

Figure 2. Unit cell diagram for WSCI4. Axes orientation: 6, down; *c,* across; *a,* toward viewer.

Table 111. Least-Squares Planes"

atom	$\mathbf x$	у	\mathbf{z}	dist. Å	esd
Plane 1: $A = 0.3937$; $B = 0.8175$; $C = -0.4203$; $D = -1.0231$					
Atoms in Plane					
Cl(1)	-2.4218	3.8192	7.6101	-0.006	0.011
Cl(2)	-1.6804	5.5469	11.6659	-0.006	0.011
Cl(3)	-0.0412	3.7507	9.6770	0.006	0.012
Cl(4)	-4.0550	5.6528	9.6167	0.006	0.011
$x^2 = 1$					
Other Atom					
W(1)	-1.8531	5.0883	9.4376	0.487	0.002
Plane 2: $A = 0.1217$; $B = 0.2492$; $C = -0.9608$; $D = -3.8532$					
Atoms in Plane					
Cl(5)	-5.1864	9.6004	5.0359	0.776	0.010
Cl(6)	-8.0662	8.6010	6.0782	-0.825	0.010
Cl(7)	-3.9291		6.8359 6.1315	-0.812	0.010
Cl(8)	-6.5073	6.5494	3.9898	0.860	0.010
$x^2 = 27940$					
Other Atom					
W(2)	-5.8415	7.9671	6.4397	-1.059	0.002

The equation of the plane is of the form $Ax + By + Cz - D = 0$, where *A, B,* **C,** and *D* are constants and *x, y,* and *z* are orthogonalized coordinates.

sulfur, the Cl'-W-S angle being 176.4° . The weak tungstenchlorine interaction occurs across a center of symmetry and results in the formation of dimeric $W_2S_2Cl_8$ units. These dimers are similar in structure to the isomorphous $W_2Cl_{10}^6$ and $Mo_2Cl_{10}^7$.

In the new polymorph, we report here there are two WSCI₄ groups in the asymmetric unit. One of the $WSCI₄$ entities (A) relates to its symmetry equivalent across a center of inversion, giving dimeric units of the type just described, while the other WSC14 molecule (B) relieves its nascent coordinative unsaturation by a longer, unreciprocated $W(1)$ -Cl(6) interaction. We will first contrast the dimeric unit in the present compound with that of the triclinic modification.

In the dimeric unit of the present modification, one of the tungsten chlorine distances, $W(2)$ –Cl(8), is much longer than the other three, 2.433 (12) Å. This lengthening is due to a 2.908 (9) **A** interaction between this chlorine atom and the tungsten atom of a symmetry-related (A)-WSC14 unit. Furthermore, the W- (2)-C1(8)' distance is 0.14 *8,* shorter than the analogous interaction in the triclinic modification and the $Cl(8)^\prime - W(2) - S(2)$ angle is 173.8 (5)^o. Simultaneously, (A)-WSCl₄ units approach the (B)-WSCl₄ units via a W(1)–Cl(6) contact of 3.233 (11) \AA . This contact causes a slight lengthening of the $W(2)$ –Cl(6) bond, which is 2.341 (12) **A.** The average W-Cl bond distance for chlorine atoms that do not interact with tungsten atoms is 2.247 [4] **A.** The remaining bond distances and angles are normal for this type of distorted-square-pyramidal structure, but they differ considerably from those of the triclinic modification. One manifestation

of these differences is that in the triclinic modification the chlorine atoms were found to be planar with the tungsten atom 0.45 **8,** above the plane. However, in the present compound the chlorine atoms are far from planar (see Table **111).**

The five ligands around the tungsten atom in the (B)-WSCl, unit form a nearly regular square pyramid. The W-Cl bond lengths and mutually cis C1-W-Cl and S-W-Cl bond angles are equivalent within experimental error. The four chlorine atoms of the B unit are planar and the tungsten atom sits 0.487 (2) *8,* above the plane.

