two separate laboratories, have failed to provide any positive evidence for the existence of  $Ga_2H_6$  or polymeric  $[GaH_3]_n$  as separate stable molecular species, despite conscientious efforts to repeat earlier preparative procedures. Since the results from two separate laboratories lead to a common conclusion, this joint communication has been prepared.

### Experimental

The Reduction of GaCl<sub>3</sub> by LiAlH<sub>4</sub> in Solvents.—The reaction between LiAlH<sub>4</sub> and GaCl<sub>3</sub> has been described in terms of three distinct processes

In our hands all hydridic products which could be obtained from  $LiAlH_4$ -GaCl<sub>3</sub>-solvent systems contained relatively large amounts of chloride which could not be removed by repeated vacuum line fractionation. The chloride-containing oils decomposed even at  $0^{\circ}$ .

In a typical run a 25-mmole sample of LiAlH<sub>4</sub> was mixed with 8 mmoles of GaCl<sub>3</sub> using about 100 cc. of solvent. Diethyl ether, dimethyl ether, benzene, and isopentane were all tried as solvents; GaBr<sub>3</sub> in benzene was also tried. Reaction times ranged from 1 to 19 hr. and reaction temperatures of -45, 0, 25, and 50° were used. In diethyl ether an oily product was obtained which decomposed when an attempt was made to fractionate it on the vacuum line. H<sub>2</sub>, Ga, ether, and a solid residue were the products. In isopentane (0 to 25°) the oily product gave 1–2 atoms of hydridic H for each Cl. At 25° the oil gave H<sub>2</sub>, Ga, and a white solid containing Ga and Cl.

The Reduction of GaCl<sub>3</sub> by Other Reagents.—GaCl<sub>3</sub> and LiH react to give unstable LiGaH<sub>4</sub> as described by Finholt, Bond, and Schlesinger.<sup>7</sup> LiGaH<sub>4</sub> (6 mmoles) and GaCl<sub>3</sub> (3 mmoles) in ether (30 cc.) at 20° for 48 hr. gave no volatile products and no ether-insoluble  $(GaH_3)_n$ .

Attempts to reduce  $GaCl_3$  with LiBH<sub>4</sub> in diethyl ether at 20° gave diborane and a trace of H<sub>2</sub>. No  $Ga_2H_6$  was isolated.

Reaction of Gallium Trimethyl and  $H_2$  in an Electric Discharge. —The original report<sup>1,2</sup> on  $Ga_2H_8$  described its preparation by the reactions

$$2(CH_3)_3Ga + H_2 \xrightarrow[discharge]{electric} [(CH_3)_2GaH]_2 + CH_4 + \dots$$

 $3[(CH_3)_2GaH]_2 + 4(C_2H_5)_3N \longrightarrow 4(CH_3)_3GaN(C_2H_5)_3 + Ga_2H_6$ 

In our hands fractionation of the products from the discharge tube gave a viscous liquid which could be condensed at  $-15^{\circ}$ along with hydrocarbons separated at -196° and unreacted  $Ga(CH_3)_3$  separated at  $-95^\circ$ . The viscous liquid in the  $-15^\circ$ trap did not correspond in properties to the compound  $[(CH_3)_2]$ -GaH]<sub>2</sub> reported as a product in the original paper of Wiberg.<sup>1</sup> Although pyrolysis of [(CH<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub>GaH]<sub>2</sub> should give 0.75 mole of H<sub>2</sub> per mole of Ga(CH<sub>3</sub>)<sub>3</sub> formed, our product, separating at  $-15^{\circ}$ , gave only 0.32 mole of  $H_2/Ga(CH_3)_3$ . Since the reported conversion of  $(CH_3)_4Ga_2H_2$  to  $Ga_2H_6$  demanded that  $(CH_3)_4Ga_2H_2$  and  $N(C_2H_5)_3$  be mixed in stoichiometric quantities, it did not seem appropriate to attempt the conversion with the poorly characterized products obtained from the discharge reaction. Difficulties in the preparation of  $Ga_2H_6$  using  $N(C_2H_5)_3$  as a reagent were also indicated by the relatively high stability of H<sub>2</sub>GaN-(CH<sub>3</sub>)<sub>3</sub> isolated in a subsequent study.<sup>8</sup>

**Displacement of GaH**<sub>3</sub> from its Complex.—An attempt was made to liberate  $Ga_2H_6$  by thermal decomposition of one of its weaker adducts. The first system studied can be represented by the equation

$$(CH_3)_3NGaH_3 + BF_3 + (CH_3)_2S \xrightarrow[-15]{\text{solvent}} -15^\circ$$

The resulting  $H_3GaS(CH_3)_2$  was purified by fractionation through a trap at  $-78^\circ$ . When the excess of  $(CH_3)_2S$  was removed at  $-70^\circ$ , pure dimethyl sulfide-gallane was obtained. It decomposed quantitatively at room temperature to  $(CH_3)_2S$ , Ga, and  $1.5 H_2$ .

