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#### Abstract

The magnetic susceptibilities of molybdenum ions with $4 d^{1}$ electronic configuration in the octahedral crystal field were calculated on the basis of ligand field theory. The experimental magnetic susceptibilities for molybdenum ions, which are stabilized at the octahedral site in the perovskite lattice of $\mathrm{Ba}_{2} \mathrm{ScMo}^{\mathrm{V}} \mathrm{O}_{6}$ and Sr ${ }_{2} \mathrm{YMO}^{{ }^{v} \mathrm{O}_{b}}$, were compared with the theoretical ones. We have tried to fit their temperature dependences of magnetic susceptibility with ligand field parameters, spin-orbit coupling constant $\zeta_{s o,}$ and orbital reduction parameter K according to intermediate field coupling and strong field theory. Strong field coupling theory could not explain experimental curves without unrealistically large axial ligand field, since it ignores the mixing up between different state via spin-orbit interaction and ligand field. On the other hand, the intermediate field coupling theory could successfully reproduce experimental data in octahedral and trigonal ligand field. The fitting result demonstrates not only the fact that spin-orbit interaction is primarily responsible for the variation of magnetic behavior but also the fact that effective orbital overlap, enhanced by cubic crystal structure, reduces significantly orbital angular momentum as indicated by $\kappa$ parameter.


## Introduction

In order to interpret the magnetic property of second and third row element, more ngorous calculation is required than the simplified one such as weak field coupling, which has been known to be quite successful in interpreting the magnetic property of first row element. There is a marked difference in the magnetic and optical properties between the $4 d^{n}$ and $5 d^{m}$ transition metal ions and $3 d^{m}$ ones, since spi-$n$-orbit interaction as well as ligand field are much stronger than interelectronic repulsion in the former, compared to the latter. ${ }^{1-7}$ In fact, in going from $3 d$ toward $4 d$ and $5 d$, we notice that the interelectronic repulsion among the outer shell

[^0]electrons gets weaker while the spin-orbit interaction becomes stronger. Therefore, the influences of spin-orbit interaction and ligand field need to be relevantly considered. As it is well-known, in the weak field coupling scheme, the starting orbital is $d$ and the zeroth order wavefunctions are
$$
\left|d, m_{l}=2>,|d, 1>,| d, 0\right\rangle, \mid d,-1>, \text { and }|d,-2\rangle
$$
and the zeroth order Hamiltonian consists of the free ion Hamiltonian, given by
$$
H_{w}=H_{c o r e}-\sum_{i} \frac{Z e^{2}}{r_{i}}+\sum_{i \neq i} \frac{e^{2}}{r_{i j}}
$$
where the summation is over all the $d$ electrons. Here $H_{\text {core }}$ involves the electrons in the closed shells. The symmetry group of $H_{W}$ is the full rotation group $R_{3}$ in the weak field
scheme. In the strong field scheme, the starting orbitals are $t_{2}$ and $e$. The zeroth order functions are
$$
\left|t_{2} \xi>\left|t_{2} \eta>t_{2} \zeta>|e \theta>| e \varepsilon>\right.\right.
$$
and the zeroth order Hamiltonian is given by
$$
H_{S}=H_{\mathrm{cize}}-\sum_{,} \frac{Z e^{2}}{r_{1}}+\sum_{1} v_{C}+\sum_{i \neq j} \frac{e^{2}}{r_{i j}}
$$
and the symmetry group of $H_{s}$ is $O_{h}$. In the intermediate coupling scheme, the starting orbitals are $\gamma_{k,}, \gamma_{2}$, and $\gamma_{\mathrm{skr}}$. The zeroth order Hamiltonian now includes the spin-orbit interaction:
$$
H_{i}=H_{\text {core }}-\sum_{i} \frac{Z e^{2}}{r_{i}}+\sum_{i} V_{c}+\sum_{i+j} \frac{e^{2}}{r_{i j}}+\zeta \sum_{i} t_{i} \cdot s_{i}
$$

Owing to the spin operators in the above Hamiltonian, the symmetry group of $H_{l}$ is now the octahedral double group, denoted by $O_{h}{ }^{\prime \prime}$.

In this work, we have applied intermediate field coupling scheme and strong field one based on ligand field theory to the magnetic property of perovskite compounds, in which molybdenum ion possessing $4 d^{\prime \prime}$ electronic configuration is stabilized at the octahedral site. Comparison of the fitting results based upon intermediate field coupling and strong field one will give us how the nature of element such as spi-n-orbit coupling and bond covalency influences the magnetic behavior of the molybdenum in the lattice of perovskite oxide.

