CONTRIBUTION FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY, UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN, MADISON, WISCONSIN 53706

Preparation and Structure of a Tetrameric Cyclopentadienyliron Sulfide, $[C_5H_5FeS]_4$

BY CHIN HSUAN WEI, GLENN R. WILKES, PAUL M. TREICHEL, AND LAWRENCE F. DAHL

Received November 30, 1965

The reaction of $[C_5H_5Fe(CO)_2]_2$ with cyclohexene sulfide has given, in addition to other organometallic products, a relatively insoluble, air-stable, black crystalline solid of formula $[C_5H_5FeS]_4$. Its structural characterization as a tetrameric complex was ascertained from a three-dimensional X-ray examination which showed $[C_{b}H_{b}FeS]_{4}$ to form monoclinic crystals with four molecules in a unit cell of symmetry C2/c and of dimensions a = 18.80 A, b = 7.68 A, c = 15.07 A, $\beta = 109^{\circ}$ 5'. A fullmatrix least-squares refinement of the nonhydrogen atoms yielded final discrepancy values of 7.8 and 8.1% for the unweighted R_1 and weighted R_2 factors, respectively. The tetrameric structure can be viewed as formed from two interpenetrating distorted tetrahedra of iron and sulfur atoms; each iron of identical environment is coordinated to a π -cyclopentadienyl ring, three sulfur atoms, and one iron atom. With the assumption of cylindrical symmetry for each cyclopentadienyl ring the molecular configuration possesses tetragonal D_{2d} symmetry. A stereochemical consequence of each iron atom attaining a closed-shell electronic configuration by the formation of only one iron-iron bond is a symmetrical deformation of the molecule from an idealized cubic configuration of T_d symmetry (with or without six metal-metal bonds) to the observed configuration of lower tetragonal symmetry (containing two metal-metal bonds). As a result of a crystallographic twofold axis passing through the molecule, the Fe₄S₄ fragment contains one independent Fe-Fe bond of 2.650 A, four chemically equivalent independent Fe-S bonds of 2.204 A (av), and two other chemically equivalent independent Fe-S bonds of 2.250 A (av). The Fe-Fe bond in each of the two identical Fe₂S₂ fragments is also responsible for the symmetrical electron-pair Fe-S bridge bonds possessing a sharp Fe-S-Fe angle of 74° (av). The detailed molecular features are compared to those of related molecular complexes.

Introduction

Although a wide variety of metal carbonyl chalcogenides have been prepared²⁻⁸ for which X-ray diffraction studies⁹⁻¹² have shown unusual configurations with new types of bonding, cyclopentadienylmetal sulfides are as yet unreported. This paper presents the synthesis and characterization by a single crystal X-ray analysis of the first such compound, $[C_5H_5FeS]_4$.¹³

Experimental Section

Preparation and Properties.—Cyclopentadienyliron dicarbonyl dimer (8.0 g, 22.6 mmoles) and cyclohexene sulfide (6.0 g, 41.1 mmoles) were heated under nitrogen in refluxing benzene for 4.5 hr. Filtration of the resulting black mixture followed by partial evaporation of the solvent led to precipitation of a black crystalline air-stable solid, which was recrystallized from a chloroform-octane mixture. Since the product slowly decomposed in solution and tended to separate out as a powder, it was rather difficult to get pure material. Several other products which were isolated from the filtrate by chromatographic separation will be discussed in a later paper.¹⁴

- (3) R. B. King, Inorg. Chem., 2, 326 (1963).
- (4) L. Markó, G. Bor, and E. Klumpp, Chem. Ind. (London), 1491 (1961).
- (5) L. Markó, G. Bor, and G. Almásy, *Chem. Ber.*, **94**, 847 (1961).
 (6) L. Markó, G. Bor, E. Klumpp, B. Markó, and G. Almásy, *ibid.*, **96**, 955 (1963).
- (7) S. A. Khattab, L. Markó, G. Bor, and B. Markó, J. Organometal. Chem., 1, 373 (1964).
 - (8) W. Hieber and T. Kruck, Chem. Ber., 95, 2027 (1962).
 - (9) L. F. Dahl and P. W. Sutton, Inorg. Chem., 2, 1067 (1963).
 - (10) C. H. Wei and L. F. Dahl, *ibid.*, 4, 1 (1965).
 - (11) C. H. Wei and L. F. Dahl, *ibid.*, 4, 493 (1965).
- (12) C. H. Wei and L. F. Dahl, Abstracts of Papers, National Meeting of the American Crystallographic Association, Montana State College, Bozeman, Mont., July 1964; to be published.

Anal. Calcd for C_5H_5FeS : C, 39.2; H, 3.3; S, 20.9; Fe, 36.6. Found:¹⁵ C, 39.0; H, 3.9; S, 21.1; Fe, 36.1. The infrared spectrum of $[C_5H_5FeS]_4$ as a Nujol null, taken on a Perkin-Elmer Model 421 grating spectrometer with NaCl plates, shows absorption bonds at 2950 (w), 2930 (m), 2850 (w), 1730 (w), 1417 (m), 1194 (w), 1005 (w), 1000 (vw), 828 (vw), 805 (vw), and 707 (vw) cm⁻¹.

