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## Key indicators

Single-crystal X-ray study
$T=153 \mathrm{~K}$
Mean $\sigma(\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{C})=0.007 \AA$
Disorder in main residue
$R$ factor $=0.027$
$w R$ factor $=0.045$
Data-to-parameter ratio $=17.2$

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

## Decacarbonyltetra- $\mu$-hydrido-bis(tricyclohexyl-phosphine)-tetrahedro-tetraruthenium

The title cluster, $\left[\mathrm{Ru}_{4} \mathrm{H}_{4}\left(\mathrm{C}_{18} \mathrm{H}_{33} \mathrm{P}\right)_{2}(\mathrm{CO})_{10}\right]$, which contains two tricyclohexylphosphine ligands, has been synthesized and characterized both spectroscopically and crystallographically. The molecular structure is very similar to that of the known triphenylphosphine derivative $\left[\mathrm{H}_{4} \mathrm{Ru}_{4}(\mathrm{CO})_{10}\left(\mathrm{PPh}_{3}\right)_{2}\right]$.

## Comment

It has been shown by Bruce et al. (1986) that the hydrogenation of $\mathrm{Ru}_{3}(\mathrm{CO})_{12}$ in the presence of tertiary phosphines $[L=$ $\mathrm{P}(\mathrm{OMe})_{3}, \mathrm{PMe}_{3}, \mathrm{PPh}_{3}$ or $\left.\left.\mathrm{PPh}(\mathrm{OMe})_{2}\right)\right]$ gives a mixture of tetranuclear complexes $\left[\mathrm{H}_{4} \mathrm{Ru}_{4}(\mathrm{CO})_{12-n}(L)_{n}\right](n=1-3)$. From a different starting material, $\left[\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{Ru}_{3}(\mathrm{CO})_{6}\left(\mathrm{PCy}_{3}\right)_{3}\right]$ (Süss-Fink et al., 1998), and also by hydrogenation in an autoclave, we have obtained the analogous compound $\left[\mathrm{H}_{4} \mathrm{Ru}_{4}(\mathrm{CO})_{10^{-}}\right.$ $\left(\mathrm{PCy}_{3}\right)_{2}$ ], (I), which contains two tricyclohexylphosphine $\left(\mathrm{PCy}_{3}\right)$ ligands. The ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectrum displays four nonequivalent hydrides, as opposed to the parent cluster, $\left[\mathrm{H}_{4} \mathrm{Ru}_{4}(\mathrm{CO})_{10}\left\{\mathrm{P}\left(\mathrm{OCH}_{3}\right)_{3}\right\}_{2}\right]$, which shows only one hydride resonance (Knox \& Kaesz, 1971). The hydride ligands adopt a similar arrangement to that observed for $\left[\mathrm{H}_{4} \mathrm{Ru}_{4}(\mathrm{CO})_{10^{-}}\right.$ $\left.\left(\mathrm{PH}_{2} \mathrm{PCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{PPh}_{2}\right)\right]$ (Shapley \& Richter, 1977).

(I)

The molecular structure of (I) (Fig. 1) was confirmed by single-crystal X-ray analysis. The geometry of (I) consists of an asymmetric $\mathrm{Ru}_{4}$ tetrahedral core, with four long metal-metal distances and two shorter ones. The four hydrido ligands bridge the long $\mathrm{Ru}-\mathrm{Ru}$ bonds, as suggested for $\left[\mathrm{H}_{4} \mathrm{Ru}_{4}(\mathrm{CO})_{10}\left(\mathrm{PPh}_{3}\right)_{2}\right]$ (Wilson et al., 1978; Sasvári et al., 1979). The metal-metal distances (long $\mathrm{Ru}-\mathrm{Ru}$, average $3.01 \AA$; short $2.79 \AA$ ) are slightly longer than those in $\left[\mathrm{H}_{4} \mathrm{Ru}_{4}(\mathrm{CO})_{10}\left(\mathrm{PPh}_{3}\right)_{2}\right]$ (long $2.97 \AA$; short $2.77 \AA$ ) and in $\left[\mathrm{H}_{4} \mathrm{Ru}_{4}(\mathrm{CO})_{10}\left\{\mathrm{P}(\mathrm{OMe})_{3}\right\}_{2}\right]$ (long $2.973 \AA$; short $2.792 \AA$ )
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Figure 1
The molecular structure of (I) with displacement ellipsoids drawn at the $50 \%$ probability level. The cyclohexyl groups and H atoms have been omitted for clarity.
(Aime et al., 1995). The phosphine ligands are coordinated to Ru1 and Ru2 with $\mathrm{Ru}-\mathrm{P}$ distances of 2.389 (1) and 2.382 (1) $\AA$, respectively. The $\mathrm{P} 1-\mathrm{Ru} 1-\mathrm{Ru} 2-\mathrm{P} 2$ torsion angle is $143.6(1)^{\circ}$. All the carbonyl groups adopt a staggered conformation with respect to the metal edges. The carbonyl groups opposite to the unbridged $\mathrm{Ru}-\mathrm{Ru}$ bonds (C46 and C48) show longer $\mathrm{Ru}-\mathrm{C}$ distances (average $1.913 \AA$ ) than those opposite to bridged $\mathrm{Ru}-\mathrm{Ru}$ bonds (average $1.878 \AA$ ). Otherwise no significant difference was observed in the carbonyl envelopes of the three analogous clusters.