The chlorine atoms on the B units do not interact with any other tungsten atoms; hence, tetrameric entities are formed that are internally linked by weak W-Cl bonds. The $W(1)-W(2)$ and W(2)-W(2)' distances are 4.844 (3) and 4.189 (3) **A,** respectively, indicating that there is no electronic interaction between the metal centers. Other than the aforementioned contacts, there are no other <4.0 **A** contacts between chlorine and sulfur atoms and tungsten atoms on adjacent molecules.

The crystal structure presented here displays a previously unknown mode of association for transition metal oxide/sulfide tetrahalides. The electron deficient and coordinatively unsaturated tungsten atoms of this modification exhibit stabilizing weak W-Cl interactions, which contrasts with the existence of monomeric molecules of WOX_4 and WSX_4 in the vapor phase.⁸

Acknowledgment. We thank the Robert A. Welch Foundation for support under Grant No. A494.

Registry No. W, 7440-33-7; S₂Cl₂, 10025-67-9; S, 7704-34-9; WSCl₄, 25127-53-1.

Supplementary Material Available: Full listings of bond distances, bond angles, and positional and isotropic equivalent displacement parameters for $WSCl_4$ (4 pages); a listing of observed and calculated structure factors for WSCI, (6 pages). Ordering information is given on any current masthead page.

(8) (a) Ward, B. *G.;* Strafford, F. E. *Inorg. Chem.* **1968, 7,** 269. (b) Britnell, D.; Fowles, *G.* W. A,; Mandyczewsky, R. *J. Chem. Soc. D* **1970,** *608.*

Contribution from the Department of Chemistry, Northern Illinois University, DeKalb, Illinois 601 **15**

Assignment of the Intense UV Bands in the Solution Electronic Spectrum of Ni(CN)₄²⁻. MCD Spectra for the 3.7and $5.0 \cdot \mu m^{-1}$ Bands

W. Roy Mason

Received November 28, 1988

The intense bands in the region 3.0–4.5 μ m⁻¹ exhibited by the planar $Ni(CN)₄²⁻$ ion in solutions and in crystalline environments have been investigated by a variety of spectroscopic methods including low-temperature absorption,' magnetic circular di-

⁽⁶⁾ Cotton, F. **A,;** Rice, C. E. *Acta Crystallogr.* **1978,** *834,* **2833.**

⁽⁷⁾ Sands, **D. E.;** Zalkin, **A.** *Acta Crystallogr.* **1959,** *12,* **723.**

Figure 1. Relative energy of the spectroscopically important one-electron Figure 1. Relative energy of the spectroscopically important one-electron molecular orbitals for planar M(CN)₄², M = Ni or Pt (z axis is normal to the xy-polarized e_g(xz,yz) \rightarrow a_{2n} and to the xy-polarized e_g(x to the xy molecular plane), showing the xy-polarized $e_g(xz,yz) \rightarrow a_{2u}$ and z-polarized $a_{1g}(z^2) \rightarrow a_{2u}$ excitations. The $b_{1g}(xy) \rightarrow a_{2u}$ excitation (broken arrow) is forbidden.

