

The Crystal Structures of Tetramethylammonium Tetrachloro-cobaltate (II), -nickelate (II), and -zincate (II)

BY J. R. WIESNER, R. C. SRIVASTAVA, C. H. L. KENNARD, M. DIVAIRA AND E. C. LINGAFELTER

Department of Chemistry, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington 98105, U.S.A.

(Received 19 December 1966)

The crystal structures of the isomorphous tetramethylammonium tetrachloro-cobaltate(II), -nickelate(II), and -zincate(II) are reported. The space group is *Pnma* with $Z=4$. The cell dimensions are $a=12.276$, $b=9.001$, $c=15.539$ Å for the cobalt isomorph; $a=12.264$, $b=8.982$, $c=15.486$ Å for the nickel isomorph; and $a=12.276$, $b=8.998$, $c=15.541$ Å for the zinc isomorph. The structures were determined from three-dimensional X-ray diffraction data and were refined by the full-matrix least-squares technique. There is some disordering in the orientation of both the $[\text{MCl}_4]^{2-}$ and the $[\text{N}(\text{CH}_3)_4]^+$ tetrahedra. The $[\text{MCl}_4]^{2-}$ tetrahedron appears to be disordered in the same manner in the three compounds.

Introduction

As an extension of investigations carried out in this laboratory into the distortion of the tetrahedral $[\text{CuCl}_4]^{2-}$ ion (Morosin & Lingafelter, 1961), we have studied the distortion of the $[\text{NiCl}_4]^{2-}$ ion in the crystal structure of tetramethylammonium tetrachloronickelate(II), $[\text{N}(\text{CH}_3)_4]_2\text{NiCl}_4$. For comparison with this structure we also report the crystal structure determination of the cobalt(II) analog and the redetermination of the crystal structure of the zinc(II) analog (Morosin & Lingafelter, 1959), which are isomorphous with it.

While simple crystal-field theory predicts a distortion of tetrahedrally coordinated copper(II) in the form of a flattened tetrahedron, it predicts a distortion of tetrahedrally coordinated nickel(II) in the form of an elongated tetrahedron (Orgel, 1960). However, it has been shown by Liehr & Ballhausen (1959) that spin orbit forces can remove the degeneracy of the ground state and leave a species which is not subject to this Jahn-Teller distortion. The present series of compounds is excellent for testing these theories since the nickel is surrounded by four identical ligands, eliminating any distortion due to asymmetric ligand fields; also, any distortion due to asymmetric crystal packing forces would be detectable in the isomorphous zinc(II) and cobalt(II) compounds since these ions are not susceptible to a Jahn-Teller distortion.

The crystal structure of tetramethylammonium tetrachlorozincate(II) was previously determined (Morosin & Lingafelter, 1959; hereafter referred to as ML) from three-dimensional film data and refined (with isotropic thermal parameters) to a final reliability index ($\Sigma ||F_o| - |F_c|| / \Sigma |F_o|$) of 0.155 by a series of difference syntheses. As noted by them, the structure exhibited high temperature factors for the lighter atoms. Attempts in this laboratory to refine the structure further by the full-matrix least-squares method with anisotropic temperature factors resulted in unusually high temperature factors. Since this behavior is typical of refinement at-

tempts in which some systematic errors have been encountered in the collection of the data used, it was decided to collect a new, more accurate, set of data on a single-crystal X-ray diffractometer.

Preparation of the compounds

Crystals of $[\text{N}(\text{CH}_3)_4]_2\text{ZnCl}_4$ and $[\text{N}(\text{CH}_3)_4]_2\text{CoCl}_4$ were prepared, as described by ML, by evaporation of an aqueous solution containing the appropriate stoichiometric amounts of $\text{N}(\text{CH}_3)_4\text{Cl}$ and MCl_2 . Attempts to prepare the nickel compound by this method resulted in deposition of a tan polycrystalline solid and not a blue compound [the color attributed to the $[\text{NiCl}_4]^{2-}$ ion (Gruen & McBeth, 1959)]. Tetramethylammonium tetrachloronickelate(II) was finally prepared in this laboratory by M. Kellerman and B. J. Schein. Appropriate stoichiometric amounts of solid $\text{N}(\text{CH}_3)_4\text{Cl}$ and $\text{NiCl}_2 \cdot 6\text{H}_2\text{O}$ were placed in a crystallizing dish and heated on a steam bath until a uniform tan paste was obtained. Heating in an oven at 80°C for several hours resulted in the blue solid, $[\text{N}(\text{CH}_3)_4]_2\text{NiCl}_4$, which is deliquescent and must be stored in a desiccator. Suitable crystals were obtained by evaporation of a nitromethane (Eastman Organic Chemicals, spectro grade) solution in a vacuum desiccator containing Drierite. Since the compound is deliquescent, unlike the zinc and cobalt analogs, the crystals were mounted in Lindemann glass capillaries for collection of the X-ray data.

Space group and cell dimensions

Preliminary Weissenberg and oscillation photographs showed the three compounds to be isomorphous and showed systematic absences of $hk0$ for $h=2n+1$ and $0kl$ for $k+l=2n+1$, confirming the possible space groups to be *Pn2₁a* or *Pnma* as reported by ML. Accurate cell parameters were determined from the least-squares fit to 2θ values measured on a Picker diffractometer equipped with a General Electric single-crystal

orienter. The cell dimensions, along with the details of the experimental conditions, are given in Table 1. The estimated standard deviations are as obtained from the least-squares refinement. The cell parameters for the cobalt and zinc isomorphs agree with those given by ML.