## Experimental

A solution of $\left[\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{Ru}_{3}(\mathrm{CO})_{6}\left(\mathrm{PCy}_{3}\right)_{3}\right]$ (Süss-Fink et al., 1998) ( 127 mg , $0.1 \mathrm{mmol})$ in degassed cyclohexane ( 40 ml ) was placed in a stainlesssteel autoclave. After purging with hydrogen, the autoclave was pressurized with hydrogen ( 30 bar ) and heated to 373 K . After 18 h , the autoclave was placed in an ice-bath and the pressure released. The solution was evaporated to dryness and the brown residue dissolved in dichloromethane ( 3 ml ) before being chromatographed on a silica gel ( 100 GF254, Merck) column, using a mixture of hexane- $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ (4:1) as eluant. The major red fraction gave $\left[\mathrm{H}_{4} \mathrm{Ru}_{4}(\mathrm{CO})_{10}\left(\mathrm{PCy}_{3}\right)_{2}\right]$ in $30 \%$ yield. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $200 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ): $\delta$ $-19.6(s, 1 \mathrm{H}),-18.0(s, 1 \mathrm{H}),-17.1(s, 1 \mathrm{H}),-15.7(s, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.25-2.10$ $(m, 66 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{31} \mathrm{P}$ NMR ( $200 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ): $\delta 57.3(s, 1 \mathrm{P}), 53.2(s, 1 \mathrm{P})$. IR (cyclohexane, $\mathrm{cm}^{-1}, \mathrm{CO}$ ): 2069 (w), 2062 (sh), 2022 (vs), 2003 (w), 1993 (s), 1982 ( $m$ ), 1971 (w), 1966 (w). MS (ESI, $m / z$ ): 1248.0 Analysis calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{46} \mathrm{H}_{70} \mathrm{O}_{10} \mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{Ru}_{4}$ : C 44.23, H $5.65 \%$; found: C 43.66, H $5.62 \%$. Red crystals of compound (I) were obtained at room temperature by slow evaporation of a $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{OH}-\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ (3:7) solution.

## Crystal data

| $\left[\mathrm{Ru}_{4} \mathrm{H}_{4}\left(\mathrm{C}_{18} \mathrm{H}_{33} \mathrm{P}\right)_{2}(\mathrm{CO})_{10}\right]$ | $D_{x}=1.510 \mathrm{Mg} \mathrm{m}^{-3}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $M_{r}=1249.24$ | Mo $K \alpha$ radiation |
| Monoclinic, $P 2_{1} / c$ | Cell parameters from 7997 |
| $a=12.461(5) \AA$ | $\quad$ reflections |
| $b=23.934(5) \AA$ | $\theta=2.0-25.9^{\circ}$ |
| $c=18.541(5) \AA$ | $\mu=1.19 \mathrm{~mm}^{-1}$ |
| $\beta=96.545(5)^{\circ}$ | $T=153(2) \mathrm{K}$ |
| $V=5494(3) \AA^{3}$ | Block, red |
| $Z=4$ | $0.30 \times 0.30 \times 0.12 \mathrm{~mm}$ |

## Data collection

Stoe \& Cie IPDS diffractometer

## $\varphi$ scans

Absorption correction: refined from
$\Delta F$ (Walker \& Stuart, 1983)
$T_{\text {min }}=0.641, T_{\text {max }}=0.895$
38794 measured reflections
10053 independent reflections

## Refinement

Refinement on $F^{2}$
$R\left[F^{2}>2 \sigma\left(F^{2}\right)\right]=0.027$
$w R\left(F^{2}\right)=0.045$
$S=0.75$
10053 reflections
586 parameters