## Experimental

The polycrystalline samples of $\mathrm{Ba}_{2} \mathrm{ScMoO}_{6}$ and $\mathrm{Sr}_{2} \mathrm{YMoO}_{6}$ have been prepared from high purity $\mathrm{BaCO}_{3}, \mathrm{SrCO}_{3}, \mathrm{Sc}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$, $\mathrm{Y}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$, and $\mathrm{MoO}_{3}$ in flowing $\mathrm{H}_{2}$ atmosphere. The stoichiometric mixtures were thoroughly ground in an agate mortar, and pelleted, and then heated. The single phase molybdenum compounds could be obtained by heat treatment at $1200^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 1 hr . The oxidation state of molybdenum was determined by redox titration using cerium sulfate with ferroin indicator. Average oxidation numbers were obtained as $4.99 \pm 0.04$ and $5.00 \pm 0.04$ for $\mathrm{Ba}_{2} \mathrm{ScMoO}_{6}$ and $\mathrm{Sr}_{2} \mathrm{YMoO}_{6}$, respectively. The powder X-ray diffraction patterns for molybdenum compounds were collected at room temperature by step scanning with an increment of $0.02^{\circ}$ (20) and a counting time of 6 sec , using Philips X'pert PW 1830 automated powder diffractometors with Ni filtered $\mathrm{Cu}-\mathrm{K}_{\alpha}$ radiation. Rietveld refinements were made with the program RIETAN-94. Experimental magnetic susceptibilities for both compounds were measured by means of an automatic DSM 8 type susceptometer in the temperature range from 10 K to 300 K . The equipment was calibrated using a single crystal of $\mathrm{Gd}_{2}\left(\mathrm{SO}_{4}\right)_{3} \cdot 8 \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$. Diamagnetic contribution of every ion was corrected according to Selwood. ${ }^{8}$ UV-Visible-NIR spectra were recorded in the diffuse reflectance mode at room temperature on Perkin-Elmer lamda 12 spectrophotometer with integrating sphere. Although the crystal structure of $\mathrm{Sr}_{2}-$ $\mathrm{YMoO}_{6}$ was reported to have pseudo cubic crystal system, ${ }^{9}$ we have found that it has monoclinic structure with the space group of $P 2_{1} / n$. Most of the strong peaks in the diffraction pattern for $\mathrm{Sr}_{2} \mathrm{YMoO}_{6}$ seem to be indexed by an

Table 1. Crystallographic data for cubic $\mathrm{Ba}_{2} \mathrm{ScMoO}_{6}$ and monoclinic $\mathrm{Sr}_{2} \mathrm{YMoO}_{6}$ with standard deviation in parentheses

ordered perovskite structure in the cubic space group $\operatorname{Fm} \overline{3} m$ with a doubled unit cell parameter of a simple perovskite lattice, but some peaks with very low intensity could not be indexed with this space group. And, as shown in Figure 2(c), body-centered orthorhomic structure (Pnnm) could not successfully index all of peaks and the splitting of peaks in high angle range could not successfully reproduced. Careful analysis of all the diffraction lines indicates that the crystal symmetry is reduced to a monoclinic $P 2_{1} / n$ space group. This space group permit ordering of $Y$ and Mo cations over 6-coordinate sites of perovskite structure. And it should be noted that the lattice parameters can be considered as those of a body-centered orthorhombic lattice, and the B-site cations retain the body-centered orthorhombicity, but only the Sr and oxygen ions lose the orthorhombic symmetry, so that the lattice symmetry was reduced to a monoclinic one. Although the crystal system of $\mathrm{Ba}_{2} \mathrm{ScMoO}_{6}$ was described as hexagonal one in the previous report, ${ }^{10}$ there is no evidence on the lowering of symmetry from cubic symmetry in the present X-ray diffraction pattern. According to the refinement, $\mathrm{R}_{w p}$ values are lowered to $6.95 \%$ and $5.02 \%$ for $\mathrm{Ba}_{2} \mathrm{ScMoO}_{6}$ and $\mathrm{Sr}_{2} \mathrm{YMoO}_{6}$, respectively. Finally refined parameters and selected bond distances and angles are presented in Tables 1 and 2, respectively. Crystal structures