In an analogous reaction, in the absence of solvent,  $(CH_2)_{\delta}$ -NGaH<sub>3</sub> and B<sub>2</sub>H<sub>6</sub> gave no reaction below room temperature, but at 20° gave a product which decomposed immediately to gallium and hydrogen. In no case was any real evidence for Ga<sub>2</sub>H<sub>6</sub> obtained.

### Discussion

Recently  $(CH_3)_3NGaH_3$  has been synthesized,<sup>8</sup> and the properties of this material can be used as an index to the stability of  $Ga_2H_6$ . For example  $(CH_3)_3NBH_3$  is stable at  $125^{\circ}$ ,<sup>9</sup> whereas  $B_2H_6$  decomposes at these temperatures to give hydrogen and higher boron hydrides.<sup>10</sup> Similarly,  $(CH_3)_3NB_3H_7$  is fairly stable at  $25^{\circ}$  but the parent boron hydride,  $B_4H_{10}$ , decomposes on storage at room temperature. It is then logical to postulate that  $Ga_2H_6$  would be significantly less stable than the known  $(CH_3)_3NGaH_3$  and  $(CH_3)_2SGaH_3$ . The relatively low stability of the latter compounds<sup>8</sup> and our inability to prepare  $Ga_2H_6$  cast serious doubt on previous literature reports relative to this compound.

A similar comparison of  $(CH_3)_3NBH_3$  with  $(CH_3)_2$ -OBH<sub>3</sub> and  $(CH_3)_3NB_3H_7$  with  $(C_2H_5)_2OB_3H_7$  suggests that  $(C_2H_5)_2OGaH_3$  should, if formed, be much less stable than  $(CH_3)_3NGaH_3$ . Such a comparison also casts serious doubt upon the reported stability of the compound  $(C_2H_5)_2OGaH_3$ .

(8) (a) D. F. Shriver and R. W. Parry, *Inorg. Chem.*, to be published (1963); (b) N. N. Greenwood, A. Storr, and M. G. H. Wallbridge, *ibid.*, to be published (1963).

(9) A. B. Burg and H. I. Schlesinger, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 59, 780 (1937).
(10) A. B. Burg and H. I. Schlesinger, *ibid.*, 55, 4009 (1933).

Contribution from the Department of Chemistry, The University of Texas, Austin 12, Texas

### Ammines of Osmium(I) and Osmium(0)

BY GEORGE W. WATT, E. M. POTRAFKE, AND DONALD S. KLETT

### Received January 10, 1963

Earlier work<sup>1-3</sup> has provided evidence for the existence of species interpreted as ammines of platinum-(0) and iridium(0), *i.e.*,  $Pt(NH_3)_4$  and  $Ir(NH_3)_5$ . We report here similar evidence for ammines of osmium(I) and osmium(0),  $[Os(NH_3)_6]Br$  and  $[Os(NH_3)_6]$ ; these were formed by the reactions

$$[Os(NH_3)_6]Br_3 + 2K^+ + 2e^- \longrightarrow [Os(NH_3)_6]Br + 2K^+ + 2Br^- (1)$$

<sup>(7)</sup> A. E. Finholt, A. C. Bond, and H. I. Schlesinger, J. Am. Chem. Soc., **69**, 1199 (1947).

<sup>(1)</sup> G. W. Watt, M. T. Walling, Jr., and P. I. Mayfield, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 78, 6175 (1953).

<sup>(2)</sup> G. W. Watt and P. I. Mayfield, ibid., 75, 6178 (1953).

<sup>(3)</sup> G. W. Watt, E. P. Helvenston, and L. E. Sharif, J. Inorg. Nucl. Chem., in press.