Data collection

Intensity data for the zinc isomorph were collected from a prismatic crystal approximately $0.31 \times 0.26 \times 0.28$ mm in size. It was mounted with the c axis parallel to the ϕ axis of a Picker diffractometer equipped with a General Electric single-crystal orienter and data were collected, with the use of Mo $K\alpha$ ($\lambda = 0.71069$ Å) radiation, by the $\omega - 2\theta$ scan method (moving-crystal moving-counter). Before scanning through the reflection, a background count (B_1) was taken for a time equal to one half the scan time. The scan (S) was then taken and another background count (B_2) was taken at the end of the scan, again for one half the scan time. The intensity of each reflection was calculated as: $I = S - B_1 - B_2$, and the standard deviation of this intensity was calculated as: $\sigma_I = (S + B_1 + B_2)^{\frac{1}{2}}$. Reflections were examined in shells of 2θ to a maximum of 47° , at which point the intensities were falling off so rapidly that it was deemed not worthwhile to collect data at any higher 2θ values. Of the 1283 reflections examined, 433 had $I < 2.7 \sigma_I$ and were coded as unobserved reflections. The factor of $2.7 \sigma_I$ assures that all of the reflections coded as observed have intensities significantly different from the background at greater than the 99% confidence level.

The crystal chosen for intensity measurements for the cobalt isomorph was a rod-like prism approximately $0.6 \times 0.12 \times 0.20$ mm in size. It was mounted with a as the rotation axis and integrated equi-inclination Weissenberg photographs were taken on multiple films in a Nonius camera with Fe $K\alpha$ ($\lambda = 1.93728$ Å) radiation. The photographs were integrated in one direction only (perpendicular to the rotation axis); the diffraction spots were then scanned normal to the direction of the camera integration, using a Moll-type densitometer feeding into a Leeds and Northrup amplifier and recorder with a logarithmic slide wire. The tracings thus obtained were then planimeted and the area under each peak taken as the relative intensity. Only those spots appearing within the linear response range of the film were measured. Data were collected for levels $0kl$ through $7kl$. The total number of reflections examined was 802, of which 315 were coded as unobserved and 487 were coded as observed. The un-

observed reflections were given an intensity equal to the minimum observable intensity for that particular level. No cross level photographs were taken.

Intensity data for the nickel isomorph were taken in the same manner as described for the cobalt isomorph with a crystal which was an approximately cylindrical rod about 0.12 mm in diameter and 0.56 mm in length and with rather poorly defined faces. It was mounted in a capillary with the rod axis (the a axis) parallel to the rotation axis. Levels $0kl$ through $9kl$ were taken, using Cu $K\alpha$ ($\lambda = 1.54178$ Å) radiation. Individual level scale factors were determined using data for about 13 reflections per level collected on a diffractometer with Cu $K\alpha$ radiation as described for the zinc isomorph. Of the 1039 reflections which were examined, 436 were coded as unobserved and given an intensity equal to the minimum observable intensity for that particular level. The density measured by the flotation technique was 1.35 g.cm^{-3} and that calculated on the basis of four molecules in the cell is 1.358 g.cm^{-3} .

Calculations

All calculations for this investigation were made on an IBM 7040-7094 Direct Couple System using the Crystal Structures Calculations System X-Ray 63 (Stewart, 1964). The scattering factors used were those for Zn^{2+} , Co^{2+} , Ni^{2+} , Cl^- , N, C (*International Tables for X-ray Crystallography*, 1962). The real part of the dispersion correction (-3.1) for the Ni^{2+} ion with Cu $K\alpha$ radiation was applied, but the imaginary part (0.7) was ignored. Lorentz and polarization factors were applied to the data for all three isomorphs, but no absorption corrections were made. For the radiation used in each case the linear absorption coefficients are 132, 71 and 21 cm^{-1} for the Co, Ni and Zn compounds, respectively. All full-matrix least-squares refinements were carried out with the modified version of ORFLS (Busing, Martin & Levy, 1962) included in X-ray 63. This program minimizes $\sum w(|F_o| - |F_c|)^2$. The reliability index is defined throughout as $R = \sum ||F_o| - |F_c|| / \sum |F_o|$, where the summation is over the observed unique reflections only.

Structure determination

Since problems had been encountered in an attempted least-squares refinement of the structure of the zinc isomorph with the data of ML with calculations made in the centric space group ($Pnma$), it was considered a distinct possibility that the correct space group might

Table 1. Cell parameters for $[\text{N}(\text{CH}_3)_4]_2\text{MCl}_4$

Estimated standard deviations are given in parentheses.

	Co	Ni	Zn
a	12.276 (1) Å	12.2639 (4) Å	12.276 (2) Å
b	9.001 (1)	8.9819 (8)	8.998 (2)
c	15.539 (2)	15.4861 (10)	15.541 (2)
Radiation used	Mo $K\alpha$	Cu $K\alpha$	Mo $K\alpha$
Number of reflections	14	15	14

be the acentric one ($Pn2_1a$). The essential difference between these two space groups is that, with four molecules in the cell, $Pnma$ requires the $[\text{MCl}_4]^{2-}$ and $[\text{NCH}_3]_4^+$ tetrahedra to lie on mirror planes parallel to (010) and at $y = \frac{1}{2}$, while in $Pn2_1a$ the mirror planes are no longer present. If calculations were made assuming the absence of the mirror planes, and they actually were present, the structure should tend to exhibit this symmetry. Therefore, initial calculations were made with the new set of data assuming space group $Pn2_1a$. In the least-squares refinement of the structure of the zinc isomorph, unit weights were used, except that unobserved reflections with $|F_c| \leq F_o$ were given a weight of zero.

The zinc and four chlorine positions were determined from a three-dimensional Patterson synthesis. Three cycles of isotropic least-squares refinement gave an R of 0.219. The R calculated with the final parameters of ML for the zinc and chlorine atoms (including the mirror related chlorine atom) was 0.229. Through a series of ΔF syntheses and subsequent least-squares refinement of the atoms that had been found, a set of parameters for all of the atoms was determined. Three cycles of isotropic least-squares refinement gave an R of 0.122; however, the temperature factors of some of the carbon atoms were unusually high and the tetramethylammonium tetrahedra were quite distorted. This was the same behavior which had been noted in the attempted refinement using ML's film data. A fresh attempt was therefore made to determine the positions of the lighter atoms. A ΔF synthesis phased on the zinc and chlorine parameters showed the positions of all of the nitrogen and carbon atoms. These were refined by a series of ΔF syntheses, reducing R to 0.127. Three cycles of isotropic least-squares refinement gave an R of 0.115, but, again, the temperature factors were high and the tetrahedra were distorted. Nevertheless, the refinement was continued with four cycles of anisotropic least-squares, resulting in an R of 0.090 and large temperature factors and distorted tetrahedra. The positions of the atoms were essentially the same as those given by ML.

