ni}(\text{N}_2\text{P}_2)\text{I}]\text{I}$ and $[\text{Co}(\text{N}_2\text{P}_2)\text{I}]\text{I}$ complexes.

below the equatorial plane, and thus much nearer to the apical iodine atom. The Co—N(1) distance is unusually long. By contrast the nickel atom is only 0.13 Å below the equatorial plane, and it is the Ni—N(2) distance which is long, i.e. the nickel complex tends to an elongated square pyramid with the N(2) atom at the apex. Since the two compounds are isomorphous the different distortions cannot be attributed to solid state effects, but must be caused by the intrinsic electronic requirements of the two metal ions.

E. CONCLUSIONS

To sum up, the Σn° and $\Sigma \chi^\circ$ values of a donor set provide a generally useful datum with which to predict the spin state of a five-coordinate complex. The prediction may fail, however, if the complex is strongly distorted towards a four-coordinate structure, indeed an unexpected spin state probably indicates that distortion is present. The most common distortion of five-coordinate complexes consists of the lengthening of one metal—donor bond so that the complex tends towards the limiting tetrahedral or planar stereochemistry. The effects of these distortions on magnetic properties can now be fairly well understood.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

It is a pleasure to record my appreciation of the efforts of all my co-workers at this Institute whose work has made this article possible.

REFERENCES

1. L. Sacconi, *J. Chem. Soc. A*, (1970) 248.
2. M. Ciampolini and I. Bertini, *J. Chem. Soc. A*, (1968) 2241.
3. L. Sacconi, G. P. Speroni and R. Morassi, *Inorg. Chem.*, 7 (1968) 1521.
4. C. J. Ballhausen, *Introduction to Ligand Field Theory*, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1962, pp. 221, 222; C. K. Jørgensen, *Modern Aspects of Ligand Field Theory*, North-Holland, London, 1971, pp. 293, 345, 347, 487.
5. (a) F. Basolo and R. G. Pearson, *Mechanism of Inorganic Reactions*, Wiley, New York, 1967, p. 399; (b) B. R. Hollebone, *J. Chem. Soc. A*, (1971) 481.
6. M. J. Norgett and L. M. Venanzi, *Inorg. Chim. Acta*, 2 (1968) 107.
7. P. L. Oriol, *Coord. Chem. Rev.*, 6 (1971) 285.

