The Significance of \( \pi \) Back-bonding in Compounds with Pyrite, Marcasite, and Arsenopyrite Type Structures
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The structural data on compounds with the pyrite, marcasite, and arsenopyrite type crystal structures have been examined and are found to give no indication of \( \pi \) back-bonding between the metal and non-metal atoms. The same conclusion is reached on reexamining the Mössbauer parameters for the iron dichalcogenides and dipnictides.

The structural, electrical, and magnetic properties of binary and some ternary compounds with the FeS\(_2\)-p (p=pyrite), FeS\(_2\)-m (m=marcasite), and CoSb\(_2\) (FeAsS-arsenopyrite) type crystal structures have, during the past five years, been extensively studied at this Institute.\(^1\)\(^-\)\(^18\) Although a bonding scheme for these substances has been proposed \(^17\),\(^18\) which accounts reasonably well for experimental observations, the significance of \( \pi \) interactions between the metal and non-metal atoms has not been thoroughly examined. However, from the symmetry of these structure types, \( \pi \) back-bonding is allowed, and this possibility should indeed be considered. Additional information concerning the bonding in these compounds is contained in the variations of the observed bond lengths and the \(^{57}\)Fe Mössbauer parameters for the compounds containing iron.

**Bond Lengths**

A common feature of the three structure types under consideration is that they contain bonding \( T - X \) and \( X - X \) distances, where \( T \) and \( X \) designate metal and non-metal atoms, respectively. (The CoSb\(_2\) type has also additional bonding \( T - T \) distances, which will not be discussed here.) As a consequence of the bonding \( X - X \) distance (which in the previous bond considerations \(^{17}\),\(^{18}\) was assumed to represent a single bond) there is an internal measure for the
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radius * of the $X$ atom ($r_X$) built into the crystal structure. Since $r_X$ is one of
the factors governing the $T - X$ bond length, it will be useful to investigate
the relationship between the $X - X$ and $T - X$ bond distances. The other factor
influencing the $T - X$ bond length is the radius of $T$ ($r_T$).

As shown in Fig. 1 there is a distinct correlation between the two categories
of interatomic distances. A conspicuous feature of this figure is the linear
relationship between the bonding $X - X$ and $T - X$ distances for a given $T$
while varying $X$ within a Group of the Periodic System. It should be noted
that the observed $X - X$ and $T - X$ distances are not independent parameters,
since they are interrelated through the positional coordinates and the unit cell
dimensions. The simplest interpretation for the linear trend in Fig. 1 is that
$r_T$ remains approximately constant in a series of compounds, or, alternatively
$r_T$ is itself a linear function of $r_X$. (The scale of the diagram is such that variations
in $r_T$ of the order of a few hundredths of an Ångström will not be notice-
able.) An examination of the data for the manganese dichalcogenides (where a
good linear fit is obtained in Fig. 1), for example, shows that $r_T$ varies very
slowly, but approximately linearly with $r_X$. The actual values for $r_X$; $r_T$ are
$1.04_5$, $1.16_5$, $1.54_4$, and $1.37_5$; $1.53_4$ Å for MnS$_2$, MnSe$_2$, and MnTe$_2$,
respectively. This tendency for a decrease in $r_T$ with increasing atomic number
of $X$ is a common feature for most of the series, the implications of which are
discussed further on.

As seen from Fig. 1 there are some deviations from linearity which require
an explanation. In the construction of the diagram, all binary compounds for
which positional coordinates are available have been included, and it would not
be unexpected, therefore, if experimental errors are a cause of some of these
discrepancies. This is a possibility for FeAs$_2$, RuP$_2$, RuAs$_2$, OsP$_2$, RhP$_2$, and
IrP$_2$, etc. and it would be of interest to have these structures redetermined on
the basis of single crystal data.

A comparison of the data for the pyrite and marcasite modifications of FeS$_2$
shows that there is a marked change in both $r_X$ and $r_T$ (Fig. 1), but
since only series of isostructural compounds are relevant to the discussion
this does not represent a real discrepancy.

It is apparent from Fig. 1 that the reported variation in composition for the
metal deficient FeS$_2$-$p$ type structures of the rhodium and iridium chalo-
genides (cf. Refs. 19–21) is of subordinate importance in influencing $r_X$ and
$r_T$.

