CONTRIBUTION FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY, BOSTON UNIVERSITY, BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS 02215

# **The Crystal Structure of a Molybdenum(II1)**   $\text{Hexaisothiocyan: } K_{3}\text{Mo}(NCS)_{6} \cdot H_{2}O \cdot CH_{3}COOH^{1}$

BY JAMES R. KNOX AND KLAAS ERIKS

*Receiaed July 21, 1967* 

The crystal structure of  $K_8MO(NCS)_6 \cdot H_2O \cdot CH_8COOH$  has been determined. The substance crystallizes in the orthorhombic space group Pm2<sub>1</sub>n with  $a = 13.547$  (2),  $b = 8.568$  (2), and  $c = 9.660$  (1) A. With  $Z = 2$  the  $D_x = 1.89$ , while  $D_M = 1.85$  g/cm<sup>3</sup>. A total of 884 photographic, visually estimated intensities was collected. The data were refined by least-squares methods to a conventional *R* factor of 6.8%. The molybdenum coordination is sixfold with the thiocyanate groups bonded *via* nitrogen; the average Mo-N distance is  $2.088 \pm 0.019$  A. Each potassium ion is surrounded by six sulfur atoms in a trigonal prism. In half of the prisms a disordered potassium ion is replaced half of the time by a water molecule; this causes the prism to expand, distorting the octahedron so that four MoSC angles deviate from linearity. Six sulfur prisms form a cavity in which the acetic acid molecule is located and bonded by a hydrogen bond to the water molecule.

### Introduction

A knowledge of whether molybdenum(III) bonds to the ambidentate thiocyanate ligand through the nitrogen or sulfur end is a good criterion for placing this ion into one of the two acceptor classes proposed by Ahrland, Chatt, and Davies.<sup>2</sup> Similarly, the NCS<sup>-</sup> ligand is an ideal species with which to measure the ion's "hard-soft" character defined by Pearson.<sup>3</sup> The nitrogen end is "harder" than the sulfur end and tends to bond to a "hard" metal ion. Borderline "hardsoft" character for Mo(III) might result in bridging through both ends of the thiocyanate ion (Mo-NCS-Mo).

The incomplete  $X$ -ray work of Zhdanov<sup>4</sup> indicated sulfur bonding in  $K_3Cr(NCS)_6 \cdot 4H_2O$ , a compound isomorphous with the Mo(II1) tetrahydrate complex. However, the spectroscopic data of Lewis, Nyholm, and Smith<sup>5</sup> pointed to nitrogen bonding in the molybdenum complex. Because the tetrahydrate of  $Mo(III)$  forms twinned crystals that are unstable in air, we have studied a related compound,  $K_3Mo(NCS)_6 \cdot H_2O \cdot$  $CH_3COOH$ , which is one in the series  $(K, NH<sub>4</sub>)<sub>3</sub>Mo (NCS)_6 \cdot H_2O \cdot HA$  where  $HA = HC1$ ,  $KHC_2O_4$ ,  $C_2H_5OH$ ,  $C_3H_7OH$ , or  $CH_3COOH$ . The presence in all of these Mo(II1) complexes of the singlet water molecule led Lewis and co-workers to reinvestigate whether the complex ion in the hydrated salts is six- or sevencoordinated,  $Mo(NCS)_{6}^{3-}$  or  $Mo(NCS)_{6}H_{2}O^{3-}$ , a question first inconclusively debated 60 years ago by Rosenheim and Maas.<sup>6</sup>

#### Experimental Section

Preparation of  $K_3Mo(NCS)_6\cdot HO_2\cdot CH_3COOH$  Crystals.--The compound was prepared by adding a half-volume of 2 *N* acetic acid to one volume of a concentrated aqueous solution of  $K_3M_0$ - $(NCS)_8.4H_2O$ ; the tetrahydrate had been synthesized by the electrolytic procedure given by Maas and Sand,7 using in the cathode compartment only half of the hydrochloric acid concentration suggested by the authors. After standing at 10° for 24 hr, the solution yielded yellow, transparent, rodlike crystals which were recrystallized twice from 2 *N* acetic acid. The crystals underwent no color change in air. *Anal*. Calcd for K<sub>3</sub>Mo-H, 0.945. Found: Mo, 15.15; *S,* 12.98; C, 15.22; H, 1.12. (NCS)s.HzO.CH3COOH: Mo, 15.00; N, 13.14; C, 15.02;

X-Ray Examination.--Weissenberg photographs with copper  $K_{\alpha}$  radiation ( $\lambda$  1.542 A) revealed that the lattice has Laue symmetry mmm; the systematic extinctions are  $h + k = 2n + 1$ for  $hk0$  reflections, showing the space group<sup>8</sup> is either  $Pm2_1n$ (no. 31, alternatively  $P2_1$ mn) or Pmmn (no. 59). Approximate cell dimensions obtained from the photographs were refined<sup>9</sup> by least squares using 38 equally weighted powder diffraction maxima obtained with a Norelco powder diffractometer. The refined dimensions are  $a = 13.547 \pm 0.002$  A,  $b = 8.568 \pm 1.002$ 0.002 A, and  $c = 9.660 \pm 0.001$  A. Assuming two formula units per cell, the calculated density is  $1.89$  g/cm<sup>3</sup>; the density measured by pycnometer is 1.83 g/cm3.