Single Crystal X-Ray Data.—Although oscillation photographs of crystals mounted about the b axis did not reveal any indications of twinning, zero- and upper-level Weissenberg photographs of a number of crystals showed extra reflections characteristic of a twinning on the (100) plane. Several recrystallizations of the compound from chloroform solution finally yielded a tiny untwinned needle crystal (of length 0.22 mm and average width 0.07 mm) which was used to collect the intensity data. The lattice cell parameters were determined from hk0 and 0kl precession photographs. Multiple-film equiinclination Weissenberg data were obtained for reciprocal levels h0l through h8lwith zirconium-filtered Mo K α radiation. The intensities of 582 independent diffraction maxima were visually estimated and then corrected for Lorentz-polarization effects. Since the estimated μR_{max} value was only 0.15, absorption corrections were not applied. The variable weights of the observed structure factor amplitudes utilized in the least-squares refinement were assigned as follows: $\sqrt{w} = 20/F_{\rm o}$ if $I_0 \ge 4I_0(\min)$, $\sqrt{w} = 1.25$. $I_0^2/F_0I_0(\min)^2$ if $I_0 < 4I_0(\min)$.

Unit Cell and Space Group.—The crystals of $[C_5H_3FeS]_4$ are monoclinic with lattice parameters $a = 18.80 \pm 0.03$ A, b = 7.68 ± 0.01 A, $c = 15.07 \pm 0.03$ A, $\beta = 109^{\circ} 5' \pm 20'$; the volume of the unit cell is 2056 A³; $\rho_{calcd} = 1.98$ g cm⁻³ for four tetramers per unit cell. The total number of electrons per unit cell, F(C00), = 1232. Systematic absences of h + k = 2n + 1for $\{hkl\}$ and l = 2n + 1 for $\{h0l\}$ indicate the probable space groups Cc (Cs⁴) and C2/c (Csh⁶), of which the latter centrosymmetric one was later confirmed by the structural refinement. All crystallographically independent atoms were found to occupy the general eightfold set of positions (8f): (0, 0, 0; 1/2, 1/2, 0) \pm (x, y, z; x, -y, 1/2 + z).¹⁶

⁽¹⁾ Alfred P. Sloan Research Fellow, 1963-1965.

⁽²⁾ W. Hieber and J. Gruber, Z. Anorg. Allgem. Chem., 296, 91 (1958).

⁽¹³⁾ Before the single crystal X-ray study was begun, this compound was believed to be a hexanuclear iron complex on the basis of preliminary analytical data. The correct formulation as a tetrameric species of the above composition was shown from the X-ray work and verified by subsequent elemental analysis.

⁽¹⁴⁾ P. M. Treichel, G. R. Wilkes, and M. Brauner, to be published.

⁽¹⁵⁾ Schwarzkopf Microanalytical Laboratory, Woodside, N. Y.

^{(16) &}quot;International Tables for X-ray Crystallography," Vol. I, The Kynoch Press, Birmingham, England, 1952, p 101.

Determination of the Structure .-- A careful examination of a three-dimensional Patterson function computed17 from the corrected intensities finally provided a complete interpretation of all intra- and intermolecular Fe-Fe and Fe-S vectors on the basis of the space group C2/c. These vectors indicated an Fe₄S₄ molecular fragment in which two irregularly shaped tetrahedra, one composed of four iron and the other of four sulfur atoms, interpenetrate such that each sulfur is bonded to three iron atoms and each iron is bonded to one iron and three sulfur atoms. Approximate positional parameters were obtained for the two independent iron atoms, Fe1 and Fe2, and the two independent sulfur atoms, S₃ and S₄, of the Fe₄S₄ fragment which possesses a crystallographic twofold axis. Two cycles of a block-diagonal least-squares isotropic refinement¹⁸ of the derived Patterson coordinates were carried out in which initial thermal parameters based on related structures9-12 were arbitrarily assumed for the iron and sulfur atoms. The resulting value of 19% for the unweighted discrepancy factor, $R_1 = [\Sigma ||F_0| - |F_0||/\Sigma |F_0|] \times 100$, indicated the correctness of the Fe4S4 model. Subsequent threedimensional Fourier syntheses17 located the ten carbon atoms of the two independent cyclopentadienyl rings.

A block-diagonal isotropic least-squares refinement¹⁸ of all fourteen nonhydrogen atoms lowered the R_1 value to 10.0%, after which a full-matrix least-squares program¹⁹ with individual atomic temperature factors and with nine interlayer scale factors was utilized for further refinement. At the end of three cycles R_1 and $R_2 = [\Sigma w || F_o| - |F_o||^2 / \Sigma w |F_o|^2]^{1/2} \times 100$ stood at 7.8 and 8.1%, respectively; all parameter shifts were less than 8% of their individual standard deviations. In the structure factor calculations the scattering factors used for iron were those of Thomas and Umeda,²⁰ for sulfur those of Dawson,²¹ and for carbon those of Berghuis, *et al.*²² A three-dimensional difference Fourier map based on the output parameters of the last cycle (given in Table I) showed no anomalies. No attempt was made to locate the positions of the hydrogen atoms.