Since it appeared that a successful refinement was not being obtained in the acentric space group, calculations were continued in space group $Pnma$. Furthermore, since the trial structure was the same as that reported by ML, their parameters were used as a starting point. These parameters gave an initial R of 0.158. Five cycles of least-squares refinement of an overall scale factor, positions, and isotropic temperature factors resulted in a decrease of R to 0.128. Again, the temperature factors were high, reaching a maximum of $B = 17.5 \text{ \AA}^2$ for a carbon atom, and the tetrahedra were quite distorted. In these refinements some of the correlation coefficients between the scale factor and the various temperature factors were rather large, ranging from 0.09 to 0.72. Therefore, another set of three cycles of least-squares refinements was carried out, in which the temperature factors were set back to 'reason-

able' fixed values, refining only positions and the overall scale factor. This reduced R only from 0.147 to 0.140. Three more cycles varying the isotropic temperature factors and the positions, but not the scale factor, reduced R to 0.127. The resulting structure was essentially the same as before these six cycles were carried out. Even though the temperature factors still were not reasonable, it was decided to continue the least-squares refinement with anisotropic temperature factors. Four cycles reduced R to 0.062. After correcting errors in the data, two further cycles brought R to the final value of 0.056. For the final cycle of refinement, the average ratio of the change in any parameter to its estimated standard deviation was 0.05 and the maximum ratio was 0.22. The data were examined for secondary extinction effects by plotting $\ln(F_o/|F_c|)$ against I_c , where $I_c = LpF_c^2$ (Housty & Clastre, 1957). This plot showed no trend for $\ln(F_o/|F_c|)$ to become negative as I_c increases; therefore, no correction was made. Observed and calculated structure factors are given in Table 2.

Although the crystal structure will be discussed in a later section, it will be of interest to mention here that the temperature factors were still unusually high and the tetrahedra were still distorted.

As an independent check on the least-squares refinement, a series of difference syntheses were calculated phased on the final parameters, but omitting a different carbon atom each time. These ΔF maps showed, in the vicinity of the omitted carbon atom, an electron density that appeared to match the final least-squares parameters quite closely.

We have also refined the structure using the data of ML to a final R of 0.094. This structure agrees quite satisfactorily with that determined with the use of the diffractometer data, both with respect to the positions of the atoms and the sizes and orientations of the thermal ellipsoids.

The final parameters for the zinc isomorph were used as a trial structure for the refinement of the cobalt isomorph. The weighting scheme used in the least-squares refinements was a modified Hughes scheme in which $\sqrt{w} = 1$ for all reflections with $F_o < 40$; $\sqrt{w} = 40/F_o$ when $F_o \geq 40$; $\sqrt{w} = 0$ for those unobserved reflections with $|F_c| \leq F_o$. Since no data had been taken to scale the individual levels together experimentally, initial individual level scale factors were determined by comparison between the observed structure factors and the structure factors calculated for the trial structure. The R for this calculation was 0.131. Holding the scale factors constant, but refining positions and anisotropic temperature factors for two cycles, then two cycles refining only the scale factors, and, finally two cycles of refinement of only the positions and temperature factors, gave a final R of 0.111. For the final cycle, the average ratio of the change in a parameter to its estimated standard deviation was 0.03 and the maximum ratio was 0.26. The data were examined for secondary extinction effects as described for the zinc compound.

Although there were some large differences between observed and calculated structure factors, these did not show a systematic trend in the plot and therefore no corrections were made. The final list of observed and calculated structure factors is given in Table 3.

The determination of the structure of the nickel isomorph was carried out completely independently from that of the zinc isomorph in order to eliminate any bias that might occur. Because of space limitations, the details will not be given here; however, the two determinations proceeded along quite similar lines, with one exception. The refinement seemed to have halted at an R of 0.115; however, up to that point the individual level scale factors had been held constant

at their experimentally determined values. One cycle of least-squares refinement of only these scale factors reduced R to 0.088. The changes in the scale factors on this cycle varied from 0.07% to 11.8%. It thus seems that some of the experimentally determined scale factors were in error. Two further cycles of anisotropic refinement resulted in the final R of 0.075. During the final cycle the average ratio of the change in a parameter to its estimated standard deviation was 0.26 and the maximum ratio was 1.16. The weighting scheme used was a modified Hughes scheme in which w=1 for those reflections with Fo < 20; w=20/Fo for those reflections with Fo >= 20; and w=0 for those unobserved reflections for which |Fc| <= Fo. Prior to the final

Table 2. Observed and calculated structure factors for tetramethylammonium tetrachlorozincate (II). Unobserved reflections are indicated by an asterisk.

Table with multiple columns listing h, k, l indices and observed (Fo) and calculated (Fc) structure factors for various reflections.

cycles of refinement, examination of the data as described for the zinc compound revealed a secondary extinction effect. The nine reflections with the largest values of I_c were therefore given a weight of zero in subsequent refinements. Observed and calculated structure factors are given in Table 4.

Discussion

Information on the three isomorphous compounds is collected in Tables 5 through 9. Positional parameters are given in Table 5 and the thermal parameters are given in Table 6.

A most exceptional feature exhibited by the structures is the unusually large values of the thermal parameters. It is unlikely that these temperature factors describe actual thermal motion of the atoms since they are much larger than any that are reported in other normal structures. We feel that they indicate a rotational disordering of the structures. This point will now be discussed.

Normally, when difficulties such as these are encountered in a crystal structure determination, the cause may be found in a systematic error in the intensity data. For the large values of the thermal parameters to have been caused by systematic errors, it would be necessary for these errors to be similar in all cases, since (as will be shown later) all of the structures show similar patterns in the thermal ellipsoids. It is difficult

to see how this could have occurred, since the four different sets of data were collected by four different investigators from crystals of different sizes and shapes using a variety of experimental techniques. A disordering (randomness) in the positions of the atoms would give rise to the large temperature factors that are observed.

