might be due to packing considerations and one might assume that one chlorine atom is bent **32'** from the plane because of an interaction with the pyridine ring. A consideration of contact distances does not show the chlorine atom to be significantly closer when it is placed in the copper-oxygen plane than when it is bent out of the plane. We do not believe that a steric interaction would be sufficiently strong to give the resulting distorted structure. Some careful theoretical considerations will have to be employed to see if the proposed mechanism is possible.

Acknowledgment.--We wish to acknowledge The Robert A. Welch Foundation for their financial support of this project and for a graduate fellowship to R. S. S. We also acknowledge the TCU Research Foundation for a university fellowship to R. J. W. and express our appreciation to Dr. Y. Okaya and Mr. Norman Stemple.

CONTRIBUTION FROM THE ISTITUTO DI CHIMICA GENERALE E INORGANICA, UNIVERSITA **DI** FIRENZE, FLORENCE, ITALY

The Crystal Structure of **Tris(2-dimethylaminoethyl)aminecobalt** (11) Bromide

BY M. DI VAIRA AND P. L. ORIOLI

Received December 10, 1966

The crystal structure of $Co(Me_{s}tren)Br_{2}$ [Me₆tren = N(CH₂CH₂N(CH₃)₂)₃] has been determined by three-dimensional X-ray analysis and refined to a final *R* factor of 8.0%. Crystals of the compound are cubic, space group P2₁3, $a = 12.088 \pm 0.004$ **A,** with four formula units per unit cell. The structure consists of Co(Meetren)Br+ and Br- ons arranged in a distorted NaCl lattice. The $Co(Me_\theta tren)Br^+$ ion has a trigonal bipyramidal structure with symmetry C_8 . The symmetry of the complex ion is essentially determined by the shape of the ligand molecule. The series of complexes $M^{II}(M_{\text{eof}}$ ren)Br₂ with $M^{II} = Cr, Mn, Fe, Co, Ni, Cu, and Zn are all isomorphous.$

Introduction

Although several five-coordinated cobalt(I1) complexes have been described by X-ray analysis,¹⁻⁶ the factors determining the stereochemistry of these complexes are not well understood. From the results it appears that, among the other factors, the geometry of the ligand molecule plays an important role in determining the stereochemistry of the complex.

Ciampolini and Nardi7 have reported the preparation and the physicochemical properties of a series of highspin complex compounds with general formula M^H - $(Me_6$ tren) X_2 , where $M^{II} = Cr$, Mn, Fe, Co, Ni, Cu, and Zn and $Me₆$ tren = tris(2-dimethylaminoethyl)amine, $N(CH_2CH_2N(CH_3)_2)_3$, and $X = Cl$, Br, I, NO₃, and $C1O₄$.

On the basis of magnetic, spectral, and conductivity measurements, these complexes have been formulated as $[M(Me₆tre_n)X|X$, and a trigonal bipyramidal structure has been proposed for the $[M(Me_\theta tren)X]^+$ ion.

All the complexes with the same anion are isomorphous, as shown by the similarity of their X-ray powder patterns. The bromides crystallize in wellformed tetrahedra with dimensions particularly suitable for X-ray investigation. We report here the three-

(4) I. *G.* Dance, M. Gerloch, J. Lewis, F. S. Stephens, and F. Lions, *Nutare,* **210,** 298 (1966).

(5) J. **A.** Bertrand and D. L. Plymale, *Inoug. Chem.,* **6,** 879 (1966).

(6) Z. Dori, R. Eisenberg, and N. B. Gray, private communication.

(7) (a) M. Ciampolini and N. Kardi, *Inorg. Chem.,* **6, 41** (1966); **(b)** *ibid.,* **6,** 1150 (1966).

dimensional X-ray analysis of the complex $[Co(Me₆$ tren) Br]Br.

Experimental Section

Data Collection.---Crystals of the complex suitable for the structural analysis were kindly supplied by Dr. Ciampolini. Cell dimensions were determined from a Weissenberg photograph using Fe K α radiation (λ 1.9373 A), with the NaCl rotation pattern superimposed on the film for calibration $(a = 5.6273 \text{ A})$. Six 2θ values were measured and treated by least squares. The results are: $a = 12.088 \pm 0.004$ A, $d_0 = 1.688$ g/cm³, $Z = 4$, $\mu = 139.0 \text{ cm}^{-1}$, space group P2₁3.

The crystal chosen for the collection of the intensities was a truncated tetrahedron with the edge of about 0.25 mm.

