lar orbitals of the ionized molecule are those of the parent molecule. Electronic relaxation *(i.e.*, change of orbitals) in the ionized molecule or a difference in correlation energies (not included in SCF-MO treatment) will invalidate Koopmans' theorem. Thus a difference in electronic relaxation energies for photoionization of the e<sub>2g</sub> electron as compared to the  $a_{1g}$ electron or a difference in correlation energy differences is the probable cause of this disagreement.

It would be interesting to have photoelectron ionization data for other metallocenes. The ligand field treatment of ruthenocene<sup>1</sup> gave  $\Delta \epsilon^{\rm core}({a_{1g}-e_{2g}}) = -6600$  $cm^{-1}$  and  $B = 260$  cm<sup>-1</sup>. In this case we would predict  $\Delta \epsilon^{\text{SCF}}(a_{1g}-e_{2g}) \cong +1400 \text{ cm}^{-1}$ , and, if the collapse of Koopmans' theorem is no more extensive in ruthenocene, the ionization potentials of the ruthenocene 4d  $a_{1g}$ and  $e_{2g}$  electrons should be closer in energy than those for the ferrocene 3d electrons.

DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY DAVID N. HENDRICKSON UNVERSITY OF ILLINOIS URBANA, ILLIXOIS 61801

RECEIVED JUNE **4,** 1971

## **On the Exchange of Oxygen between Sulfate and Water**

*Sir:* 

A good deal of conflicting data on the rate and mechanism of oxygen exchange between sulfate and water has been reported;<sup>1</sup> for example, the exchange in 1  $N$ NaOH at  $100^{\circ}$  has been reported to be as great as  $85\%$ in 26 hr<sup>1a</sup> and as little as  $\langle 1\%$  in 456 hr.<sup>1d</sup>

More recently, Hoering and Kennedy<sup>2</sup> reported some experiments on the acid-catalyzed exchange of oxygen between sulfuric acid and water. The results of these experiments, coupled with earlier reports  $(e.g.,$  ref 1a), suggest that there may be a change in the exchange mechanism from acid-catalyzed dehydration to, for example, nucleophilic displacement by  $H_2O$  and/or  $OH^-$  at higher pH values. We wish to report a reinvestigation of this question using <sup>18</sup>O-labeled sulfate (91.9 atom  $\%$  excess obtained from Miles-Yeda Ltd.).

In these experiments solutions of 0.1 *M*  $Na<sub>2</sub>S<sup>18</sup>O<sub>4</sub>$ were incubated at  $100^{\circ}$  for 63 days in Teflon bombs, either with no additions of in the presence of  $1 N$  Na-OH. A 0.1-ml aliquot of the incubated solution was then introduced with a syringe into an evacuated 5-ml stoppered serum vial containing sufficient  $NAHCO<sub>3</sub>$  to produce 5 ml (at STP) of CO<sub>2</sub> upon acidification. An excess of  $85\%$  lactic acid (0.05 ml) was then added to release the  $CO<sub>2</sub>$ . (The small dilution of <sup>18</sup>O label due to  $H_2O$ -lactic acid oxygen exchange was accounted for in the calculation of exchange rates.) After an equilibration time of 18 hr at room temperature (sufficient for complete isotopic equilibration<sup>3</sup>), the  $CO<sub>2</sub>$  was introduced into a modified CEC isotope ratio mass

(1) (a) S. C. Datta, J. N. E. Day, and C. K. Ingold, *J. Chem.* Soc., **1968 (1937); (b) G.** A. Mills, *J. Amev. Chem.* Soc., **62, 2833 (1940);** (c) N. **F.**  Hall and *0.* R. Alexander, *ibid.,* **62, 3455 (1940);** (d) E. R. S. Winter, M. Carlton, and H. V. A. Briscoe, *J. Chem.* Soc., **131 (1940);** *(e)* E. R. *S.* "inter and H. V. A. Briscoe, *ibid.,* 631 **(1942).** 

spectrometer through a syringe-needle inlet and the <sup>18</sup>O: <sup>16</sup>O ratio of the CO<sub>2</sub> determined (at  $m/e$  46 and 44). Preliminary experiments showed that, under the conditions used for equilibration with *CO,,* no exchange of l80 between the sulfate and water occurred. Therefore, it was not necessary to separate the water from the salt solutions before analyses.

Four readings were made on each of three replicates for each experimental condition. Measurements of "standard  $CO<sub>2</sub>$ " (derived from NaHCO<sub>3</sub> in the same manner) were interspersed between experimental measurements to detect and correct for any drift in the mass spectrometer readings. Preliminary experiments using  $H_2^{18}$ O indicated that we could reliably detect an exchange of  $0.1\%$  under the conditions employed.

These experiments showed that under neutral or alkaline conditions  $(1 N \text{ NaOH})$ , no exchange  $(<0.1\%)$ occurred at 100" in 63 days. This suggests that the second-order rate constant  $(k_2)$  is  $\lt 1 \times 10^{-11}$  M<sup>-1</sup> sec<sup>-1</sup> using  $H_2O$  as a nucleophile. Similarly, using  $OH^-$  as a nucleophile, the second-order rate constant  $(k_2)$  is  $\lt 8 \times 10^{-10}$  *M*<sup>-1</sup> sec<sup>-1</sup>. By way of comparison, we find  $k_2 = 5.3 \times 10^{-5} M^{-1} \text{ sec}^{-1}$  for the acid-catalyzed exchange reaction at  $100^\circ$ , a value in good agreement with the value calculated from the data in ref **2.**  It thus appears that sulfate oxygen does not undergo appreciable exchange with the oxygen of  $H_2O$  by any mechanism other than acid-catalyzed dehydration under these conditions.

Acknowledgment.—This work was supported by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration under Contract NASw-2109.

BIOSCIENCES DEPARTMENT RICHARD RADMER BALTIMORE, MARYLAXD 21227 RESEARCH INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDIES

RECEIVED OCTOBER **4,** 1971

## **On the Observation of** *cis-* **and trans-Bis(2,2'-bipyridyl)copper(II) by Electron Spin Resonance**

## *Sir:*

Several recent investigations of  $bis(2,2'-bipyridyl)$ copper (II),  $[Cu(bipy)<sub>2</sub>(OH<sub>2</sub>)<sub>2</sub>]^{2+}$ , have been concerned with the existence and relative stability of the two possible geometrical isomers of this complex: one in which the two water molecules are cis to each other



**CIS** trcns

Among these investigations is the comprehensive nmr and esr study of Noack and Gordon<sup>1</sup> of the  $Cu^{2}$ <sup>+</sup>-(1) M. **Noack** and G. Gordon, *J. Chem. Phys.,* **48, 2689** (1968).

**(2)** C. K Jgrgenson, *Acta Chem. Scand.,* **9, 1362 (1955).** 

**(3)** *Y.* **I.** Skurlatov and **A.** P. Purmal, *Russ J. Phys. Chem.,* **43, 880 (1969).** 

*<sup>(2)</sup>* T. C. Hoering and J. **W.** Kennedy, *J. Amev. Chem.* Soc., **79, 56 (1967). (3)** M. Cohn and H. C. Urey, *ibid.,* **60, 679 (1938).**