Examination of the thermal parameters reveals a number of differences between the values for the three structures. As has been noted by other authors (Srivastava & Lingafelter, 1966; Werner, 1964), the temperature factors can compensate for errors in the data due to absorption and dispersion effects, and can therefore be in error by amounts much larger than indicated by the estimated standard deviations. It is therefore not surprising that there are some differences in the temperature factors. However, the same general pattern in the temperature factors exists in the structures. This can be seen more clearly from Table 7, which gives the root mean square displacements along the principal axes of the thermal ellipsoids and the direction of these axes relative to the cell edges. The axes are listed in order of increasing size, axis 1 being the smallest, axis 2 intermediate, and axis 3 the largest.

The thermal ellipsoids of all the chlorine atoms show similar orientations, except for axes 2 and 3 of Cl(1). However, the ellipsoids for this atom are essentially isotropic in the plane defined by axes 2 and 3, and therefore, any orientation calculated for them has no

Table 3. Observed and calculated structure factors for tetramethylammonium tetrachlorocobaltate (II)
Unobserved reflections are indicated by an asterisk.

hkl	Observed	Calculated	hkl	Observed	Calculated	hkl	Observed	Calculated	hkl	Observed	Calculated
001	100	100	002	100	100	003	100	100	004	100	100
010	100	100	011	100	100	012	100	100	013	100	100
020	100	100	021	100	100	022	100	100	023	100	100
030	100	100	031	100	100	032	100	100	033	100	100
040	100	100	041	100	100	042	100	100	043	100	100
050	100	100	051	100	100	052	100	100	053	100	100
060	100	100	061	100	100	062	100	100	063	100	100
070	100	100	071	100	100	072	100	100	073	100	100
080	100	100	081	100	100	082	100	100	083	100	100
090	100	100	091	100	100	092	100	100	093	100	100
100	100	100	101	100	100	102	100	100	103	100	100
110	100	100	111	100	100	112	100	100	113	100	100
120	100	100	121	100	100	122	100	100	123	100	100
130	100	100	131	100	100	132	100	100	133	100	100
140	100	100	141	100	100	142	100	100	143	100	100
150	100	100	151	100	100	152	100	100	153	100	100
160	100	100	161	100	100	162	100	100	163	100	100
170	100	100	171	100	100	172	100	100	173	100	100
180	100	100	181	100	100	182	100	100	183	100	100
190	100	100	191	100	100	192	100	100	193	100	100
200	100	100	201	100	100	202	100	100	203	100	100
210	100	100	211	100	100	212	100	100	213	100	100
220	100	100	221	100	100	222	100	100	223	100	100
230	100	100	231	100	100	232	100	100	233	100	100
240	100	100	241	100	100	242	100	100	243	100	100
250	100	100	251	100	100	252	100	100	253	100	100
260	100	100	261	100	100	262	100	100	263	100	100
270	100	100	271	100	100	272	100	100	273	100	100
280	100	100	281	100	100	282	100	100	283	100	100
290	100	100	291	100	100	292	100	100	293	100	100
300	100	100	301	100	100	302	100	100	303	100	100

Table 4. Observed and calculated structure factors for tetramethylammonium tetrachloronickelate (II)

Unobserved reflections are indicated by an asterisk. Reflections removed because of secondary extinction effects are indicated by E.

001	100	110	111	120	121	130	131	140	141	150	151	160	161	170	171	180	181	190	191	200	201	210	211	220	221	230	231	240	241	250	251	260	261	270	271	280	281	290	291	300	301	310	311	320	321	330	331	340	341	350	351	360	361	370	371	380	381	390	391	400	401	410	411	420	421	430	431	440	441	450	451	460	461	470	471	480	481	490	491	500	501	510	511	520	521	530	531	540	541	550	551	560	561	570	571	580	581	590	591	600	601	610	611	620	621	630	631	640	641	650	651	660	661	670	671	680	681	690	691	700	701	710	711	720	721	730	731	740	741	750	751	760	761	770	771	780	781	790	791	800	801	810	811	820	821	830	831	840	841	850	851	860	861	870	871	880	881	890	891	900	901	910	911	920	921	930	931	940	941	950	951	960	961	970	971	980	981	990	991	1000	1001
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	------	------

Table 5. Positional parameters (x 10⁴)

Table 5 (cont.)

Estimated standard deviations are given in parentheses.									
		Co	Ni	Zn					
M	x	2447 (3)	2429 (2)	2459 (1)	C(1)	x	2614 (36)	2678 (12)	2686 (12)
	y	2500 (*)	2500 (*)	2500 (*)		y	2500 (*)	2500 (*)	2500 (*)
	z	4070 (2)	4070 (1)	4068 (1)	C(2)	x	1118 (28)	1063 (17)	1098 (17)
Cl(1)	x	631 (7)	620 (3)	631 (3)		y	2500 (*)	2500 (*)	2500 (*)
	y	2500 (*)	2500 (*)	2500 (*)	C(3)	x	1103 (34)	1046 (16)	1046 (13)
	z	4055 (6)	4020 (3)	4062 (3)		y	3737 (39)	3805 (20)	3708 (18)
Cl(2)	x	3035 (5)	3018 (3)	3061 (2)		z	1430 (25)	1407 (13)	1421 (12)
	y	432 (6)	440 (3)	456 (3)	C(4)	x	4370 (38)	4418 (20)	4436 (20)
	z	3386 (4)	3401 (2)	3388 (2)		y	2500 (*)	2500 (*)	2500 (*)
Cl(3)	x	3145 (8)	3122 (4)	3142 (4)		z	7378 (27)	7397 (11)	7377 (11)
	y	2500 (*)	2500 (*)	2500 (*)	C(5)	x	4117 (36)	4119 (20)	4111 (20)
	z	5400 (5)	5404 (2)	5414 (2)		y	2500 (*)	2500 (*)	2500 (*)
N(1)	x	1515 (24)	1463 (10)	1508 (8)		z	8943 (30)	8964 (15)	8880 (15)
	y	2500 (*)	2500 (*)	2500 (*)	C(6)	x	5404 (38)	5500 (18)	5330 (16)
	z	960 (14)	958 (6)	954 (7)		y	3906 (44)	3873 (18)	3756 (18)
N(2)	x	4936 (19)	4940 (9)	4914 (8)		z	8434 (21)	8417 (10)	8415 (10)
	y	2500 (*)	2500 (*)	2500 (*)					
	z	8269 (15)	8260 (6)	8256 (6)					

* Required by symmetry to be identically equal to 0.25; therefore, e.s.d. is zero.

