N1-C1	1.350 (7)	1.362 (7)	1.357 (4)
N1-C2	1.417 (7)	1.406 (7)	1.418 (4)
N2-C1	1.348 (7)	1.342 (7)	1.344 (4)
N2-C8	1.468 (7)	1.464 (7)	1.471 (4)
N2-C11	1.473 (7)	1.467 (7)	1.473 (4)
C8—C9	1.506 (10)	1.501 (10)	1.484 (6)
C10-C11	1.501 (10)	1.510 (10)	1.496 (5)
C7—C12			1.508 (6)
	100.0.45		
CI0	109.8 (5)	110.6 (5)	109.1 (3)
CINIC2	128.1 (5)	126.2 (5)	125.6 (3)
CIN2C8	122.1 (5)	123.6 (4)	122.8 (3)
CI-N2-CII	124.7 (4)	125.0 (5)	123.9 (3)
CII—N2—C8	111.2 (5)	111.2 (5)	111.2 (3)
N2—C1—N1	116.5 (4)	116.3 (5)	116.2 (3)
N2C1S1	121.6 (4)	122.4 (4)	122.9 (2)
NI-CI-SI	121.9 (4)	121.2 (4)	121.0 (3)
C3—C2—C7	119.6 (5)	118.6 (6)	120.2 (3)
C7-C2-N1	121.8 (5)	120.3 (5)	121.1 (3)
C3-C2-N1	118.4 (5)	121.0 (6)	118.5 (3)
C6C7C2	119.3 (6)	120.9 (7)	117.4 (4)
N2-C8-C9	108.8 (5)	110.2 (5)	110.1 (3)
O1_C9_C8	113.4 (6)	110.2 (6)	112.6 (3)
01_C10_C11	111.7 (6)	112.2 (5)	111.8 (3)
N2-C11-C10	110.3 (5)	108.1 (6)	110.2 (3)
C2-C7-C12			121.4 (4)
C6-C7-C12			121.1 (4)
C2-N1-C1-N2	169.2 (5)	170.0 (5)	166.0 (3)
C2-N1-C1-S1	-12.7(8)	-12.8(8)	-158(4)
C1-N1-C2-C3	137.3 (6)	-56.2(8)	122.5 (4)
CI_NI_C2_C7	-46.5(8)	125.8 (6)	-63.6(4)
C8-N2-C1-N1	175.2 (6)	166.7 (5)	178.3 (3)
C8-N2-C1-S1	-2.9(8)	-10.4(8)	01(4)
C11-N2-C1-N1	-22.0(9)	-19.1(9)	19.6 (6)
C11-N2-C1-S1	159.9 (5)	163.7 (5)	162.2 (3)
C1-N2-C8-C9	-141.0(6)	117.6 (6)	-143.4(3)
C1-N2-C11-C10	140.5 (6)	-118.7 (7)	143.4 (3)

Both of the structures were solved by direct methods and refined by the full-matrix least-squares technique. All H atoms in both structures were located from difference maps and refined isotropically. The *PARST* (Nardelli, 1983) program was used for geometric calculations.

For both compounds, data collection: XSCANS (Siemens, 1994); cell refinement: XSCANS; data reduction: XSCANS; program(s) used to solve structures: SHELXS86 (Sheldrick, 1990*a*); program(s) used to refine structures: SHELXL93 (Sheldrick, 1993); molecular graphics: SHELXTL/PC (Sheldrick, 1990*b*); software used to prepare material for publication: SHELXL93 (Sheldrick, 1993); geometric calculations: PARST (Nardelli, 1983).

One of the authors (KS) thanks the Universiti Sains Malaysia for a Visiting Postdoctoral Research Fellowship.

References

Allen, F. H., Kennard, O., Watson, D. G., Brammer, L., Orpen, A. G. & Taylor, R. (1987). J. Chem. Soc. Perkin Trans. 2, pp. S1–S19. Flack, H. D. (1983). Acta Cryst. A39, 876–881.

Nardelli, M. (1983). Comput. Chem. 7, 95–98.

Naluelli, M. (1965). Comput. Chem. 1, 95-98.

©1996 International Union of Crystallography Printed in Great Britain – all rights reserved Ramnathan, A., Sivakumar, K., Janarthanan, N., Meerarani, D., Ramadas, K. & Fun, H.-K. (1996). Acta Cryst. C52, 411-414.
Ramnathan, A., Sivakumar, K., Subramanian, K., Janarthanan, N., Ramadas, K. & Fun, H.-K. (1995a). Acta Cryst. C51, 1627-1629.
Ramnathan, A., Sivakumar, K., Subramanian, K., Janarthanan, N., Ramadas, K. & Fun, H.-K. (1995b). Acta Cryst. C51, 2446-2450.
Sarkis, G. Y. & Faisal, E. D. (1985). J. Heterocycl. Chem. 22, 137-140.
Sheldrick, G. M. (1990a). Acta Cryst. A46, 467-473.
Sheldrick, G. M. (1990b). SHELXTL/PC Users Manual, Siemens Analytical X-ray Instruments Inc., Madison, Wisconsin, USA.
Sheldrick, G. M. (1993). SHELXL33. Program for the Refinement of Crystal Structures. University of Göttingen, Germany.
Siemens (1994). XSCANS. X-ray Single Crystal Analysis System.

