metal-organic compounds

Acta Crystallographica Section C Crystal Structure Communications

ISSN 0108-2701

μ -Oxo-bis[(η^{5} -1,2-dicarbaundecaborato)bis(N,N-dimethylacetamidinato)tantalum] dichloromethane hemisolvate

Andrès E. Goeta, Andrew K. Hughes* and John M. Malget

Department of Chemistry, University of Durham, South Road, Durham DH1 3LE, England

Correspondence e-mail: a.k.hughes@durham.ac.uk

Received 22 February 2001 Accepted 12 March 2001

The structure of the title compound, $[Ta_2O(C_2B_9H_{11})_2(C_4H_9-N_2)_4] \cdot 0.5CH_2Cl_2$, contains two $(C_2B_9H_{11})Ta[NC(Me)NMe_2]_2$ units bridged by a nearly linear $[Ta-O-Ta\ 163.4\ (4)^\circ] \mu$ -oxo ligand. The dichloromethane molecule lies on a twofold axis.

Comment

Treating tantalum-tris(N,N-dimethylamide)–1,2-dicarbaundecaborate, ($C_2B_9H_{11}$)Ta(NMe_2)₃, (I), with MeCN results in insertion of the nitrile into the metal–amide bond to give mainly tantalum–tris(N,N-dimethylacetamidinate)–1,2-dicarbaundecaborate, ($C_2B_9H_{11}$)Ta[$NC(Me)NMe_2$]₃, (II), whose structure has been described by Broder *et al.* (2000). The title complex, {($C_2B_9H_{11}$)Ta[$NC(Me)NMe_2$]₂}₂(μ -O), (III), was identified as a minor product and results from hydrolysis of (II) by adventitious water. Following recrystallization, the poor solubility of (III) in all common laboratory solvents hampered attempts to obtain supporting spectroscopic data, but the crystals proved suitable for a diffraction study.



The asymmetric unit of (III) comprises two Ta atoms, each ligated by two monodentate N,N-dimethylacetamidinate ligands, [NC(Me)NMe₂], and tethered by a μ -oxo bridge, plus a half-occupancy dichloromethane solvent molecule. The two Ta units are oriented mutually *trans* to each other to minimize the considerable steric interactions between the amidinate ligands. These factors are reflected in the almost linear

[163.4 (4)°] Ta-O-Ta bond. The *N*,*N*-dimethylacetamidinate ligands are close to being planar, with the mean deviations from planarity of the N $-C-(C)NC_2$ units varying from 0.011 (7) to 0.038 (7) Å. The Me₂N-C(Me)N bonds in the amidinate are shorter than typical N-C single bonds. The Ta-N bonds [1.855 (6)–1.881 (6) Å] are intermediate between tantalum amido, Ta $-NR_2$ [Cambridge Structural Database (CSD; Allen & Kennard, 1993) mean 1.99 Å], and tantalum imido, Ta-NR (CSD mean 1.79 Å), distances.

These structural features reflect a delocalized π -bonding framework over the entire amidinate ligand and a balance between the tantalum amide and tantalum imide canonical



Figure 1

The molecular structure of (III), with displacement ellipsoids drawn at the 40% probability level and H atoms shown as small spheres of arbitrary radii.

forms. The strong π -donation to the metal atom from the amidinate ligands results in a competitive weakening of the carborane to metal π -donation, and the C₂B₃ ring-centroidmetal distances of 2.050 (8) Å to TaA and 2.037 (7) Å to TaB are intermediate between those of the parent amide complex, (I) [2.019 (6) and 2.003 (6) Å; Batsanov et al., 1999], with moderate π -donor amide ligands, and of the tris(acetamidinate), (II) [2.097 (5) Å]. There is often an orientational preference displayed by $C_2B_9H_{11}$ ligands with respect to other ligands, as previously noted in amido (Batsanov et al., 1999, 2000), indenyl (Grädler et al., 1996; Smith & Welch, 1986), pyrollyl (Teixidor et al., 1997; Gómez et al., 1997) and carbonyl (Cowie et al., 1990) complexes. This can be described as a strong trans influence of the C₂ unit of the dicarbollide, and arises from the non-equivalence of the two π -donor orbitals of the ligand. In the case of (III), the midpoint of the C-C bond of the dicarbollide is preferentially located approximately over the Ta-O vector, as quantified by the (C2 midpoint) $-(C_2B_3 \text{ centroid})-Ta-O \text{ torsion angles, which are}$ 11.4 (5)° for TaA and 4.6 (5)° to TaB.

Experimental

MeCN containing a trace of water was added to a toluene solution of tantalum–tris(N,N-dimethylamide)–1,2-dicarbaundecaborate and the solution was brought to reflux, and heating was continued for 24 h. The resulting solution was cooled and layered with pentane. Interdiffusion of the two solvents over a period of two weeks afforded bright yellow crystals of (III).