Table 6. *Thermal parameters* ($\times 10^2$)

The temperature factor is defined by:

$$\exp \left[-\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^3 \sum_{j=1}^3 B_{ij} h_i h_j a_i^* a_j^* \right].$$

Estimated standard deviations are given in parentheses.

		Co	Ni	Zn
M	B_{11}	483 (29)	842 (12)	382 (5)
	B_{22}	431 (14)	610 (8)	453 (5)
	B_{33}	395 (14)	526 (7)	367 (5)
	B_{12}	*	*	*
	B_{13}	3 (17)	-3 (8)	8 (6)
	B_{23}	*	*	*
Cl(1)	B_{11}	421 (62)	797 (24)	378 (15)
	B_{22}	745 (43)	1149 (26)	931 (24)
	B_{33}	709 (42)	1233 (26)	958 (24)
	B_{12}	*	*	*
	B_{13}	43 (39)	60 (19)	33 (18)
	B_{23}	*	*	*
Cl(2)	B_{11}	717 (41)	1235 (18)	802 (15)
	B_{22}	611 (26)	839 (14)	680 (14)
	B_{33}	882 (33)	1239 (18)	1075 (19)
	B_{12}	144 (25)	181 (13)	186 (13)
	B_{13}	55 (28)	94 (15)	65 (15)
	B_{23}	-181 (32)	-333 (16)	-314 (15)
Cl(3)	B_{11}	828 (73)	1354 (29)	865 (26)
	B_{22}	1407 (75)	1788 (38)	1670 (41)
	B_{33}	427 (35)	542 (16)	424 (17)
	B_{12}	*	*	*
	B_{13}	-177 (38)	-170 (17)	-186 (18)
	B_{23}	*	*	*
N(1)	B_{11}	525 (192)	1158 (88)	434 (46)
	B_{22}	330 (89)	605 (47)	504 (49)
	B_{33}	496 (103)	638 (49)	612 (54)
	B_{12}	*	*	*
	B_{13}	-147 (127)	19 (51)	37 (47)
	B_{23}	*	*	*
N(2)	B_{11}	403 (154)	1120 (72)	465 (49)
	B_{22}	357 (93)	642 (48)	499 (49)
	B_{33}	597 (125)	533 (44)	431 (46)
	B_{12}	*	*	*
	B_{13}	-64 (106)	-174 (48)	-95 (40)
	B_{23}	*	*	*
C(1)	B_{11}	323 (323)	522 (99)	379 (74)
	B_{22}	2340 (506)	2652 (227)	2155 (205)
	B_{33}	856 (221)	1523 (137)	1203 (128)
	B_{12}	*	*	*
	B_{13}	-79 (200)	-64 (83)	-12 (83)
	B_{23}	*	*	*
C(2)	B_{11}	229 (255)	1565 (142)	1163 (148)
	B_{22}	3163 (656)	2700 (238)	2367 (239)
	B_{33}	870 (230)	722 (76)	664 (96)
	B_{12}	*	*	*
	B_{13}	-242 (176)	-395 (88)	-389 (96)
	B_{23}	*	*	*
C(3)	B_{11}	1690 (305)	1959 (126)	1468 (120)
	B_{22}	1194 (220)	1861 (127)	1566 (124)
	B_{33}	1920 (320)	2717 (177)	2237 (160)
	B_{12}	566 (205)	965 (102)	546 (101)
	B_{13}	-82 (237)	-270 (121)	-204 (113)
	B_{23}	-731 (246)	-1227 (135)	-1126 (121)
C(4)	B_{11}	1319 (368)	2593 (207)	2102 (202)
	B_{22}	1341 (318)	1161 (110)	1090 (120)
	B_{33}	908 (261)	1116 (110)	780 (104)
	B_{12}	*	*	*
	B_{13}	-440 (237)	-1021 (123)	-931 (121)
	B_{23}	*	*	*

Table 6 (cont.)

		Co	Ni	Zn
C(5)	B_{11}	657 (322)	1492 (184)	1136 (165)
	B_{22}	2529 (570)	3920 (490)	3505 (379)
	B_{33}	1071 (312)	1467 (164)	1052 (151)
	B_{12}	*	*	*
	B_{13}	355 (241)	430 (141)	142 (132)
	B_{23}	*	*	*
C(6)	B_{11}	2636 (451)	3778 (242)	2945 (201)
	B_{22}	1492 (271)	1661 (114)	1679 (127)
	B_{33}	1098 (215)	1618 (108)	1516 (119)
	B_{12}	-1035 (291)	-1698 (146)	-1749 (140)
	B_{13}	-582 (250)	-1087 (132)	-942 (131)
	B_{23}	124 (233)	761 (98)	747 (105)

* Required by symmetry to be zero.

physical significance. The thermal ellipsoids for the carbon atoms of the three compounds are oriented similarly, except for axes 1 and 2 of C(2) and axes 1 and 2 of C(6) in the cobalt isomorph. Axes 1 and 2 of C(6) are essentially the same length; therefore, directions calculated for them also have no physical significance. The orientations of the thermal ellipsoids for the metal atoms and the two nitrogen atoms do not generally agree in the three isomorphs. For the zinc and cobalt isomorphs, these are the atoms which are, to a large extent, isotropic. Again this would give the directions of the axes no physical meaning.