- 8 (a) J Lewis, R S Nyholm and G A Rodley, *Nature*, 207 (1965) 72
(b) P Pauling, G B Robertson and G A. Rodley, *Nature*, 207 (1965) 73
- 9 (a) W Byers, A B P Lever and R V Parish, *Inorg Chem*, 7 (1968) 1835.
(b) B A Coyle and J A Ibers, *Inorg Chem*, 9 (1970) 767
- 10 (a) A M Brodie, S H Hunter, G A Rodley and C J Wilkins, *Inorg Chim Acta*, 2 (1968) 195
(b) S H Hunter, K Emerson and G A Rodley, *Chem. Commun*, (1969) 1398
- 11 N M Karayannis, J V Minkiewicz, L L Pytlewski and M.M Labes, *Inorg Chim Acta*, 3 (1969) 129
- 12 N M. Karayannis S D Sonsino, C M Mikulski, M J Strocko, L L Pytlewski and M M Labes, *Inorg Chim Acta*, 4 (1970) 141
- 13 (a) L Sacconi, M. Ciampolini and G P Speroni, *J Amer Chem Soc*, 87 (1965) 3102
(b) P L Orioli, M. Di Vaira and L Sacconi, *Chem Commun*, (1965) 103, P L Orioli, M Di Vaira and L Sacconi, *Inorg Chem*, 5 (1966) 400
- 14 L Sacconi, P L Orioli and M Di Vaira, *Chem Commun*, (1967) 849
- 15 J I Legg, D O Nielson, D L Smith and M L Larson, *J Amer Chem. Soc*, 90 (1968) 5030
- 16 L Sacconi and R Morassi, *J. Chem Soc A*, (1970) 575
- 17 L Sacconi, M Ciampolini and G P Speroni, *Inorg Chem*, 4 (1965) 1116
- 18 (a) L Sacconi and I Bertini, *J Amer Chem Soc*, 88 (1966) 5180
(b) P L Orioli, M Di Vaira and L Sacconi, *Chem Commun*, (1966) 300, M Di Vaira, P L Orioli and L Sacconi, *Inorg Chem*, 10 (1971) 953
(c) M Seleborg, S L Holt and B Post, *Inorg Chem*, 10 (1971) 1501
- 19 (a) L Sacconi, P Nannelli, N Nardi and U Campigli, *Inorg Chem*, 4 (1965) 943
(b) L Sacconi, P L Orioli and M Di Vaira, *J Amer Chem Soc*, 87 (1965) 2059, P L Orioli, M Di Vaira and L Sacconi, *J Amer Chem. Soc*, 88 (1966) 4383.
- 20 P Dapporto and L Sacconi, *Chem Commun*, (1969) 329
- 21 (a) L L Goedken, J V Quagliano and L M Vallarino, *Inorg Chem*, 8 (1969) 2331
(b) F K Ross and G D Stucky, *Inorg Chem*, 8 (1969) 2734
- 22 M Ciampolini and N Nardi, *Inorg Chem*, 6 (1967) 445
- 23 L Sacconi and I Bertini, *Inorg Chem*, 7 (1968) 1178
- 24 F K Ross and G D Stucky, *J Amer Chem Soc*, 92 (1970) 4538
- 25 H S Preston and C H L Kennard, *Chem. Commun*, (1968) 819, *J Chem. Soc A*, (1969) 2682
- 26 (a) M Ciampolini and G P Speroni, *Inorg Chem*, 5 (1966) 45
(b) M Di Vaira and P L Orioli, *Chem Commun*, (1965) 590, *Inorg Chem*, 8 (1969) 2729
- 27 (a) Z Dori and H B Gray, *J Amer Chem Soc*, 88 (1966) 1394
(b) Z Dori, R Eisenberg and H B Gray, *Inorg Chem*, 6 (1967) 483
- 28 L Sacconi, I Bertini and R Morassi, *Inorg Chem*, 6 (1967) 1548
- 29 (a) F. Lions, I G Dance and J Lewis, *J Chem Soc A*, (1967) 565.
(b) I G. Dance, M. Gerloch, J Lewis, F S Stephens and F Lions, *Nature*, 210 (1966) 298, M Gerloch, *J Chem. Soc*, (1966) 1317
- 30 J S Judge, W M Reiff, G M Intille, P Ballway and W A Baker, *J Inorg Nucl Chem*, 29 (1967) 1711
- 31 J S Judge and W A. Baker, *Inorg Chim. Acta*, 1 (1967) 239
- 32 Z Dori and H B Gray, *Inorg Chem*, 7 (1968) 889
- 33 L Sacconi, R Morassi and S Midollini, *J Chem Soc A*, (1968) 1510
- 34 (a) C M Harris, T N. Lockyer, R L Martin, H R H. Patil, E Sinn and I M Stewart, *Aust. J Chem.*, 22 (1969) 2105.
(b) E Goldschmied and N C Stephenson, *Acta Crystallogr, Sect B*, 26 (1970) 1867
- 35 P Bamfield, R. Price and R.G J. Miller, *J Chem. Soc A*, (1969) 1447
- 36 M.M Da Mota, J Rodgers and S M Nelson, *J Chem Soc A*, (1969) 2036
- 37 M Ciampolini and N Nardi, *Inorg. Chem*, 5 (1966) 41
- 38 L V Interrante and J.L Shafer, *Inorg Nucl. Chem. Lett*, 4 (1968) 411.
- 39 A Dei and R. Morassi, *J Chem. Soc. A*, (1971) 2024
- 40 (a) J.G Gibson and E D McKenzie, *J Chem. Soc A*, (1971) 1029.
(b) N.A Bailey, J.G Gibson and E D McKenzie, *Chem Commun*, (1969) 741.