TABLE I

Atomic Parameters with Standard Deviations^a

Atom	$x (10^4 \sigma_x)$	$y~(10^4\sigma_y)$	\mathbf{z} (104 $\sigma_{\mathbf{z}}$)	$B (10^2 \sigma_B)$
Fe1	0.4294(2)	0.4339(4)	0.1473(2)	3.18(11)
Fe_2	0.4148(2)	0.1902(4)	0.2645(2)	3.06(11)
S_3	0.4448(4)	0.4648(7)	0.2976(5)	3.27(15)
S_4	0.4629(4)	0.1588(8)	0.1495(4)	3.47(15)
Ċš	0.3702(13)	0.4300(33)	-0.0036(15)	4.14(53)
C ₆	0.4197(14)	0.5856(33)	0.0260(17)	5.31(60)
C ₇	0.3791(13)	0.6829(35)	0.0921(16)	4.82(58)
C ₈	0.3323(13)	0.5942(30)	0.1055(16)	4.06(52)
C,	0.3167(14)	0.4451(35)	0.0490(17)	5.09(60)
C10	0.3733(13)	-0.0592(28)	0.2834(16)	4.02(50)
C11	0.3232(13)	0.0259(31)	0.2005(17)	4.40(54)
C_{12}	0.2919(13)	0.1779(32)	0.2288(17)	4.29(52)
C ₁₃	0.3253(13)	0.2038(30)	0.3282(17)	4.09(51)
C ₁₄	0.3736(14)	0.0607(35)	0.3604(17)	4.89(56)

 a Standard deviations of last significant figures are given in parentheses.

A listing of the observed and calculated structure factors based on these atomic parameters is shown in Table II. The interatomic distances and bond angles calculated with the Busing-Martin-Levy function and error program²³ are tabulated in



Figure 1.—Molecular configuration of $[C_5H_5FeS]_4$.

Tables III and IV, respectively. Standard deviations obtained from the full inverse matrix also include the estimated lattice constant errors. Table V gives the "best" molecular planes formed by certain atoms and the distances of these and other atoms from the planes obtained by a least-squares method with the Smith program.²⁴

Results and Discussion

Crystalline $[C_{5}H_{5}FeS]_{4}$ is composed of tetrameric molecules with the configuration depicted in Figure 1. Each iron atom of similar localized environment is coordinated to a π -cyclopentadienyl ring, three sulfur atoms, and one iron atom such that it attains a closedshell electronic configuration. With the assumption of cylindrical symmetry for each cyclopentadienyl ring, the molecular configuration conforms to the tetragonal point group D_{2d} - $\overline{4}2m$ (Figure 2) within the limits of accuracy. The corresponding bond lengths and angles for the iron-sulfur framework are identical within 2σ of the individual values. The close distributions of the chemically equivalent molecular parameters about their weighted averages (given in Tables III and IV) support the estimates of the standard deviations computed from the variance-covariance matrix. Hence, the "best values" of the molecular parameters utilized in this discussion are based on D_{2d} molecular symmetry. One of the two symmetry-related molecular twofold axes is crystallographically required.

The stereochemical consequence of only two Fe–Fe bonds in the molecule is a symmetrical deformation of the metal–sulfur cluster from a cubic T_d - $\overline{43}m$ configura-

⁽¹⁷⁾ J. F. Blount, "A Three-Dimensional Crystallographic Fourier Summation Program for the CDC 1604 Computer," Ph.D. Thesis (Appendix), University of Wisconsin, 1965.

⁽¹⁸⁾ P. W. Sutton, "A Block-Diagonal Least-Squares Program for the CDC 1604," University of Wisconsin, 1962.

⁽¹⁹⁾ W. R. Busing, K. O. Martin, and H. A. Levy, "ORFLS, A Fortran Crystallographic Least-Squares Program," ORNL-TM-305, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, 1962.

⁽²⁰⁾ L. H. Thomas and K. Umeda, J. Chem. Phys., 26, 293 (1957).

⁽²¹⁾ B. Dawson, Acta Cryst., 13, 403 (1960).
(22) J. Berghuis, IJ. M. Haanappel, M. Potters, B. O. Loopstra, C. H. MacGillavry, and A. L. Veenendaal, *ibid.*, 8, 478 (1955).

⁽²³⁾ W. R. Busing, K. O. Martin, and H. A. Levy, "ORFEE, A Fortran Crystallographic Function and Error Program," ORNL-TM-306, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, 1964.

⁽²⁴⁾ D. L. Smith, "A Least-Squares Plane Program for the CDC 1604 Computer," Ph.D. Thesis (Appendix IV), University of Wisconsin, 1962.