Optical Examination.-The four crystal faces parallel to the rod axis *b* were found to be  $\{101\}$ ; at the ends of the rods the faces are  $\{110\}$ . The crystals are biaxial negative, with  $n_{\alpha}$ ,  $n_{\beta}$ , and  $n_{\gamma}$  coincident with *c*, *a*, and *b*, respectively. There was no evidence of macroscopic twinning in the crystals used for data collection.

X-Ray Data Collection.- A single crystal was ground to a sphere of 0.229-mm diameter. With a precession camera and molybdenum K $\alpha$  radiation ( $\lambda$  0.7107 A) 887 nonunique intensity data for the  $h kL$  ( $L = 0-4$ ) and  $h K l$  ( $K = 0-4$ ) reflections were recorded on Ilford Industrial G film. A series of six exposures was made of each level, the maximum exposure being 60 hr. From another crystal measuring  $0.120 \times 0.093 \times 0.095$  mm<sup>3</sup> an additional 431 *Hkl* ( $H = 0-4$ ) reflections were collected with a Weissenberg camera and copper  $K\alpha$  radiation. By the two methods a total of 884 visually estimated independent reflections of measurable intensity were gathered at room temperature.

Following the method of  $Simpson^{10}$  the standard deviation  $\sigma(|F_{\circ}|^2)$  of each intensity reading was estimated from the precision of the film-scaling factors and then correlated with experimental parameters such as film number,  $(\sin^2 \theta)/\lambda^2$ , and raw

<sup>(1)</sup> Research supported by National Institute of Dental Research Training Grant No. 1Tl-DE116 and presented in part before the 7th Congress of the International Union of Crystallography, Moscow, July 1966.

*<sup>(2)</sup>* S. Ahrland, J. Chatt, and N. Davies, Quart. *Rev.* (London), **12,** 262 (1958).

**<sup>(3)</sup>** R. G. Pearson, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.,* **86,** 3533 (1963).

<sup>(4)</sup> G. S. Zhdanov, *Z.* V. Zvonkova, and V. P. Glushkova, *Zh. Fis. Khiiit.,*  **27,** 106 (1953).

*<sup>(5)</sup>* J. Lewis, R. Npholm, and P. Smith, *J. Chem.* Soc., 45Y0 **(lYGl).**  *(6)* **A.** IZosenheim, *Bey.,* **42,** 2295 (1909).

*<sup>(7)</sup>* J. Maas and J. Sand, *ibid.,* **41,** 1506 (1908).

<sup>(8) &</sup>quot;International Tables for X-ray Crystallography," Vol. I, The Kynoch Press, Birmingham, England, 1965.

<sup>(9)</sup> C. B. Shoemaker, "LSCELP, Least-Squares Cell Parameters," Massa chusetts Institute of Technology, 1963.

<sup>(10)</sup> P. G. Simpson, Ph.D. Thesis, Harvard University, 1963, Chapter 5.

intensity. Through the conversion  $\sigma(|F_o|) = \sigma(|F_o|^2)/2|F_o|$  this error analysis of the intensity readings made possible the assignment of weights  $1/\sigma^2(|F_o|)$  in the subsequent least-squares refinement of the structure.

Lorentz-polarization corrections were applied to all data. Absorption corrections for the precession data were neglected because  $\mu R$  ( $\mu$ , absorption coefficient; *R*, crystal radius) is only 0.19 and therefore the absorption changes little with  $\theta$ . The  $\mu R$ for the Weissenberg data is larger (0.93), the absorption changing  $24\%$  as  $\theta$  goes from 0 to 90°; hence, absorption corrections were applied to the Weissenberg data.

## Solution **and** Refinement of the Structure

A three-dimensional Patterson function'' showed the Mo-Mo interaction near *u*, *v*, *w* coordinates  $\frac{1}{2}$ ,  $\frac{1}{2}$ ,  $\frac{1}{2}$ . Two other prominent Patterson peaks near 0,  $\frac{1}{2}$ ,  $\frac{1}{5}$  and  $\frac{1}{4}$ ,  $\frac{1}{4}$ ,  $\frac{1}{4}$  were assumed to be overlapping Mo-S interactions; this allowed the thiocyanate groups to be arranged octahedrally around the molybdenum ion and linked to it through the nitrogen end. The only Mo-K interaction found was near  $\frac{1}{6}$ ,  $\frac{1}{2}$ , 0. The second Mo-K peak, expected to fall on  $0, v, w$ , was not seen. On the basis of this interpretation, the space group of the crystal is noncentrosymmetric,  $Pm2<sub>1</sub>n$ .