Table 2. Selected interatomic distances ( $\AA$ ) and bond angles ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ) for molybdenum perovskites

| Compounds | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mo-O distance }(\AA) \\ & \text { B-O distance }(\AA) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { O-Mo-O bond angle }\left({ }^{\circ}\right) \\ & \text { Mo-O-B bond angle }\left({ }^{\circ}\right) \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{Ba}_{2} \mathrm{ScMoO}_{5}$ | Mo-O 2.042 (1) | O-Mo-O 180 |
|  | Sc-O 2.042 (1) | Mo-O-Sc 180 |
| $\mathrm{Sr}_{2} \mathrm{YMOO}_{6}$ | Mo-O1 1.96 (4) $\times 2$ | O1-Mo-O2 93 (2) |
|  | Mo-O2 1.93 (4) $\times 2$ | O1-Mo-O3 84 (1) |
|  | Mo-O3 2.00 (4) $\times 2$ | O2-Mo-O3 94 (2) |
|  | Y-O1 2.23 (4) $\times 2$ | Y-O1-Mo 159 (2) |
|  | Y-O2 2.22 (3) $\times 2$ | Y-O2-Mo 163 (2) |
|  | Y-O3 2.25 (4) $\times 2$ | Y-O3-Mo 150 (2) |

of cubic $\mathrm{Ba}_{2} \mathrm{ScMoO}_{6}$ and monoclinic $\mathrm{St}_{2} \mathrm{YMoO}_{6}$ are shown in Figure 1. The observed, calculated, and difference profiles are shown in Figure 2.

## Ligand Field Calculation

In the strong field coupling scheme, in which the spin-orbit interaction is not included in zeroth order Hamiltonian, there are two single-electron levels denoted by $t_{2}$ (lower level) and $e$ (upper level) whose spatial degeneracies are 3 and 2 , respectively. The sets of spatial basis functions for these two levels are $(\xi, \eta, \zeta)$ and $(\theta, \varepsilon)$ with a spin degeneracy of


Figure 1. (a) Cubic crystal structure of $\mathrm{Ba}_{2} \mathrm{ScMoO}_{6}$. Filled circles and octahedra represent barium, $\mathrm{ScO}_{6}$, and $\mathrm{MoO}_{6}$, respectively. (b) Monoclinic crystal structure of $\mathrm{SI}_{2} \mathrm{YMoO}_{6}$.


Figure 2. X-ray powder diffraction patterns for (a) $\mathrm{Ba}_{2} \mathrm{ScMoO}_{6}$ and (b) $\mathrm{Sr}_{2} \mathrm{YMoO}_{6}$. Observed ( + ), calculated ( - ), difference ( - ) profiles and Bragg positions (|) for $\mathrm{Ba}_{2} \mathrm{ScMoO}_{6}$ and $\mathrm{Sr}_{2} \mathrm{YMoO}_{6}$ are presented. (c) The observed ( - ) and calculated profiles based on the orthorhombic ( $P n n m$; dashed line) and monoctinic ( $P 2, / n$; solid line) space group are compared.

2, respectively, which span the $\mathrm{T}_{2 \mathrm{~g}}$ and $\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{g}}$ representations of the $O_{k}$ group. ${ }^{7}$ These functions are suitable linear combinations of the five $d$ orbitals ( $d_{2}, d_{1}, d_{0}, d_{1}, d_{2}$ ). The electronic energies for the $t_{2}$ and $e$ levels are, respectively, $-4 D q$ and $6 D q$ measured from the free ion energy level. The effects of tetragonal crystal field and spin-orbit coupling were treated as simultaneous perturbations, which are represented in Table 5 by $\Delta$ and $\zeta_{\infty}$ as an indication of respective interaction. Spin-orbit interaction parameter $\zeta_{\text {so }}$ should not be confused with the spatial basis function $\zeta$. The effect of a magnetic field, which causes changes in energy which are considerably smaller than the previous perturbations, is then treated as a further perturbation. ${ }^{11}$

The complete sets of basis functions in the intermediate field coupling are obtained by coupling of spatial basis functions, $(\xi, \zeta, \eta)$ and $(\theta, \varepsilon)$ for $t_{2}$ and $e$, respectively, with the spin functions. And then the symmetry adapted irreducible representations $\Gamma_{7}$ and $\Gamma_{R}$ of the double group $O_{h}{ }^{\prime}$ could be