Siemens (1994). ASCANS. X-ray Single Crystal Analysis System. Siemens Analytical X-ray Instruments Inc., Madison, Wisconsin, USA.

Acta Cryst. (1996). C52, 1288-1293

Hydrogen Bonding *versus* van der Waals Repulsion in 1,3,5-Trideoxy-1,3,5-tris-(trimethylammonio)-*cis*-inositol Triiodide Sesquihydrate, $C_{15}H_{36}N_3O_3^{3+}.3I^-.1.5H_2O$

HELMUT W. SCHMALLE^a AND KASPAR HEGETSCHWEILER^b

^aInstitute of Inorganic Chemistry, University of Zürich, Winterthurerstrasse 190, CH-8057 Zürich, Switzerland, and ^bInorganic Chemistry Laboratory, ETH-Center, CH-8092 Zürich, Switzerland. E-mail: schmalle@aci.unizh.ch

(Received 26 June 1995; accepted 2 October 1995)

Abstract

The crystal structure of the trimethylammonio-*cis*inositol molecule displays one bifurcated intramolecular hydrogen bond of the form $O-H\cdots O$, a strong intermolecular $O-H\cdots OW$ contact and possible intermolecular $C-H\cdots O$ and $O-H\cdots I$ interactions. $C-H\cdots I$ interactions may also be considered. As a result of the three bulky N(CH₃)₃ groups and the OH groups, increased puckering of the cyclohexane ring is observed compared with an undistorted ideal cyclohexane chair conformation.

Comment

This paper reports the structure of a cyclohexane chair substituted by bulky $N(CH_3)_3$ groups and OH groups. Intra- and intermolecular hydrogen bonds are competitors in this structure. Intramolecular three-center bonds, intermolecular OH···OW, CH···OW, OH···I and possible CH···I interactions are discussed. Fundamental work is summarized by Jeffrey & Saenger (1994). Additional information on OH···O and CH···O interactions is given by Steiner & Saenger (1993, 1994) and by

Lists of structure factors, anisotropic displacement parameters, Hatom coordinates and complete geometry have been deposited with the IUCr (Reference: MU1225). Copies may be obtained through The Managing Editor, International Union of Crystallography. 5 Abbey Square, Chester CH1 2HU, England.

Ramadas, K., Srinivasan, N. & Janarthanan, N. (1993). *Tetrahedron Lett.* **34**, 6447–6450.

Steiner (1995). Crystallographic evidence for the existence of $CH \cdots X$ (X = O, N, Cl) hydrogen bonds has been described by Taylor & Kennard (1982).

Cyclohexane molecules having a syn-1.3.5-triaxial orientation of donor groups $X (X = OH \text{ or } NH_2)$ are of interest because of their optimal steric arrangement for metal binding. Their high affinity for Fe^{III} and their different complexation properties for a variety of mono-, di-, tri- and tetravalent metal ions have been extensively studied by X-ray analysis, spectroscopic methods and molecular-mechanics calculations (Angyal, 1980; Hegetschweiler, Ghisletta, Fässler, Nesper, Schmalle & Rihs, 1993; Hegetschweiler, Hancock, Ghisletta, Kradolfer, Gramlich & Schmalle, 1993; Hausherr-Primo, Hegetschweiler, Rüegger, Odier, Hancock, Schmalle & Gramlich, 1994; Hegetschweiler, Kradolfer, Gramlich & Hancock, 1995; Hancock & Hegetschweiler, 1993), On the one hand, the free ligands are destabilized by van der Waals repulsion of the electronegative OH or NH₂ groups, while on the other hand they are stabilized by attractive forces of intramolecular hydrogen bonds of the type $X \rightarrow H \cdots X$. With respect to this interesting contradiction the question arises whether more than one intramolecular $X \longrightarrow H \cdots X$ hydrogen bond can be formed in the same molecule.



Fig. 1(a) shows some possible hydrogen-bonding schemes and Fig. 1(b) the observed intramolecular hydrogen bonds for the above-mentioned molecules. Up to now two examples are known in which equatorial N atoms can act as additional intramolecular acceptors: in TACI.2H₂O (1,3,5-trideoxy-1,3,5-triamino-*cis*-inositol dihydrate) (Hegetschweiler, Hancock, Ghisletta, Kradolfer, Gramlich & Schmalle, 1993) and in TDCI [1,3,5-trideoxy-1,3,5-tris(dimethylamino)-*cis*inositol (Hegetschweiler, Erni, Schneider & Schmalle, 1990)]. Thus, the title compound, TTCI.3I.1.5H₂O, has been prepared in order to find out if additionally formed intra $(X - H \cdots X)$ or intermolecular hydrogen bonds $(X - H \cdots OH_2, X - H \cdots X)$ can occur when the N atoms are entirely blocked by space-filling CH₃ groups.