For the partial structure  $K_2Mo(NCS)_6$ <sup>-</sup> thus found, structure factor calculations in space group Pmnn gave a reliability factor  $R = \sum ||F_o|| - k|F_o||/\sum |F_o|$ equal to 42%. Several three-dimensional Fourier syntheses, first in Pmnn, later in Pm2<sub>1</sub>n, failed to show in the twofold positions (0, y, *z* of the mirror section) the water oxygen atom, the remaining potassium ion, or a complete acetic acid skeleton. For this reason and because two unidentified peaks appeared above the mirror section in fourfold positions, static disorder was suspected; therefore, the stronger peak was assigned as half of a potassium ion. Following least-squares refinement<sup>12</sup> of the parameters of the  $K_3Mo(NCS)_6$ unit, normal and difference Fourier syntheses now revealed the remaining atoms and showed that only the carbon atoms of the acid molecule were lying in the mirror section, the two oxygen atoms being on opposite sides of this section. Thus the acetic acid molecule has an imposed mirror symmetry which makes the two C-0 bonds equivalent. No attempt was made to locate the hydrogen atoms.

In the full-matrix refinement the quantity minimized was  $\sum w||F_{o}| - |F_{o}||^{2}$ , where *w* is a weighting term equal to the reciprocal of the variance of each  $|F_{o}|$ as estimated from the precision of film-scaling factors. Scattering curves were taken from the "International Tables for X-ray Crystallography," the curve for singly ionized molybdenum being used. Potassium  $K(2)$  and the water oxygen  $O(2)$  were refined as halfatoms. With isotropic temperature factor coefficients the refinement proceeded smoothly through four cycles, giving final parameter shifts which were less than

 $0.6\sigma_i$ , where  $\sigma_i$  is the standard error estimated from the least-squares inverse matrix. The reliability factors *R* and *WR* stood at 9.8 and 12.3% for all 884 individually weighted reflections. The weighted factor  $wR =$  $(\Sigma w||F_{o}|-k|F_{o}|^{2}/\Sigma w|F_{o}|^{2})^{1/2}.$ 

Anisotropic temperature factor coefficients were assigned to all atoms and the refinement was continued. Each cycle had to be divided into two parts so that the positional and thermal parameters were varied separately. For the last two cycles the scattering curve of the molybdenum ion was corrected for the real part of the dispersion effect. From the anisotropic refinement with all observed reflections the reliability factors R and *wR* were 6.8 and *8.2%,* and the errors in an observation of unit weight were 1.43 and 1.45 for the two parts of the last cycle. A final difference electron density map did not show any abnormalities. Observed and calculated structure factors are listed in Table I. The 400 unobserved reflections were not used in the refinement and are not listed. There were no significant discrepancies between calculated values for these reflections and their threshold values. Positional and thermal parameters are shown in Table I1 together with the standard errors resulting from the least-squares procedure. The thermal parameters were not used for any further analysis of thermal motion in the crystal. Important interatomic distances and angles are given in Table 111.

### Description **and** Discussion of the Structure

In this hydrated isothiocyanate complex the water molecule is not coordinated to the molybdenum ion. The ion bonds octahedrally to the nitrogen end of the thiocyanate group rather than to the sulfur end (Figure 1). These findings agree with the spectroscopic and magnetic data of Lewis, Nyholm, and Smith. $5$  In the terminology of Pearson,<sup>3</sup> the preference of  $Mo(III)$ for the "hard" nitrogen end classifies this ion as a "hard" acid. The ion falls into the group of class a acceptor ions defined by Ahrland, Chatt, and Davies.2

The weighted average of the Mo-N distances and the standard deviation of the mean are 2.088 and 0.019 A, respectively. This Mo-N distance is within experimental error of the 2.10-A value obtained from the atomic radii of Slater.<sup>13</sup> We assume that for this system  $d_{\pi}$ - $p_{\pi}$  bonding is unlikely and that the thiocyanate nitrogen atom is sp hybridized (see below). While comparable Mo-N (sp) distances are not known to us, the Mo-N(sp<sup>3</sup>) distances in (dien)MoO<sub>3</sub><sup>14</sup> and cis-Mo(dien)(CO)<sub>8</sub><sup>15</sup> are 2.32  $\pm$  0.01 A. A comparison with these distances may be made through the fact that in  $MCr(NH_3)(NCS)_4^{16}$  (M =  $NH_4^+$ , pyH<sup>+</sup>, choline) the  $Cr-N(NH_3)$  distances are longer than the Cr-N(NCS) distances by about 0.18 A, giving  $2.09 +$  $0.18$  = 2.27 A as the expected Mo-N(sp<sup>3</sup>) distance. The further lengthening of the Mo-N(dien) bonds

<sup>(11)</sup> W. G. Sly, D. P. Shoemaker, and J. H. van den Hende, **"A** Two- and Three-Dimensional Crystallographic Fourier Summation Program for the IBM 709/7090 Computer," Massachusetts Institute **of** Technology, Esso Research and Engineering Co., 1962.