chroism (MCD) ,² and polarized single-crystal absorption.³ These chroism (MCD),² and polarized single-crystal absorption.³ These
studies have led to assignments based on Ni 3d $\rightarrow a_{2u}(Ni 4p_x,$
 $+KCN₁$), registrians (see Figure 1). These section and the registrial $\pi^*(CN^-)$) excitations (see Figure 1). These assignments have stood for some time and seem to be generally accepted. Further, they parallel Pt 5d \rightarrow a_{2u}(Pt 6p_r, $\pi^*(CN^-)$) assignments for analogous intense UV bands for the isostructural $Pt(CN)₄²⁻$ ion when differences due to strong Pt 5d spin-orbit coupling are taken into account.^{2,4} However, recently Arndt, Danielson, Fanta, and Musselman (ADFM)⁵ reported polarized specular reflectance spectra for the mixed crystals $Ba[Ni_xPt_{1-x}(CN)_4]\cdot 4H_2O$ in the region 3.2-4.2 μ m⁻¹, and as a result of their findings, they have proposed new assignments for the $3.72\text{-}\mu\text{m}^{-1}$ band and a higher energy band system located near 5.0 μ m⁻¹. The mixed crystals were prepared by cocrystallization of isomorphous $(C2/c)$ Ba- $[Ni(CN)_4]$ -4H₂O and Ba[Pt(CN)₄]-4H₂O and were assumed to have structures analogous to those of the pure crystals where the metal ions form chains parallel to the *c* crystal axis and the molecular planes of the complexes are parallel to one another normal to this axis. The M-M distance along the chains was assumed to be in the range 3.3-3.4 **A,** characteristic of the pure crystals.^{6,7} The in-plane xy-polarized spectra derived from the reflectance of the mixed crystals showed two bands: band A, which was composition independent at $3.53 \pm 0.01 \ \mu m^{-1}$, was attributed to Ni(CN) $_4^2$ ⁻ (aqueous solution band at 3.72 μ m⁻¹), and band B, which varied with composition from 3.75 μ m⁻¹ (76% Ni, 24% Pt) to 3.86 μ m⁻¹ (100% Pt), was attributed to Pt(CN)₄²⁻ (aqueous solution band at 3.92 μ m⁻¹). The solution bands for both complexes had been assigned earlier to transitions to an xy -polarized solution band at 3.92 μ m⁻¹). The solution bands for both com-
plexes had been assigned earlier to transitions to an *xy*-polarized
 E_u state derived from the $e_g(xz,yz) \rightarrow a_{2u}$ excitation.^{2,3} ADFM argued that the different composition dependences, together with the observation of two separate bands for Ni and Pt centers in the mixed crystals, implied differing excitations on the two types of metal centers. The lack of composition dependence of the energy for band A was taken to imply that the orbitals of the Ni excited configuration were *nor* delocalized and therefore could not involve the out-of-plane a_{2u} orbital, which is oriented along the metal chain and overlaps strongly with neighboring metal ions. ADFM proposed that band A, and by implication the solution

- (1) Mason, W. R.; Gray, H. B. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1968,** *90,* **5721.**
- Piepho, **S.** B.; Schatz, P. N.; McCaffery, A. J. *J. Am. Chem. SOC.* **1969,** *91.* **5994.**
- (3) Cowman, C. D.; Ballhausen, C. J.; Gray, H. B. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1973,** *95,* 7873.
- Isci, H.; Mason, W. R. *Inorg. Chem.* **1975,** *14,* 905. Arndt, G. A.; Danielson, **E.** D.; Fanta, **A.** D.; Musselman, R. L. *Inorg.*
- *Chem.* **1988,** *27,* 1400.
- Larsen, F. K.; Hazell, R. G.; Rasmussen, S. **E.** *Acta. Chem. Scand.* **1969,** *23,* 61.
- Maffly, R. L.; Johnson, P. L.; Williams, **J.** M. *Acta Crystallogr., Sect.* (7) *B: Struct. Crystallogr. Cryst. Chem.* **1977,** *833,* 884.