6046 reflections with $I>2 \sigma(I)$
$R_{\text {int }}=0.057$
$\theta_{\text {max }}=25.9^{\circ}$
$h=-14 \rightarrow 15$
$k=-29 \rightarrow 29$
$l=-20 \rightarrow 20$

H -atom parameters constrained
$w=1 /\left[\sigma^{2}\left(F_{o}{ }^{2}\right)+(0.0085 P)^{2}\right]$
where $P=\left(F_{o}{ }^{2}+2 F_{c}{ }^{2}\right) / 3$
$(\Delta / \sigma)_{\max }=0.002$
$\Delta \rho_{\text {max }}=0.48 \mathrm{e}_{\mathrm{m}} \AA^{-3}$
$\Delta \rho_{\min }=-0.49 \mathrm{e}^{-3}$

Table 1
Selected geometric parameters ( $\mathrm{A},{ }^{\circ}$ ).

| P1-Ru1 | $2.3894(12)$ | $\mathrm{Ru} 1-\mathrm{Ru} 2$ | $3.0484(12)$ |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| $\mathrm{P} 2-\mathrm{Ru} 2$ | $2.3824(11)$ | $\mathrm{Ru} 2-\mathrm{Ru} 4$ | $2.7977(6)$ |
| $\mathrm{Ru} 1-\mathrm{Ru} 4$ | $3.0031(9)$ | $\mathrm{Ru} 2-\mathrm{Ru} 3$ | $2.9600(7)$ |
| $\mathrm{Ru} 1-\mathrm{Ru} 3$ | $3.0267(7)$ | $\mathrm{Ru} 3-\mathrm{Ru} 4$ | $2.7824(8)$ |
|  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{P} 1-\mathrm{Ru} 1-\mathrm{Ru} 4$ | $113.69(3)$ | $\mathrm{P} 2-\mathrm{Ru} 2-\mathrm{Ru} 1$ | $107.43(3)$ |
| $\mathrm{P} 1-\mathrm{Ru} 1-\mathrm{Ru} 3$ | $109.62(3)$ | $\mathrm{Ru} 4-\mathrm{Ru} 2-\mathrm{Ru} 1$ | $61.642(11)$ |
| $\mathrm{Ru} 4-\mathrm{Ru} 1-\mathrm{Ru} 3$ | $54.960(18)$ | $\mathrm{Ru} 3-\mathrm{Ru} 2-\mathrm{Ru} 1$ | $60.475(14)$ |
| $\mathrm{P} 1-\mathrm{Ru} 1-\mathrm{Ru} 2$ | $166.33(3)$ | $\mathrm{Ru} 4-\mathrm{Ru} 3-\mathrm{Ru} 2$ | $58.216(12)$ |
| $\mathrm{Ru}-\mathrm{Ru} 1-\mathrm{Ru} 2$ | $55.07(2)$ | $\mathrm{Ru}-\mathrm{Ru} 3-\mathrm{Ru} 1$ | $62.088(18)$ |
| $\mathrm{Ru}-\mathrm{Ru} 1-\mathrm{Ru} 2$ | $58.316(16)$ | $\mathrm{Ru} 2-\mathrm{Ru} 3-\mathrm{Ru} 1$ | $61.21(2)$ |
| $\mathrm{P} 2-\mathrm{Ru} 2-\mathrm{Ru} 4$ | $169.05(3)$ | $\mathrm{Ru} 3-\mathrm{Ru} 4-\mathrm{Ru} 2$ | $64.070(18)$ |
| $\mathrm{P} 2-\mathrm{Ru} 2-\mathrm{Ru} 3$ | $118.85(3)$ | $\mathrm{Ru} 3-\mathrm{Ru} 4-\mathrm{Ru} 1$ | $62.952(13)$ |
| $\mathrm{Ru} 4-\mathrm{Ru} 2-\mathrm{Ru} 3$ | $57.714(18)$ | $\mathrm{Ru} 2-\mathrm{Ru} 4-\mathrm{Ru} 1$ | $63.29(2)$ |

The hydride ions were located in a difference Fourier map and their positions fixed, while the remaining H atoms were included in calculated positions and treated as riding atoms. One cyclohexyl group has been treated as disordered over two sites (C34-C36), with partial occupancy factors of 0.5 .

Data collection: EXPOSE in IPDS Software (Stoe \& Cie, 2000); cell refinement: CELL in IPDS Software; data reduction: INTEGRATE in IPDS Software; program(s) used to solve structure: SHELXS97 (Sheldrick, 1990); program(s) used to refine structure: SHELXL97 (Sheldrick, 1997); molecular graphics: ORTEP-3 (Farrugia, 1997); software used to prepare material for publication: SHELXL97.
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