Table 3. Symmetry adapted wavefunctions for $d^{\text {d }}$ configuration

| Terms | Wavefunctions |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\Gamma_{8}^{\prime}\left(T_{2 g}\right)$ | $\Gamma_{8} \frac{3}{2}>=\frac{i}{\sqrt{6}} \xi^{+}+\frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} \eta^{+}+\frac{i \sqrt{2}}{\sqrt{3}} \zeta^{-}$ |
|  | $\Gamma_{8} \frac{1}{2}>=\frac{-i}{\sqrt{2}} \xi^{-}-\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \pi$ |
|  | $\Gamma_{8} \frac{-1}{2}>=\frac{i}{\sqrt{2}} \xi^{+}-\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \eta^{\prime}$ |
|  | $\Gamma_{\mathrm{R}} \frac{-3}{2}>=\frac{-i}{\sqrt{6}} \xi^{-}+\frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} \eta^{-}+\frac{i \sqrt{2}}{\sqrt{3}} \zeta^{+}$ |
| $\Gamma_{7}\left({ }^{2} T_{2 g}\right)$ | $\Gamma_{7} \frac{-1}{2}>=\frac{-1}{\sqrt{3}} \xi^{+}-\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \eta^{+}+\frac{i}{\sqrt{3}} \zeta^{-}$ |
|  | $\Gamma_{7} \frac{1}{2}>=\frac{-1}{\sqrt{3}} \xi^{+}+\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \eta^{-}-\frac{i}{\sqrt{3}} \zeta^{+}$ |
| $\Gamma_{\mathrm{A}}^{\prime}\left({ }^{2} E_{g}\right)$ | $\Gamma_{8}^{\prime} \frac{3}{2}>=\varepsilon^{-}$ |
|  | $\Gamma_{8}^{\prime} \frac{1}{2}>=-\theta^{+}$ |
|  | $\Gamma_{8}^{\prime} \frac{-1}{2}>=\theta^{-}$ |
|  | $\Gamma_{8}^{\prime} \frac{-3}{2}>=-\varepsilon^{+}$ |

where,
$\xi=\frac{i}{\sqrt{2}}(|1>+|-1>)=d_{x} ;$
$\eta=\frac{-1}{\sqrt{2}}(|1>-|-1>)=d_{x z}$
$\zeta=\frac{-i}{\sqrt{2}}(|2>+|-2>)=d_{x}$.
$\theta=\mid 0>=d_{z 2}$
$\varepsilon=\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|2>+|-2>)=d_{x 2 y}=$
obtained. Since the spin functions

$$
\left\lvert\, S=\frac{1}{2}\right., m_{S}=+\frac{1}{2}>\text { and }\left|S=\frac{1}{2}, m_{S}=-\frac{1}{2}\right\rangle
$$

span the $\Gamma_{6}$ representation of $O_{h}{ }^{\prime}, \Gamma_{8}$ and $\Gamma_{7}$ can be obtained after decomposition of the direct product $T_{2 g} \otimes \Gamma_{6}$, which give the two sets in Table 3 . Similarly $\mathbf{E}_{8} \otimes \Gamma_{6}$ gives the next set. The coupling coefficients required here are given in Table A20 of reference 12.

In the presence of the spin-orbit interaction term $l \cdot s$, there will be a mixing between the $\Gamma_{8 r_{2}}$ and $\Gamma_{8 c}$ terms. The matrix of $H_{0}$ between these two terms is as follows:

$$
H_{0}=\Gamma_{k_{12}}\left(\begin{array}{cc}
-4 D q-\frac{1}{2} \zeta_{\mathrm{si}} & \sqrt{32} \zeta_{\mathrm{K}} \\
\sqrt{32} \zeta_{\mathrm{so}} & 6 D q
\end{array}\right)
$$

Diagonalization of the above matrix gives two eigenvalues,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left.\varepsilon_{0}(8 l)=D q-1 / 4 \zeta_{s c}-1 \not \approx 2\left[910 D q+1 / 2 \zeta_{s c}\right)^{2}+6 \zeta_{s s}^{2}\right]^{1 / 2} \\
& \left.\varepsilon_{0}(8 u)=D q-1 / 4 \zeta_{s o}-1 \kappa 2\left[910 D q+1 / 2 \zeta_{s o}\right)^{2}+6 \zeta_{s o}^{2}\right]^{1 / 2}
\end{aligned}
$$