band at 3.7 μ m⁻¹, be assigned to the E_u state from the $b_{2g}(xy) \rightarrow e_u(\pi^*(CN^-))$ excitation, since both orbitals are primarily inplane and are not expected to be delocalized to any extent. The earlier $e_g(xz,yz) \rightarrow a_{2u}$ interpretation for the Pt excitation was considered satisfactory, since band B exhibited a small (~ 0.1) μ m⁻¹) composition dependence. In this context, it is noteworthy that ADFM base their arguments on an earlier study of the out-of-plane z-polarized reflectance spectra for the Ba- $[Ni_xPt_{1-x}(CN)_4]$.4H₂O crystals.⁸ A single intense z-polarized band was observed, the energy of which showed a large composition dependence from 2.26 μ m⁻¹ (100% Ni) to 2.76 μ m⁻¹ (100%) Pt), and was significantly red-shifted from the solution positions $(Ni(CN)₄²⁻, 3.50 \mu m⁻¹; Pt(CN)₄²⁻, 3.92 \mu m⁻¹).$ The z-polarized band was interpreted as the transition to an A_{2u} excited state resulting from the excitation $a_{1g}(z^2) \rightarrow a_{2u}$ at both Ni and Pt centers in the crystal. The energy shift and composition dependence were attributed to the delocalization of the a_{2u} orbitals along the metal chain and to a lesser extent to the delocalization of the $a_{1g}(z^2)$ orbitals also. Finally after rejecting the $e_g(xz,yz) \rightarrow a_{2u}$ excitation for band A in the in-plane polarized study, ADFM suggested that this excitation be assigned to a high-energy band near 5.0 μ m⁻¹ in the solution spectrum of Ni(CN)₄²⁻.

The new assignments proposed by ADFM are difficult to rationalize in view of the earlier MCD results and analysis² and provided the motivation for a reinvestigation in our laboratory. MCD measurements have also been extended to include the $5.0\text{-}\mu\text{m}^{-1}$ band and are reported here in an effort to clarify the assignment of this band.

Results and Discussion

New MCD measurements at 7-T field strength were made **on** aqueous solutions of $K_2Ni(CN)_4$ by using a spectrometer and magnet system described earlier,⁹ which allows simultaneous and synchronous MCD and absorption determination. The spectrum between 3.2 and 5.4 μ m⁻¹ is presented in Figure 2. The spectrum between 3.2 and 4.5 μ m⁻¹ is in good agreement with the earlier MCD results;² the region 4.5-5.4 μ m⁻¹ has not been reported previously. It is clear from Figure 2 that there is a strong positive *A* term¹⁰ for the 3.7- μ m⁻¹ band (\bar{A}_1/\bar{D}_0 = +2.1 \pm 0.1, by the method of moments;¹⁰ compares favorably with the value $+2.3$ given earlier²) and a weaker negative A term for the 5.0- μ m⁻¹ band $(\bar{A}_1/\bar{D}_0 = -0.15 \pm 0.03)$

The observation of MCD \vec{A} terms for both the 3.7- and 5.0- μ m⁻¹ bands is consistent with xy-polarized transitions to degenerate E_u states, since the ground state is totally symmetric ${}^{1}A_{1g}$, but the two terms differ in sign and magnitude. The *A* term sign and magnitude depend upon the orbitals involved in the transition and for the space-averaged case appropriate for a nonisotropic molecule in solution are given by the \bar{A}_1/\bar{D}_0 parameter ratio in eq 1,¹⁰ where

$$
\bar{A}_1 / \bar{D}_0 = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}\mu_B} \langle E_u || \mu || E_u \rangle \tag{1}
$$

 \bar{D}_0 is the dipole strength of the transition, $\mu = -\mu_B(L + 2S)$ (the magnetic moment operator), and μ_B is the Bohr magneton. For the e_g(xz,yz) \rightarrow a_{2u} excitation $\overline{A}_1/\overline{D}_0$ depends upon the magnetic moment of the occupied $3d_{xz}3d_{yz}$ orbitals and is calculated to be moment of the occupied $3d_{x2}3d_{y2}$ orbitals and is calculated to be $+1.00$ for pure 3d orbitals.^{2,10} In contrast, the $\overline{A_1}/\overline{D_0}$ value for the $b_{2g}(xy) \rightarrow e_y$ excitation depends upon the magnetic moment the $b_{2g}(xy) \rightarrow e_u$ excitation depends upon the magnetic moment of the e_u ligand-based orbitals. The calculation of \bar{A}_1/\bar{D}_0 depends upon the exact form of the **e,,** orbitals, which is difficult to specify. In the earlier MCD analysis² an estimate was made of $\bar{A}_1/\bar{D}_0 =$ \sim +0.3. Therefore, it appears that the observed A term for the ~+0.3. Therefore, it appears that the observed *A* term for the 3.7- μ m⁻¹ band ($\overline{A}_1/\overline{D}_0$ = +2.1-2.3) is too large for the $b_{2g}(xy)$