Table 8 gives the orientation of the thermal ellipsoids of the chlorine and carbon atoms with respect to the bond between them and the central atom of their respective tetrahedra. In every case, with the exception of C(2) in the cobalt isomorph, the axis with the smallest displacement is the one that is nearly parallel to the bond direction. The other two axes are then, of course, approximately perpendicular to the bond direction. This indicates that the disorder is of the form of a rotation or oscillation of the tetrahedron about its central atom - any translation of the tetrahedron would cause some of the larger axes of the thermal ellipsoids to lie in directions other than perpendicular to the bonds. The thermal ellipsoids of the metal and nitrogen atoms are also consistent with this description, since the temperature parameters for these atoms are not excessively large, indicating that they are not disordered.

Thus, with the exception of only C(2) of the cobalt isomorph, all of the atoms which appear to be disordered in the structures have their thermal ellipsoids oriented in similar directions. It is interesting to note that the cobalt isomorph is the only one in which experimental cross-level scaling was not available; this causes the B_{11} values (those associated with the direction of the rotational axis) and the individual level scale factors to be completely degenerate (Lingafelter & Donohue, 1966) and could, therefore, cause the temperature factors to be rather unrealistic. However, the initial scale factors were determined on the basis of a structure factor calculation using the final zinc parameters; thus, if the two structures are as isomorphous

Table 7. *R.M.S. displacements along the principal axes of the thermal ellipsoids and the angles between these axes and the cell edges*

Reading across each line the numbers are: the r.m.s. displacement (with e.s.d. given in parentheses) in Å and the angles (°) which the axis makes with the *a*, *b*, and *c* axes. Semicolons separate the three axes. Axis 1 (shortest) is listed first, then axis 2 (intermediate) and then axis 3 (longest). The different lines for each atom give the values for the cobalt, nickel, and zinc isomorphs in that order. For M, Cl(1), Cl(2), Cl(3) the r.m.s. displacements have been multiplied by 10. For the remaining atoms they have been multiplied by 10². An asterisk indicates an axis required to be perpendicular to the *b* axis. A dagger indicates an axis required to be parallel to the *b* axis.

M	224 (4)	92	*	2;	234 (4)	†		;	247 (8)	2	*	88
	258 (2)	89	*	1;	278 (2)	†		;	327 (2)	1	*	91
	215 (2)	113	*	23;	221 (2)	157	*	113;	240 (1)		†	
Cl(1)	229 (17)	8	*	98;	301 (9)	82	*	8;	307 (9)		†	
	316 (5)	8	*	98;	382 (4)		†	;	397 (4)	82	*	8
	218 (4)	3	*	93;	343 (5)		†	;	349 (4)	87	*	3
Cl(2)	235 (7)	119	38	68;	318 (8)	151	113	106;	351 (7)	94	118	28
	273 (3)	107	34	62;	406 (3)	162	104	101;	425 (3)	93	120	30
	228 (3)	116	38	65;	337 (3)	153	110	107;	398 (4)	95	120	30
Cl(3)	214 (10)	69	*	21;	337 (14)	159	*	69;	422 (11)		†	
	254 (4)	79	*	11;	419 (5)	169	*	79;	476 (5)		†	
	212 (5)	70	*	20;	344 (5)	160	*	70;	460 (6)		†	
N(1)	20 (3)		†	;	21 (4)	132	*	138;	29 (4)	138	*	48
	28 (1)		†	;	28 (1)	88	*	178;	38 (1)	2	*	88
	23 (1)	11	*	101;	25 (1)		†	;	28 (1)	79	*	11
N(2)	21 (3)		†	;	22 (4)	163	*	107;	28 (3)	107	*	17
	25 (1)	75	*	15;	29 (1)		†	;	38 (1)	15	*	105
	21 (1)	50	*	40;	25 (1)		†	;	26 (1)	140	*	50
C(1)	20 (10)	8	*	82;	33 (4)	82	*	172;	54 (6)		†	
	26 (2)	4	*	86;	44 (2)	86	*	176;	58 (2)		†	
	22 (2)	1	*	89;	39 (2)	89	*	179;	52 (2)		†	
C(2)	14 (11)	18	*	71;	35 (5)	71	*	161;	63 (7)		†	
	27 (2)	68	*	22;	47 (2)	158	*	68;	58 (3)		†	
	24 (2)	61	*	29;	42 (2)	151	*	61;	55 (3)		†	
C(3)	27 (4)	112	35	65;	46 (4)	145	95	125;	57 (4)	116	124	45
	28 (1)	120	39	67;	50 (2)	141	101	127;	70 (2)	113	127	46
	28 (2)	112	38	61;	43 (2)	152	98	116;	64 (2)	106	127	41
C(4)	28 (5)	57	*	33;	41 (5)		†	;	45 (5)	33	*	123
	27 (2)	63	*	27;	38 (2)		†	;	63 (2)	27	*	117
	19 (2)	63	*	27;	37 (2)		†	;	57 (3)	27	*	117
C(5)	24 (7)	150	*	60;	40 (6)	120	*	150;	57 (6)		†	
	36 (2)	134	*	44;	49 (3)	136	*	134;	70 (4)		†	
	35 (3)	127	*	37;	40 (3)	143	*	127;	67 (4)		†	
C(6)	30 (4)	59	53	52;	37 (4)	81	50	139;	65 (5)	32	119	104
	29 (1)	67	28	105;	38 (1)	115	94	154;	81 (2)	35	118	110
	24 (2)	57	34	96;	36 (2)	111	83	158;	77 (2)	40	123	111

Table 8. *Angles between principal axes of thermal ellipsoids and a vector defined by two atoms*

Table 8 (cont.)