In molecules such as TACI, TDCI and TTCI, the axial hydroxy groups are well positioned to form intramolecular hydrogen bonds. Fig. 1 shows some possible O—H···O or O—H···N interactions. Both such types of intramolecular hydrogen bonds [(1) and (2)] may be realised in one molecule at the same time. The free donor, available for intermolecular hydrogen bonds, shown in (3) and (4), may also rotate towards the N-acceptor atom to form an additional O—H···N intramolecular hydrogen bond, whereas the conformation shown in (5) represents a bifurcated



Fig. 1. (a) Possible hydrogen-bonding schemes and (b) observed intramolecular hydrogen bonds for cyclohexane molecules with a *syn*-1,3,5-triaxial orientation of donor groups X (X = OH and NH₂).

hydrogen-bonding type that is extensively discussed, together with more complex hydrogen bonds found in biological systems, by Jeffrey & Saenger (1994). Additional water molecules and I⁻ ions, as well as participating in intermolecular bonding, will influence or even determine the number of possible intramolecular hydrogen bonds in the ring system. In TACI.2H₂O, the two water O atoms participate as donors and acceptors in intermolecular hydrogen bonds. The crystal packing also causes intermolecular hydrogen bonds between the axial OH and the NH₂ groups and between different TACI molecules. Thus, only one OH group can act as a donor for the bifurcated intramolecular hydrogen bond (Hegetschweiler, Hancock, Ghisletta, Kradolfer, Gramlich & Schmalle, 1993). TDCI crystallizes without solvent molecules, but in the structure intermolecular hydrogen bonds of the type $O - H \cdots N(CH_3)_2$ compete with intramolecular O-H···O and O-H···N bonds. As in TACI, only one bifurcated intramolecular O- $H \cdots O$ hydrogen bond and one $O - H \cdots N$ hydrogen bond are realised.

Conformational analyses of the eight isomers of inositol carried out by *ab initio* calculations showed an excellent agreement between the calculated model of epi-inositol and TDCI, and confirmed the geometry of the intramolecular hydrogen bond (Liang, Ewig, Stouch & Hagler, 1994). TTCI crystallizes with 1.5 water molecules that are distributed over two sites and with three I^- ions, of which two appear to

be disordered. Within this molecule again only one bifurcated intramolecular O—H···O hydrogen-bonding system is observed, with two hydroxy O atoms as acceptors (Fig. 2). These acceptor atoms also function as donors in intermolecular hydrogen-bonding interactions of the types O—H···OW and O—H···I (Fig. 3). The intermolecular O4···O1W distance [2.628 (8) Å] is short and corresponds to a minimum value of O···O distances (2.55 Å) theoretically calculated by Ferraris & Ivaldi (1988), but it is far from the shortest experimentally observed O···O distances of about 2.40 Å (Joswig, Fuess & Ferraris, 1982). C—H···O hydrogen bonds in



Fig. 2. ORTEPII (Johnson, 1976) view of TTCI with atom-numbering scheme. The anisotropic displacement ellipsoids are drawn at the 50% probability level. H atoms are shown as small spheres of arbitrary radii. The three-center hydrogen bond is indicated by broken lines.



Fig. 3. A SCHAKAL (Keller, 1986) plot showing the hydrogenbonding details in TTCI.3I.1.5H₂O.

crystal structures have been discussed extensively by Taylor & Kennard (1982) and reviewed by Desiraju (1991). The observed $C \cdots O$ distances and $C - H \cdots O$ angles in TTCI [ranging 2.96(1) and 3.56(1) Å and between 117 and 162°, respectively (see Table 3)] also indicate intermolecular hydrogen-bonding contacts.

Possible hydrogen bonds with $O \cdots I$ distances between 3.6 and 3.7 Å are discussed by Johansson, Molund & Oskarsson (1978). Some possible CH $\cdots I$ interactions are also listed in Table 3, but 23 further CH $\cdots I$ 'contacts' are not shown, as their $C \cdots I$ distances exceed 4.0 Å. However, all these corresponding CH $\cdots I$ angles range between 145 and 175°. Fig. 4 indicates the distribution of the water O atoms and the I⁻ ions in the structure. The hydrogen-bonding geometries of the title compound were calculated by using the program *ORFFE* (Busing, Martin, Levy, Brown, Johnson & Thiessen, 1971) and are listed in Table 3.



Fig. 4. A SCHAKAL (Keller, 1986) stereoview of a packing diagram of TTCI.3I.1.5H₂O.

Bulky substituents in a 1,3,5-syn-axial arrangement cause considerable van der Waals repulsion. This can be seen by viewing the molecules along the pseudo threefold axis (Fig. 1): the six axial substituents of a regular cyclohexane chair are located exactly above and below the corresponding C atoms. As shown in Fig. 2, the three O atoms of TTCI are significantly displaced from the ideal positions, therefore indicating a considerable amount of repulsion between the three axial hydroxy groups. Assuming C_{3v} symmetry, equal O···O distances should be found. The observed asymmetry is obviously a consequence of the presence of one bifurcated but asymmetric intramolecular hydrogen bond. Since the same hydrogen-bonding system occurs in TACI, TDCI and TTCI, it probably represents a low-energy conformation for such molecules. The O···O distances involved in the bifurcated intramolecular hydrogen bonds are 2.762(2) and 2.827(2) Å in TACI, 2.732 (2) and 2.862 (2) Å in TDCI, and 2.758 (5) and 2.883 (6) Å in TTCI. The repulsion between the non-hydrogen-bonded O atoms results in significantly longer O···O distances of 2.935 (3) Å for TACI and 3.006 (2) Å for TDCI. This is not the case for the title compound, where the non-hydrogen-bonded O···O distance is shorter $[O2 \cdots O4 \ 2.824 \ (6) Å]$ than one of the hydrogen-bonded O···O distances $[O2 \cdots O6 \ 2.883 \ (6) Å]$. If no water molecules were present in the crystal of TTCI, a second intramolecular hydrogen bond O4—H4O···O2 could possibly be formed, such as the one shown in (3). Furthermore, if it was possible to also remove the iodide I2 (I2A, I2B) from its (their) acceptor function(s) (see Fig. 3), the intramolecular hydrogen bonds may be completed as shown in (1).