→ e_u excitation and the *A* term for the 5.0- μ m⁻¹ band has the \rightarrow e_u excitation and the A term for the 5.0- μ m⁻¹ band has the wrong sign for the e_g(xz,yz) \rightarrow a_{2u} excitation. The earlier MCD

⁽⁸⁾ Anex, B. G.; Musselman, R. L. *J. Phys. Chem.* **1980,** *84,* 883.

⁽⁹⁾ Mason, W. R. *Anal. Chem.* **1982,** *54,* 646.

The standard (Stephens, 1976) conventions for MCD terms are used throughout as described by: Piepho, **S.** B.; Schatz, P. N. *Group Theory in Spectroscopy with Applications to Magnetic Circular Dichroism;* Wiley-Interscience: New **York,** 1983. The method **of** moments for determining MCD parameters **is** also described in this book.

Figure 2. MCD (upper curves) and absorption (lower curve) spectra for aqueous solutions of $K_2Ni(CN)_4$. The MCD data between 4.1 and 5.3 μ m⁻¹ were multiplied by a factor of 5 before plotting.

analysis² noted that the *A* term for the 3.7- μ m⁻¹ band was also larger than could be explained on the basis of the 3d_{xz}3d_{yz} orbitals alone and explained the larger magnitude in terms of a pseudo *A* term contribution originating from *B* terms of opposite sign for the E_u state and a neighboring A_{2u} state at 3.5 μ m⁻¹, which A term contribution originating from B terms of opposite sign for
the E_u state and a neighboring A_{2u} state at 3.5 μ m⁻¹, which
originates from the a_{1g}(z²) \rightarrow a_{2u} excitation. An upper limit of originates from the $a_{1g}(z^2) \rightarrow a_{2u}$ excitation. An upper limit of \bar{A}_1/\bar{D}_0 was estimated to be +2.6 (see ref 2 for details). Thus, it appears that the earlier interpretation² including the pseudo \boldsymbol{A} term contribution provides a better explanation of the magnitude of the A term for the 3.7- μ m⁻¹ band than does the ADFM proposal, The negative *A* term observed cannot be explained by the of the A term for the 3.7- μ m⁻¹ band than does the ADFM pro-
posal. The negative A term observed cannot be explained by the
ADFM assignment. However, the excitation $a_{1g}(z^2) \rightarrow e_u$, which ADFM assignment. However, the excitation $a_{1g}(z^2) \rightarrow e_u$, which would be expected at slightly higher energies than the 3d $\rightarrow a_{2u}$ excitations, is expected to give an *A* term the same in magnitude but opposite in sign compared to the *A* term for the $b_{2g}(xy) \rightarrow$ e_u excitation or $\bar{A_1}/\bar{D_0} = \sim -0.3$, on the basis of the earlier estimates.2 This value compares favorably with the observed value (-0.15). Therefore, the assignment of the $5.0\text{-}\mu\text{m}^{-1}$ band to the $a_{1g}(z^2) \rightarrow e_u$ excitation is proposed here.

In conclusion, the MCD results reported here and earlier² are explained easily by the generally accepted 3d $\rightarrow a_{2u}$ assignments for Ni(CN)_4^2 . The new data support the logical extension of these assignments to the higher energy e_u orbital for the 5.0- μ m⁻¹ band. The ADFM crystal results are not so easily explained, but however they are explained, the solution spectrum is still best interpreted by the conventional excitation scheme.

Registry No. Ni(CN)₄²⁻, 48042-08-6.