with the corresponding eigenvectors

$$
\binom{\cos \theta}{-\sin \theta}\binom{\sin \theta}{\cos \theta}
$$

Table 4. Energy matrix for $\Gamma_{4}, \Gamma_{5}$ and $\Gamma_{6}$ states in $D_{3 d}{ }^{\prime}$

| $\Gamma_{4}$ | $\Gamma_{7}\left({ }^{2} T_{2 g}\right)$ | $\Gamma_{8}\left({ }^{2} T_{2 g}\right)$ | $\Gamma_{7}{ }^{\left(2 E_{g}\right)}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $4 D q-\frac{14}{9}$ | $\begin{gathered} \frac{\sqrt{2}}{9}(9 D \sigma+20 D \tau) \\ -\frac{1}{2} \zeta_{s o}-4 D q-\frac{1}{9} \\ (9 D \sigma+34 D \tau) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \frac{2}{3 \sqrt{3}}(2 D \sigma-5 D \tau) \\ \frac{1}{\frac{3}{2}} \zeta_{s o}+\frac{\sqrt{2}}{3 \sqrt{3}} \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \hline D q+\frac{7}{3} D \tau \tau \end{gathered}$ |
| $\underline{\Gamma_{5,} \Gamma_{6}}$ |  |  | $\Gamma_{8}{ }^{\left(2 E_{g}\right)}$ |
|  | $\frac{1}{2} \zeta_{m m}-4 D$ | $\sigma+\frac{3}{2} D \tau$ | $\begin{gathered} \sqrt{\frac{3}{2}} \zeta_{s o}-\frac{\sqrt{2}}{3} e^{i \beta / 2} \\ (2 D \sigma-5 D \tau) \\ 6 D q+\frac{7}{3} D \tau \end{gathered}$ |

where,

$$
\cos \beta=-\frac{1}{3}, \sin \beta=\frac{2 \sqrt{2}}{3}
$$

respectively, where

$$
\tan \theta=\frac{\sqrt{6} \zeta_{\mathrm{so}}}{10 D q+\frac{1}{2} \zeta_{\mathrm{so}}}
$$

Now, the $\Gamma_{8 t}$ and $\Gamma_{84}$ basis sets corresponding to the two fourfold degenerate energy levels in energy matrix are linear combinations of the original $\Gamma_{8 r 2}$ and $\Gamma_{8 c}$ basis sets;

$$
\begin{aligned}
& a_{t}=\left|\Gamma_{k j} a>=6 \cos \theta\right| \Gamma_{k \cdot 2} a>-\sin \theta \mid \Gamma_{\mathrm{ke}} a> \\
& a_{H}=\left|\Gamma_{\mathrm{Ku}} a>=6 \sin \theta\right| \Gamma_{8 / 2} a>+\cos \theta \mid \Gamma_{8 e} a>
\end{aligned}
$$

The $\Gamma_{8 \nu}$ level is above the $\Gamma_{8 t}$ level and the remaining doubly degenerate $\Gamma_{\text {, level lies in between those two. The en- }}^{\text {l }}$ ergy value of the $\Gamma$, level is

$$
\varepsilon_{0}\left(\Gamma_{7}\right)=\left\langle\Gamma_{7} a\right| H_{o}\left|\Gamma_{7} a\right\rangle=-4 D q+\zeta_{c i}
$$

The levels in $O_{h}$ ligand field are further split by trigonal ligand field interaction, and five Kramer's doublet belonging to the irreducible representation $\Gamma_{4}, \Gamma_{5}$, and $\Gamma_{6}$ of the trigonal double group $D_{3 d}$ can be obtained. ${ }^{2,7}$ The irreducible representation $\Gamma_{4}$ is doubly degenerate, whereas $\Gamma_{5}$ and $\Gamma_{6}$ are nondegenerate. But, these nondegenerate representations are Kramer's conjugate and constitute a Kramer's doublet. The energy matrices for $\Gamma_{4}, \Gamma_{5}$, and $\Gamma_{6}$ states have been reported in Table 4. After the energy matrices were diagonalized to obtain the energy and the zeroth order wavefunctions, three doubly degenerated terms at the lower energy level were used. From these three doubly degenerate wavefunctions, the matrices of parallel and perpendicular magnetic moments and 1 st and 2 nd order Zeeman coefficients could be derived with the orbital ( $I_{i}$ ) and spin ( $s_{i}$ ) operators. ${ }^{13}$ Orbital reduction factors $\kappa$ and $\kappa^{\prime}$ were defined as a measure of quenching of orbital angular momentum within $t_{2 \mathrm{~g}}$ orbitals and between $t_{2 \mathrm{~g}}$ and $e_{\mathrm{g}}$ orbitals, respectively. Finally, the magnetic susceptibility $\chi_{i}(i=x, y, z)$ could be calculated using Van Vleck's equation. ${ }^{1}$ Electronic states of $\mathrm{Mo}^{\mathrm{v}}$ ion ( $4 d^{\mathrm{l}}$ ) in octahedral symmetry are described in Figure 3. The UV-Visible-NIR diffuse reflectance spectra of $\mathrm{Mo}^{v}$ compounds in the range of $300 \mathrm{~nm}-700 \mathrm{~nm}$