Puckering parameters (Cremer & Pople, 1975) of the three ligands, calculated with MOLEG (Schweizer, 1985) are compared in Table 4. The undistorted cyclohexane chair has a Q_3 value of 0.630. The value of Q_3 for the unsubstituted TACI is significantly lower. This is consistent with a flattening of the ring due to the $O \cdots O$ repulsion. On the other hand, a significant increase for O_3 is observed in the order TACI < TDCI < TTCI. This is obviously a consequence of the enlarged steric requirements of the three equatorial substituents. Thus, the axial-axial $O \cdots O$ and axial-equatorial $O \cdots N(CH_3)_n$ repulsions have opposite effects with respect to the ring puckering. This is also indicated by a comparison of the bond angles of the cyclohexane ring: the C-C-C ring angles around C1, C3 and C5 are larger (mean 113.1°) and those around C2, C4 and C6 are smaller (mean 104.7°) than the ideal tetrahedral angle of 109.5° (see Table 2). The mean C-C distances in the cyclohexane chairs of 1.533 (3) Å for TACI and 1.535(2) Å for TDCI are in excellent agreement with the mean value of 1.535 Å for C_{sp^3} — C_{sp^3} distances listed in International Tables for Crystallography (1992, Vol. C), where 2814 distances are averaged (Allen, Kennard, Watson, Brammer, Orpen & Taylor, 1992). The mean C-C distance in the title compound is increased to 1.548 (6) Å, probably due to the bulky substituents. The averaged values of the C_{ring} -NR and C_{ring} -OH distances are 1.468(3) and 1.427 Å, respectively, for TACI, 1.476(2) and 1.430(2) Å, respectively, for TDCI, but 1.547(5) and 1.412(5)Å, respectively, for TTCI, compared to values of 1.498 (for C_{sp^3} —N⁺R) and 1.431 Å, respectively, given by Allen et al., (1992).

Figs. 2 and 3 show considerable repulsion between the hydroxy O atoms and pairs of neighboring methyl groups which are parallel to the OH groups. The following values were calculated: $O2\cdots C11$ 3.004 (8) and $O2\cdots C33$ 3.091 (8) Å; $O4\cdots C33$ 2.957 (8) and $O4\cdots C53$ 3.213 (7) Å; $O6\cdots C11$ 3.010 (9) and $O6\cdots$ C53 2.893 (7) Å. This repulsion leads to increased C_{ring} —N—CH₃ angles of 114.7 (3)–115.1 (4)°, and to elongated C_{ring} —N bond lengths of 1.531 (5)– V= 1.556 (5) Å. As a consequence, the axial hydroxy O atoms approach distances < 2.90 Å, and the C—C distances within the chair increase to the aforementioned D_m

higher values. Both effects, the $O \cdots C$ repulsion and the $O \cdots O$ approach, are responsible not only for an increased puckering but also for the unusual C-C-C angles in the ring (Table 2). Methylation of the axial O atoms in TACI results in a loss of intramolecular hydrogen bonds. The O···O distances in this structure range between 2.95 and 3.11 Å (mean value 3.01 Å) (Hegetschweiler, Weber & Gramlich, 1995). These distances could be considered as a reference where no intramolecular hydrogen bonding is involved. This finding is also in agreement with the non-hydrogen-bonded O···O distances in TACI and TDCI. In the title compound, both the hydrogen-bonded and the non-bonded $O \cdots O$ distances are shorter than 2.90 Å, reflecting the unusual molecular geometry, mainly caused by the arrangement of the bulky methyl and hydroxy groups.

The mean value of the N—C trimethyl distances in TTCI is 1.502 Å. The C—C, C—N and C—O distances in TACI and TDCI agree well not only with the above-mentioned values but also with values found in crystal structures where N or O atoms are coordinated to metal ions (Schmalle, Hegetschweiler & Ghisletta, 1991; Hegetschweiler, Ghisletta, Fässler, Nesper, Schmalle & Rihs, 1993; Hegetschweiler, Hancock, Ghisletta, Kradolfer, Gramlich & Schmalle, 1993; Hegetschweiler, Weber & Gramlich, 1995).