Contribution from the Laboratoire de Chimie-Physique (UA 253 du CNRS), HEI, 59046 Lille Cédex, France

Photochemical Observations in Solutions of Sulfur in Liquid Ammonia

P. Dubois, J. P. Lelieur,* and G. Lepoutre

Received *March 14, 1988*

The photosensitivity of solutions of sulfur in liquid ammonia was first observed by Bernard et al.^{1,2} They have shown the

Figure *1.* Raman spectra of sulfur-ammonia solutions **(1** M) recorded with the 514.5-nm excitation line: **(A)** sample at **223** K recorded just at the beginning of the laser irradiation; (B) sample at 200 K recorded after the laser irradiation had **been** focused for 2 h on the sample after which the spectrum was then stationary; (C) sample at **223** K recorded after the laser irradiation had been focused for **1** h on the sample after which the spectrum was then stationary.

influence of white-light illumination of the solutions on the absorption spectrum. They have also shown that the photosensitivity could be induced by laser excitation lines (488.0 and 514.5 nm). It was shown that the initial equilibrium state was recovered if the sample was kept for several days in the dark. The experiments of Bernard et al., carried out at room temperature, did not allow identification of the **species** resulting from the decrease of the S4Nconcentration since the spectrophotometry experiments were performed only in the visible range. The observations of Bernard et al. were taken into account in the characterization of the equilibrium state of these solutions.^{3,4} Prestel and Schindewolf⁵⁻⁸ showed that sulfur-ammonia solutions contain several photosensitive species. They established that S_3N^- or S_4N^- can be produced through photoinduced reactions.^{7,8} However, their experiments did not lead to an overall interpretation of the observed photochemical effects. Furthermore, it was shown recently that the solutions studied by Prestel and Schindewolf were not in the equilibrium state before illumination.^{4,9} It is now well established that sulfur in ammonia undergoes a disproportionation process giving S_6^2 in equilibrium with S_3^- as reduced species and mainly **S4N-** as oxidized species. **In** the equilibrium state a large fraction of solubilized sulfur is still in the zero oxidation state. 4.13 This neutral form of sulfur, S_{am} , is not cyclic S_8 , and likely involves ammonia molecules. For the sake of simplicity we call it $S_{n,am}$. We have proposed⁴ the following disproportionation equilibrium to describe the equilibrium state, if the concentration of S_3N^- is neglected:

- (1) Bernard, L. Thèse de docteur ingénieur, University of Lille, 1982.
- (2) Bernard, L.; Lelieur, J. P.; Lepoutre, G. *Nouu. J. Chim. 1985, 9,* 199.
- (3) Dubois, P.; Lelieur, J. P.; Lepoutre, G. *Inorg. Chem. 1987, 26,* 1897.
- (4) Dubois, P.; Lelieur, J. P.; Lepoutre, G. The Solubilization Process of Sulfur in Liquid Ammonia and the Equilibrium State of These Solutions. *Inorg. Chem. 1989, 28,* 195.
- (5) Prestel, H.; Schindewolf, U. *Ber. Bunsen-Ges. Phys. Chem. 1986, 90,* 150.
- *(6)* Prestel, H.; Seelert, S.; Schindewolf, U. *Z. Phys. Chem. (Munich)* **1986,** *148, 91.*
- (7) Prestel, H.; Schindewolf, U. Z. *Anorg. Allg. Chem. 1987, 551,* 21.
- (8) Prestel, H. Dissertation, University of Karlsruhe, 1986.
- (9) Dubois, P. ThEse de doctorat No. 184, Universite des Sciences et Techniques de Lille, 1987.
- (10) Bojes, J.; Chivers, T.; Drummond, I. *Inorg. Synrh. 1978, 18,* 203.
- (1 1) Steudel, R. *J. Phys. Chem. 1977, 81,* 343.
- (12) Chivers, T.; Lau, C. *Inorg. Chem. 1982, 21,* 453.
- (13) Dubois, P.; Lelieur, J. P.; Lepoutre, G. *Inorg. Chem. 1988, 27,* 3032.