

Refinement

Refinement on F

R = 0.031

wR = 0.030

S = 1.748

2924 reflections

235 parameters

H atoms not refined

w = 1/[σ²(F_o)
+ 0.00004|F_o|²](Δ/σ)_{max} = 0.002Δρ_{max} = 0.50 e Å⁻³Δρ_{min} = -0.32 e Å⁻³

Extinction correction: none

Scattering factors from

International Tables for
Crystallography (Vol. C)

Table 1. Selected geometric parameters (Å, °)

Pd1—Cl1	2.295 (1)	Pd1—N1	2.017 (3)
Pd1—O1	1.990 (2)	Pd1—N2	2.051 (2)
Cl1—Pd1—O1	176.24 (8)	O1—Pd1—N1	84.1 (1)
Cl1—Pd1—N1	94.65 (8)	O1—Pd1—N2	93.2 (1)
Cl1—Pd1—N2	88.16 (8)	N1—Pd1—N2	176.7 (1)

Table 2. Hydrogen-bonding geometry (Å, °)

D—H...A	D—H	H...A	D...A	D—H...A
O2—H23...O1 ⁱ	0.87	1.77	2.604 (3)	160
N1—H4...C11 ⁱⁱ	1.04	2.31	3.285 (3)	156
N2—H18...O2	0.95	2.41	2.776 (3)	103

Symmetry codes: (i) y, x - 1, 2 - z; (ii) x - y, -y, $\frac{z}{2}$ - z.

All H atoms were located by difference Fourier syntheses.

Data collection: *CAD-4 Software* (Enraf-Nonius, 1989).
Cell refinement: *CAD-4 Software*. Data reduction: *TEXSAN*
(Molecular Structure Corporation, 1992–1997). Program(s)
used to solve structure: *TEXSAN*. Program(s) used to refine
structure: *TEXSAN*. Software used to prepare material for
publication: *TEXSAN*.

Supplementary data for this paper are available from the IUCr
electronic archives (Reference: GS1045). Services for accessing these
data are described at the back of the journal.

References

- Allen, F. H., Kennard, O., Watson, D. G., Brammer, L., Orpen, A. G. & Taylor, R. (1987). *J. Chem. Soc. Perkin Trans. 2*, pp. S1–19.
- Andrieu, J., Steele, B. R., Screttas, C. G., Cardin, C. J. & Fornies, J. (1998). *Organometallics*, **17**, 839–845.
- Cambridge Structural Database (1999). Version 2.3.7. Cambridge Crystallographic Data Centre, 12 Union Road, Cambridge, England.
- Enraf-Nonius (1989). *CAD-4 Software*. Version 5.0. Enraf-Nonius, Delft, The Netherlands.
- Itami, K., Palmgren, A., Thorarensen, A. & Bäckvall, J.-E. (1998). *J. Org. Chem.* **63**, 6466–6471.
- Jamal Aboulhoda, S., Létinois, S., Wilken, J., Reiners, I., Hénin, F., Martens, J. & Muzart, J. (1995). *Tetrahedron Asymmetry*, **6**, 1865–1868.
- Johnson, C. K. (1976). *ORTEPII*. Report ORNL-5138. Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Tennessee, USA.
- Kapteijn, G. M., Baesjou, P. J., Alsters, P. L., Grove, D. M., Smeets, W. J. J., Kooijman, H., Spek, A. L. & van Koten, G. (1997). *Chem. Ber.* **130**, 35–44.
- Molecular Structure Corporation (1992–1997). *TEXSAN. Single Crystal Structure Analysis Software*. Version 1.7. MSC, 3200 Research Forest Drive, The Woodlands, TX 77381, USA.
- Mortezaei, R., Awandi, D., Hénin, F., Muzart, J. & Pète, J. P. (1988). *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **110**, 4824–4826.
- North, A. C. T., Phillips, D. C. & Mathews, F. S. (1968). *Acta Cryst.* **A24**, 351–359.

Thorey, C., Hénin, F. & Muzart, J. (1996). *Tetrahedron Asymmetry*, **7**, 975–976.

Tsuiji, J. (1995). Editor. *Palladium Reagents and Catalysts*. Chichester: Wiley.

