	ROOT-MEAN-SQUARE	AMPLITUDES OF VIB	RATION $(A)^a$
Aton	. Minimum	Intermediate	Maximum
Re	0.206(2)	0.251(2)	0.263(1)
$C1_1$	0.217(7)	0.294(7)	0.336(6)
Cl_2	0.254(7)	0.267(6)	0.310(6)
\mathbf{P}_1	0.215(7)	0.241(8)	0.291(7)
P_2	0.208(8)	0.224(7)	0.254(7)
P_3	0.207(8)	0.249(7)	0.270(7)

TABLE VI

 a Figure 2 provides an indication of the directions of these principal axes of vibration.

group phenyl atoms seem reasonable; there is the general trend that vibration is least for the C_1 atoms attached to P and greatest for the C_4 atoms *trans* to C_1 . Similarly, the α -carbon atoms of the ethyl groups are vibrating less than the β -carbon atoms. In short, it appears that this particular data set is free enough from systematic errors so that the information on thermal motions derived from it has some elements of truth.

The derived bond distances may be "corrected" for the effects of thermal motion under various assumptions.²⁹ Perhaps the most reasonable assumption to

(29) W. R. Busing and H. A. Levy, Acta Cryst., 17, 142 (1964).

make in the present case is that the lighter atoms are riding on the Re atom. The corrections for thermal motion are then rather small. For example, the Re-N bond distance becomes 1.782 A. This small decrease (0.006 A) occurs because the amplitude of vibration of the N atom normal to the Re-N bond is less than that of Re. It is important to keep in mind that generally the errors of assumption in the thermal model exceed the precision with which the bond distances have been determined. Thus great care must be exercised in discussing apparent, small differences in bond distances, especially in those determinations where the thermal motions of the atoms are poorly defined owing to residual systematic errors in the data.

Acknowledgments.—We are indebted to Professor J. Chatt and Miss R. J. Paske for supplying the crystals and for useful discussions. We have also enjoyed useful discussions with our colleagues, especially with Professors F. Basolo and R. G. Pearson. Dr. T. C. Furnas, Jr., has been of considerable assistance to us in problems related to the Picker diffractometer. The support of the National Institutes of Health, GM-12985, is gratefully acknowledged.

CONTRIBUTION FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY, NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY, EVANSTON, ILLINOIS 60201

Studies of Metal-Nitrogen Multiple Bonds. II. The Crystal and Molecular Structure of Nitridodichlorobis(triphenylphosphine)rhenium(V), $ReNCl_2(P(C_6H_5)_3)_2$

BY ROBERT J. DOEDENS AND JAMES A. IBERS

Received August 22, 1966

The crystal and molecular structure of nitridodichlorobis(triphenylphosphine)rhenium(V), ReNCl₂(P($C_{\delta}H_{\delta}$)₃)₂, has been determined from three-dimensional X-ray data collected by counter methods. The structure has been refined by least-squares techniques down to a final *R* factor of 4.8% on *F*. The material crystallizes in space group C_{2h}⁶-I2/a of the monoclinic system, with four molecules in a cell of dimensions a = 15.71, b = 9.53, c = 22.17 A; $\beta = 103^{\circ} 26'$. The crystal structure is made up of well-separated monomeric molecular units. Twofold crystallographic symmetry is imposed on the molecule. The inner coordination about Re is distorted from both idealized five-coordinate geometries: the trigonal bipyramid and the tetragonal pyramid. Roughly the structure may be described as a distorted tetragonal pyramid, with N at the apex and with the P atoms moved out of the basal plane of the Cl atoms toward the Re. The Re–Cl, Re–P, and Re–N distances are 2.377 \pm 0.002, 2.448 \pm 0.002, and 1.603 \pm 0.009 A. Although the Re–Cl and Re–N distances differ markedly from those found in the closely related six-coordinated Re(V) complex, ReNCl₂(P(C₂H₅)₂C₆H₆)₈, the nonbonded interligand distances in the two compounds are very similar.

