metal-organic papers

Acta Crystallographica Section E Structure Reports Online

ISSN 1600-5368

Chian Sing Lai and Edward R. T. Tiekink*

Department of Chemistry, National University of Singapore, Singapore 117543

Correspondence e-mail: chmtert@nus.edu.sg

Key indicators

Single-crystal X-ray study T = 183 K Mean σ (C–C) = 0.008 Å R factor = 0.042 wR factor = 0.108 Data-to-parameter ratio = 26.1

For details of how these key indicators were automatically derived from the article, see http://journals.iucr.org/e.

Phenyl(pyrrolinedithiocarbamato)mercury(II)

An approximately linear geometry around Hg is found in the title compound, $PhHg[S_2CN(CH_2)_4]$ or $[Hg(C_6H_5)(C_5H_8-NS_2)]$. Distortions in the geometry arise from intra- and intermolecular Hg...S interactions, with the latter resulting in the formation of loosely associated dimeric units.

Received 10 October 2002 Accepted 21 October 2002 Online 25 October 2002

Comment

Owing to varying $Hg \cdot \cdot S$ supramolecular association, diverse coordination geometries and molecular arrays (monomeric, dimeric, polymeric, two-dimensional layers and three-dimensional networks) are known for the binary 1,1-dithiolates (e.g. compounds containing ⁻S₂CNR₂, dithiocarbamate; ⁻S₂COR, xanthate; ${}^{-}S_2P(OR)_2$ dithiophosphate ligands) of mercury(II) (Cox & Tiekink, 1997, 1999a,b). By contrast, significantly reduced molecular aggregation has been found in the organomercury(II) 1,1-dithiolate structures (Chieh & Leung, 1976; Tiekink, 1986, 1987, 1994; Zukerman-Schpector et al., 1991; Vázquez-López et al., 1992; Casas et al., 1994, 2002), where linear C-Hg-S geometries predominate. However, a careful analysis of the crystal structures of these compounds shows that distinctive molecular associations may be delineated (e.g. Casas et al., 2002). In this connection, the X-ray analysis of PhHg[S₂CN(CH₂)₄], (I), was undertaken.



The immediate coordination geometry about the Hg atom in (I) is defined by the *ipso*-C atom of the phenyl group and atom S1 of the dithiocarbamate ligand (Fig. 1 and Table 1). The Hg–S1 bond length of 2.4009 (13) Å is significantly shorter than the Hg···S2 distance of 2.9056 (13) Å, a result reflecting the propensity of Hg to exist in linear coordination geometries. The proximity of atom S2 is partly responsible for the deviation from the ideal linear geometry, as seen in the C6–Hg–S1 bond angle of 172.22 (14)°.

The deviations from planarity of atoms Hg, S1, S2 and C1, *i.e.* those defining the 'chelate' ring, are -0.0231 (13), 0.0231 (18), 0.0231 (18) and -0.023 (5) Å, respectively, and the angle between this least-squares plane and that through the Hg-bound phenyl ring is 10.8 (2)°, indicating a certain degree of coplanarity. In addition to the close intramolecular Hg...S2 contact, there is an interaction between a centrosymmetrically related S2 atom (-x, -y, 1-z) and Hg of 3.1178 (13) Å. These secondary bonds lead to the formation of

 \odot 2002 International Union of Crystallography Printed in Great Britain – all rights reserved



Figure 1

Association between centrosymmetrically related molecules (symmetry code: -x, -y, 1-z) in (I), showing the crystallographic numbering scheme. Displacement ellipsoids are shown at the 50% probability level (Johnson, 1976).

loosely associated dimers, as has been noted for the phenylmercury species PhHg(S₂CNEt₂) (Tiekink, 1987), PhHg-(S₂PPh₂) (Zukerman-Schpector *et al.*, 1991) and PhHg[S₂P- $(OEt)_2$] (Vázquez-López *et al.*, 1992), as well as in the methylmercury analogue of (I), viz. MeHg(S₂CNEt₂) (Chieh & Leung, 1976). In contrast with the loosely associated dimers formed in these structures, loosely associated polymeric chains, mediated by weak Hg. . . S interactions, are found in the remaining organomercury(1,1-dithiolates) cited above.

Experimental

To a stirred solution of PhHgCl (0.1939 g, Aldrich) in CH₂Cl₂ (30 ml) was added a stoichiometric amount of NH₄S₂CN(CH₂)₄ (Aldrich) in water (20 ml). After 3 h, the organic layer was separated, dried over MgSO4 and evaporated to dryness. Colourless crystals were obtained from the recrystallization of the precipitate from a CH₂Cl₂-CH₃OH (1/1) solution (m.p. 427–429 K). IR (KBr disc): (C–S) 945 cm⁻¹ and (C-N) 1439, 1468 cm⁻¹.