Acta Cryst. (1999). **C55**, 2030–2032

Di-μ-bromo-bis[bromo(η⁶-para-cymene)-ruthenium(II)] benzene solvate and di-μ-iodo-bis[(η⁶-para-cymene)iodo-ruthenium(II)] toluene solvate

ANTONIA NEELS, HELEN STOECKLI-EVANS, LAURENT PLASSERAUD, EVA GARCIA FIDALGO AND GEORG SÜSS-FINK

Institut de Chimie, Université de Neuchâtel, Avenue de Bellevaux 51, CH-2000 Neuchâtel, Switzerland. E-mail: antonia.neels@ich.unine.ch

(Received 20 July 1999; accepted 29 July 1999)


Abstract

The homologous title molecules, [Ru₂Br₄(C₁₀H₁₄)₂]-C₆H₆, (1), and [Ru₂I₄(C₁₀H₁₄)₂]-C₇H₈, (2), consist of arene-ruthenium moieties [Ru-to-ring distances of 1.655 (2) Å in (1) and 1.673 (3) Å in (2)] with a terminal halogen ligand [Ru—Br 2.548 (1) Å in (1) and Ru—I 2.726 (1) Å in (2)], held together by two symmetrical halogen bridges [Ru—Br 2.575 (1) Å in (1) and Ru—I 2.736 (1) Å in (2)]. The arene rings are planar and parallel to each other, and the terminal halogen ligands are coordinated to ruthenium *trans* with respect to each other. Both molecules possess C_i symmetry.

Comment

The title compounds, (η⁶-p-MeC₆H₄ⁱPr)₂Ru₂(μ-X)₂X₂ [(1) X = Br; (2) X = I], were first obtained from the reaction of [(η⁶-p-MeC₆H₄ⁱPr)₂Ru₂(μ-OH)₃][BPh₄] with HBr and HI, respectively (Gould *et al.*, 1984), while the chloro analogue, (η⁶-p-MeC₆H₄ⁱPr)₂Ru₂(Cl)₂-Cl₂, was first reported as a product of the reaction of hydrated ruthenium(III) chloride with α-phellandrene (Bennett & Smith, 1974). The benzene complexes (η⁶-C₆H₆)₂Ru₂(μ-X)₂X₂ have been known for even longer (Zelinka & Baird, 1972), the chloro derivative having been reported first, erroneously as a polymer (Winkaus & Singer, 1967). Surprisingly, structural information is available only for chloro derivatives of the hexamethylbenzene, ethylbenzoate and trindane analogues, *i.e.* (η⁶-C₆Me₆)₂Ru₂(μ-Cl)₂Cl₂ (McCormick & Gleason, 1988), (η⁶-C₆H₆CO₂Et)₂Ru₂(μ-Cl)₂Cl₂ (Therrien *et al.*, 1998) and (η⁶-C₁₅H₈)₂Ru₂(μ-Cl)₂Cl₂ (Gupta *et al.*, 1997). As

(1) and (2) are easily accessible in high yield from $(\eta^6\text{-}p\text{-MeC}_6\text{H}_4\text{Pr})_2\text{Ru}_2(\mu\text{-Cl})_2\text{Cl}_2$ with NaBr and KI, respectively, giving high quality crystals, we decided to undertake a single-crystal X-ray structure analysis of these simple compounds.



(1) $X = \text{Br}$, benzene solvate
(2) $X = \text{I}$, toluene solvate

In the molecular structures of (1) (Fig. 1) and (2) (Fig. 2), the two metal atoms and the symmetrically bridging Br^- or I^- ions are coplanar, with average an Ru—Br distance of 2.573 (3) Å for (1) and an average Ru—I distance of 2.733 (3) Å for (2). The Ru—Ru distances are 3.854 (1) Å in (1) and 4.092 (1) Å in (2), and are too long to be considered as bonds. The two halves of the molecules are related by a crystallographic inver-




Fig. 1. The molecular structure of (1) showing the numbering scheme. Displacement ellipsoids are drawn at the 40% probability level.




Fig. 2. The molecular structure of (2) showing the numbering scheme. Displacement ellipsoids are drawn at the 40% probability level.

sion center, and thus the two *p*-cymene ligands lie in parallel planes. The distance of the Ru atom from the *p*-cymene centroid in (1) is slightly shorter [1.655 (2) Å] than in (2) [1.673 (3) Å]. In similar $\text{Ru}_2\text{Cl}_4\text{L}_2$ structures [$L =$ hexamethylbenzene (McCormick & Gleason, 1988) and trindane (Gupta *et al.*, 1997)] the corresponding ruthenium–ligand–centroid distances are even shorter, with an average distance of 1.647 (2) Å. The Ru—I terminal bond distances in (2) [2.726 (1) Å] are longer than the corresponding Ru—Br bond distances in (1) [2.547 (1) Å]. The similar position of the terminal halogen ligand in both compounds with respect to the isopropyl group of the *p*-cymene ligand can be expressed by the torsion angles Br2—Ru1—C1—C7 [31.7 (7) Å] and I2—Ru1—C1—C7 [33.2 (6) Å]. Selected bond lengths and angles for (1) and (2) are given in Tables 1 and 2, respectively.