<sup>(12)</sup> **W.** R. Busing, K. 0. Martin, and H. **A.** Levy, "ORFLS, **A** Fortran Crystallographic Least-Squares Program," ORNL-TM-305, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, 1962.

<sup>(13)</sup> J. C. Slater, *J. Chem. Phys,* **41,** 3199 (1964).

<sup>(14)</sup> F. **A.** Cotton and R. C. Elder, *Inovg. Chem.,* **3,** 397 (1964).

<sup>(16)</sup> **I?. A.** Cotton and R. M. Wing, *ibid.,* **4,** 314 (1965).

<sup>(16)</sup> Y.,Takeuchi and *Y.* Saito, *Bull. Chem.* SOC. *Japan, 30,* 319 (1957).



TABLE I OBSERVED AND CALCULATED STRUCTURE FACTORS (X10) FOR  $\mathrm{K}_3\mathrm{Mo}(\mathrm{NCS})_6\cdot\mathrm{H}_2\mathrm{O}\cdot\mathrm{CH}_3\mathrm{COOH}^a$ 

*<sup>5</sup>*Absolute values are equal to the tabulated valucs dividcd by 1.128.

TABLE I1

								FRACTIONAL ATOMIC COORDINATES $(X10^4)^a$ and Anisotropic Temperature FACTOR COEFFICIENTS $(X10^2)^a$	
Atom	$\boldsymbol{x}$	$\mathcal{Y}$	$\mathbf{z}$	$\beta_{11}$	$\beta_{22}$	$\beta$ 33	$\beta_{12}$	$\beta_{18}$	$\beta_{22}$
Mo	0000	0000	2603(1)	221(7)	512(16)	548(17)	000	000	$-044(21)$
N(1)	0000	2041 (19)	1387(18)	157(96)	588 (266)	929(205)	000	000 <sub>1</sub>	510 (204)
C(1)	0000	3414 (29)	1020(19)	240(141)	1260(401)	533(216)	000 <sub>1</sub>	000	$-150(261)$
S(1)	0000	5165(9)	0538(6)	503(56)	961 (106)	1280 (79)	000	000	315(81)
N(2)	5000	2958 (22)	6323(18)	497 (160)	769 (324)	860 (226)	000	000	$-191(231)$
C(2)	5000	1708 (32)	5926 (20)	148(125)	1825 (513)	781 (248)	000	000	1173 (339)
S(2)	5000	$-0231(7)$	5521(6)	497 (56)	559 (94)	1164(74)	000	000 <sub>1</sub>	$-258(67)$
N(3)	1080(11)	1009(16)	3818(13)	309 (84)	862 (214)	1055(167)	36 (126)	2(119)	$-113(162)$
C(3)	1638(10)	1617(18)	4505(16)	184 (72)	639 (199)	1200(213)	$-3(111)$	$-39(121)$	$-254(193)$
S(3)	2474(3)	2552(6)	5396(4)	350(23)	1252(68)	1488 (72)	$-194(40)$	$-294(46)$	66 (62)
N(4)	3888 (10)	4050(16)	8690 (15)	235 (79)	789 (207)	1657(210)	$-145(114)$	20(125)	$-251(184)$
C(4)	3232 (12)	3315(20)	9169(16)	396 (101)	754(254)	1103(213)	252(135)	$-93(141)$	$-73(195)$
S(4)	2334(3)	2313(5)	9845(6)	338 (25)	1265(77)	1888 (79)	$-336(42)$	264 (45)	$-342(74)$
K(1)	2088(3)	4609(5)	2503(3)	548 (22)	1564(85)	922(44)	$-26(35)$	$-49(33)$	99(45)
K(2)	3875(8)	0309(18)	2489 (16)	703(62)	1857 (309)	1414 (185)	$-125(108)$	126(132)	$-366(185)$
C(5)	0000	$-0738(51)$	7434 (26)	241 (127)	3787 (968)	1228(425)	000	000	$-1472(530)$
C(6)	0000	1122(53)	7426 (32)	817 (305)	2648 (809)	1754 (672)	000	000	$-814(472)$
O(1)	0802(10)	$-1434(23)$	7514 (14)	473 (80)	2812 (405)	1922 (273)	63(164)	$-108(121)$	$-121(200)$
O(2)	3699 (22)	0445(46)	2576 (30)	679 (152)	2016 (738)	365(253)	630(360)	41 (246)	602(354)
								$a + 104\pi$ is given in parentheses $b$ Coefficients have the form $\exp[-(h^2\theta_{11} + h^2\theta_{22} + 2h\theta_{32} + 2hh\theta_{32} + 2hl\theta_{13} + 2hl\theta_{22})]$	$105$ $\sigma$ is giver

FRACTIONAL ATOMIC COORDINATES  $(\times 10^{4})^{a}$  and Anisotropic Temperature Factor Coefficients  $(\times 10^{4})^{a}$ 

(given in parentheses. \* Coefficients have the form  $\exp[-(h^2\beta_{11} + k^2\beta_{22} + l^2\beta_{33} + 2hk\beta_{.2} + 2hl\beta_{13} + 2kl\beta_{23})].$ in parentheses.  $10<sup>5</sup> \sigma$  is given