- 41 (a) A T Phillip, W Mazurek and A T Casey, *Aust J Chem.*, 24 (1971) 501
(b) W Mazurek, A T Phillip, B F Hoskinson and F D Whillans, *Chem. Commun.*, (1970) 184.
- 42 M Ciampolini and P Paoletti, *Inorg Chem.*, 6 (1967) 126
- 43 M Di Vaira and P L Orioli, *Inorg Chem.*, 6 (1967) 955
- 44 J L Shafer and K N Raymond, *Inorg Chem.*, 10 (1971) 1799
- 45 M Di Vaira and P L Orioli, *Acta Crystallogr., Sect. B*, 24 (1968) 595
- 46 L Sacconi and R Morassi, *Inorg Nucl. Chem. Lett.*, 4 (1968) 449
- 47 P Dapporto, M Di Vaira and L Sacconi, *Chem. Commun.*, (1969) 153, *J. Chem. Soc. A*, (1971) 1891
- 48 M Di Vaira and L Sacconi, *Chem. Commun.*, (1969) 10, M Di Vaira, *J. Chem. Soc. A*, (1971) 148.
- 49 P L Orioli and M Di Vaira, *J. Chem. Soc. A*, (1968) 2079
- 50 M. Ciampolini and J Gelsomini, *Inorg Chem.*, 6 (1967) 1821.
- 51 P S Chia and S E Livingstone, *Aust J Chem.*, 22 (1969) 1613
- 52 S M Nelson and J Rodgers, *Inorg Chem.*, 6 (1967) 1390
- 53 L Sacconi and R Morassi, *Inorg Chem.*, 7 (1968) 295
- 54 J Rodgers and R A Jacobson, *J. Chem. Soc. A*, (1970) 1826.
- 55 L Sacconi and R Morassi, *J. Chem. Soc. A*, (1969) 2904
- 56 M Ciampolini, J Gelsomini and N Nardi, *Inorg. Chim. Acta*, 2 (1968) 343.
- 57 Unpublished results from this laboratory
- 58 R Morassi and L Sacconi, *J. Chem. Soc. A*, (1971) 1487
- 59 I Bertini, P Dapporto, G Fallani and L Sacconi, *Inorg. Chem.*, 10 (1971) 1703
- 60 R Morassi and L Sacconi, *J. Amer. Chem. Soc.*, 92 (1970) 5241
- 61 M Mathew and G Palenik, *J. Amer. Chem. Soc.*, 91 (1969) 4923
- 62 M O Workman, G. Dyer and D.W. Meek, *Inorg. Chem.*, 6 (1967) 1544
- 63 L Sacconi, I Bertini and F Mani, *Inorg. Chem.*, 7 (1968) 1417
- 64 (a) G. Dyer and D W Meek, *Inorg. Chem.*, 4 (1965) 1398
(b) L.P. Haugen and R Eisenberg, *Inorg. Chem.*, 8 (1969) 1072
- 65 (a) R Morassi and L Sacconi, *J. Chem. Soc. A*, (1971) 492
(b) P Dapporto, G Fallani and L Sacconi, *J. Coord. Chem.*, 1 (1971) 269
- 66 A Bianchi and C A Ghilardi, *J. Chem. Soc. A*, (1971) 1096
- 67 S M Nelson and W S J Kelly, *Chem. Commun.*, (1969) 94
- 68 W S J Kelly, G H Ford and S M Nelson, *J. Chem. Soc. A*, (1971) 388
- 69 W V Dahloff and S M Nelson, *J. Chem. Soc. A*, (1971) 2184
- 70 S M Nelson and W S J. Kelly, *Chem. Commun.*, (1968) 436
- 71 L Sacconi and A. Dei, *J. Coord. Chem.*, 1 (1971) 229
- 72 L Sacconi and I Bertini, *J. Amer. Chem. Soc.*, 89 (1967) 2235
- 73 P Dapporto, R Morassi and L Sacconi, *J. Chem. Soc. A*, (1970) 1298
- 74 G Dyer and D W Meek, *Inorg. Chem.*, 6 (1967) 149
- 75 (a) G A Barclay, R S Nyholm and R V Parish, *J. Chem. Soc.*, (1961) 4433
(b) G A Mair, H M Powell and D E Henn, *Proc. Chem. Soc., London*, (1960) 415
- 76 J G Hartley, D.G.E. Kerfoot and L.M. Venanzi, *Inorg. Chim. Acta* 1 (1967) 145
- 77 (a) L Sacconi and R. Morassi, *J. Chem. Soc. A*, (1968) 2997
(b) P.L. Orioli and L Sacconi, *Chem. Commun.*, (1968) 1310, P L. Orioli and C A. Ghilardi, *J. Chem. Soc. A*, (1971) 1511
- 78 D W Meek and J A Ibers, *Inorg. Chem.*, 8 (1969) 1915
- 79 T Du Bois and D W Meek, *Inorg. Chem.*, 8 (1969) 146
- 80 J F Siekhaus and T Layloff, *Inorg. Chem.*, 6 (1967) 2185
- 81 L M. Venanzi, *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed. Engl.*, 3 (1964) 453
- 82 G Dyer, J C Hartley and L M Venanzi, *J. Chem. Soc.*, (1965) 1293
- 83 G Dyer and D W. Meek, *J. Amer. Chem. Soc.*, 89 (1967) 3983
- 84 O St C Headley, R S Nyholm, C A McAuliffe, L Sindellari, M L Tobe and L M Venanzi, *Inorg. Chim. Acta*, 4 (1970) 93
- 85 G Degischer and G Schwarzenbach, *Helv. Chim. Acta*, 49 (1966) 1297