Introduction

This paper describes the crystal and molecular structure of nitridodichlorobis(triphenylphosphine)rhenium-(V), ReNCl₂(P(C₆H₅)₃)₂. This study is part of a series on the structures of complexes containing metalnitrogen multiple bonds and it was undertaken for two interrelated reasons. First, the compound may be thought of as derived from ReNCl₂(PR₃)₃, in which the Re is six-coordinated, by removal of one PR₃ ligand with no resultant change in the formal oxidation state of Re (Re(V)). It seemed to us to be of obvious interest to carry out accurate structure determinations on both the six- and five-coordinated complexes in order that useful information on the relations of six- and five-coordination might be obtained. The first paper in this series¹ described the structure of ReNCl₂(P(C₂H₅)₂-C₆H₅)₃. Second, five-coordinate transition metal complexes are of interest in themselves, since no consistent

(1) P. W. R. Corfield, R. J. Doedens, and J. A. Ibers, Inorg. Chem., 6, 197 (1967).

set of rules exists that allows one to predict which, if either, idealized geometry (trigonal bipyramidal or tetragonal pyramidal) will obtain in a given case.^{2,3} Obviously, reliable experimental information on fivecoordination is needed before much advance can be made on the theoretical side.

Collection and Reduction of the Intensity Data

Crystals of $ReNCl_2(P(C_6H_5)_3)_2$ were prepared by Miss R. J. Paske in the manner described by Chatt, et al.,4 and were kindly supplied by Professor J. Chatt. Optical and X-ray examination of the small, wellformed orange crystals confirmed the monoclinic symmetry and lattice constants reported by Chatt, et al.4 The lattice constants and standard deviations obtained by a least-squares refinement of the setting angles of 13 reflections which had been carefully centered on a Picker four-circle automatic X-ray diffractometer are: $a = 15.712 \pm 0.005, b = 9.531 \pm 0.004, c = 22.168 \pm$ 0.009 A; $\beta = 103^{\circ} 26' \pm 1' (t \ 28^{\circ}; \lambda(Cu \ K\alpha_1) \ 1.5405)$ A). The extinctions observed on Weissenberg and precession photographs were hkl absent for h + k + lodd and h0l absent for h odd. These extinctions, which are those previously reported,⁴ are consistent with either of the space groups C_{2h}^{6} -I2/a or C_{s}^{4} -Ia. The density of 1.65 g/cm³ calculated for four molecules in the unit cell agrees satisfactorily with the reported⁴ density of 1.63 g/cm^3 . Thus if the space group is the centrosymmetric one, 12/a, then twofold molecular symmetry is imposed; if the space group is the noncentrosymmetric one, Ia, then no crystallographic symmetry need be imposed on the molecule.

The experimental and computational procedures used in data collection and processing parallel those described previously,1 and only the differences will be emphasized. No crystal could be found that was large enough to be ground into a suitable sphere. The crystal used for gathering intensity data was a small plate of approximate dimensions $0.13 \times 0.11 \times 0.05$ mm. In preparation for an absorption correction of the intensity data, the selected crystal was carefully measured by means of a micrometer eyepiece and the eight crystal faces were identified with the aid of an optical goniometer. The crystal was attached to the end of a small glass fiber and was then mounted roughly along a^* on the Picker diffractometer. Since the crystal was not oriented about a symmetry direction, the effects of multiple reflections were minimized.⁵ The cell parameters and orientation angles were determined from a least-squares refinement of observations on a series of centered reflections in the manner previously described.¹ The small size and low mosaicity of the crystal were indicated by an average half-width of 0.06° on ω scans through several strong reflections by the narrow-source, open-counter technique.⁶

(2) J. A. Ibers, Ann. Rev. Phys. Chem., 16, 375 (1965).

(3) E. L. Muetterties and R. A. Schunn, *Quart Rev.* (London), **20**, 245 (1966).

(4) J. Chatt, J. D. Garforth, N. P. Johnson, and G. A. Rowe, J. Chem. Soc., 1012 (1964).

(5) W. H. Zachariasen, Acta Cryst., 18, 705 (1965).