			Distances and Angles in the $Mo(NCS)_{6}^{3-}$ Ion		
Atoms	Value	Multiplicity	Atoms	Value	Multiplicity
$Mo-N(1)$	2.107(15)	1	$N(2)b-Mo-N(3)$	94.0(0.5)	$\boldsymbol{2}$
$Mo-N(2)$	2.034(18)	1	$N(2)$ - $Mo^{a}$ - $N(4)$	88.3 (0.5)	$\boldsymbol{2}$
$Mo-N(3)$	2.065(14)	$\boldsymbol{2}$	$N(3)-Mo-N(3)c$	90.2(0.8)	1
$Mo-N(4)$	2.119(14)	$\boldsymbol{2}$	$N(3)-Mo-N(4)b$	89.6(0.4)	$\,2$
$N(1) - C(1)$	1.228(29)	1	$N(4)-Mo-N(4)c$	90.6(0.8)	1
$N(2) - C(2)$	1.138(31)	$\mathbf{1}$	$N(1)-Mo-N(2)b$	176.8(0.8)	$\mathbf{1}$
$N(3)-C(3)$	1.133(17)	$\boldsymbol{2}$	$N(3)-Mo-N(4)^{c,b}$	177.7(0.6)	2
$N(4)-C(4)$	1.184(21)	$\,2\,$	$Mo-N(1)-C(1)$	162.9(1.7)	1
$C(1) - S(1)$	1.571(25)	1	$Moa-N(2)-C(2)$	169.0(1.8)	1
$C(2)$ -S $(2)$	1.706(29)	1	$M_0-N(3)-C(3)$	176.4(1.3)	$\boldsymbol{2}$
$C(3)-S(3)$	1.633(15)	$\boldsymbol{2}$	$Mo^{a} - N(4) - C(4)$	165.6(1.4)	$\overline{2}$
$C(4)-S(4)$	1.626(18)	2	$N(1) - C(1) - S(1)$	179.5(1.9)	1
			$N(2)-C(2)-S(2)$	173.5(1.9)	1
$N(1)-Mo-N(3)$	88.2(0.5)	$\,2$	$N(3)-C(3)-S(3)$	175.9(1.6)	$\overline{\mathbf{2}}$
$N(1)-Mo-N(4)b$	89.4(0.5)	$\boldsymbol{2}$	$N(4)-C(4)-S(4)$	179.3(1.6)	$\,2\,$
		Contacts Involving Sulfur Atoms			
Atoms	Value		Atoms	Value	
$K(1)-S(1)$	3.439(5)		$O(2)$ -S(1) <sup>d</sup>	3.494(27)	
$K(1)-S(2)^a$	3.415(5)		$O(2)$ -S(2)	3.396(30)	
$K(1)-S(3)$	3.346(6)		$O(2)$ -S(3)	3.665(30)	
$K(1)-S(3)^a$	3.291(6)		$O(2)$ -S(3) <sup>b</sup>	3.536(35)	
$K(1)-S(4)$	3.252(6)		$O(2)$ -S $(4)$ <sup>b</sup>	3.825(40)	
$K(1)-S(4)^a$	3.335(6)		$O(2)$ -S(4) <sup>e</sup>	3.598(30)	
$K(2)$ -S $(1)^d$	3.300(14)		$O(1)^{a} - S(3)$	3.756(15)	
$K(2)$ -S(2)	3.334(16)		$O(1)^{a} - S(4)^{c}$	3.746(15)	
$K(2)$ -S $(3)$ <sup>b</sup>	3.618(16)		$N(2)$ -S(3)	3.554(6)	
$K(2)$ -S(3)	3.896(13)		$C(2)$ -S(3)	3.535(7)	
$K(2)$ -S $(4)$ <sup>b</sup>	3.789(16)		$N(1) - S(4)$	3.503(8)	
$K(2)$ -S(4) <sup>e</sup>	3.719(17)		$C(1) - S(4)$	3.489(10)	
			Other Important Distances and Angles		
Atoms	Value		Atoms	Value	
$C(5)-C(6)$	1.593(52)		$C(6)-C(3)$	3.614(29)	
$C(5)-O(1)$	1.242(26)		$O(2) - N(3)$	3.78(3)	
$O(1)a-O(2)$	2.76(5)		$O(2) - N(4)$ <sup>b</sup>	3.90(4)	
$K(1)-O(1)^a$	2.995(15)		$O(1) - N(1)$	4.904 (25)	
$K(2)-O(1)^a$	$2.83(3)$ /		$O(1) - N(2)^b$	3.897(22)	
$K(2)-O(2)^c$	3.29(3)		$O(1) - N(3)$	4.156(20)	
$K(1)-N(1)$	3.742(13)		$O(1) - N(4)$ <sup>b</sup>	3.714(22)	
$K(1)-N(3)$	3.605(14)		$Mo-O(2)$	5.026(30)	
$K(2)-N(3)$	4.04(2)				
$K(2)-N(4)b$	$4.06(2)^{f}$		$O(1)$ –C(5)– $O(1)$ °	122.1(4.1)	
$O(1)^{a} - C(4)^{e}$	3.468(21)		$C(5)-C(6)-O(1)$	118.7(2.0)	