Crystal data

 $[Hg(C_6H_5)(C_5H_8NS_2)]$ $M_r = 423.93$ Monoclinic, $P2_1/n$ a = 13.3711 (10) Åb = 6.3641(5) Å c = 14.5826 (11) Å $\beta = 95.535 (2)^{\circ}$ $V = 1235.12 (16) \text{ Å}^3$ Z = 4

Data collection

Bruker AXS SMART CCD	357
diffractometer	320
ω scans	$R_{\rm in}$
Absorption correction: multi-scan	θ_{ma}
(SADABS; Bruker, 2000)	h =
$T_{\min} = 0.049, \ T_{\max} = 0.279$	<i>k</i> =
9689 measured reflections	l =

 $D_x = 2.280 \text{ Mg m}^{-3}$ Mo $K\alpha$ radiation Cell parameters from 4116 reflections $\theta = 2.2 - 30.0^{\circ}$ $\mu = 12.77 \text{ mm}^{-1}$ T = 183 (2) KWedge, colourless $0.39 \times 0.18 \times 0.10 \text{ mm}$

74 independent reflections 08 reflections with $I > 2\sigma(I)$ $h_{\rm nt} = 0.051$ $_{\rm max} = 30.0^{\circ}$ $= -17 \rightarrow 18$ $= -8 \rightarrow 8$ $-18 \rightarrow 20$

Refinement

w. S

Refinement on F^2	$w = 1/[\sigma^2(F_o^2) + (0.0501P)^2]$
$R[F^2 > 2\sigma(F^2)] = 0.042$	+ 0.4638P]
$wR(F^2) = 0.108$	where $P = (F_o^2 + 2F_c^2)/3$
S = 1.04	$(\Delta/\sigma)_{\rm max} < 0.001$
3574 reflections	$\Delta \rho_{\rm max} = 3.60 \ {\rm e} \ {\rm \AA}^{-3}$
137 parameters	$\Delta \rho_{\rm min} = -4.26 \text{ e } \text{\AA}^{-3}$
H-atom parameters constrained	Extinction correction: SHELXL97
	Extinction coefficient: 0.0021 (3)

Table 1

Selected geometric parameters (Å, °).

Hg-C6	2.074 (5)	\$1-C1	1.741 (5)
Hg-S1	2.4009 (13)	S2-C1	1.715 (5)
Hg-S2	2.9056 (13)	N1-C1	1.307 (6)
C6-Hg-S1	172.22 (14)	C1-S2-Hg	77.93 (17)
C6-Hg-S2	115.68 (16)	C1-N1-C2	124.2 (4)
S1-Hg-S2	68.07 (4)	C1-N1-C5	124.7 (4)
C1-S1-Hg	93.46 (16)	C2-N1-C5	111.1 (4)

H atoms were placed in calculated positions and included in the final refinement in the riding-model approximation. The maximum and minimum residual electron-density peaks were 0.82 and 0.81 Å, respectively, from the Hg atom.

Data collection: SMART (Bruker, 2000); cell refinement: SAINT (Bruker, 2000); data reduction: SAINT and SHELXTL (Bruker, 2000); program(s) used to solve structure: PATTY in DIRDIF92 (Beurskens et al., 1992); program(s) used to refine structure: SHELXL97 (Sheldrick, 1997); molecular graphics: ORTEPII (Johnson, 1976); software used to prepare material for publication: SHELXL97.

The National University of Singapore is thanked for the award of a research grant (No. R-143-000-151-112).

References

Beurskens, P. T., Admiraal, G., Beurskens, G., Bosman, W. P., Garcia-Granda, S., Gould, R. O., Smits, J. M. M. & Smykalla, C. (1992). The DIRDIF Program System. Technical Report. Crystallography Laboratory, University of Nijmegen, The Netherlands.

Bruker (2000). SMART, SAINT and SHELXTL (Versions V5.6) and SADABS (Version 2.01). Bruker AXS Inc., Madison, Wisconsin, USA.

Casas, J. S., Castellano, E. E., Ellena, J., Haiduc, I., Sánchez, A., Semeniuc, R. F. & Sordo, J. (2002). Inorg. Chim. Acta, 329, 71-78.

Casas, J. S., Castiñeiras, A., Sánchez, A., Sordo, J. & Vázquez-López, E. M. (1994). J. Organomet. Chem. 468, 1-6.

Chieh, C. & Leung, L. P. C. (1976). Can. J. Chem. 54, 3077-3084.

Cox, M. J. & Tiekink, E. R. T. (1997). Rev. Inorg. Chem. 17, 1-23.

- Cox, M. J. & Tiekink, E. R. T. (1999a). Z. Kristallogr. 214, 486-491.
- Cox, M. J. & Tiekink, E. R. T. (1999b). Z. Kristallogr. 214, 571-579.
- Johnson, C. K. (1976). ORTEPII. Report ORNL-5138. Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Tennessee, USA.

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

- Tiekink, E. R. T. (1986). Inorg. Chem. Acta, 112, L1-L2.
- Tiekink, E. R. T. (1987). J. Organomet. Chem. 322, 1-10.
- Tiekink, E. R. T. (1994). Acta Cryst. C50, 861-862.
- Vázquez-López, E. M., Castiñeiras, A., Sánchez, A., Casas, J. S. & Sordo, J. (1992). J. Crystallogr. Spectrosc. Res. 22, 403-409.
- Zukerman-Schpector, J., Vázquez-López, E. M., Sánchez, A., Casas, J. S. & Sordo, J. (1991). J. Organomet. Chem. 405, 67-74.