н	× 1	L FO	FC	н	ĸ	L FO	FG	н	к L	FO	FC	н	ĸ	L FI	FG	н	ĸ	L FO	FC	н	к	L	FO	FC
H ももちちちちらら7アアプタ8月99901233もちら71~ - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	K OBL33508133502RL332501521717461352441133577244135766113461243523527657700246R3357024R133500246	c 60 c 70 c 307 c 58 c 307 c 577 c 570 c 570 c 570 c 570 c 570 c 570<	$ \begin{array}{c} FC \\ FC \\ C \\$	H 100001111122222353333333444444444555556666667777778888899999100011111112222313417800011111122223333344444444444	K 02661350226121214611374813352244681357224681135722468113357224613355226113524612232246137700246133700224.	L 22	$ \begin{array}{c} FC \\ 75.67 \\ 75.67 \\ 75.67 \\ 75.67 \\ 86.75 \\ 82.4 $	H 5555566666777778888899900011122233344580001122223333445555566666777777778888899001112233440001111	K 133570224651337702461350026135226113261226833224668137224133572266133555555555555555555555555555555555	$ \begin{array}{c} F_{0} \\ 3_{0}, 8 \\ 9 \\ 9_{1}, 7 \\ , 7 \\ 9_{1}, 7 \\ , 9 \\ 9_{1}, 7 \\ , 7 \\ , 9 \\ , 9 \\ , 1 \\ , 7 \\ , 9 \\ , 9 \\ , 1 \\ , 7 \\ , 9 \\ , 9 \\ , 1 \\ , 7 \\ , 9 \\ , 9 \\ , 1 \\ , 1 \\ , $	$ \begin{array}{c} FC \\ +81.3 \\ -93.4 \\ -7.5 \\ -93.4 \\ -7.5 \\ -93.4 \\ -93$	H 2223333334444455555556666677778888899990011111122333460011112222233333334444445555566667789990001111111222678	K 22811335700268113357002266113022613508113502132026135224461133577224461337246132135241335724414	$ \begin{bmatrix} c \\ c$	$ \begin{array}{c} FG \\ 4 & 594 - 5 \\ 4 & 594 - 5 \\ 8 & 84 - 5 \\ 8 & 84 - 5 \\ 8 & 84 - 5 \\ 1 & 105 - 5 \\ -85 - 5 \\ 1 & 105 - 5 \\ -85 - 5 \\ 1 & 105 - 5 \\ -85 - 5 \\ -75 - 5 \\ -85 - 5 \\ -75 - 5 \\ -85 - 5 \\ -85 - 5 \\ -75 - 5 \\ -85 - 5 \\ -75 - 5 \\ -85 - 5 \\ -75 - 5 \\ -85 - 7 \\ -855 \\ $		K 281355002813355002811350283502611504813502120201241141413741134141524551245212420285026413002813550028133550028133550028113111111111111111111111111111111111	L FO 8 546 8 546 8 546 8 626 8 626 8 626 8 626 8 626 8 626 8 8.026 8 8.026 8 756 8 756 8 756 8 746 8 746 8 746 8 746 8 746 8 746 8 746 8 746 8 746 8 746 8 746 8 746 8 746 8 746 8 746 9 746 9 746 9 746 <td>$\begin{array}{c} F_{C} \\ F_{C}$</td> <td>H 7811444516800112334446678890112334446678889000121112451122334456667788890024556667788901122465788900245566677889011224657894901122465789490112246594200245566677889001245556667788900124555666778890011224659400024556894000024556667788900002455666778890000245566677889000024556667788900002455666778890000245566677889000024556667788900002455666778890000024556667788900000245566677889000002455666778890000024556667788900000000000000000000000000000000</td> <td>× 505152024112550045252045252520452525252525252525252</td> <td>$\begin{matrix} L \\ 100 \\$</td> <td>$\begin{array}{c} F_0 & , 9 \\ e \\ 57.6, 7, 3 \\ 57.6, 7, 3 \\ 57.6, 7, 3 \\ 57.6, 7, 3 \\ 57.6, 7, 3 \\ 57.6, 7, 3 \\ 57.6, 7, 3 \\ 57.6, 7, 3 \\ 57.6, 7, 3 \\ 57.6, 7, 3 \\ 57.6, 7, 3 \\ 57.6, 7, 3 \\ 57.6, 7, 3 \\ 57.6, 7, 3 \\ 57.6, 7, 3 \\ 57.6, 7, 3 \\ 57.6, 7, 4 \\ 65.6, 7, 3 \\ 57.6, 7, 4 \\ 65.6, 7, 2 \\ 57.6, 7, 4 \\ 65.6, 7, 2 \\ 57.6, 7, 4 \\ 65.6, 7, 2 \\ 57.6, 7, 4 \\ 65.6, 7, 2 \\ 57.6, 7, 4 \\ 65.6, 7, 2 \\ 57.6, 7, 4 \\ 65.6, 7, 2 \\ 57.6, 7, 4 \\ 65.6, 7, 2 \\ 57.6, 7, 4 \\ 65.6, 7, 2 \\ 57.6, 1 \\ 65.7, 7 \\ 57.6, 1 \\ 4 \\ 65.7, 7 \\ 57.6, 1 \\ 4 \\ 65.7, 7 \\ 57.5, 7 \\ 60.7, 2 \\ 57.5, 7 \\ 7 \\ 7 \\ 7 \\ 7 \\ 7 \\ 7 \\ 7 \\ 7 \\ 7$</td> <td>$\begin{array}{c} {} {\rm FC} & {\rm C} & {\rm c}^{-61.6} {\rm s}^{-6} {\rm c}^{-61.6} {\rm s}^{-6} {\rm c}^{-6} {\rm c}^{-6}$</td>	$ \begin{array}{c} F_{C} \\ F_{C} $	H 7811444516800112334446678890112334446678889000121112451122334456667788890024556667788901122465788900245566677889011224657894901122465789490112246594200245566677889001245556667788900124555666778890011224659400024556894000024556667788900002455666778890000245566677889000024556667788900002455666778890000245566677889000024556667788900002455666778890000024556667788900000245566677889000002455666778890000024556667788900000000000000000000000000000000	× 505152024112550045252045252520452525252525252525252	$ \begin{matrix} L \\ 100 \\ $	$ \begin{array}{c} F_0 & , 9 \\ e \\ 57.6, 7, 3 \\ 57.6, 7, 3 \\ 57.6, 7, 3 \\ 57.6, 7, 3 \\ 57.6, 7, 3 \\ 57.6, 7, 3 \\ 57.6, 7, 3 \\ 57.6, 7, 3 \\ 57.6, 7, 3 \\ 57.6, 7, 3 \\ 57.6, 7, 3 \\ 57.6, 7, 3 \\ 57.6, 7, 3 \\ 57.6, 7, 3 \\ 57.6, 7, 3 \\ 57.6, 7, 3 \\ 57.6, 7, 4 \\ 65.6, 7, 3 \\ 57.6, 7, 4 \\ 65.6, 7, 2 \\ 57.6, 7, 4 \\ 65.6, 7, 2 \\ 57.6, 7, 4 \\ 65.6, 7, 2 \\ 57.6, 7, 4 \\ 65.6, 7, 2 \\ 57.6, 7, 4 \\ 65.6, 7, 2 \\ 57.6, 7, 4 \\ 65.6, 7, 2 \\ 57.6, 7, 4 \\ 65.6, 7, 2 \\ 57.6, 7, 4 \\ 65.6, 7, 2 \\ 57.6, 1 \\ 65.7, 7 \\ 57.6, 1 \\ 4 \\ 65.7, 7 \\ 57.6, 1 \\ 4 \\ 65.7, 7 \\ 57.5, 7 \\ 60.7, 2 \\ 57.5, 7 \\ 7 \\ 7 \\ 7 \\ 7 \\ 7 \\ 7 \\ 7 \\ 7 \\ 7 $	$ \begin{array}{c} {} {\rm FC} & {\rm C} & {\rm c}^{-61.6} {\rm s}^{-6} {\rm c}^{-61.6} {\rm s}^{-6} {\rm c}^{-6} {\rm c}^{-6}$