TABLE **I11**  DISTANCES **(A)** AND ANGLES (DEG) WITH STANDARD DEVIATIONS IN PARENTHESES

O(1)<sup>a</sup>-C(4)<sup>e</sup> 3.468(21)<br>  $C(5)-C(6)-O(1)$  118.7(2.0)<br>  $C(5)-C(6)-O(1)$  118.7(2.0)<br>  $C(6)-C(6)-O(1)$  118.7(2.0) <sup>*a*- $e$ </sup> Symmetry transformations:  ${}^aM = M(1/2 - x, 1/2 + y, 1 - z), {}^bM = M(1/2 - x, y - 1/2, 1 - z), {}^cM = M(-x, y, z), {}^dM = M(1/2 - x, y - 1/2, -z), {}^eM = M(x, y, z - 1).$  *Positions of* K(2) and O(2) are only approximate, as a result of the disorder. Distances involving these two atoms are given in two decimal places only.



Figure 1.-Angles NCS and MoNC in  $Mo(NCS)_{6}^{3-}$ .

to 2.32 A has been attributed to  $Mo=O$  and  $Mo=C$ multiple bonding *trans* to the Mo-N(dien) bonds.<sup>15</sup>

Six of the twelve octahedral  $N-Mo-N$  angles vary from  $90^{\circ}$  by more than  $3\sigma$ , so the molybdenum-nitrogen arrangement appears to have only the C<sub>s</sub> symmetry (17) A. Ferrari, *et al., Acta Cryst.*, 18, 367 (1965).

required by the space-group mirror plane. The angle  $NCS(2)$  is 3.4 $\sigma$  from 180°, indicating a possible nonlinearity in that NCS group." The weighted averages of the N-C and C-S distances are  $1.159 \pm 0.027$  and  $1.630 \pm 0.024$  A, respectively. In no case does an individual bond distance deviate significantly from its average value.

Given the two resonance forms



one would expect that in N-bonded thiocyanate complexes the distances N-C and C-S and the angle MNC

are mutually dependent. To detect correlation between the distances and the angle MNC, Hazell<sup>18</sup> suggested plotting these distances against angle. From crystallographic data for twelve thiocyanates he showed that the N-C distances generally decrease with the increasing angle MNC, while the C-S distances increase. Adding the more recent data<sup>17,19</sup> to this plot and using our average distances with either the averaged or (more realistically) the unaveraged angles, it is found that our  $Mo(NCS)_{6}^{3-}$  data points fall well within the ranges defined by the other data points. In  $Mo(NCS)<sub>6</sub><sup>3-</sup>$  the variation in the unaveraged N-C distances correlates with angle while the C-S variation does not. The insignificant variation of the unaveraged distances from their mean value does not allow a full discussion of this point.

To find out which of the two resonance forms is dominant in this structure, we note that Pauling<sup>20</sup> gives the following distances:  $S-C = 1.81$ ,  $S=C$  $= 1.61$ , N=C = 1.29, and N=C = 1.15 A. A comparison of the average  $N-C$  distance with Pauling's values indicates a major contribution from resonance form A. However, the B form is favored by the average C-S distance, a contradiction often seen in the thiocyanate data.21

The angles MoNC are all nearer 180 than  $120^{\circ}$ ; in fact, within experimental error two of the six are linear, suggesting the dominance of resonance form A. Following a description of the crystal structure, we shall show that the nonlinearity observed in four of the MoNC angles is likely to be due to packing conditions in the crystal.

The closest approach between  $Mo(NCS)_{6}^{3-}$  ions is the  $S(1)\cdots S(2)^{a}$  distance of 3.82 A, very near the 3.80-A  $S \cdots S$  contact in  $[Zn(N_2H_4)_2(NCS)_2]$ .<sup>17</sup> Each potassium ion is surrounded by six sulfur atoms, which form a distorted trigonal prism (Figure *2).* K(2) is replaced half of the time by a water molecule. Six prisms share edges to form a cylindrical cavity in which the acetic acid is contained (Figure *3),* leading one to suspect the presence of similar cavities in the related compounds  $M_3Mo(NCS)_6 \cdot H_2O \cdot HA$ , where  $HA =$ HCl,  $C_2H_5OH$ ,  $C_3H_7OH$ ,  $KHC_2O_4$ , or  $CH_3COOH$ .<sup>5</sup> Stabilization of HA in the cavity would result from hydrogen bonding between it and either the water molecule or a thiocyanate group. Indeed, a hydrogen bond between the acetic acid and water was found, the  $O(1)\cdots O(2)$  distance being 2.76 A (Figure 4). The  $O(2) \cdots N$  distances show that the water is not hydrogen bonded to a thiocyanate nitrogen atom, consistent with the assumption that the resonance in the molybdenum complex is primarily form A, for hydrogen bonding to the formally positive nitrogen atom is unlikely. **A**  hydrated thiocyanate complex with the B resonance



Figure 2.-Trigonal-prismatic coordination of potassium by sulfur in  $K_3Mo(NCS)_6 \cdot H_2O \cdot CH_3COOH$ .