Other factors which could produce a departure from linearity in Fig. 1 are
(a) variations in the electronic band structure, (b) changes in the number of
localized unpaired electrons on $T$, (c) a varying degree of ionicity, and (d)
a variation in the degree of $\pi$ back-bonding between $T$ and $X$. Point (a) is
apparently relevant only when comparing cases like PdAs$_2$ and PdSb$_2$ with
PtAs$_2$ and PtSb$_2$ (metallic type of conduction versus semiconduction, cf. Ref.
22), point (b) is probably of importance when considering NiS$_2$ and NiSe$_2$.

---

*The term “radius” is here used loosely as a measure of atomic size. However, this appears
to be a reasonable approximation within this family of structures, where distortion and bond
strength are interrelated. Furthermore, the implication of spherical symmetry through this
description has no effect on the conclusions.
Fig. 1. $X - X$ versus (average) $T - X$ bond distance for compounds with the FeS$_3$-p (○), FeS$_3$-m (■), and CoSb$_3$ (▲) type crystal structures. The straight lines connect isostructural compounds with a common metal atom.

two unpaired electrons per Ni atom versus a delocalized electron configuration, cf., e.g., Ref. 11), and for point (c) there seems to be no reliable measure.

On considering the final point, which is the object of the study, it is relevant to point out that not only does the figure demonstrate linear relationships, but it shows that the lines are also approximately parallel. The data for the manganese dichalcogenides may be taken as a reference. The magnetic susceptibility and neutron diffraction data confirm that Mn has a high-spin $d^5$ configuration in this series, which immediately eliminates the possibility of a significant degree of $\pi$ back-bonding between Mn and chalcogen. Since the other series of compounds in Fig. 1 exhibit a parallel relationship with the manganese dichalcogenides, their bonding must be predominantly of a similar nature.

*Fig. 2. Bond distances as a function of $d^i$ configuration. The symbols used to distinguish between the different structure types correspond with those in Fig. 1.*
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and $T-X$ π back-bonding should therefore be relatively insignificant in all these compounds. Furthermore, the degree of $T-X$ π back-bonding is expected to decrease as the atomic number of $X$ increases within a series. This is contrary to the observed decrease in $r_T$ with increasing atomic number of $X$ in most of the series.

The variation of the $T-X$ bond length with the electron configuration ($d^1$) localized on $T$ for the disulphides of the 3$d$ metals is illustrated in the bottom part of Fig. 2. (The particular choice of these compounds is motivated by the fact that their magnetic data unambiguously support the assigned $d^1$ configuration; cf. Ref. 18.) The full lines connect the observed points, while the broken lines (which are, in this diagram, experimentally unfounded) are drawn parallel to the full lines. The resulting figure is similar to that due to Pearson$^{24}$ for the radius of the “divalent” 3$d$ metals in octahedral coordination as a function of $d^1$ configuration. (Such diagrams reflect a small portion of the atomic size versus atomic number relationship for the elements, as frequently shown in textbooks.)

The $T-X$ bond length, for a given X atom, is a function of $r_T$ as well as the bond strength of the $T-X$ bond. The changes in $r_T$, however, outweigh the differences in bond strength in this case, and the bottom part of Fig. 2 is therefore essentially a diagram of the variation in $r_T$ with the $d^1$ configuration. The broken line from $d^0$ to low-spin $d^0$ reflects the decrease in $r_T$ on progressively increasing the atomic number of $T$ and the number of electrons contained in essentially non-bonding $t_{2g}$ bands. The increased $T-S$ bond length at MnS$_2$ is due to the high-spin $d^5$ configuration of Mn, where two electrons enter anti-bonding $e_g^*$ bands. Similarly, the steady increase in $T-S$ from low-spin $d^6$, through low-spin $d^7$ to $d^8$ results from an increasing number of electrons entering the anti-bonding $e_g^*$ bands. The full line from MnS$_2$ to NiS$_2$ runs through hypothetical high-spin compounds.

Although it is evident that the dependences of $r_T$ on $d^1$ configuration mask the variations in $T-X$ bond strengths, information on these are contained in the corresponding $X-X$ bond lengths. The change in the $S-S$ bond length with the $d^1$ configuration of $T$ is also shown in Fig. 2. The shortest $S-S$ distances are found for MnS$_2$ and NiS$_2$ and the longest for FeS$_2$; a steady decrease is seen on going from FeS$_2$ through CoS$_2$ to NiS$_2$. The parallelogram in the middle section of Fig. 2 is constructed by drawing the broken lines parallel to the experimentally founded, full lines. The horizontal line from $d^0$ to low-spin $d^8$ in this diagram is supported by the dependence of the Sb–Sb bond lengths on $d^1$ configuration for the corresponding diantimonides shown in the top part of Fig. 2.