Figure 3. Schematic electronic states of $\mathrm{Mo}^{\vee}$ ion (4 $d^{1}$ ) in octahedral symmetry.
are shown in Figure 4. Ligand field parameter Dq was constrained to be $2850 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$ according to the bands around 350 nm , and the other parameters were obtimized as variables in the nonlinear least-squares fitting procedure. The result of best-fit between the experimental magnetic susceptibilities and the calculated ones is shown in Figure 5, and the fitted parameters are summarized in Table 5.

## Discussion

For the molybdenum belonging to second transition metal series, it is necessary to consider the mixing between $t_{2}$ and $e$ level via spin-orbit interaction and crystal field. In this point of view, it is expected that the intermediate field coupling theory, in which spin-orbit interaction matrices could be completely diagonalized, could give us more physically meaningful parameters. For $\mathrm{Ba}_{2} \mathrm{ScMoO}_{6}$ with cubic crystal


Figure 4. Diffuse reflectance spectra for (a) $\mathrm{Ba}_{2} \mathrm{ScMoO}_{6}$ and (b) $\mathrm{Sr}_{2} \mathrm{YMoO}_{6}$.


Figure 5. (a) Experimental ( $\Delta$ ) and theoretical ( - ) magnetic susceptibilities for $\mathrm{Ba}_{2} \mathrm{ScMoO}_{6}$. (b) Experimental ( $O$ ) and theoretical ( - ) ones for $\mathrm{S}_{2} \mathrm{YMoO}_{6}$.
structure, the theoretical calculation of magnetic susceptibility based on the strong field coupling could not give satisfactory fitting with experimental data without axial field parameter $\Delta\left(550 \mathrm{~cm}^{1}\right)$, whereas that based on the intermediate field coupling is in good agreement with the experimental one. It is therefore concluded that the latter theory is more appropriate than the former one in the case of molybdenum. For $\mathrm{Sr}_{2} \mathrm{YMoO}_{6}$ with monoclinic crystal structure, the ligand field of cubic symmetry does not explain experimental curve without extreme reduction of orbital angular momentum ( $\kappa=\sim 0.2$ ). Although we have tried to fit the experimental data by assuming a tetragonal distortion from cubic symmetry ( $D s, D t=0$ or $D \sigma, D \tau=0$ ), the calculation under the action of tetragonal ligand field does not give any satisfactory agreement with the observed magnetic susceptibility without unrealistically large tetragonal field parameters $D s$ and $D t$, as much as $400-800 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$, and extreme reduction of $\kappa$ parameter ( $\kappa=0.1-0.3$ ). On the other hand, the calculation assuming the action of trigonal field gives reasonable fitting result. Trigonal field parameters $D \sigma$ and $D \tau$ were assumed to be equal, and $D q$ parameter for each compound was constrained according to the bands around 350 nm in optical spectra as shown in Figure 4, which are due to vibronically allowed $d$-d transitions $\left(t_{2 g} \rightarrow\right.$ $e_{g}{ }^{\text {a }}$ ). As the band corresponding to $d-d$ transition does not exhibit discemible variation, the ligand field parameters $D q$ for both molybdenum compounds were set equal to 2850 $\mathrm{cm}^{-1}$.