Experimental

A suspension of $(\eta^6\text{-}p\text{-MeC}_6\text{H}_4\text{Pr})_2\text{Ru}_2(\mu\text{-Cl})_2\text{Cl}_2$ (100 mg, 0.16 mmol) in water (20 ml) was stirred with silver sulfate (102 mg, 0.33 mmol) for 2 h at room temperature. After filtration, solid NaBr (168 mg, 1.63 mmol) or NaI (245 mg, 1.63 mmol) was added to the yellow solution, which was stirred for 2 h. The deep-red precipitate obtained was filtered off, washed with water (3×5 ml) and dried *in vacuo*. Recrystallization of (1) from chloroform/benzene gave dark-brown crystals (78 mg, 60%) and recrystallization of (2) from chloroform/toluene gave black crystals (121 mg, 76%).

Compound (1)

Crystal data

$[\text{Ru}_2\text{Br}_4(\text{C}_{10}\text{H}_{14})_2] \cdot \text{C}_6\text{H}_6$

$M_r = 868.31$

Triclinic

$P\bar{1}$

$a = 8.5740$ (10) Å

$b = 8.7391$ (10) Å

$c = 9.9027$ (11) Å

$\alpha = 102.879$ (13)°

$\beta = 97.367$ (14)°

$\gamma = 100.535$ (14)°

$V = 700.00$ (14) Å³

$Z = 1$

$D_x = 2.060$ Mg m⁻³

D_m not measured

Mo $K\alpha$ radiation

$\lambda = 0.71073$ Å

Cell parameters from 5000 reflections

$\theta = 1.65\text{--}26.05^\circ$

$\mu = 6.800$ mm⁻¹

$T = 293$ (2) K

Block

$0.76 \times 0.38 \times 0.30$ mm

Dark brown

Data collection

Stoe Image Plate diffractometer

φ oscillation scans

Absorption correction:

semi-empirical (MULABS in PLATON99; Spek, 1999)

$T_{\min} = 0.037$, $T_{\max} = 0.130$

5433 measured reflections

2515 independent reflections

2204 reflections with

$I > 2\sigma(I)$

$R_{\text{int}} = 0.056$

$\theta_{\max} = 25.87^\circ$

$h = -10 \rightarrow 10$

$k = -10 \rightarrow 10$

$l = -11 \rightarrow 12$

Intensity decay: none

Refinement**Refinement on F^2**

$R[F^2 > 2\sigma(F^2)] = 0.057$

$wR(F^2) = 0.139$

$S = 1.029$

2515 reflections

149 parameters

H atoms constrained

$w = 1/[\sigma^2(F_o^2) + (0.1031P)^2]$

where $P = (F_o^2 + 2F_c^2)/3$

$(\Delta/\sigma)_{\max} < 0.001$

$\Delta\rho_{\max} = 1.97 \text{ e } \text{\AA}^{-3}$

$\Delta\rho_{\min} = -2.21 \text{ e } \text{\AA}^{-3}$

Extinction correction:

SHELXL97 (Sheldrick, 1997)

Extinction coefficient:

0.027 (3)

Scattering factors from

International Tables for Crystallography (Vol. C)

$w = 1/[\sigma^2(F_o^2) + (0.0629P)^2$

$+ 1.2754P]$

where $P = (F_o^2 + 2F_c^2)/3$

$(\Delta/\sigma)_{\max} = 0.001$

Scattering factors from

International Tables for


Crystallography (Vol. C)

Table 2. Selected geometric parameters (\AA , $^\circ$) for (2)

Ru1—I1	2.7292 (8)	Ru1—I2	2.7256 (8)
Ru1—I1'	2.7359 (7)	Ru1...Ru1'	4.0918 (12)
I1—Ru1—I1'	83.04 (2)	Ru1—I1—Ru1'	96.96 (2)
I2—Ru1—I1	87.59 (2)		

Symmetry code: (i) $1 - x, 1 - y, 2 - z$.Table 1. Selected geometric parameters (\AA , $^\circ$) for (1)

Ru1—Br1	2.5650 (8)	Ru1—Br2	2.5471 (8)
Ru1—Br1'	2.5802 (8)	Ru1...Ru1'	3.8539 (11)
Br1—Ru1—Br1'	82.99 (3)	Ru1—Br1—Ru1'	97.01 (3)
Br2—Ru1—Br1'	88.03 (3)		