An approximately constant $X-X$ bond length (for a given X) for $d^0$ to low-spin $d^8$ configurations of $T$ implies that the $T-X$ bond strengths are similar in such compounds. This is consistent with the view$^{18}$ that the additional electrons which enter $t_{2g}$ bands must be virtually non-bonding. Accepting that the bonding in these compounds is of a predominantly covalent nature (vide infra), the $X-X$ bond lengths in the interval $d^0$–low-spin $d^8$ are longer than the corresponding single bond lengths listed by, e.g., Pauling.$^{25}$ This may be accounted for by noting that the bonding interaction between the $X$ and $T$ atoms will result in some depletion of the electron density on the
$X - X$ pairs. Since the density of bonding electrons is concentrated between the nuclei concerned, any depletion in this electron density is equivalent to a decrease in bond strength. In inorganic macromolecules of the type considered here, an increase in the $T - X$ bond strength consequently results in a decrease in the strength of the $X - X$ bond.

When the $t_{2g}$ bands are filled, the additional electrons go into the antibonding $e_g^*$ bands. The presence of anti-bonding electrons weakens the $T - X$ bond and causes a consequent increase in $X - X$ bond strength. For the disulphides considered in Fig. 2, the progressive decrease in $S - S$ bond lengths with an increase in the population of the anti-bonding $e_g^*$ bands clearly demonstrates that the $S - S$ bond strength depends on the number of electrons contained in these bands. The order for the $S - S$ bond strengths in these compounds is $\text{NiS}_2 > \text{MnS}_2 > \text{CoS}_2 > \text{FeS}_2$. (The difference between the pyrite and marcasite modifications of $\text{FeS}_2$ emphasizes the modifying influence of the structure type on bond strength.) According to this scheme, the shortest $X - X$ bond lengths are to be found in compounds where $T$ has a $d^{10}$ configuration. This prediction can be tested when the positional parameters become available for the recently discovered zinc dichalcogenides with the $\text{FeS}_2-p$ type structure.

Elliott $^{27}$ was the first to correlate the variations in the interatomic $T - S$ and $S - S$ distances for disulphides with the $\text{FeS}_2-p$ type structure with the $d^1$ configuration of $T$. However, since he uses an ionic model and crystal field theory, his interpretation differs substantially from that presented above. An ionic model is, on the other hand, clearly inconsistent with the Mössbauer parameters for the iron dichalcogenides and dipnictides. From the structural data it is concluded that there is no evidence for $\pi$ back-bonding by the participation of the $t_{2g}$ electrons of $T$ and these remain essentially non-bonding. The variations in $X - X$ and (in part) $T - X$ bond lengths with the $d^1$ configuration of $T$ (for a given $X$) is attributed to the changes in bond strength on populating the anti-bonding $e_g^*$ bands.

**REEXAMINATION OF MOSSBAUER DATA**

Mössbauer chemical shifts ($\delta$) and quadrupole splittings ($\Delta$) for the dichalcogenides and dipnictides of iron have been collected from various references, and are listed in Table 1. Some of the values have also been confirmed by the present authors. With a few exceptions the various data for each compound are in reasonable agreement.

The Mössbauer chemical shifts for the iron dichalcogenides (in contrast to the dipnictides) have previously been interpreted $^{28,36}$ by invoking a significant degree of $\pi$ back-bonding. Since such an interpretation is inconsistent with the overall picture presented in the preceding section, the Mössbauer data should be subjected to a reexamination.