Experimental

TACI and its N-methylated derivatives TDCI and the title compound have been prepared as described previously (Hegetschweiler, Erni, Schneider & Schmalle, 1990). It is interesting to note that all three ligands crystallize in the monoclinic space group $P2_1/n$. A safe and more efficient ligand preparation method and the structure of TACI were found later (Ghisletta, Jalett, Gerfin, Gramlich & Hegetschweiler, 1992; Hegetschweiler, Hancock, Ghisletta, Kradolfer, Gramlich & Schmalle, 1993). As TTCI is completely alkylated, the ligand bears three positive charges, thus, three counterions of iodide were necessary for crystallization. According to elemental analysis and the relatively large displacement parameters for the two water O atoms, it seems likely that the water positions are not fully occupied. Analysis for the air-dried product: calculated for C₁₅H₃₉N₃O_{4,5}I₃ C 25.23, H 5.50, N 5.88%; found C 25.26, H 5.56, N 5.73%.

Crystal data

$C_{15}H_{36}N_{3}O_{3}^{3+}.3I^{-}.1.5H_{2}O_{3}$
$M_r = 714.19$
Monoclinic
$P2_1/n$
a = 9.690(3) Å
b = 21.620 (4) Å
c = 12.835(3) Å
$\beta = 106.26 (3)^{\circ}$
$V = 2581.4 (11) \text{ Å}^3$
<i>Z</i> = 4
$D_x = 1.838 \text{ Mg m}^{-3}$
D_{-} not measured

Mo $K\alpha$ radiation $\lambda = 0.71073$ Å Cell parameters from 25 reflections $\theta = 8.3-16.7^{\circ}$ $\mu = 3.656$ mm⁻¹ T = 295 (2) K Plate $0.70 \times 0.53 \times 0.18$ mm Transparent, colorless

$C_{15}H_{36}N_3O_3^{\,3+}.3I^-.1.5H_2O$

Data collection		C2—O2	1.417 (5)	NI-C13		1.479 (6)
	P 0.0209	C2—C3	1.551 (6)	N1-C12		1.495 (7)
Enraf-Nonius CAD-4	$R_{\rm int} = 0.0398$	C3—C4	1.543 (6)	N1—C11		1.506 (6)
diffractometer	$\theta_{\rm max} = 29.97^\circ$	C3—N3	1.556 (5)	N3—C31		1.497 (6)
ω –2 θ scans	$h = -13 \rightarrow 13$	C4—O4	1.407 (5)	N3-C33		1.504 (8)
Absorption correction:	$k = 0 \rightarrow 30$	C4—C5	1.555 (6)	N3-C32		1.518(7)
analytical	$l = 0 \rightarrow 18$	C5—N5	1.531 (5)	N5-C51		1.504 (6)
T = 0.221 $T = -$	3 standard reflections	$C_{-C_{0}}$	1.347 (0)	N5_C53		1.507 (0)
$I_{\min} = 0.221, I_{\max} = 0.722$	5 standard reflections	0-00	1.412 (5)	N3-C32		1.509 (0)
0.723	monitored every 400	C6-C1-N1	113.3 (3)	C13—N1	C12	106.5 (4)
7808 measured reflections	reflections	C6-C1-C2	113.2 (3)	C13—N1	C11	109.2 (5)
7506 independent reflections	frequency: 180 min	N1—C1—C2	113.5 (3)	C12—N1	C11	107.4 (4)
5250 observed reflections	intensity decay: 2.1%	O2C2C3	111.4 (3)	C13—N1	C1	108.6 (3)
[L > 2-(D)]	intensity decay: 20276	02—C2—C1	113.4 (3)	CI2—NI		109.8 (3)
[I > 20(I)]		$C_3 = C_2 = C_1$	104.6 (3)	CII—NI		115.1 (4)
5		(4 - (3 - (2 - (2 - (3 - (2 - (3 - (2 - (3 - (2 - (3 - (3	114.7 (3)	C31—N3	 	108.1 (3)
Refinement		$C_4 = C_3 = N_3$	112.4(3)	C31—N3	-032	100.7 (4)
Refinement on F^2	$\Delta a_{max} = 1.203 \text{ e} \text{ Å}^{-3}$	04 C4 C3	1129(4)	C31_N3	C3	109.0(3)
$P[F^2 > 2\pi(F^2)] = 0.0472$	$\Delta a_{1} = -1.030 \text{ e}^{-3}$	04-04-05	112.9(4)	C33-N3		1151(4)
K[F > 20(F)] = 0.0472	$\Delta p_{\min} = -1.050 \text{ C A}$	C_{3}	$104 \pm (3)$	C32—N3	-03	108.2 (4)
$wR(F^2) = 0.1637$	Extinction correction:	N5-C5-C6	113.0 (3)	C51N5	-C53	108.2 (4)
S = 1.285	SHELXL93 (Sheldrick,	N5-C5-C4	115.1 (3)	C51N5	-C52	106.3 (4)
7496 reflections	1993)	C6—C5—C4	111.3 (3)	C53—N5	-C52	108.8 (4)
297 parameters	Extinction coefficient:	O6-C6-C1	113.1 (3)	C51—N5	C5	108.2 (3)
Ring and OH H stoms	0.0031(2)	O6-C6-C5	115.7 (3)	C53—N5	C5	114.7 (3)
refined freely	Atomia souttaring factors	C1—C6—C5	105.4 (3)	C52—N5	C5	110.4 (3)
refined freely	Atomic scattering factors				٥	
$w = 1/[\sigma^2(F_o^2) + (0.0520P)^2]$	from International Tables	Table 3. H	lydrogen-b	onding g	eometry (A	,°)
+ 6.7866P	for Crystallography (1992,					
where $P = (F_1^2 + 2F_2^2)/3$	Vol. C, Tables 4.2.6.8 and	$D - H \cdot \cdot \cdot A$	<i>D</i> —Н	$\mathbf{H} \cdot \cdot \cdot \mathbf{A}$	$D \cdot \cdot \cdot A$	$D = H \cdots$
$(\Lambda/\sigma) = 0.105$	6114	$O4 - H4O \cdots O1W$	0.83 (8)	1.82 (8)	2.628 (8)	163 (8)
$(\Delta / 0)_{max} = -0.105$	0.1.1.7)	06—H6O···O4	0.79 (8)	2.10(8)	2.758 (5)	141 (7)
Table 1 Fractional atomic	coordinates and isotronic or	06—H6O···O2	0.79(8)	2.44 (8)	2.883 (6)	116 (6)
$1000 1. \Gamma I U U U U U U U U U U U U U U U U U U$	coordinates and isotropic or	$O_2 = H_2 O_2 \cdots I_2 A$	0.66(6)	2.83(6)	3.44 / (6)	155 (5)