# Vol. 2, No. 4, August, 1963

## $[Os(NH_8)_6]Br_3 + 3K^+ + 3e^- \longrightarrow$

$$[Os(NH_3)_6] + 3K^+ + 3Br^- (2)$$

in liquid ammonia at  $-33.5^{\circ}$ . Both Pt(NH<sub>3</sub>)<sub>4</sub> and Os(NH<sub>3</sub>)<sub>6</sub> are too unstable for use in experiments designed to determine whether these species involve metal-hydrogen bonds; such studies, however, are in progress using the relatively more stable Ir(NH<sub>3</sub>)<sub>5</sub>.

An improved procedure for the synthesis of hexaammineosmium(III) bromide also is described.

### Experimental

Materials.—Ammonium hexabromoösmate(IV) was prepared by the method of Dwyer and Gibson.<sup>4</sup>

For the preparation of hexaammineosmium(III) bromide, 4.6210 g. of (NH<sub>4</sub>)<sub>2</sub>OsBr<sub>6</sub> was placed in a Faraday tube and maintained at 10<sup>-3</sup> mm. for 12 hr. to ensure complete dryness. Forty ml. of anhydrous NH3 was condensed on the solid and the tube was sealed and allowed to stand for 28 days at 25°. Thereafter, the insoluble product was washed four times with 40-ml. portions of NH<sub>3</sub>, the tube was cooled to  $-78^{\circ}$ , opened, and the solvent evaporated. The brown NH3-insoluble product was dissolved in 40 ml. of H<sub>2</sub>O and the resulting solution was passed through a column (18 in.  $\times$  15 mm. i.d.) of freshly activated Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>. The column was washed with H<sub>2</sub>O until the washings failed to produce a white precipitate when added to  $NH_4Br$ -saturated  $C_2H_5OH$ ; brown impurities remained on the column. When excess NH4Brsaturated C<sub>2</sub>H<sub>5</sub>OH was added to the eluate, 1.0990 g. [31.6% based on (NH<sub>4</sub>)<sub>2</sub>OsBr<sub>6</sub>] of white solid precipitated. Anal. Calcd. for  $[Os(NH_3)_6]Br_3$ : Os, 35.8. Found: Os, 35.8. X-Ray diffraction data for this product were essentially identical with those reported earlier<sup>5</sup> for  $[Os(NH_8)_6]Br_8$ .

**Preliminary Experiments.**—To establish that  $[Os(NH_3)_6]Br_3$ does not ammonolyze, a 0.2072-g. sample was dissolved in 125 ml. of liquid NH<sub>3</sub> and allowed to stand for 4 hr., after which the solvent was evaporated. The dry residue gave an X-ray diffraction pattern identical with that of the original bromide; there were no lines attributable to NH<sub>4</sub>Br.

Using equipment and procedures described elsewhere<sup>6,7</sup> a solution of 0.2958 g. of [Os(NH<sub>3</sub>)<sub>6</sub>]Br<sub>3</sub> in 135 ml. of liquid NH<sub>3</sub> was titrated potentiometrically with a  $0.0912 \ M$  solution of K in  $NH_3$  at  $-33.5^\circ$  over a period of 14 hr. Significant changes in potential occurred upon addition of 1, 2, and 3 molar equivalents of the titrant. The solid phase that began to separate during the addition of the latter part of the first equivalent and that was present upon addition of 2 equivalents was a voluminous bright yellow precipitate; that present after addition of 3 equivalents was more dense and dark brown. Water-insoluble gases were not evolved during the course of the titration. The yellowbrown supernatant solution was removed by filtration and the brown solid was washed three times with 100-ml. portions of NH<sub>3</sub>; analysis of the residue from the combined supernatant solution and washings accounted for 94.3% of the Br used as  $[Os(NH_3)_6]Br_3$ . The brown NH<sub>3</sub>-insoluble product was stable at  $-33.5^{\circ}$  but decomposed when warmed to  $25^{\circ}$  to form (only) NH<sub>3</sub> and Os; the latter was identified by X-ray diffraction data.