The Mössbauer chemical shift depends on the total $s$ electron density at the nucleus, whereas the occupation of $d$ and $p$ orbitals influence $\delta$ indirectly by virtue of their shielding properties. The values of $\delta$ listed in Table 1 must be taken as a clear evidence for the covalent nature of the compounds. Attempts have, nevertheless, been made $^{28,36}$
Table 1. Mössbauer parameters ($^{57}$Fe) for the dichalcogenides and dipnictides of iron. (Chemical shifts are given with respect to metallic iron. Error limits are bracketed after the corresponding values.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compound</th>
<th>Structure type</th>
<th>T (°K)</th>
<th>$\delta$ (mm/s)</th>
<th>$\Delta$ (mm/s)</th>
<th>Reference quoted</th>
<th>Further references</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FeS$_2$</td>
<td>FeS$_2$, p</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.314(2)</td>
<td>0.614(6)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29–33$^d$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FeS$_2$, p</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>0.407(3)</td>
<td>0.620(9)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30, 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FeS$_2$, p</td>
<td>300, 50 kbar</td>
<td>0.23$^a$</td>
<td>0.77$^a$</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FeS$_2$</td>
<td>FeS$_2$, m</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.277(2)</td>
<td>0.506(7)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29, 30, 33$^d$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FeS$_2$, m</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>0.373(2)</td>
<td>0.504(6)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FeSe$_2$</td>
<td>FeSe$_2$, m</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.395(4)</td>
<td>0.584(10)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FeSe$_2$, m</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>0.493(5)</td>
<td>0.566(10)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FeTe$_2$</td>
<td>FeTe$_2$, m</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.471(5)</td>
<td>0.502(11)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FeSb$_2$</td>
<td>FeSb$_2$, m</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>0.577(6)</td>
<td>0.524(10)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FeP$_2$</td>
<td>FeP$_2$, m</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.08(3)</td>
<td>2.08(2)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>35$^d$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FeP$_2$, m</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0.07(2)</td>
<td>2.06(2)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FeAs$_2$</td>
<td>FeAs$_2$, m</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>0.39(2)</td>
<td>1.68(7)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>35$^d$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FeAs$_2$, m</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>0.39(2)</td>
<td>1.71(7)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FeSb$_2$</td>
<td>FeSb$_2$, m</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.455(4)</td>
<td>1.281(16)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>35$^d$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FeSb$_2$, m</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>0.569(5)</td>
<td>1.585(19)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FeAs$_2$</td>
<td>FeAs$_2$, m</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>0.31$^b$</td>
<td>~0$^b$</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FeAs$_2$, m</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>0.34(2)</td>
<td>1.05(5)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$ Estimated from a diagram. $^b$ Room temperature, high pressure. $^c$ Not observed. $^d$ Present article.

To correlate these data with the “oxidation state” groupings, proposed by Walker et al.,$^{37}$ on the basis of essentially ionic reference compounds. (A number of similar relationships between $\delta$ and the electron configuration of iron are found in the literature, which differ mainly in the assumptions made, concerning the selected reference compounds.) The correlation diagram of Walker et al. has proved to be unsatisfactory in a number of cases, and some of the discrepancies have been attributed to the perturbation of the 3d shell of iron by the chemical bonding.$^{38}$ The $\delta$ values for covalent iron compounds are, in fact, somewhat insensitive to differences in the formal oxidation state.

The values of $\delta$ for the iron dichalcogenides (Table 1) are quite low in comparison with those for Fe$^{2+}$ salts, whereas they are generally much higher than those for covalent (low-spin) Fe(II) compounds, where π back-bonding is supposed to be significant (cf., e.g., Ref. 38). The $\delta$ values for the iron dipnictides are slightly lower than those for the corresponding dichalcogenides.

This can be attributed, in part, to the increased shielding by the two additional non-bonding $t_2g$ electrons on Fe in the latter compounds. The low $\delta$ values for the iron dichalcogenides and dipnictides may reflect an increased 4s and/or a decreased 3d and 4p character of the bonding σ bands. Both effects would lead to a relative increase in the s electron density at Fe. The progressive increase in $\delta$ within both series of compounds shows that the effective s electron density at Fe decreases as the atomic number of X increases. This may be
taken as evidence for a (slight) decrease in Fe–X bond strength with increasing atomic number of X, i.e. consistent with a corresponding decrease in the donor ability of X.

There is a significant difference in $\delta$ between the two modifications of FeS$_2$ (Table 1), which suggests that the Fe–S bonds in the marcasite form are slightly stronger than in pyrite. This view is consistent with the shorter average Fe–S bond length in the marcasite modification and shows the importance of the structure type on bond strength.