Figure 3.-Cavity enclosing acetic acid molecule.

form is more likely to have a water-nitrogen bond, as found, for example, in  $K_2Co(NCS)_4.4H_2O^{22}$  which has a CoNC angle equal to  $111^\circ$ .

There seem to be reasonable chemical explanations for the structural disorder of  $O(1)$ ,  $O(2)$ , and  $K(2)$ . (a) In its crystal environment (see Figure 3) the acid molecule may have orientation I or I1



**(22)** G. *S.* Zhdanov and Z. V. Zvonkova, *Zh. ITiz. Khim,,* **24,** 188Y (IeXI).

<sup>(18)</sup> **A.** C. Hazell, *J. Chem.* Soc., **5745** (1963). For Cd(etujz(NCS)z the MNC angle should read 143".

<sup>(19) (</sup>a) "Abstracts of Papers Presented before the Tth Congress of the International Union of Crystallography," Moscow, July 1966, No. 9-61; **(b) 31.** Sardelli, *e! d., Acta Qys!.,* **20,** 349 (1966).

<sup>(20)</sup> L. Pauling, "The Nature of the Chemical Bond," 3rd ed, Cornell University Pi-ess, Ithaca, **K.** *Y.,* 1960, **pp 224, 228, 274.** 

<sup>(21)</sup> See ref lga, Abstract No. 9-38. See tables in ref 17 and 1s.



Figure 4.-Acetic acid coordination.

If the water molecule is to form a hydrogen bond with the carboxyl oxygen atom and if  $K(2)$  is to coordinate to the carbonyl oxygen atom, orientation I' exists in  $50\%$  of the cells and orientation II' exists in the other *50%* 



Thus the disorder of the acetic acid molecule correlates with that of  $K(2)$  and  $O(2)$ . (b) Alternatively, one may say that because the water molecule and potassium ion are equally able to fit into the sulfur atom prisms, the orientation of the acid in each cell is determined by whichever arrangement of  $H_2O$  and  $K(2)$  is present



In the acid the observed CCO angle is the average of the  $CC=O$  and  $CC-OH$  angles in solid acetic acid.<sup>23</sup> The methyl carbon  $C(6)$  is  $7^{\circ}$  from the plane of  $O(1)$ - $C(5)-O(1)^c$ .

To see what effect, if any, the crystal structure (Figure *5)* has on the MoNC angles, one argues that, in view of the formal charges in resonance forms A and B, the amount of nonlinearity in the angles should be proportional to the  $K \cdot \cdot \cdot N$  distances and inversely proportional to the K...S distances.<sup>16</sup> From Table IV a comparison of the two compounds reveals an electrostatic correlation between the angle MNC and the distance of the positive ion from the thiocyanate ligand. However, within the molybdenum complex itself, the correlation breaks down. That is, the largest angles are not associated with the shortest  $K \cdots S$  distances and longest  $K \cdots N$  distances. This fact suggests that steric or packing effects within the crystal may have upset the expected relationship.

The source of this disruption is most likely the water molecule, which half the time replaces the potassium ion  $K(2)$  in half of the sulfur atom prisms. Because the water molecule is larger  $(R = 1.7 \text{ A})$  and less electro-



Figure 5.-(010) projection of  $K_3Mo(NCS)_6\cdot H_2O\cdot CH_3COOH$ .



Figure 6.-Packing diagram showing crystal environment of  $Mo(NCS)<sub>6</sub>3 - octahedron in  $K_3Mo(NCS)<sub>6</sub>·H_2O·CH_3COOH.$$ Dashed lines drawn along the Ma-N bonds show the amount and direction of bending of the Mo-NCS linkages.

philic than the potassium ion  $(R = 1.3 \text{ A})$  which it replaces, the sulfur prism is forced to expand. Atoms  $S(1)$  and  $S(2)$  are forced apart, each moving to within

		$\overline{K}$ $\cdot \cdot$ S distance $\overline{K}$		$-\leftarrow K \cdot \cdot \cdot N$ distance $-\leftarrow -\leftarrow$	
Compound	Angle MNC	Average	Shortest	Average	Shortest
$K_2Co(NCS)_4 \cdot H_2O$	111	3.66	3.59	3.24	2.62
$K_3MO(NCS)_6 \cdot H_2O \cdot CH_3COOH$	163	3.39	3.30	>4	3.74
	169	3.39	3.33	>4	4.19
	$176$ (two)	3.46	3.29	>4	3.60
	$166$ (two)	3.45	3.25	>4	4.06

TABLE IV RELATIONSHIP OF MNC ANGLES (DEG) TO K... SAND K... N DISTANCES (A) IN TWO THIOCYANATES

the van der Waals limit of the neighboring sulfur atom (Figure 6). The water molecule is rather close to the  $S(1)$  and  $S(2)$  atoms, the two contacts being 3.40 and 3.49 A. Consequently, a torque is applied to the ends of two ligands, KCS(1) and NCS(2). This torque would force the octahedron to rotate (counterclockwise in the figure) were it not for the other potassium ion  $K(1)$ , which prevents any movement of the sulfur atom ends of the remaining four ligands, NCS(3)  $(two)$  and NCS $(4)$   $(two)$ .