	Axis	Atoms defining vector	Angle between axis and vector				Axis	Atoms defining vector	Angle between axis and vector			
			Co	Ni	Zn				Co	Ni	Zn	
Cl(1)	1	M-Cl(1)	171°	170°	177°	C(3)	1	N(1)-C(3)	6	9	2	
	2		81	90	90		2		94	99	89	
	3		90	100	93		3		86	91	88	
Cl(2)	1	M-Cl(2)	169	179	173	C(4)	1	N(2)-C(4)	174	179	176	
	2		80	91	83		2		90	90	90	
	3		93	90	91		3		84	89	86	
Cl(3)	1	M-Cl(3)	2	11	2	C(5)	1	N(2)-C(5)	164	1	9	
	2		92	101	92		2		106	91	81	
	3		90	90	96		3		90	90	90	
C(1)	1	N(1)-C(1)	6	1	3	C(6)	1	N(2)-C(6)	31	26	16	
	2		84	89	93		2		60	115	105	
	3		90	90	90		3		97	94	95	
C(2)	1	N(1)-C(2)	127	178	172							
	2		37	92	98							

The e.s.d.'s range from 1 to 10°.

as they appear to be, these scale factors should be fairly accurate. Furthermore, if the B_{11} values are incorrect, it is difficult to explain why only one atom does not agree, while the others agree quite well.

The thermal parameters for the nickel isomorph are generally larger than for the other isomorphs. The cause for this is not apparent.

Analysis of the directions of the thermal ellipsoid axes of the chlorine atoms in the zinc isomorph reveals the probable mode of disorder of the $[\text{ZnCl}_4]^{2-}$ tetrahedra. There is a disorder caused by an oscillation of the tetrahedra in all directions about the central metal atom. Superimposed upon this is a disorder caused by an oscillation about the Zn-Cl(1) bond. It can be seen that the same general pattern exists throughout the three isomorphs.

It is well known that determination of parameters for carbon and nitrogen atoms cannot be accomplished with a great deal of accuracy in the presence of heavy atoms, as is the case in these structures. This is particularly true of the thermal parameters. For this reason, no analysis of the directions of the thermal ellipsoids for these atoms will be made.

Table 9 lists the bond lengths and angles for all three compounds. For the metal-chlorine bond lengths, the values are given both with and without correction for thermal motion, calculated with the program of Busing & Levy (1959) assuming the chlorine atoms to 'ride' on the metal atoms. It was not considered that the accuracy of the thermal parameters of the atoms in the tetramethylammonium ions is enough for the calculation of thermal motion corrections to be significant. The mean values of the metal-chlorine bond lengths, corrected for thermal motion, are Co-Cl 2.280, Ni-Cl 2.273, Zn-Cl 2.287 Å.* The Ni-Cl distance is in excellent agreement with the value 2.27 Å found in dichlorobis(triphenylphosphine)nickel (Garton, Henn, Powell & Venanzi, 1963) and in triphenylmethylarsonium tetrachloronickelate(II) (Pauling, 1966). In order to make the correction for thermal motion, we have extended the refinement of the triphenylmethylarsonium tetrachloronickelate(II) with anisotropic thermal parameters, using Pauling's data. This refinement reduced R from 0.074 to 0.064 but caused no significant changes in atomic positions. The mean Ni-Cl distance, corrected for thermal motion, is 2.275 Å.

The $[\text{MCl}_4]^{2-}$ tetrahedra appear to be distorted in all three of the isomorphs in the form of flattened tetrahedra. For nickel(II) this is contrary to what simple crystal-field theory predicts. It is true that the nickel isomorph has a distortion which is greater than the other two, but this is in the direction of greater

* B. Morosin has informed us that he has investigated the crystal structure of the manganese(II) compound, with experience quite similar to ours. Some of his results are: $a_0=12.33$, $b_0=9.06$, $c_0=15.64$ Å; 1248 reflections; refined in $Pnam$ to $R=0.088$; mean Mn-Cl bond length 2.324 Å without correction for thermal motion, 2.372 Å with correction for thermal motion.

Table 9. Bond lengths and angles

Primed atoms are related to unprimed by reflection in mirror plane at $y=\frac{1}{2}$. The estimated standard deviations as obtained from the least-squares refinement are given in parentheses.

M-Cl(1)*	2.229 (9) Å	2.220 (4) Å	2.244 (4) Å
M-Cl(2)*	2.261 (6)	2.240 (3)	2.246 (3)
M-Cl(3)*	2.266 (9)	2.234 (4)	2.253 (4)
M-Cl(1)†	2.248	2.256	2.274
M-Cl(2)†	2.287	2.279	2.285
M-Cl(3)†	2.306	2.283	2.303
N(1)-C(1)	1.35 (5)	1.49 (2)	1.45 (2)
N(1)-C(2)	1.51 (5)	1.49 (2)	1.44 (2)
N(1)-C(3)	1.43 (4)	1.46 (2)	1.42 (2)
N(2)-C(4)	1.55 (5)	1.48 (2)	1.49 (2)
N(2)-C(5)	1.45 (5)	1.49 (3)	1.38 (3)
N(2)-C(6)	1.41 (4)	1.43 (2)	1.38 (2)
Cl(1)-M-Cl(2) } Cl(1)-M-Cl(2') } Cl(1)-M-Cl(3) } Cl(3)-M-Cl(2) } Cl(3)-M-Cl(2') } Cl(2)-M-Cl(2') }	108.3 (2)° 112.8 (4) 108.3 (2) 110.8 (4)	107.8 (1)° 114.4 (2) 107.8 (1) 111.4 (2)	109.1 (1)° 112.1 (2) 108.4 (1) 109.9 (2)
C(1)-N(1)-C(2) C(1)-N(1)-C(3) C(1)-N(1)-C(3') } C(2)-N(1)-C(3) C(2)-N(1)-C(3') } C(3)-N(1)-C(3') }	111 (3) 110 (2) 112 (2) 103 (4)	112 (1) 109 (1) 110 (1) 107 (2)	114 (1) 111 (1) 110 (1) 99 (2)
C(4)-N(2)-C(5) C(4)-N(2)-C(6) C(4)-N(2)-C(6') } C(5)-N(2)-C(6) C(5)-N(2)-C(6') } C(6)-N(2)-C(6') }	110 (3) 110 (2) 99 (2) 127 (4)	112 (1) 111 (1) 102 (1) 119 (2)	111 (1) 112 (1) 105 (1) 110 (2)

* Without correction for thermal motion.