Symmetry code: (i) $1 - x, 1 - y, 1 - z$.**Compound (2)****Crystal data**

$M_r = 1070.34$

Triclinic

 $P\bar{1}$

$a = 8.755 (1) \text{\AA}$

$b = 9.090 (1) \text{\AA}$

$c = 10.420 (1) \text{\AA}$

$\alpha = 103.71 (1)^\circ$

$\beta = 96.18 (1)^\circ$

$\gamma = 100.12 (1)^\circ$

$V = 783.37 (15) \text{\AA}^3$

$Z = 1$

$D_x = 2.269 \text{ Mg m}^{-3}$

 D_m not measuredMo $K\alpha$ radiation

$\lambda = 0.71073 \text{\AA}$

Cell parameters from 32 reflections

$\theta = 12.8\text{--}20.5^\circ$

$\mu = 4.919 \text{ mm}^{-1}$

$T = 293 (2) \text{ K}$

Block

$0.68 \times 0.60 \times 0.38 \text{ mm}$

Black

Data collection

Stoe AED-2 four-circle diffractometer

 $\omega/2\theta$ scan

Absorption correction:

 ψ scans (North *et al.*, 1968)

$T_{\min} = 0.063, T_{\max} = 0.154$

2866 measured reflections

2866 independent reflections

2603 reflections with

$I > 2\sigma(I)$

$\theta_{\max} = 25.48^\circ$

$h = -10 \rightarrow 10$

$k = -11 \rightarrow 10$

$l = 0 \rightarrow 12$

2 standard reflections

frequency: 60 min

intensity decay: <3%

Refinement**Refinement on F^2**

$R[F^2 > 2\sigma(F^2)] = 0.036$

$wR(F^2) = 0.123$

$S = 1.294$

2866 reflections

156 parameters

H atoms constrained

$\Delta\rho_{\max} = 1.13 \text{ e } \text{\AA}^{-3}$

$\Delta\rho_{\min} = -1.28 \text{ e } \text{\AA}^{-3}$

Extinction correction:

SHELXL97 (Sheldrick, 1997)

Extinction coefficient:

0.051 (3)

In (1), one benzene molecule was found per asymmetric unit, while (2) crystallizes with one disordered molecule of toluene per asymmetric unit. The toluene disorder was modeled with three C atoms and two H atoms at population 1.0, with the methyl moiety at population 0.5. The disordered H atom at population 0.5 was not included in the model.

Data collection: EXPOSE (Stoe & Cie, 1997) for (1); STADIA (Stoe & Cie, 1995a) for (2). Cell refinement: CELL (Stoe & Cie, 1997) for (1); STADIA for (2). Data reduction: INTEGRATE (Stoe & Cie, 1997) for (1); X-RED (Stoe & Cie, 1995b) for (2). For both compounds, program(s) used to solve structures: SHELXS97 (Sheldrick, 1990); program(s) used to refine structures: SHELXL97 (Sheldrick, 1997); molecular graphics: PLATON99 (Spek, 1999); software used to prepare material for publication: SHELXL97.

This work has been supported by the Swiss National Science Foundation.

Supplementary data for this paper are available from the IUCr electronic archives (Reference: SK1323). Services for accessing these data are described at the back of the journal.

References

- Bennett, M. A. & Smith, A. K. (1974). *J. Chem. Soc. Dalton Trans.* pp. 233–241.
- Gould, R. O., Jones, C. L., Stephenson, T. A. & Tocher, D. A. (1984). *J. Organomet. Chem.* **264**, 365–378.
- Gupta, H. K., Lock, P. E., Hughes, D. W. & McGlinchey, M. J. (1997). *Organometallics*, **16**, 4355–4361.
- McCormick, F. B. & Gleason, W. B. (1988). *Acta Cryst.* **C44**, 603–605.
- North, A. C. T., Phillips, D. C. & Mathews, F. S. (1968). *Acta Cryst.* **A24**, 351–359.
- Sheldrick, G. M. (1990). *Acta Cryst.* **A46**, 467–473.
- Sheldrick, G. M. (1997). *SHELXL97. Program for the Refinement of Crystal Structures*. University of Göttingen, Germany.
- Spek, A. L. (1999). *PLATON99. Multipurpose Crystallographic Tool*. Utrecht University, The Netherlands.
- Stoe & Cie (1995a). *STADIA. Diffractometer Control Program for Windows*. Stoe & Cie, Darmstadt, Germany.
- Stoe & Cie (1995b). *X-RED. Data Reduction Program for Windows*. Stoe & Cie, Darmstadt, Germany.
- Stoe & Cie (1997). *EXPOSE, CELL and INTEGRATE. Versions 2.79. Programs for Data Collection, Cell Refinement and Reduction of IPDS Data*. Stoe IPDS, Darmstadt, Germany.
- Therrien, B., Ward, T., Pilkington, M., Hoffmann, C., Gilardoni, F. & Weber, J. (1998). *Organometallics*, **17**, 330–337.
- Winkaus, G. & Singer, H. (1967). *J. Organomet. Chem.* **7**, 487–491.
- Zelonka, R. A. & Baird, M. C. (1972). *Can. J. Chem.* **55**, 3063–3072.