Doubly integrated Weissenberg photographs *hkO* through hk6 were taken on a Nonius camera, with the multiple-film, equiinclination technique. The intensities of the reflections were measured on a Nonius microdensitometer, the intensity being assumed proportional to the density of the spots. The various levels were scaled by means of common reflections. We examined 390 independent reflections, about 95% of the total number in the Fe sphere of reflection; we found **53** too weak to be measured.

Intensities were corrected for Lorentz and polarization effects and for spot elongation on upper levels according to Phillips.⁸

Later, during the determination of the structure, inspection of the observed and calculated structure factors at $R = 12.1\%$ showed the existence of strong secondary extinction effects. This was confirmed by a plot of $\ln (I_0/I_0)$ against I_0 for the strongest reflections, but an attempt to correct all of the reflections on the basis of the plot did not give satisfactory results. It was decided then to continue the refinement, omitting those reflections which appeared to be affected most heavily by extinction. These reflections are 210, 220, 121, 231, 331, 431, 241, 351, 171, 222, and 262.

The atomic scattering factors were taken from the Dirac-

⁽¹⁾ P. R. H. Alderman, P. G. Owston, and J. M. Rowe, J. *Chem. Soc.,* 668 (1962).

⁽²⁾ P. Pauling, G. B. Robertson, and G. A. Rodley, *Natuve,* **207, 73** (1965). (3) M. Di Vaira and P. L. Orioli, *Chem. Commun.*, 590 (1965).

⁽⁸⁾ D. C. Phillips, *Acto Cryst.,* **9,** 81Y (1866)

TABLE I

			POSITIONAL PARAMETERS, TEMPERATURE FACTORS, AND THEIR ESTIMATED STANDARD DEVIATIONS [®]						
	\leftarrow - - - - - - Positional parameter \times 104 - - - - - -								
Atom	x/a	y/b	z/c	β_{11}	β_{22}	β_{33}	β_{12}	β_{13}	B_{23}
Co	2280(3)	2280(3)	2280(3)	44(2)	44(2)	44(2)	$-1(2)$	$-1(2)$	$-1(2)$
Br(1)	1119(2)	1119(2)	1119(2)	52(2)	52(2)	52(2)	$-8(2)$	$-8(2)$	$-8(2)$
Br(2)	8151(2)	8151(2)	8151(2)	61(2)	61(2)	61(2)	5(2)	5(2)	5(2)
N(1)	3308 (17)	3308 (17)	3308(17)	60(16)	60(16)	60(16)	10(15)	10(15)	10(15)
N(2)	2752(16)	1106(16)	3446(15)	32(15)	54(15)	41(15)	6(13)	$-4(13)$	$-25(13)$
C(1)	3619(18)	2698 (19)	4292(18)	49 (16)	64(17)	8(17)	2(15)	$-7(14)$	30(15)
C(2)	3820(18)	1470(17)	3993 (18)	21(15)	46(16)	47(16)	23(14)	$-18(15)$	$-3(13)$
C(3)	2957 (22)	$-54(23)$	2984 (22)	55(23)	53(22)	92(21)	39(19)	21(20)	$-16(18)$
C(4)	1868 (27)	945(26)	4294(25)	103(25)	62(25)	77 (24)	$-24(23)$	$-13(22)$	23(21)
				$\mathbf{3}$ 3					

Anisotropic thermal factors are of the form: $\exp(-\sum_{i=1}^{3} \sum_{j=1}^{3} h_i h_j \beta_{ij})$. Estimated standard deviations are given in parentheses.

Slater calculations of Cromer and Waber.⁹ No correction was made for anomalous dispersion or for absorption effects.

Structure Determination.-The positions of the heavy atoms were determined by means of a three-dimensional Patterson synthesis. There are eight bromine and four cobalt atoms in the unit cell. Examination of the equivalent positions of the space group $P2_13$ shows that these atoms must lie on the threefold axes, *i.e.*, in 4a: *x*, *x*, *x*; ¹/₂ + *x*, ¹/₂ - *x*, \bar{x} ; \bar{x} , ¹/₂ + *x*, ¹/₂ - *x*; $\frac{1}{2} - x$, \bar{x} , $\frac{1}{2} + x$. Each set of equivalent atoms generates a set of 12 peaks in the vector space lying in the three Harker sections having, respectively, $u = \frac{1}{2}$, $v = \frac{1}{2}$, $w = \frac{1}{2}$. On the other hand, two different sets of equivalent atoms in 4a give rise to 32 vectors, eight of which lie along the threefold axes. One of the bromine atoms was located from one of the two Harker sets which showed the highest peaks. The second bromine atom and the cobalt atom were successively located from the peaks lying along the threefold axes. These positions were then checked for all of the highest peaks in the Patterson synthesis.