Isolation of  $[Os(NH_3)_6]Br.$ —Using equipment and procedures described earlier,<sup>8</sup> 0.3600 g. of  $[Os(NH_3)_6]Br_3$  in 130 ml. of liquid NH<sub>3</sub> was reduced by addition of 2 molar equivalents of K in NH<sub>8</sub> (13.8 ml. of 0.0905 *M* solution). The resulting bright yellow precipitate was separated by filtration and washed three times with 30-ml. portions of NH<sub>3</sub>; analysis of the residue from the combined filtrate and washings accounted for 63.3% of the Br used as  $[Os(NH_3)_6]Br_3$ . The yellow solid was warmed to room temperature, dried under reduced pressure for 4 hr., and removed from the reactor in an anhydrous O<sub>2</sub>-free atmosphere. *Anal.* Calcd. for  $[Os(NH_3)_6]$ -Br: Os, 51.1; Br, 21.5. Found: Os, 50.5; Br, 22.0. As expected, this product was paramagnetic (1.5 B.M.). An X-ray diffraction pattern<sup>9</sup> led to the following *d*-spacings (Å.) (relative intensities in parentheses): 6.10 (0.75), 5.16 (0.20), 3.74 (1.00), 3.14 (0.05), 2.72 (0.07), 2.59 (0.15), 2.15 (0.05). Upon exposure to the atmosphere or water this product decomposed slowly.

Establishment of the Composition of  $[Os(NH_3)_6]$ .—Since the separation of KBr from the Os-containing product of reaction 2 had been demonstrated and because this product was too unstable for analysis at  $25^{\circ}$ , it was necessary and possible otherwise to establish its composition without separation from KBr; this was done as follows.

In a typical experiment, 0.4534 g. of [Os(NH<sub>3</sub>)<sub>6</sub>]Br<sub>3</sub> in 130 ml. of liquid NH<sub>3</sub> was treated with 3 molar equivalents of K in NH<sub>3</sub> (0.111 M solution). A connection was made from the top of the reactor<sup>8</sup> to a trap inside a dewar flask. The trap was cooled by adding liquid nitrogen at a rate such that the solvent distilled from the reactor at a smooth controlled rate. When all of the liquid NH3 was removed, the trap was maintained at liquid nitrogen temperature for 1 hr., the temperature of the reactor was lowered to  $-78^{\circ}$ , and the pressure therein was reduced to 10<sup>-3</sup> mm. for 18 hr. The brown solid showed no evidence of change during these operations. Thereafter, the reactor was connected to a gas collection system (including a Toepler pump) and the brown solid was decomposed by allowing it to warm to 25° followed by heating it at 100° for 1 hr. The solid turned black and  $4.85 \times 10^{-3}$  mole of NH<sub>3</sub> gas was collected; this corresponds to 5.71 moles of NH3/mole of Os originally introduced as [Os- $(NH_3)_6]Br_3$ . The X-ray data obtained using a sample of the black residue showed the presence of only Os and KBr.

Acknowledgment.—This work was supported by The United States Atomic Energy Commission and by the Robert A. Welch Foundation.

(9) Copper K $\alpha$  radiation (Ni filter), 35 kv. tube voltage, 15 ma. filament current, and 8 hr. exposure time; relative intensities were estimated visually.

Contribution No. 1272 from the Institute for Atomic Research and Department of Chemistry, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa

# Rare Earth Metal-Metal Halide Systems. VI. Praseodymium Chloride<sup>1</sup>

By Leonard F. Druding, John D. Corbett,<sup>2</sup> and Bob N. Ramsey

Received January 31, 1963

The reaction of praseodymium with liquid  $PrCl_3$  is of interest in relation to the behavior of the neighboring rare earth metal-metal halide systems. Lanthanum and cerium show only the phenomenon of solution in their respective molten trichlorides with no intermediate solid phases. The solubility in LaCl<sub>3</sub> has been reported to be 9 (mole) % at the eutectic (826°) and 11% at 920°,<sup>3</sup> and in CeCl<sub>3</sub>, 9.3% at the monotectic (777°)

(3) F. J. Keneshea and D. Cubicciotti, J. Chem. Eng. Data, 6, 507 (1961).

<sup>(4)</sup> F. P. Dwyer and N. A. Gibson, Nature, 165, 1012 (1950).

<sup>(5)</sup> G. W. Watt and L. Vaska, J. Inorg. Nucl. Chem., 5, 308 (1958).

<sup>(6)</sup> G. W. Watt and J. B. Otto, Jr., J. Electrochem. Soc., 98, 1 (1951).

<sup>(7)</sup> G. W. Watt and D. M. Sowards, *ibid.*, **102**, 46, 545 (1955).

<sup>(8)</sup> G. W. Watt and R. J. Thompson, J. Inorg. Nucl. Chem., 9, 311 (1959).

<sup>(1)</sup> Presented at the 142nd National Meeting of the American Chemical Society, Atlantic City, N. J., September 12, 1962. Work was performed in the Ames Laboratory of the U. S. Atomic Energy Commission.

<sup>(2)</sup> Author to whom correspondence should be addressed.