(6) T. C. Furnas, Jr., "Single Crystal Orienter Instruction Manual," General Electric Co., Milwaukee, Wis., 1957. For reasons indicated earlier¹ Cu K α radiation was employed in the data collection. The diffracted beams were filtered through 1.0-mil Ni foil. The intensities were collected by the θ -2 θ scan technique at a take-off angle of 0.8°. At this take-off angle the peak intensity of a typical reflection was about 75% of its maximum value as a function of take-off angle. A symmetric scan range of 1.4° in 2 θ was found to be sufficient for all reflections. Stationary-crystal, stationary-counter background counts of 10 sec were taken at each end of the scan. The scan rate was 1.0°/min. A counter aperture 3.5 mm high by 5.0 mm wide was used, and the aperture was placed 21 cm from the crystal.

Intensity data were collected from all possible forms of this monoclinic crystal $(hkl, \bar{h}k\bar{l}, h\bar{k}l, and \bar{h}k\bar{l})$ up to $\theta(\operatorname{Cu} K \alpha_1) \leq 54^\circ$. Past this point, very few intensities were above background under the conditions of data collection just described. A total of 7169 intensities were collected. The data were processed in the manner described earlier¹ with the following exceptions. After initial correction for background, and estimation of the standard deviation $\sigma(I)$ of the corrected intensity Ifrom the formula

 $\sigma(I) = [CT + 0.25(t_{\rm c}/t_{\rm b})^2(B_1 + B_2) + (pI)^2]^{1/2}$

where CT is the total integrated peak count obtained in a scan of time t_0 , B_1 and B_2 are the background counts, each obtained in time $t_{\rm b}$, and I = CT - 0.5. $(t_c/t_b)(B_1 + B_2)$, and p = 0.03, the intensities were corrected for Lorentz-polarization factors, and then for absorption. The absorption correction was carried out by numerical methods using our version of the program GON09, originally written by W. C. Hamilton. With the use of a calculated absorption coefficient of 101.1 cm^{-1} the corresponding transmission factors ranged from 1.6 to 2.7. This again emphasizes that even with very small crystals (ours had a computed volume of 0.00049 mm⁸ corresponding to a weight of 0.8 μg) absorption corrections can be very important, especially if one wishes to achieve high accuracy in the description of the structure.

The anomalous scattering of Cu K α radiation by Re (and even by P and Cl) cannot be ignored at the level of precision with which intensity data can be obtained by counter methods. In the presence of such anomalous scattering, Friedel's law, which states that F^2 $(hkl) = F^2(h\bar{k}\bar{l})$ (F being the structure amplitude), breaks down if the space group is not centrosymmetric. Thus before the possibly equivalent F^2 values can be averaged, it is necessary to know which space group, I2/a or Ia, is the correct one. It may not be commonly realized that, in principle, the point group can be determined from the manner in which Friedel's law breaks down. Table I details this for the monoclinic system. In our case we wish to distinguish point group m (Ia) from point group 2/m (I2/a), and the absorption-corrected data, now corresponding to F^2 values, were examined to see if there were systematic variations among possibly equivalent forms that would correspond to point group m; *i.e.*, $F^2(hkl) \neq F^2(\bar{h}k\bar{l})$.

No systematic variations could be detected. This, together with our failure to observe a piezoelectric effect, suggested that the correct space group is the centrosymmetric one, 12/a. As a final check on this, a Patterson function was calculated from the inner reflections and it too provided support for I2/a. Consequently, the four forms were averaged together and standard deviations were assigned in the manner described earlier.¹ Of the 1966 independent F^2 values thus obtained, 170 were less than one standard deviation above background. The weighted R factor, R_2 , on F^2 is defined as $R_2 = (\Sigma w (F_o^2 - F_c^2)^2 / \Sigma w F_o^4)^{1/2}$. If it is assumed that $\sigma(F^2)$ is a measure of $|F_0{}^2 - F_c{}^2|$, then one may, prior to the solution of the structure, compute an R_2 value from the F^2 and $\sigma(F^2)$ values; in our case we calculate R_2 to be 4.0%. If the range estimates of standard deviations do not exceed the individual estimates¹ and if the effects of counting statistics on $\sigma(F^2)$ are negligible, then the predicted value of R_2 should be 100p (3.0% in our case). An initial estimate of R_2 serves the useful function of preventing overrefinement of the data; in principle, the final value of R_2 , as computed from the agreement of F_0^2 with the F_c^2 values from the final structure, should not be less than the initial value.