- 86 R.G. Hayter, *Inorg. Chem.*, 2 (1963) 932.
87 L. Sacconi and I. Bertini, *J. Amer. Chem. Soc.*, 90 (1968) 5443
88 G.S. Benner and D.W. Meek, *Inorg. Chem.*, 6 (1967) 1399
89 R.S. Nyholm, M.L. Tobe and A.T. Phillip, *Proc. Int. Conf. Coord. Chem.*, 11th, 1969, p. 164
90 T. Du Bois and D.W. Meek, *Inorg. Chem.*, 6 (1967) 1395
91 (a) G.S. Benner, W.E. Hatfield and D.W. Meek, *Inorg. Chem.*, 3 (1964) 1544
(b) D.L. Stevenson and L.F. Dahl, *J. Amer. Chem. Soc.*, 89 (1967) 3424
92 (a) K. Issleib and E. Wenschuch, *Z. Anorg. Allg. Chem.*, 305 (1960) 15
(b) J.A. Bertrand and D.L. Plymale, *Inorg. Chem.*, 5 (1966) 879
93 P.L. Orioli and L. Sacconi, *Chem. Commun.*, (1969) 1012, C. Mealli, P.L. Orioli and L. Sacconi, *J. Chem. Soc. A*, (1971) 2691
94 P. Dapporto and L. Sacconi, *Chem. Commun.*, (1969) 1091, *J. Chem. Soc. A*, (1970) 1804
95 (a) K.N. Raymond and F. Basolo, *Inorg. Chem.*, 5 (1966) 949
(b) K.N. Raymond, P.W.R. Corfield and J.A. Ibers, *Inorg. Chem.*, 7 (1968) 1362
96 A. Terzis, K.N. Raymond and T.G. Spiro, *Inorg. Chem.*, 9 (1970) 2415
97 E.F. Riedel and R.A. Jacobson, *Inorg. Chim. Acta*, 4 (1970) 407
98 B.R. Higginson, C.A. McAuliffe and L.M. Venzani, *Inorg. Chim. Acta*, 5 (1971) 37.
99 E.A. Rick and R.L. Pruett, *Chem. Commun.*, (1966) 697
100 P. Rigo, C. Pecile and A. Turco, *Inorg. Chem.*, 6 (1967) 1636
101 B.B. Chastain, E.A. Rick, R.L. Pruett and H.B. Gray, *J. Amer. Chem. Soc.*, 90 (1968) 3994
102 (a) K.J. Coskran, J.M. Jenkins and J.G. Verkade, *J. Amer. Chem. Soc.*, 90 (1968) 5437
(b) J.K. Stalick and J.A. Ibers, *Inorg. Chem.*, 8 (1969) 1084
103 (a) B. Bosnich, R. Bramley, R.S. Nyholm and M.L. Tobe, *J. Amer. Chem. Soc.*, 88 (1966) 3926
(b) B. Bosnich, R.S. Nyholm, P.J. Pauling and M.L. Tobe, *J. Amer. Chem. Soc.*, 90 (1968) 4741
104 T.L. Blundell, H.M. Powell and L.M. Venzani, *Chem. Commun.*, (1967) 763
105 K. Issleib and H. Weichmann, *Z. Anorg. Allg. Chem.*, 362 (1968) 33
106 J.K. Stalick and J.A. Ibers, *Inorg. Chem.*, 8 (1969) 1090
107 (a) D.W. Allen, I.T. Millar and F.G. Mann, *J. Chem. Soc. A*, (1969) 1101.
(b) D.W. Allen, F.G. Mann, I.T. Millar, H.M. Powell and D.J. Watkin, *Chem. Commun.*, (1969) 1004
(c) H.M. Powell, D.J. Watkin and J.B. Wilford, *J. Chem. Soc. A*, (1971) 1803
108 L. Sacconi, *Pure Appl. Chem.*, 27 (1971) 161
109 C.J. Ballhausen and E.M. Ancmon, *Kgl. Dan. Vidensk. Selsk., Mat.-Fys. Medd.*, 29 (1954) 4
110 (a) S. Brückner, M. Calligaris, G. Nardin and L. Randaccio, *Acta Crystallogr., Sect. B*, 25 (1969) 1671
(b) R. De Iasi, S.L. Holt and B. Post, *Inorg. Chem.*, 10 (1971) 1498
111 M. Calligaris, D.M. Minichelli, G. Nardin and L. Randaccio, *J. Chem. Soc. A*, (1970) 2411
112 P.R.H. Alderman, P.G. Owston and T.M. Rowe, *J. Chem. Soc.*, (1962) 668
113 L. Sacconi, M. Di Vaira and A. Bianchi, *J. Amer. Chem. Soc.*, 92 (1970) 4465
114 E.B. Fleischer and S.W. Hawkinson, *Inorg. Chem.*, 7 (1968) 2312
115 E.P.S. Shetty, R.E. Ballard and Q. Fernando, *Chem. Commun.*, (1969) 717
116 P.S. Shetty and Q. Fernando, *J. Amer. Chem. Soc.*, 92 (1970) 3964
117 M. Bonamico, G. Dessy and V. Fares, *Chem. Commun.*, (1969) 324.