## A New Cluster Ruthenium Carbonyl

By F. Piacenti\*, M. Bianchi, and E. Benedetti

(\*Institute of Industrial Organic Chemistry, Pisa University, and Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche, Roma, Italy)

Up to now  $Ru(CO)_5$  and  $[Ru(CO)_4]_3$  were the only known unsubstituted ruthenium carbonyls. The ruthenium carbonyl hydride H<sub>3</sub>Ru<sub>4</sub>(CO)<sub>12</sub>, recently detected by mass spectrometry, suggested the existence of cluster ruthenium carbonyls of higher complexity.

We now report that a new cluster ruthenium carbonyl may be obtained by heating [Ru(CO)<sub>4</sub>]<sub>3</sub> in benzene or cyclohexane solution at 150° under nitrogen. A deep red compound is thus formed which crystallizes in needles from cyclohexane, and analyzes as  $[Ru(CO)_3]_x$ . The compound is diamagnetic, and on heating under vacuum decomposes above 235°; heated in benzene solution at 150°, under 100 atm. CO pressure, it may be reconverted into [Ru(CO)<sub>4</sub>]<sub>3</sub>.

According to differential vapour-pressure measurements (Mechrolab osmometer, dichloroethane solution,  $c \cdot 2.21 \text{ g./l.}$ ) the molecular weight is 1050, not very far from the value corresponding to

 $Ru_6(CO)_{18}$  (*M* calc. for  $Ru_6C_{18}O_{18}:1110.61$ ); an X-ray investigation is in progress.

The i.r. spectrum of a cyclohexane solution of this compound in the 2200-1600 cm.-1 region shows two strong bands at 2066 and 2047 cm.-1 and two very weak bands at 2002 and 1850 cm.-1.

The extremely low relative intensity of the absorption in the 1800 cm.-1 region strongly suggest that the 1850 cm. -1 band is not fundamental, and hence that there are no bridging carbon monoxide groups of the type previously suggested for  $Co_2(CO)_8$ ,  $Co_4(CO)_{12}$ ,  $Rh_4(CO)_{12}$ , and  $Rh_6$ -(CO)<sub>16</sub>.3,4

On the other hand, the very low intensity of the bands appearing at 1858 and 1866 cm.<sup>-1</sup> in the i.r. spectrum of Fe<sub>3</sub>(CO)<sub>12</sub>,<sup>5</sup> for which a structure having at least two bridging CO groups has recently been suggested, leads us to consider the question as still open.

(Received, July 3rd, 1967; Com. 690.)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> J. W. S. Jamieson, J. V. Kingston, and G. Wilkinson, Chem. Comm., 1966, 569.

J. W. Cable, R. S. Nyholm, and R. K. Sheline, J. Amer. Chem. Soc., 1954, 76, 3373.
W. Beck and K. Lottes, Chem. Ber., 1961, 94, 2578.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> E. R. Corey, L. R. Dahl, and W. Beck, J. Amer. Chem. Soc., 1963, 85, 1202. <sup>5</sup> F. A. Cotton and G. Wilkinson, J. Amer. Chem. Soc., 1957, 79, 752.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> L. F. Dahl and J. F. Blout, Inorg. Chem., 1965, 4, 1373.