According to the magnetic susceptibility fitting result, the

Table 5. Summaty of magnetic susceptibility best-fit results

| Compounds | Intermediate coupling |  |  |  | Strong field |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} D \sigma, D \tau \\ \left(\mathrm{~cm}^{-1}\right) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \zeta_{\infty} \\ \left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right) \end{gathered}$ | $k$ | K | $\begin{array}{r} \Delta \\ \text { (cm } \end{array}$ | $\mathrm{m}$ | $\kappa$ |
| $\mathrm{Ba}_{2} \mathrm{ScMoO}_{6}$ | $D \sigma=D \tau=0$ | 950 | 0.86 | 0.55 | 550 | 996 | 1.00 |
| $\mathrm{Sr}_{2} \mathrm{YMoO}_{6}$ | $D \sigma=D \tau=131$ | 704 | 1.0 | 0.75 | 897 | 649 | 1.00 |

spin-orbit coupling constant for $\mathrm{St}_{2} \mathrm{YMOO}_{6}\left(\zeta_{\mathrm{s}}=704 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}\right)$ is more reduced than that for $\mathrm{Ba}_{2} \mathrm{ScMoO}_{0}\left(\zeta_{\mathrm{sc}}=950 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}\right)$, which implies that the ( $\mathrm{Mo}-\mathrm{O}$ ) bond for $\mathrm{Sr}_{2} \mathrm{YMoO}_{6}$ is more covalent than that for $\mathrm{Ba}_{2} \mathrm{ScMoO}_{6}{ }^{7.11-13}$ The spin-orbit coupling constant for free $\mathrm{Mo}^{\mathrm{v}}$ ion is known to be $1030 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$. ${ }^{4}$ This result could be explained by considering the local structure of the molybdenum site. It is expected that more acidic scandium will reduce ( $\mathrm{Mo}-\mathrm{O}$ ) bond covalency because ( $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{O}$ ) bond ( $\mathrm{B}=\mathrm{Sc}, \mathrm{Y}$ ) competes with ( $\mathrm{Mo}-\mathrm{O}$ ) bond by the pathway of $180^{\circ}$. ${ }^{5}$ According to Rietveld refinement, the bond distance between molybdenum and oxygen for $\mathrm{Ba}_{2} \mathrm{ScMoO}_{6}$ ( 2.042 (1) $\AA$ ) is larger than the average value of $1.96 \AA$ for $\mathrm{Sr}_{2} \mathrm{YMoO}_{6}(1.93$ (4), 1.96 (4), and 2.00 (4) $\AA$ ), as shown in Table 2 , which supports the magnetic susceptibility fitting result. The trend of orbital reduction factor could be explained by crystal structure. Smaller reduction of x parameter in $\mathrm{Sr}_{2} \mathrm{YMoO}_{6}\left(\kappa=1.00, \kappa^{\prime}=0.75\right)$ than $\mathrm{Ba}_{2} \mathrm{ScMoO}_{6}(\kappa=0.86$, $\kappa^{\prime}=0.55$ ) implies the fact that distorted crystal structure disturbs effective orbital overlap between molybdenum and oxygen.
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#### Abstract

${ }^{13} \mathrm{C},{ }^{15} \mathrm{~N}$, and ${ }^{29} \mathrm{Si}$ NMR chemical shifts have been computed for selected X -substituted silatranes $(\mathrm{X}=\mathrm{Cl}, \mathrm{F}, \mathrm{H}$, $\mathrm{CH}_{3}$ ) using Gauge-Including Atomic Orbitals (GIAO) at the Hartree-Fock level of theory. The isotropic ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ chemical shifts are largely insensitive to substituent-induced structural changes. In this study, the isotropic ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ chemical shifts between 1-methyl- and 1-hydrogensilatranes by GIAO-SCF calculation at the HF/6-31G level are very similar. But the results of 1 -chloro- and 1 -fluorosilatranes are about 4 ppm different from the experimental values. In contrast, the isotropic ${ }^{15} \mathrm{~N}$ and ${ }^{29} \mathrm{Si}$ chemical shifts and the chemical shielding tensors are quite sensitive to substituent-induced structural changes. These trends are consistent with those of the experiment. The isotropic ${ }^{15} \mathrm{~N}$ chemical shift demonstrates a very clear correlation with $\mathrm{Si}-\mathrm{N}$ distance. But in case of ${ }^{29} \mathrm{Si}$ the correlations are not as clean as for the ${ }^{15} \mathrm{~N}$ chemical shift; the calculated variation in the ${ }^{29} \mathrm{Si}$ chemical shift is much larger.


## Introduction

The isotropic chemical shift is an immensely useful para-

[^1]meter in the determination of chemical structure. This usefulness is largely due to empirical structure/chemical shift correlations. However, the problem of the understanding of the relationship between the chemical shift and molecular structure can be quite difficult. $A b$ initio calculations are
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