The Mössbauer quadrupole splitting is a measure of the asymmetry of the total wave function at the iron nucleus, and this parameter can be useful in examining the $\sigma$ donor and possible $\pi$ acceptor properties of the atoms bonded to iron. The effect on $\Delta$ by a $\pi$ component would be opposite in sign to that produced by the $\sigma$ component. The increase in electron asymmetry at the iron nucleus produced by removing two $t_2g$ electrons on going from the dichalcogenides to the dipnictides results in larger $\Delta$ values for the latter compounds. This is in addition to the differences in electron asymmetry caused by the different bonding characteristics of the chalcogen and pnictogen atoms.

The quadrupole interactions for the iron dichalcogenides are a result of an imbalance in the distribution of the d (and p) electrons caused by a distortion of the $X_6$ octahedra around Fe. $\Delta$ does not vary uniformly with the atomic number of the chalcogen, but reaches an apparent maximum with FeSe$_2$. In the dipnictide series, on the other hand, $\Delta$ undergoes a progressive decrease with increasing atomic number of the pnictogen. The fact that the crystallographically more symmetric pyrite modification of FeS$_2$ has a larger $\Delta$ value than marcasite strongly suggests that it is the latter modification which departs from the trend in having an anomalously low $\Delta$ value. The crucial difference between FeS$_2$-m and FeP$_2$ is, in this context, the presence of a filled (say) $d_{xy}$ orbital in the former, which is directed along [001] of the unit cell and points towards a similar orbital from a neighbouring iron atom (see Ref. 18). The smaller size of the sulphur atom allows a closer approach of the lobes of the $d_{xy}$ orbital in the structure of FeS$_2$-m than in the corresponding modifications of FeSe$_2$ and FeTe$_2$. The interaction of the $d_{xy}$ orbital on neighbouring iron atoms raises it in energy relative to the $d_{xz}$ and $d_{yz}$ orbitals and may, moreover, cause a reduction in the imbalance of the overall electron density on iron. This perturbation diminishes with increasing size of the chalcogen atom and is absent in the dipnictide series.

The asymmetry in the electron distribution around the iron nucleus may perhaps be divided into two categories, one which is associated with the bonding orbitals, and one which is due to any distortion of the non-bonding $t_{2g}$ orbitals. The latter component may either be a result of distortion, as in the iron dichalcogenides, or be predominantly due to an electron imbalance, as in the case of the iron dipnictides.

Since the repulsive interaction between the $d_{xy}$ orbitals on neighbouring Fe atoms reaches a maximum at FeS$_2$-m, it may be suggested that the two above effects oppose each other in the dichalcogenide series. The electric field gradient at the Fe nucleus produced by the filled $d_{xy}$ orbital can be regarded as being proportional to $+\frac{1}{2}\langle r^{-3}\rangle k_1$ (where the factor $k_1$ is a measure of the distortion relative to an undistorted $d_{xy}$ orbital). The $d_{xz}$ and $d_{yz}$ orbitals are less distorted and very similar in energy (if not degenerate). The electric field gradients due to the latter orbitals are proportional to $-\frac{1}{2}\langle r^{-3}\rangle k_2$ and $-\frac{1}{2}\langle r^{-3}\rangle k_3$ (where the factors $k_2$ and $k_3$ become equal in the case of degeneracy). The total
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electric field gradient due to the $t_{2g}$ orbitals is hence $-\frac{1}{2}(r^{-3})(k_4 + k_2 - 2k_1)$. In the case of
the more crystallographically symmetric FeS$_4$-$p$ it seems reasonable to assume that the
term $(k_4 - k_2 - 2k_1)$ approaches zero, and that the $\Delta$ value of 0.614(6) mm/s at 300$^\circ$K
therefore reflects predominantly the asymmetry of the bonding orbitals. The decreased
$\Delta$ value for FeS$_4$m accordingly suggests that $2|k_1| > |k_4 + k_2|$, which is consistent with
the increased energy of the $d_{xy}$ orbitals (vide supra). The term $(k_4 + k_2 - 2k_1)$ clearly
decreases in the sequence FeS$_4$-$p$-FeSe$_4$-FeTe$_4$. In the case of the iron dipnictides,
the electric field gradient due to the filled $d_{yz}$ and $d_{zx}$ orbitals is proportional to
$-\frac{1}{2}(r^{-3})(k_4 + k_2)$. This term is opposite in sign to the corresponding one for the iron
dichalcogenides. For the iron dipnictides, the contributions to the electric field gradient
at the iron nucleus from the bonding orbitals and the non-bonding $t_{2g}$ orbitals are of the
same sign. This appears to account for the relatively large $\Delta$ values for the iron dipnictides.