From this argument it should follow., and indeed does, that the four  $K(1) \cdots S$  distances in the direction of the forced rotation are significantly shorter than the four distances in the reverse direction. The two  $MoNC(4)$  angles are more bent (166 $^{\circ}$ ) than the two  $MoNC(3)$  angles (176°), agreeing with the fact that the ends of the  $NCS(4)$  groups approach  $K(1)$  ions

and neighboring SCS(1) groups more closely than the  $NCS(3)$  groups approach  $K(1)$  ions and  $NCS(2)$  groups. The bending occurs in the expected direction (see Figure 6).

Thus, the effect of the crowding of the water molecules against the  $S(1)$  and  $S(2)$  atoms is not to initiate rigid-body rotation but to cause four of the six Mo-NCS linkages to bend at the nitrogen atom. The remaining two linkages, being relatively free from steric effects, have MoNC angles which are nearest the  $180^{\circ}$  value expected for form A resonance.

Acknowledgments.-We wish to thank Dr. Robert Thomas for helpful discussions during the early part of this research. Calculations were done at the Computation Centers of Boston University and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

> CONTRIBUTION FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY, UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA, ATHENS, GEORGIA 30601

# Organometallic Chemistry of the Transition Metals. **XXII.**  The Synthesis of Unusual Cyclopentadienylmolybdenum Nitrosyl Derivatives Using Thallium Cyclopentadienide<sup>1,2</sup>

BY R. B. KING<sup>3</sup>

*Received July 18, 1967* 

Thallium cyclopentadienide reacts with  $[C_6H_5Mo(NO)I_2]_{2}$  in tetrahydrofuran solution to give green-black  $(C_5H_5)_{2}Mo(NO)I$ apparently containing a novel type of allylic  $\pi$ -cyclopentadienyl ring. Reaction of this iodide derivative with methylmagnesium bromide gives the brown volatile  $\sigma$ -methyl derivative (C<sub>5</sub>H<sub>5</sub>)<sub>2</sub>Mo(NO)CH<sub>3</sub>. Reaction of the molybdenum nitrosyl chloride  $[Mo(NO)_2Cl_2]$ , with thallium cyclopentadienide in tetrahydrofuran solution gives yellow-green unstable  $C_5H_5MO(NO)_2Cl$ . The reactivity of metal halide derivatives toward thallium cyclopentadienide is discussed.

#### Introduction

A common method for the synthesis of  $\pi$ -cyclopentadienyl derivatives is the reaction of sodium cyclopentadienide with various transition metal halides.<sup>4</sup> However, in some cases sodium cyclopentadienide does not give  $\pi$ -cyclopentadienyl derivatives with metal halides owing to destruction of the metal complex arising from the strongly reducing and basic

(1) For Part XXI of this series see R. B. King and M. B. Bisnette, *J.* 0i.guiiornetal. *Chenz.* (Amsterdam), *8,* 287 (1967).

properties of sodium cyclopentadienide. Xore recently thallium cyclopentadienide has been shown to be a suitable reagent for the preparation of many  $\pi$ -cyclopentadienyl derivatives.<sup>5</sup> Since thallium cyclopentadienide is a weaker reducing agent and base than sodium cyclopentadienide, certain reactions of halide derivatives which failed to give isolable  $\pi$ -cyclopentadienyl derivatives with sodium cyclopentadienide were reinvestigated using thallium cyclopentadienide.

<sup>(2)</sup> Portions of this work were presented at the Third International (3) Fellow of the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation, 1967-1969. Symposium on Organometallic Chemistry, Munich, Germany, **Aug** 1967.

<sup>(4)</sup> For a review on the synthesis of cyclopentadienylmetal derivatives see J. Birmingham, Advan. Organometal. Chem., 2, 365 (1964).

<sup>(6)</sup> **A. h-,** Zlesmeyanov, R. B. hlaterikova, and N. **S.** Kochetkova, *Izv. Akad. .\-air/? S'SSK,* **Sei.** *Kkim.,* 1:38 & (19K3); *('hem,* Abslr., *59,* 12841d (1903); **A.** N. Nesmeyanov, K. N. Anisimov, and **1'.** E. Kolobova, *12%'. Akad. .\'ad? SSSR, SCV. Kltinz., 2220* (196t); *Chem. Absl~.,* **62,** *77886* (1965); C. C. Hunt and J. R. Doyle *Inorg. Nucl. Chem. Letters*, 2, 283 (1966); T. J. Katz and J. J. Mrowca, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 89, 1105 (1967).