TABLE II Opserved and Calculated Structure Factors

tion of *regular* interpenetrating concentric tetrahedra (based on *six* equivalent metal-metal bonds)²⁵ to one of reduced D_{2d} symmetry. The following geometric features are inherent in the Fe₄S₄ framework: (1) Two Fe-Fe bonds of length 2.650 \pm 0.006 A vs. four nonbonding Fe…Fe distances of average value 3.365 \pm 0.006 A and two larger nonbonding S···S distances of 3.334 ± 0.009 A vs. four smaller nonbonding S···S distances of average value 2.880 ± 0.007 A for the distorted tetrahedron of sulfur atoms. The resulting dihedral angle of the two Fe₂S₂ fragments at the bonding Fe–Fe edges is $142.3 \pm 0.4^{\circ}$ compared to the average dihedral angle of 161.0° (individual esd, 0.5°) for the other four Fe₂S₂ fragments along the nonbonding Fe-··Fe edges. (2) A shorter mean Fe-S bond length of 2.204 ± 0.004 A for these two identical Fe₂S₂ fragments containing the Fe-Fe bonds compared to the mean bond length of 2.250 ± 0.008 A for the four Fe-S bonds linking the two Fe₂S₂ fragments to each other. These Fe-S bond lengths compare favorably with the mean lengths for the chemically equivalent Fe-S bonds found

⁽²⁵⁾ The probable existence of a [CsHsCrS]4 tetramer with this symmetrical configuration of holohedral tetrahedral symmetry (Td) such that each chromium atom obtains a closed-shell electronic configuration is in accord with the announcement by Professor E. O. Fischer (Münich) at the Second International Symposium on Organometa'lic Chemistry (Madison, Wis, Aug 30-Sept 3, 1965) that this compound has been prepared. Allusion to this cyclopentadienylchromium sulfide complex was first made by Fischer and co-workers (E. O. Fischer, K. Ulm, and H. P. Fritz, Chem. Ber., 93, 2167 (1960)) in their paper describing the preparation and characterization of the corresponding oxide complex [CsHsCrO]4. Presumably this latter molecular complex also possesses the Td configuration.

I ABLE III
Molecular Bond Lengths (A)
with Standard Deviations ^a

.

		DEVINITION	5
Fe1-Fe2	2.650 (6)	Fe ₁ —C ₅	2.18 (2)
$Fe_1 \cdots Fe_1'$	3.355 (16)	C6	2.12 (2)
$Fe_1 \cdots Fe_2'$	3.362 (9)	C7	2.09 (3)
$Fe_2 \cdots Fe_2'$	3,372 (9)	-Cs	2.12 (2)
		C9	2.15 (3)
	3.365 (6) (wtd av)	Fe2-C10	2.12(2)
0 0.	2 224 (0)	C11	2.10 (2)
5854	3,334 (9)	C_{12}	2.20(2)
$S_8 \cdot \cdot \cdot S_8'$	2,883 (14)	C13	2.20 (2)
Sa · · · S4'	2.874 (10)	C14	2.10 (3)
$s_4 \cdots s_4'$	2.891 (16)		2.14 (1) (wtd av)
	2.880 (7) (wtd av)	C5C6	1.49 (3)
Fer-Ss	2.201(9)	C6-C7	1.42 (3)
Fei-S4	2,202 (8)	C7C8	1.47 (3)
Fer53	2,198 (8)	C8C9	1.40 (3)
Fee-S	2 215 (9)	C9-C3	1.48 (3)
102 04		C10C11	1.45(3)
	2.204 (4) (wtd av)	C_{11} C_{12}	1.43 (3)
		C12-C13	1.44 (3)
Fe₁—S³′	2.248 (10)	C18-C14	1,41 (3)
Fe2	2.252(11)	C14-C10	1.48 (3)
	2.250 (8) (wtd av)		1.45 (1) (wtd av)

^{*a*} Standard deviations of last significant figures are given in parentheses.