 $\begin{array}{c} Q_2 \\ Q_3 \\ Q \\ \varphi \\ \theta \end{array}$

equivalent isotropic displacement parameters (\AA^2)

$$U_{\rm eq} = (1/3) \sum_i \sum_j U_{ij} a_i^* a_j^* \mathbf{a}_i \cdot \mathbf{a}_j$$

	x	у	z	$U_{\rm eq}/U_{\rm iso}$
11	0.13370 (4)	0.08326(2)	0.26648 (3)	0.05453 (9)
12	0.08036 (5)	0.34024 (2)	-0.00450(4)	0.04415 (12
13	-0.12720 (6)	0.58628 (3)	0.51522 (5)	0.0580(2)
12A†	0.0521 (4)	0.3394 (2)	-0.0269 (3)	0.0409 (9)
12B†	0.1015 (6)	0.3382 (3)	0.0121 (5)	0.0573 (14)
13A†	0.1417(7)	0.4233 (3)	0.4970 (5)	0.069 (2)
13B†	0.1036 (6)	0.4034 (3)	0.4905 (5)	0.0587 (13)
C1	-0.2081 (4)	0.4298 (2)	0.2257 (3)	0.0333 (8)
C2	-0.1540 (4)	0.3668 (2)	0.1942 (3)	0.0364 (9)
C3	-0.1743 (5)	0.3209(2)	0.2817 (4)	0.0378 (9)
C4	-0.3305 (4)	0.3146 (2)	0.2878 (3)	0.0344 (9)
C5	-0.3698 (4)	0.3807 (2)	0.3181 (3)	0.0327 (8)
C6	-0.3659 (4)	0.4280 (2)	0.2285 (3)	0.0333 (8)
O2	-0.2289 (4)	0.3469 (2)	0.0883 (3)	0.0499 (8)
O4	-0.4259 (4)	0.2949 (2)	0.1893 (3)	0.0462 (8)
O6	-0.4636 (4)	0.4170 (2)	0.1258 (3)	0.0456 (8)
N1	-0.1740 (4)	0.4855 (2)	0.1601 (3)	0.0354 (7)
C11	-0.2449 (8)	0.4830(3)	0.0397 (4)	0.077 (2)
C12	-0.0154 (6)	0.4897 (3)	0.1760 (6)	0.068 (2)
C13	-0.2169 (7)	0.5432 (2)	0.2045 (5)	0.075 (2)
N3	-0.1016 (4)	0.2571 (2)	0.2783 (4)	0.0452 (9)
C31	0.0494 (5)	0.2655 (2)	0.2724 (5)	0.0535 (12)
C32	-0.0890 (7)	0.2243 (3)	0.3851 (6)	0.079 (2)
C33	-0.1785 (8)	0.2155 (3)	0.1865 (7)	0.085 (2)
N5	-0.5072 (4)	0.3848 (2)	0.3543 (3)	0.0369 (8)
C51	-0.5010 (6)	0.4434 (2)	0.4187 (4)	0.0480(11)
C52	-0.5135 (6)	0.3324 (2)	0.4303 (5)	0.0556 (12)
C53	-0.6445 (5)	0.3853 (3)	0.2629 (5)	0.0553 (14)
01 <i>W</i>	0.3962 (8)	0.2132 (3)	0.2314 (5)	0.106(2)
O2 <i>W</i>	0.3243 (6)	0.1173 (4)	0.0778 (5)	0.076 (2)

† Disordered; U_{iso} (see text).