Crystal data

$$\begin{split} & [\text{Ta}_2\text{O}(\text{C}_2\text{B}_9\text{H}_{11})_2(\text{C}_4\text{H}_9\text{N}_2)_4] - \\ & 0.5\text{CH}_2\text{Cl}_2 \\ & M_r = 1025.69 \\ & \text{Monoclinic, } P2_1 \\ & a = 11.414 \text{ (3) Å} \\ & b = 10.769 \text{ (3) Å} \\ & b = 10.769 \text{ (3) Å} \\ & c = 17.863 \text{ (5) Å} \\ & \beta = 93.303 \text{ (6)}^{\circ} \\ & V = 2192.1 \text{ (11) Å}^3 \\ & Z = 2 \end{split}$$

Data collection

Bruker SMART CCD area-detector diffractometer ω scans Absorption correction: by integration (*XPREP* in *SHELXTL-NT*; Bruker, 1998) $T_{\rm min} = 0.381, T_{\rm max} = 0.690$ 26 944 measured reflections

Refinement

Refinement on F^2 $R[F^2 > 2\sigma(F^2)] = 0.035$ $wR(F^2) = 0.095$ S = 1.1010 933 reflections 470 parameters H-atom parameters constrained $D_x = 1.554 \text{ Mg m}^{-3}$ Mo K\alpha radiation Cell parameters from 616 reflections $\theta = 13.7-19.1^{\circ}$ $\mu = 5.08 \text{ mm}^{-1}$ T = 150 (2) KRectangular prism, colourless $0.22 \times 0.12 \times 0.08 \text{ mm}$

6464 independent reflections (plus 4469 Friedel-related reflections) 9396 reflections with $I > 2\sigma(I)$ $R_{int} = 0.042$ $\theta_{max} = 30.4^{\circ}$ $h = -15 \rightarrow 15$ $k = -15 \rightarrow 14$ $l = -25 \rightarrow 24$

 $w = 1/[\sigma^{2}(F_{o}^{2}) + (0.0485P)^{2} + 0.8328P]$ where $P = (F_{o}^{2} + 2F_{c}^{2})/3$ $(\Delta/\sigma)_{max} < 0.001$ $\Delta\rho_{max} = 1.34 \text{ e} \text{ Å}^{-3}$ $\Delta\rho_{min} = -0.76 \text{ e} \text{ Å}^{-3}$ Absolute structure: Flack (1983) Flack parameter = 0.41 (1) H atoms were included as riding atoms, with B-H = 1.12 Å and C-H = 0.98-1.00 Å. The Flack parameter (Flack, 1983) indicates racemic twinning.

Data collection: *SMART-NT* (Bruker, 1998); cell refinement: *SMART-NT*; data reduction: *SAINT-NT* (Bruker, 1998); program(s) used to solve structure: *SHELXS*97 (Sheldrick, 1997); program(s) used to refine structure: *SHELXL*97 (Sheldrick, 1997); molecular graphics: *SHELXTL-NT* (Bruker, 1998).

We thank the ERDF for financial support (JMM).

Supplementary data for this paper are available from the IUCr electronic archives (Reference: GD1146). Services for accessing these data are described at the back of the journal.

References

- Allen, F. H. & Kennard, O. (1993). Chem. Des. Autom. News, 8, 1, 31-37.
- Batsanov, A. S., Churakov, A. V., Howard, J. A. K., Hughes, A. K., Johnson, A L., Kingsley, A. J., Neretin, I. S. & Wade, K. (1999). J. Chem. Soc. Dalton Trans. pp. 3867–3875.
- Batsanov, A. S., Eva, P. A., Fox, M. A., Howard, J. A. K., Hughes, A. K., Johnson, A. L., Martin, A. M. & Wade, K. (2000). *J. Chem. Soc. Dalton Trans.* pp. 3519–3525.

Broder, C. K., Goeta, A. E., Howard, J. A. K., Hughes, A. K., Johnson, A. L., Malget, J. M. & Wade, K. (2000). J. Chem. Soc. Dalton Trans. pp. 3526–3533.

Bruker (1998). SMART-NT (Version 5.0), SAINT-NT (Version 5.0) and SHELXTL-NT (Version 5.1). Bruker AXS Inc., Madison, Wisconsin, USA. Cowie, J, Hamilton, E. J. M., Laurie, J. C. V. & Welch, A. J. (1990). J. Organo-

met. Chem. **394**, 1–13.

Flack, H. D. (1983). Acta Cryst. A39, 876-881.

Gómez, S., Viñas, C., Lamrani, M., Teixidor, F., Kivekäs, R. & Sillanpää, R. (1997). *Inorg. Chem.* **36**, 3565–3567.

Grädler, U., Weller, A. S., Welch, A. J. & Reed, D. (1996). J. Chem. Soc. Dalton Trans. pp. 335–342.

Sheldrick, G. M. (1997). SHELXL97 and SHELXS97. University of Göttingen, Germany.

Smith, D. E. & Welch, A. J. (1986). Organometallics, 5, 760-766.

Teixidor, F., Gómez, S., Lamrani, M., Viñas, C., Sillanpää, R. & Kivekäs, R. (1997). Organometallics, 16, 1278–1283.