TABLE IV

Bond	Angles (deg) with	Standard I	Deviations ^a
S3-Fe1-S4 S3-Fe2-S4	98.4 (3) 98.1 (2) 98.2 (2) (wtd av)	Fe ₁ -S ₃ -S ₄ ' Fe ₁ -S ₄ -S ₄ ' Fe ₂ -S ₃ -S ₃ ' Fe ₂ -S ₄ -S ₅ '	93.5 (3) 93.1 (2) 93.5 (2) 93.3 (3)
$S_3-Fe_1-S_3'$ $S_3-Fe_2-S_4'$ $S_4-Fe_1-S_3'$ $S_4-Fe_2-S_4'$	80.8 (4) 80.5 (3) 80.5 (2) 80.6 (3) 	S3-S3'-S4 S4-S4'-S3	93.3 (2) (wtd av) 70.8 (2) 70.7 (3) 70.8 (2) (wtd av)
$S_{3}'-Fe_{1}-Fe_{2}$ $S_{4}'-Fe_{2}-Fe_{1}$ $S_{3}-Fe_{1}-Fe_{2}$ $S_{4}-Fe_{1}-Fe_{2}$ $S_{5}-Fe_{2}-Fe_{1}$ $S_{4}-Fe_{2}-Fe_{1}$	98.8 (3) 98.6 (3) 98.7 (2) (wtd av) 52.9 (2) 53.4 (2) 53.0 (2) 52.9 (2)	$C_8-C_6-C_7$ $C_6-C_7-C_8$ $C_7-C_8-C_9$ $C_8-C_9-C_6$ $C_9-C_8-C_6$ $C_{10}-C_{11}-C_{12}$ $C_{11}-C_{12}-C_{13}$ $C_{12}-C_{18}-C_{14}$ $C_{18}-C_{16}-C_{10}$ $C_{14}-C_{10}-C_{11}$	$109.4 (2.1) 107.8 (2.3) 108.3 (2.1) 110.4 (2.2) 104.1 (2.0) 108.9 (2.1) 110.0 (2.1) 105.3 (2.0) 112.3 (2.1) 103.3 (2.1) 103.3 (2.1) 103.3 (2.1) 103.3 (2.1) 103.3 (2.1) 103.3 (2.1) 103.3 (2.1) 103.3 (2.1) 103.3 (2.1) 103.3 (2.1) 103.3 (2.1) 103.3 (2.1) 103.3 (2.1) 103.3 (2.1) 103.3 (2.1) 103.3 (2.1) 103.3 (2.1) 103.3 (2.1) 105.3 \\105.3 \\105.3 \\105.3 \\105.3 \\105.3 \\105.3 \\105.3 \\105.3 \\105.3 $
$Fe_1-S_5-Fe_2$ $Fe_1-S_4-Fe_2$ $Fe_1-S_5-Fe_1'$ $Fe_1-S_5-Fe_2'$ $Fe_2-S_5-Fe_1'$	53.0 (1) (wtd av) 74.1 (2) 73.7 (2) 73.9 (2) (wtd av) 97.9 (4) 98.0 (3) 98.2 (3)		108.0 (8) (wtd av)
Fe2-S3-Fe1' Fe2-S4-Fe2'	98.2 (3) 98.0 (3)		

98.0 (2) (wtd av)

^a Standard deviations of last significant figures are given in parentheses.

in $[C_2H_5SFe(CO)_3]_2$ (2.26 A),²⁶ $[C_2H_5SFe(NO)_2]_2$ (2.27 A),²⁷ CsFe₄S₃(NO)₇·H₂O (2.25 and 2.20 A),²³ [SFe-(CO)₃]₂ (2.23 A),¹⁰ and $[S_2Fe_3(CO)_3][S_2Fe_2(CO)_6]$ (2.23 and 2.22 A).¹¹ (3) A larger average S–Fe–S angle of 98.2 ± 0.2° and a smaller average Fe–S–Fe angle of 73.9 ± 0.2° for the two identical Fe₂S₂ fragments compared to the average value of 80.6 ± 0.3° for the other S–Fe–S angles and the average value of 98.0 ± 0.2°

(26) L. F. Dahl and C. H. Wei, Inorg. Chem., 2, 328 (1963).

(27 J. T. Thomas, J. H. Robertson, and E. G. Cox, Acta Cryst., 11, 599 (1958).