Table 2. Selected geometric parameters (Å, °)

C1—C6	1.540 (6)	O2—H2O	0.66 (6)
CI-NI	1.556 (5)	04—H4O	0.83 (8)
C1—C2	1.554 (6)	O6—H6O	0.79 (8)

				、 、 、	
r	O2—H2O· · · I2A	0.66 (6)	2.83 (6)	3.447 (6)	155 (5)
	O2—H2O· · · I2	().66 (6)	2.93 (6)	3.524 (4)	150 (5)
	O2—H2O···I2B	().66 (6)	3.04 (6)	3.604 (8)	146 (5)
	C5-H5···O2W ¹	1.08 (4)	2.40(4)	3.338 (7)	145 (3)
	C33—H332···O2	0.96(2)	2.47 (3)	3.091 (8)	123(1)
	C33—H333· · · O4	0.96 (3)	2.39 (4)	2.957 (8)	117 (2)
)	C51—H512···O2W"	0.96 (2)	2.66 (2)	3.497 (7)	146 (2)
2)	C52—H521···O1W	0.96(1)	2.63(1)	3.560 (8)	162(1)
- /	C52—H523···O2W"	0.96(2)	2.62 (2)	3.466 (8)	147 (2)
	C1—H1···I3B	0.96 (4)	3.03 (4)	3.905 (6)	152(3)
)	$C1$ — $H1 \cdot \cdot \cdot I3^{in}$	0.96 (4)	3.08 (4)	3.960 (4)	152 (3)
	C3—H3···I3B	1.06 (6)	2.68 (6)	3.684 (7)	157 (6)
)	C3-H3···I3 ^m	1.06 (6)	2.91 (6)	3.884 (4)	153 (6)
·	$C11$ — $H1111 \cdot \cdot \cdot I1^{u}$	0.96 (4)	3.14(1)	3.664 (6)	116(3)
	C13—H131····I3A ⁱⁿ	0.96(1)	2.85(1)	3.76(1)	160 (3)
	C13—H131···I3B ⁱⁿ	0.96(1)	3.03(1)	3.931 (9)	157 (2)
	C13—H131····I3	0.96(1)	3.04 (2)	3.949 (7)	159 (3)
	C31—H312···I2	0.96 (2)	3.04 (2)	3.991 (6)	173 (1)
	C51—H511···II"	0.96(1)	2.95 (1)	3.838 (5)	154 (3)
	C51—H513· · · I3A ¹	().96 (3)	2.95 (3)	3.89(1)	165 (2)
	C51—H513· · ·I3'	0.96 (3)	3.06 (3)	3.978 (6)	161 (2)
	Symmetry codes: (i) x –	-1, y, z; (ii).	$x = \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2} = v, \frac{1}{2}$	+z;(iii) - x, 1	-v, 1-z;
		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		· · · · · ·	• • •

٠A

 $(iv) - \frac{1}{2} - x, \frac{1}{2} + y, \frac{1}{2} - z; (v) - 1 - x, 1 - y, 1 - z.$

Table 4. Puckering parameters Q(Å), φ and $\theta(°)$ for the ring atoms C1 to C6 in the TACI molecule and for its methylated derivatives TDC1 and TTC1

TACI	TDCI	TTCI
0.039	0.072	0.037
0.553	-0.582	-0.648
0.554	-0.586	-0.649
246.39	-45.23	247.15
4.03	-7.05	-3.27

Data collection, unit-cell parameter refinement and crystal-face indexing were carried out with *Enraf–Nonius CAD-4 Software* (Enraf–Nonius, 1989). Data reduction and the numerical absorption correction, which was based on eight crystal faces, were performed using the *MolEN* program package (Fair, 1990). The crystal structure of TTCI was determined by using

the Patterson method and refined by full-matrix least-squares techniques. For all non-H atoms, anisotropic displacement parameters were refined, except the disordered parts of I2 and 13. Two pairs of peaks in the difference electron-density map relating to I2 and I3 were refined as disordered parts of these ions, with site occupations of 80% for both I2 and I3. For the isotropically refined split positions I2A, I2B, I3A and I3B, 10% site occupations were assumed according to their isotropic displacement parameter values from a previous refinement. Test refinements in which these peaks were treated as parts of water O atoms, assuming a statistical disorder between I⁻ ions and water, failed completely. The cyclohexane H atoms H1 to H6 and the hydroxy H atoms H2O, H4O and H6O were refined with individual isotropic displacement parameters. The H-atom positions of the methyl groups were geometrically idealized and their isotropic displacement parameters were assigned as $1.5U_{eq}$ of the preceding C atom. Only one water H atom could be located in the difference electron-density map, but it was not refined.

Program(s) used to solve structure: *SHELXS*86 (Sheldrick, 1990). Program(s) used to refine structure: *SHELXL*93 (Sheldrick, 1993). Molecular graphics: *ORTEP*II (Johnson, 1976); *SCHAKAL*86 (Keller, 1986). Software used to prepare material for publication: CIF (Hall, Allen & Brown, 1991).

Special thanks go to Miriam Bryant, University of Zürich, for her continuous help during the scientific writing course in correcting and improving my English (HWS).

Lists of structure factors, anisotropic displacement parameters, Hatom coordinates and complete geometry have been deposited with the IUCr (Reference: JZ1076). Copies may be obtained through The Managing Editor, International Union of Crystallography, 5 Abbey Square, Chester CH1 2HU, England.

References

Allen, F. H., Kennard, O., Watson, D. G., Brammer, L., Orpen, A. G. & Taylor, R. (1992). *International Tables for Crystallography*, edited by A. J. C. Wilson, Vol. C, pp. 685–706. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Angyal, S. J. (1980). Chem. Soc. Rev. 9, 415-428.