If $\pi$ back-bonding is a significant factor in the Fe-$X$ bonding, then a progressive
increase in $\Delta$ with increasing atomic number of $X$ would be expected.
This is opposite to the trend found in Table 1, which shows that the order for the
$\Delta$ values is FeP$_2$ > FeAs$_2$ > FeSb$_2$ and (neglecting FeS$_2$, vide supra)
FeSe$_2$ > FeTe$_2$.

FeSb$_2$ shows an anomalously large increase in $\Delta$ between 81 and 300$^\circ$K
(Table 1), which may result from a thermal population of the $d_{yz}$ orbital from
the filled (at absolute zero) $d_{yz}$ and $d_{zx}$ orbitals (cf. Refs. 18, 28). (A similar
phenomenon does not occur in FeP$_2$ or FeAs$_2$, where the Fe-$X$ distances
along [001] are shorter than in FeSb$_2$, and hence the energy separation between
d$_{xy}$ on the one hand, and $d_{yz}$ and $d_{zx}$ on the other become larger.) The same
explanation has been offered$^{14,18}$ for the anomalous temperature dependence of
the magnetic susceptibility curve for this compound. (Neutron diffraction
data collected between 4 and 300$^\circ$K confirm that no cooperative magnetic
phenomenon occurs within this region.$^{14}$ Furthermore, FeSb$_2$ does not undergo
a structural transformation below room temperature.) More data are, however,
needed in order to confirm this suggestion.

High pressure Mössbauer data are available for FeS$_2$-$p$, FeP$_2$, FeAs$_2$, and
FeSb$_2$ (Table 1). The decrease in $\delta$ generally observed on the application of
high pressure is a reflection of the compression of the $s$ electron wave functions,
and the decreased shielding caused by the “spreading out” of the iron 3$d$ elec-
trons because of the increased orbital overlap.$^{40}$ In the case of FeP$_2$, $\delta$ increases
on the application of high pressure, but it is difficult to propose a non-
speculative interpretation for this phenomenon.

The effect of high pressure on $\Delta$ is different for FeS$_2$-$p$ on the one hand, and
the iron dipnictides on the other. The progressive increase in $\Delta$ with increasing
pressure, which is observed for FeS$_2$-$p$, is associated with an increasing elec-
tronic distortion. High pressures induce a large decrease in $\Delta$ for the iron
dipnictides, and this may be due to a decrease in $d$ electron imbalance produced
by a redistribution of electron density as a consequence of the altered $t_{2g}$
band structure. Further discussion on this effect must await results from
similar experiments on the marcasite modifications of the iron dichalcogenides.

In addition to the $^{57}$Fe Mössbauer data, considered above, a recent paper$^{41}$
has been published concerning the $^{125}$Te Mössbauer effect in MnTe$_2$. However,
in view of the lack of suitable reference compounds, the bonding implications
of these data are difficult to assess at present. It should nevertheless be men-

tioned that Pasternak and Spijkervet 41 interpreted their data in terms of a purely ionic model which is clearly incorrect.

Within the family of compounds under consideration, the Mössbauer effect can be observed for those containing the following elements: Ni, Zn, Ru, Os, Ir, Pt, Au, and Sb in addition to Fe and Te. When data for those compounds containing the additional Mössbauer nucleides become available, there will be more detailed bonding information at hand.

CONCLUSION

All the properties of compounds with the FeS$_2$-p, FeS$_2$-m, and CoSb$_2$ type crystal structures suggest that the bonding is of a highly covalent nature, and this is confirmed by the Mössbauer data for the iron dichalcogenides and dipnictides. Neither the structural, nor the Mössbauer data give any indication for the need to invoke $\pi$ back-bonding from the essentially non-bonding $t_{2g}$ orbitals on the metal to the non-metal atoms.

A survey of the literature suggests that, perhaps, the importance of $\pi$ back-bonding has, in general, been over-emphasized, particularly in relation to Mössbauer spectroscopy. It is therefore considered relevant to draw attention to a recent paper by Venanzi 42 who points out that $\pi$ bonds need not always be invoked just because they are allowed by symmetry.
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