TABLE V

Equation of Molecular Plane and Distances (A) of Atoms from These Planes^ $\$

(a)	Plane thro	ugh Fe ₁ , F	e2, and Midg	ooint of F	$e_1' - Fe_2'$
	0.318X -	-0.708Y -	-0.631Z +	1.345 =	0
S_3'	0.002	C۹	0.30	C_{12}	-0.29
S_4'	-0.006	Cs	1.26	C11	1.02
S_3	-1.662	C ₈	-1.01	C13	-1.28
S_4	1.672	Ce	0.40	C_{10}	0.91
	1	C ₇	-0.96	C_{14}	-0.55
(b)	Plane thre	ough Fe1'.	Fe ₂ ' and Mic	lpoint of	Fe1-Fe2
	0.318X -	+ 0.708Y -	-0.631Z -	2.047 =	0
S ₃	-0.002	C,	1.75	C12	-1.75
S_4	0.006	C ₈	2.06	C ₁₃	-2.46
S3'	1.662	C_7	3.07	C14	-3.29
S₄′	-1.672	C	3.37	Cia	-3.13
		C ₅	2.54	C ₁₁	-2.09
	(c) Play	ne through	C5. C6. C7. C	C_{s} , and C_{s}	•
	-0.398X	+ 0.532Y	- 0.748Z -	+ 0.977	= 0
C ₅	-0.00	C ₇	-0.00	C,	0.00
C ₆	0.00	C ₈	0.00	Fe_1	-1.74
	(d) Plane	e through (C ₁₀ , C ₁₁ , C ₁₂ ,	C_{13} , and (C14
	0.842X -	+ 0.524 Y	-0.130Z -	3.987 =	= 0
C10	-0.02	C12	-0.20	C_{14}	0.01
C_{11}	0.03	C ₁₃	0.01	Fe_2	1.75
	(e)	Plane thro	ough S₃, S₃′,	and S ₄	
	-0.407X	+ 0.500 Y	-0.764Z	+ 4.259	= 0
C₅	3.11	Fe_1	1.33		
C ₆	3.07	Fe_2	-0.53		
C7	3.03	S_4'	-2.35		
C ₈	3.06	$\mathrm{Fe_1}'$	-1.57	· 1	
C,	3.11	Fe_{2}'	-1.58		
	(f) -	Plane thro	ough S3, S4, a	and S₄'	
	0.858X -	+ 0.499Y	-0.121Z -	- 7.186 =	= 0
C10	-3.08	Fe_2	-1.34		
C11	-3.07	Fe_1	0.53		
C12	-3.16	S_3'	2.35	,	
C18	-3.11	Fe_1'	1.58		

^a The equation of each plane is expressed in orthogonal coordinates X, Y, and Z, which are related to the monoclinic cell coordinates by the transformation $X = ax + cz \cos \beta$, Y = by, and $Z = cz \sin \beta$.

for the other Fe–S–Fe angles. Hence, the Fe–Fe bonds in the two identical Fe₂S₂ fragments are responsible for the resulting molecular geometry with the sharp Fe–S–Fe bridge angles of 74° (av). Similar remarkably acute Fe–S–Fe angles for the symmetrical electron-pair bridge bonds in $[C_2H_5SFe(CO)_3]_2$ (68° (av)),²⁶ $[C_2H_5SFe(NO)_2]_2$ (74°),²⁷ CsFe₄S₃(NO)₇·-H₂O (75° (av)),²⁸ $[SFe(CO)_3]_2$ (70° (av)),¹⁰ $[S_2Fe_3$ (CO)₉][S₂Fe₂(CO)₆] (71° (av) and 70°)¹¹ also are the result of strong Fe–Fe bonds which in these complexes vary in average length from 2.55 to 2.72 A.

The equivalence both the carbon-carbon bond lengths in the cyclopentadienyl rings and of the (cyclopentadienyl carbon)-iron distances within their standard deviations (Table III) is consistent with a uniform delocalized bonding of each ring with its iron atom. The least-squares plane through each of the cyclopentadienyl rings (Table V, (c) and (d)) show that the ring atoms do not deviate significantly from coplanarity. No evidence of unusual cyclopentadienyl ring libration

⁽²⁸⁾ G. Johansson and W. N. Lipscomb, ibid., 11, 594 (1958).

(C)





Figure 2.—Projections of the molecule down the three orthogonal symmetry directions corresponding to the tetragonal point group D_{d2} (based on cylindrical symmetry for the cyclopentadienyl rings). The direction of the *crystallographic* twofold axis is indicated for each of the three views. (a) Projection down the principal molecular S_4 - $\overline{4}$ axis which contains two vertical σ_d mirror planes at right angles to each other. (b) Projection down one of the two symmetry-related molecular C_2 -2 axes. (c) Projection down the other symmetry-related molecular C_2 -2 axis which is crystallographically required.

is indicated from the three-dimensional Fourier and electron-density difference maps or from the isotropic atomic thermal parameters listed in Table I. The perpendicular distances from the iron atoms to the mean plane of their cyclopentadienyl carbon rings (Table V, (c) and (d)) are 1.74, and 1.75 A; the average value of 1.75 A is similar to the corresponding perpendicular Fe-(cyclopentadienyl ring) distance in $[C_5H_5Fe(CO)_2]_2$ (1.74 A)²⁹ $(C_6H_5C_2CO_2CH_3)_3COFe(CO)_2$ (1.71 A)³⁰ and $[C_5H_4CH_2Fe(CO)_4]Fe(CO)_2$ (1.67 A),³¹ but appears significantly longer than the corresponding perpendicular distance in ferrocene (1.66 A),³² dibenzoylferrocene (1.66 A),³³ a-keto-1,1'-trimethyleneferrocene (1.64 A),³⁴ and 1,1'-tetramethyleneferrocene (1.64 A).³⁵ These differences may be interpreted in terms of a weaker (cyclopentadienyl ring)-iron interaction for complexes with only one cyclopentadienyl ring coordinated to an iron compared to that for complexes with two cyclopentadienyl rings bonded to an iron.

The packing of the four molecules in the unit cell as viewed along the *b* axis is shown in Figure 3. The short-(29) O. S. Mills, *Acta Cyrst.*, **11**, 620 (1958).

(a) L. F. Dahl, R. J. Doedens, W. Hübel, and J. Nielsen, J. Am. Chem.
 Soc. 88, 446 (1966).

- (31) J. Meunier-Piret, P. Piret, and M. Van Meerssche, Acta Cryst., 19, 85 (1965).
- (32) J. D. Dunitz, L. E. Orgel, and A. Rich, *ibid.*, 9, 373 (1956).

(33) Y. T. Struchkov, and T. L. Khotosyanova, Kristallografia, 2, 382 (1957).