Busing, W. R., Martin, K. O., Levy, H. A., Brown, G. M., Johnson, C. K. & Thiessen, W. A. (1971). ORFFE3. Report ORNL-TM-306, revised. Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Tennessee, USA.

Cremer, D. & Pople, J. A. (1975). J. Am. Chem. Soc. 97, 1354–1358.

- Desiraju, G. R. (1991). Acc. Chem. Res. 24, 290-296.
- Enraf-Nonius (1989). CAD-4 Software. Version 5.0. Enraf-Nonius, Delft, The Netherlands.
- Fair, C. K. (1990). MolEN. An Interactive Intelligent System for Crystal Structure Analysis. Enraf-Nonius, Delft, The Netherlands. Ferraris, G. & Ivaldi, G. (1988). Acta Cryst. B44, 341-344.
- Ghisletta, M., Jalett, H.-P., Gerfin, T., Gramlich, V. & Hegetschweiler, K. (1992). *Helv. Chim. Acta*, **75**, 2233-2242.
- Hall, S. R., Allen, F. H. & Brown, I. D. (1991). Acta Cryst. A47, 655-685.
- Hancock, R. D. & Hegetschweiler, K. (1993). J. Chem. Soc. Dalton Trans. pp. 2137-2140.
- Hausherr-Primo, L., Hegetschweiler, K., Rüegger, H., Odier, L., Hancock, R. D., Schmalle, H. W. & Gramlich, V. (1994). J. Chem. Soc. Dalton Trans. pp. 1689–1701.
- Hegetschweiler, K., Erni, I., Schneider, W. & Schmalle, H. (1990). Helv. Chim. Acta, 73, 97-105.

©1996 International Union of Crystallography Printed in Great Britain – all rights reserved

- Hegetschweiler, K., Ghisletta, M., Fässler, T. F., Nesper, R., Schmalle, H. W. & Rihs, G. (1993). *Inorg. Chem.* 32, 2032–2041.
- Hegetschweiler, K., Hancock, R. D., Ghisletta, M., Kradolfer, T., Gramlich, V. & Schmalle, H. W. (1993). *Inorg. Chem.* **32**, 5273– 5284.
- Hegetschweiler, K., Kradolfer, T., Gramlich, V. & Hancock, R. D. (1995). Chem. Eur. J. 1, 74-88.
- Hegetschweiler, K., Weber, M. & Gramlich, V. (1995). In preparation.

Jeffrey, G. A. & Saenger, W. (1994). In Hydrogen Bonding in Biological Structures. Berlin: Springer Verlag.

- Johansson, L., Molund, M. & Oskarsson, A. (1978). Inorg. Chim. Acta, 31, 117-123.
- Johnson, C. K. (1976). ORTEPII. Report ORNL-5138. Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Tennessee, USA.
- Joswig, W., Fuess, H. & Ferraris, G. (1982). Acta Cryst. B38, 2798– 2801.
- Keller, E. (1986). SCHAKAL86. A Fortran Program for the Graphic Representation of Molecular and Crystallographic Models. University of Freiburg, Germany.
- Liang, C., Ewig, C. S., Stouch, T. R. & Hagler, A. T. (1994). J. Am. Chem. Soc. 116, 3904–3911.
- Schmalle, H. W., Hegetschweiler, K. & Ghisletta, M. (1991). Acta Cryst. C47, 2047-2052.
- Schweizer, W. B. (1985). MOLEG. Program for the Calculation of Molecular Geometries. Version 4.1. Unpublished.
- Sheldrick, G. M. (1990). Acta Cryst. A46, 467-473.
- Sheldrick, G. M. (1993). SHELXL93. Program for the Refinement of Crystal Structures. University of Göttingen, Germany.
- Steiner, T. (1995). Acta Cryst. D51, 93-97.
- Steiner, T. & Saenger, W. (1993). J. Am. Chem. Soc. 115, 4540-4547.
- Steiner, T. & Saenger, W. (1994). Acta Cryst. B50, 348-357.
- Taylor, R. & Kennard, O. (1982). J. Am. Chem. Soc. 104, 5063-5070.

Acta Cryst. (1996). C52, 1293-1296

3-(4-Methoxyphenoxy)-1,2-benzisothiazole 1,1-Dioxide: its Relation to Mechanistic Behaviour in Catalytic Transfer Hydrogenolysis

AMADEU F. BRIGAS[†] AND ROBERT A. W. JOHNSTONE^{*}

Department of Chemistry, University of Liverpool, Liverpool L69 3BX, England. E-mail: rj05@liv.ac.uk

(Received 19 October 1995; accepted 6 December 1995)

Abstract

Conjugation of oxygen with an aromatic ring, as in a phenol, gives a C—O bond length of about 1.35 Å, whereas the C—O bond length in an aliphatic alcohol is about 1.45 Å. A saccharyl ether derivative of a phenol changes the phenolic C—O bond length to 1.42 Å and makes the bond chemically more susceptible

[†] Present address: Universidade do Algarve, UCEH, Campus de Gambelas, 8000 Faro, Portugal.