The Fourier synthesis phased on the positons of the heavy atoms showed clearly all the other nonhydrogen atoms. At this point the *R* factor was 13.6% , but some of the bond lengths between light atoms were rather improbable. *R* is throughout defined as $\mathbb{Z}[[F_{0}] - [F_{c}]/\mathbb{Z}[F_{0}],$ where the sums are over the independent, observed reflections.

A *AF* synthesis calculated at this point did not give auy decisive improvement. Refinement was then continued by means of block-diagonal, least-squares analysis, with individual isotropic temperature factors for the atoms. Reflections were weighted according to the function:¹⁰ $w = 1/(a + F_0 + cF_0^2)$, with $a = 30.0$ and $c = 0.02$ A. Unobserved reflections were not introduced in this series of calculations. A set of three cycles reduced the R factor to 12.1% but the C-C bond length still appeared to be rather long (1.69 A).

It mas then decided to continue the refinement with the fullmatrix, least-squares program of Busing and Levy, adapted for the 7090 by Stewart.¹¹

Unobserved reflections were introduced in this set of calculations with the minimum observable intensity. Reflections affected by extinction were omitted as mentioned above. The weighting scheme used was as follows: $\sqrt{w} = 0$ for unobserved reflections with $F_c \leq F_{\text{min}}$; $\sqrt{w} = 1$ for unobserved reflections with $F_e > F_{\text{min}}$ and for observed reflections with $F_o \le 60$; $\sqrt{w} = 60/F_o$ for observed reflections with $F_o > 60$.

Three cycles with individual isotropic temperature factors reduced the R factor to 9.1% . The C-C bond length showed a decisive improvement (1.59 A).

At this point the hydrogen atoms were introduced in calculated positions with a thermal parameter $B = 4.0$ A², and their coordinates were not refined. Individual anisotropic temperature factors were applied to all the nonhydrogen atoms. One more

cycle of least squares gave a final *R* factor of *8.0%* and for the C-C bond a satisfactory value of 1.55 **A.** It should be noted that in this cycle the temperature factor of $C(1)$ went nonpositive definite, probably owing to the uncorrected absorption.

Table I reports the final atomic parameters and the temperature factors with their estimated standard deviations. Standard deviations of the parameters were calculated from the expression

$$
\sigma_i = \sqrt{\frac{(\Sigma w \Delta^2) a_{ii}}{n - s}}
$$

where a_{ii} is the diagonal term of the inverse least-squares matrix, *n* is the number of observations, and s the number of parameters. Table **I1** reports the coordinates of the hydrogen atoms and Table **111** the observed and calculated structure factors.

All of the calculations, with the exception of the full-matrix, least-squares cycles, were performed with a set of programs written for the IBM 1620 by Albano, Bellon, Pompa, and Scatturin.12

Discussion

The structure of $Co(Me₆tren)Br₂$ consists of $Co (Me₆$ tren)Br⁺ and Br⁻ ions arranged in a distorted NaCl lattice. Each cation is surrounded by three Br- ions at 5.85 **A** and three at 6.87 **A,** forming a distorted octahedron.

The $Co(Me_6tren)Br^+$ ion (Figure 1) has a trigonal bipyramidal structure with symmetry C_3 . The cobalt atom is five-coordinated by the four nitrogen atoms of the amine and by one bromine atom. Bond lengths and angles in the ion with their estimated standard deviations are reported in Table IV.

The average Co–N distance of 2.11 A is in good agree-

⁽⁹⁾ D. T. Cromer and J. T. Waber, Acta Cryst., 18, 104 (1965).

⁽¹⁰⁾ D. **W.** J. Cruickshank, *et ai.,* "Computing Methods and the Phase Problem in X-ray Crystal Analysis," Pergamon Press Ltd., Oxford, 1961. (11) J. M. Stewart, Technical Report TR-64-6, University of Maryland Comuuter Science Center, 1964.

^{(12) (}a) **17.** Albano, P. L. Bellon, and F. Pompa, *Ric. Sci. Suppl.,* **33, 283** (1963); (b) **V.** Albano, P. L. Bellon, F. Pompa, and V. Scatturin, *ibid.,* **33,** 1067 (1963).

TABLE **I11**

^{*a*} Columns are *l* index, $10F_0$, $10F_0$, and α (millicycles). Unobserved reflections are marked by L; reflections considered

Figure 1.--A perspective drawing of the $Co(Me_6tren)Br^+$ ion.