(34) N. D. Jones, R. F. Marsh, and J. H. Richards, Acta Cryst., 19, 330 (1965).

(35) M. B. Laing and K. N. Trueblood, ibid., 19, 373 (1965).



Figure 3.—Molecular packing in the unit cell viewed down the [010] direction.

est intermolecular C···C distances of 3.6 A and C···S distances of 3.8 A do not indicate any abnormal CH···HC and CH···S interactions other than the usual van der Waals forces.

The coordination about each of the two crystallographically independent iron atoms projected down a line perpendicular to its cyclopentadienyl ring is given in Figure 4. It is noteworthy that for each iron atom the ring of cyclopentadienyl carbon atoms is parallel within $2^{\circ} \pm 10'$ to the plane through the three sulfur ligands (Table V, (e) and (f)). The localized environment of the one cyclopentadienyl ring, one iron, and three sulfur ligands about each iron atom is not unlike that observed for each metal atom in $[C_5H_5Mo(CO_3)]_{2}$,³⁶ $C_5H_5Nb(CO)_4$ ³⁷ and $[(C_5H_5)_2Mo_2H\{P(CH_3)_2\}(CO)_4]$.³⁸ However, a symmetrical distortion in $[C_5H_5FeS]_4$ due to the coordination of the iron ligand to two of the three sulfur ligands results in two sets of ligand-metal-ligand angles of 80.6° (av) and 53.1° (av) (see Figure 4) rather than the corresponding angles of approximately 76° found for the four nonbonding ligands in each of the above-mentioned complexes. With the assumption that the cyclopentadienyl groups occupy three coordination sites, the bonding of these complexes has been interpreted in terms of a seven-coordinated metal.^{37, 38} The three normally σ -type metal orbitals directed toward the metal-coordinated cyclopentadienyl ring can be delocalized under assumed C3v local symmetry into one

(37) H. W. Baird and L. F. Dahl, to be published.

⁽³⁶⁾ F. C. Wilson and D. P. Shoemaker, J. Chem. Phys., 27, 809 (1957).

⁽³⁸⁾ R. J. Doedens and L. F. Dahl, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 87, 2576 (1965).



Figure 4.—Localized environment about each of the two crystallographically independent iron atoms of $[C_bH_bFeS]_4$ projected along the normal of the cyclopentadienyl ring. The essentially identical orientation of the cyclopentadienyl ring relative to the other iron and three sulfur ligands is shown for both Fe₁ and Fe₂. The close conformity of the molecular parameters for the iron-sulfur framework to the vertical σ_d mirror plane is seen.

orbital of a_1 symmetry and one pair of e symmetry which interact by direct overlap with the appropriate orbitals of equivalent symmetry belonging to the cyclopentadienyl ring. Under this simplified perfect-pairing bonding description the resulting *bonding* MO's contain the three pairs of electrons.

Since submission of our paper, we have received a preprint from Drs. R. A. Schunn, C. J. Fritchie, Jr., and C. T. Prewitt [Inorg. Chem., 5, 892 (1966)] on the crystal structure of another crystal modification of $[C_5H_5FeS]_4$. We are indebted to them for making their results available to us prior to publication in order to allow a detailed comparison of their structure of the orthorhombic phase with our structure of the monoclinic phase. Schunn, Fritchie, and Prewitt isolated and characterized by X-ray diffraction both the monoclinic and orthorhombic phases of [C₅H₅FeS]₄, but they carried out a complete structural analysis of only the orthorhombic phase. We isolated and characterized by a complete structure determination only the monoclinic phase. A comparison of their monoclinic crystal data with ours shows all three corresponding lattice lengths and the β angle to agree very well within 0.5 of our estimated uncertainties.

A comparison of the two sets of molecular parameters is informative. Although the molecular packing is different for the two phases, the corresponding bond lengths are amazingly similar, as can be seen from the tabulation of the "best values" of these parameters based on D_{zd} - $\overline{4}2m$ symmetry in which each cyclopentadienyl ring is assumed to possess cylindrical symmetry (Table VI). In the monoclinic crystal modification one of the two symmetry-related molecular twofold axes is

	Table VI	
	Bond Lengths	(A)
	Monoclinic phase	Orthorhombic phase
FeFe	2.650 ± 0.006	2.618 ± 0.002 2.644 ± 0.002 2.631 (av)
Fe–S	2.204 ± 0.004	2.206 ± 0.002 2.256 ± 0.003
$Fe-C_{\delta}F_{\delta}$ (ring center)	1.74 and 1.75	1.757 ± 0.005

crystallographically required, while in the orthorhombic crystal form one of the two vertical σ_d mirror planes is crystallographically demanded. The significant deviation of the two cyclopentadienyl carbon atoms of the two crystallographically independent rings from an idealized vertical mirror plane in the monoclinic phase of $[C_5H_6FeS]_4$ is indicated in Figures 2 (a) and 4. In contrast, each molecule of the orthorhombic phase has two cyclopentadienyl rings bisected by a mirror plane of Pnam with the other two rings being mirror images of each other.

The excellent agreement of the molecular parameters for the two phases indicates that "good" photographic data can yield under proper treatment significant structural results which compare favorably with the generally more precise results obtained from "good" counter data.

Acknowledgments.—We are grateful to the Air Force Office of Air Research and Development Command for their generous financial support of this research. We also are pleased to acknowledge the partial support of NSF and WARF made by the University Research Committee for the use of the CDC 3600 and 1604 computers at the University of Wisconsin Computing Center.