† With correction for thermal motion ('riding' model assumed).

flattening rather than in the direction of elongation. Since the observed distortions are similar, it would appear that they are caused by crystal packing forces and not by the Jahn-Teller effect. The $[\text{NiCl}_4]^{2-}$ ion in the crystal structure of bis(triphenylmethylarsonium)tetrachloronickel(II) is found to be regular tetrahedral (Pauling, 1966). This would seem to corroborate Liehr & Ballhausen's conclusion that tetrahedral nickel(II) is not subject to a Jahn-Teller distortion. Tetramethylammonium tetrachlorocuprate(II), which is approximately isomorphous with the present structures, contains a tetrahedral $[\text{CuCl}_4]^{2-}$ ion which is distorted in a similar manner to that of the present structure (Morosin & Lingafelter, 1961), although to a greater extent. This is quite compatible with crystal field theory which predicts a Jahn-Teller distortion for copper(II) complexes in the form of a flattened tetrahedron.

It is unfortunate that the structures are disordered since the only other reported structures of a non-chelated tetrahedral complex of nickel are those of dichlorobis(triphenylphosphine)nickel(II) (Garton,

Henn, Powell & Venanzi, 1963) and bis(triphenylmethylarsonium)tetrachloronickel(II) (Pauling, 1966).

The phase diagram of the CsCl-NiCl₂ system has been determined (Iberson, Gut & Gruen, 1962) and it is found that below 50 mole% NiCl₂ there is a solid-to-solid color change from yellow to blue at 417°C caused by the formation of the compound Cs₃NiCl₅, which was shown to be isomorphous with Cs₃CoCl₅ by powder methods. Cs₃CoCl₅ is known to contain [CoCl₄]²⁻ tetrahedra; therefore, Cs₃NiCl₅ presumably contains [NiCl₄]²⁻ tetrahedra. We have prepared this compound in powder form and have found it to be stable at room temperature for long periods of time when stored in a desiccator. If single crystals of it can be prepared, it would probably provide a compound for an accurate structure determination of the tetrahedral [NiCl₄]²⁻ ion.

This study has been supported in part by the U.S. National Science Foundation.

References

- BUSING, W. R. & LEVY, H. A. (1959). *ORFFE, A Crystallographic Function and Error Program*. ORNL-59-12-3, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, Tennessee.
 BUSING, W. R., MARTIN, K. O. & LEVY, H. A. (1962). *ORFLS, A Fortran Crystallographic Least-Squares*

- Program*. ORNL-TM-305, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, Tennessee.
 GARTON, G., HENN, D. E., POWELL, H. M. & VENANZI, L. M. (1963). *J. Chem. Soc.* p.3625.
 GRUEN, D. M. & MCBETH, R. L. (1959). *J. Phys. Chem.* **63**, 393.
 HOUSTY, J. & CLASTRE, J. (1957). *Acta Cryst.* **10**, 695.
 IBERSON, E., GUT, R. & GRUEN, D. M. (1962). *J. Phys. Chem.* **66**, 65.
 LIEHR, A. D. & BALLHAUSEN, C. J. (1959). *Ann. Phys. (N. Y.)*, **6**, 134.
 LINGAFELTER, E. C. & DONOHUE, J. (1966). *Acta Cryst.* **20**, 321.
International Tables for X-Ray Crystallography (1962). Vol. III. Birmingham: Kynoch Press.
 MOROSIN, B. & LINGAFELTER, E. C. (1959). *Acta Cryst.* **12**, 611.
 MOROSIN, B. & LINGAFELTER, E. C. (1961). *J. Phys. Chem.* **65**, 50.
 ORGEL, L. E. (1960). *An Introduction to Transition-Metal Chemistry, Ligand Field Theory*, p.65. New York: John Wiley.
 PAULING, P. (1966). *Inorg. Chem.* **5**, 1498.
 SRIVASTAVA, R. C. & LINGAFELTER, E. C. (1966). *Acta Cryst.* **20**, 918.
 STEWART, J. M. (1964). *Crystal Structures Calculations System, X-ray 63, for the IBM 709/7090/7094*. Technical Report TR-64-6 Univ. of Maryland, College Park, Maryland.
 WERNER, P. (1964). *Acta Chem. Scand.* **18**, 1851.

Acta Cryst. (1967). **23**, 574

A Neutron Structure Analysis of S₄N₄H₄

BY T. M. SABINE* AND G. W. COX†

Materials Division, A. A. E. C. Research Establishment, Lucas Heights, N. S. W., Australia

(Received 19 January 1967)

The hydrogen atoms in S₄N₄H₄ have been found to be covalently bonded to the nitrogen atoms in agreement with the inference of Sass & Donohue (*Acta Cryst.* (1958) **11**, 497) from an X-ray study. There is trigonal bonding about the nitrogen atom with coplanar SNHS groupings. The S₄N₄H₄ molecules are connected by N-H...N and N-H...S hydrogen bonds.

Introduction

A study of the structure of S₄N₄H₄ by X-ray methods was made by Sass & Donohue (1958) in an attempt to resolve conflicting chemical evidence regarding the molecular structure. Arnold (1938) and Goehring (1947) favoured a structure containing N-H bonds while Meuwesen (1929) and Sidgwick (1950) preferred a structure with S-H bonds. Measurements of the infrared and Raman spectra (Lippinscott & Tobin, 1953) showed strong absorption bands at 3220, 3285, and 3320 cm⁻¹ which are characteristic of N-H bonds. Sass

& Donohue located the sulphur and nitrogen atoms, and from considerations of ring angles and molecular packing, inferred that the hydrogen atoms were bound to nitrogen.

The present neutron structure analysis was carried out to obtain direct evidence for the location of the hydrogen atoms in the molecule and to study the nature of the intermolecular hydrogen bonding.

Experimental

The crystal, in the form of a rough cube of volume 0.92 mm³, was supplied by Dr B. Dawson of the C.S.I.R.O. Division of Chemical Physics, Melbourne. The crystal data (taken from Sass & Donohue) are: $a = 8.010$, $b = 12.20$, $c = 6.727$ Å.

* Visiting Scientist, Department of Physics, Brookhaven National Laboratory, Upton, New York.

† Present address: Solid State Physics Division, Atomic Energy Research Establishment, Harwell, England.