TABLE IV DISTANCES AND ANGLES IN THE $Co(Me_{6}tren)Br^{+}$ ION WITH THEIR ESTIMATED STANDARD DEVIATIONS[®]

$Co-N(1)$	2.151	0.021	$N(1)-C_0-N(2)$	81.1	0.8		
$Co-N(2)$	2 080	0.018	$N(2)$ –Co–Br (1)	98.9	0.5		
$Co-Br(1)$	2.431	0.004	$N(2)-Co-N(2')$	117.6	0.7		
$N(1) - C(1)$	1.449	0.029	$Co-N(1)-C(1)$	109.3	1.4		
$C(1)-C(2)$	1.547	0.031	$N(1)$ -C (1) -C (2)	109.7	1.8		
$C(2)-N(2)$	1.515	0.028	$C(1)-C(2)-N(2)$	104.3	1.7		
$N(2) - C(3)$	1.529	0.033	$C(2)-N(2)-C(3)$	106.7	1.7		
$N(2) - C(4)$	1.492	0.036	$C(2)-N(2)-C(4)$	110.4	1.8		
$Br(1)-C(3)$	3.468	0.026	$C(3)-N(2)-C(4)$	104.3	1.9		
$Br(1)-C(4)$	3.950	0.030	$Co-N(2)-C(3)$	115.0	1.4		
$Br(1)-N(2)$	3.437	0.018	$Co-N(2)-C(4)$	111.0	1.6		
$N(2)-N(2')$	3.558	0.026	$Co-N(2)-C(2)$	109.3	1.3		

Primes refer to atoms related to reference atom by the threefold axis.

ment with the analogous 2.12 A reported for $(1,3$ -bis- $(2'-pyridyl) - 2,3-diaza-1-propene) cobalt(II)$ chloride⁴ and with the 2.13 A of $Co(Me₅dien)Cl₂³$ [Me₅dien = be noted that the axial Co-N distance is about three standard deviations longer than the equatorial Co-N distances, but the difference is hardly significant since standard errors in Table IV are probably underestimates. The comparison with the structures of the isomorphous complexes of the series, in progress in our laboratory, will further elucidate this question. $(CH_3)_2NCH_2CH_2N(CH_3)CH_2CH_2N(CH_3)_2$. It should

The Co-Br distance of 2.43 A is in good agreement with the sum (2.43 A) of the Pauling covalent radii of the cobalt (octahedral) and of the bromine. Since the bond cannot be purely covalent, owing to the different electronegativity of the two elements, this seems to indicate the existence of π bonding between the metal and the halogen atom, which would contribute to the stability of the complex.

The $N(1)-C_0-N(2)$ angle of 81.1° appears essentially imposed by the stereochemistry of the ligand molecule, although this value is somewhat smaller than those found in ethylenediamine metal chelates, **l3** This causes the metal atom to lie 0.32 A below the equatorial plane of the three nitrogen atoms. The angles formed by the equatorial nitrogen atoms at the cobalt are 117.6° . Bond lengths and angles in the ligand molecule appear to be normal (Table IV).

Gillespie¹⁴ has discussed the main factors which determine the configuration of five-coordinate complexes. Although the electrostatic repulsions between the ligands favor the trigonal bipyramidal configuration, crystal field stabilization energy favors the squarepyramidal configuration, and this effect should predominate in complexes with essentially ionic binding. Anyhow, in most cases, both effects will be comparable and the resultant structure will be intermediate between the two configurations, or other factors, such as the shape of the ligand molecule or packing effects in the solid state, may determine the structure of the complex.

Of the reported structures of five-coordinated cobalt(II) complexes, three^{1,2,4} have been described as more or less distorted square pyramids, and three $3,5,6$ are intermediate between the two configurations. $Co(Me_6tren)Br₂$ is then the first five-coordinate cobalt(I1) complex having a trigonal bipyramidal structure with C_3 symmetry. Undoubtedly the symmetry of the complex cation is determined by the particular shape of the ligand molecule.

Acknowledgment.—We wish to thank Dr. M. Ciampolini for supplying crystals of the compound and for many helpful discussions. Thanks are also expressed to Professor L. Sacconi for his continuous interest. Financial support of the Italian CNR is gratefully acknowledged.

(13) J. R. Wiesner and E. C. Lingafelter, *Inorg. Chem.*, **5**, 1770 (1966), and references therein.

(14) R. J. **Gillespie,** *J. Chcm.* Soc., 4672 (1963).