TABLE I

Point Group Determination from Failure of Friedel's Law (Monoclinic System, b Axis Unique)

Point	
group	
2	$F^{2}(hkl) = F^{2}(\bar{h}k\bar{l}); F^{2}(h\bar{k}l) = F^{2}(\bar{h}\bar{k}\bar{l}); F^{2}(hkl) \neq F^{2}(h\bar{k}l)$
m	$F^{2}(hkl) = F^{2}(h\bar{k}l); F^{2}(\bar{h}k^{l}) = F^{2}(\bar{h}k\bar{l}); F^{2}(hkl) \neq F^{2}(\bar{h}k\bar{l})$
2/m	$F^{2}(hkl) = F^{2}(\bar{h}\bar{k}\bar{l}) = F^{2}(h\bar{k}\bar{l}) = F^{2}(\bar{h}k\bar{l})$

Solution and Refinement of the Structure

The coordinates of the rhenium and one other atom (later shown to be a chlorine) were found from a threedimensional Patterson function,7 and two successive difference Fourier syntheses, with intermediate leastsquares refinements, yielded the coordinates of the remaining nonhydrogen atoms. The Re and N atoms occupy the special fourfold positions of I2/a: (0, 0, 0; $\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2} \pm (\frac{1}{4}, y, 0)$; the remaining atoms are in the general eightfold positions: $(0, 0, 0; \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}) \pm (x, y, y)$ z; 1/2 - x, y, \bar{z}). Calculation of structure factors based on these trial coordinates yielded discrepancy factors $R_1 =$ $\Sigma ||F_{\rm c}| - |F_{\rm c}|| / \Sigma |F_{\rm o}|$ and $R_2 = (\Sigma w (|F_{\rm o}| - |F_{\rm c}|)^2 / \Sigma w F_{\rm o}^2)^{1/2}$ of 24.0 and 25.6%, respectively, where the weights w were taken as $4F^2/\sigma^2(F^2)$. In all calculations of F_c , the atomic scattering factors tabulated by Ibers8 were used for P, Cl, C, N, and H, and those of Cromer and Waber⁹ were used for Re. The effects of anomalous dispersion were included in F_c ;¹⁰ the values of f' and f'' for Re, Cl, and P were those given by Cromer.¹¹

Initial refinements were carried out on F, rather than F^2 . After three cycles of isotropic least-squares refinement the values of R_1 and R_2 were 5.4 and 5.7%. A difference Fourier computed at this point showed evidence of anisotropic motion of the heavier atoms, although the maximum peak height of $1.4 \text{ e}^{-}/\text{A}^3$ indicated that the degree of anisotropy was not great. Although the peaks due to hydrogen atoms by no means dominated the map, the calculated positions of the 15 phenyl hydrogen atoms all lay on or near positive peaks ranging in height from 0.5 to 0.8 e⁻/A³.

Least-squares refinements were continued with the phenyl rings treated as rigid groups, use being made of the group-refinement program NUGLS.¹ Comparison of the weighted R factor of 5.9% obtained after the initial group refinement employing isotropic thermal parameters with that of 5.7% obtained in the unrestricted refinement indicates¹² that the unrestricted refinement is better than the group refinement at the 0.5% significance level. This statistical test is based on the premise that there are only random errors in the data. Again¹ it seems to us more reasonable to conclude that there are residual systematic errors in the data that invalidate the statistical test, rather than to conclude that the phenyl rings are significantly distorted. In two further cycles of group least-squares refinement, anisotropic thermal parameters were assigned to the Re, Cl, and P atoms. In agreement with the modest degree of anisotropy deduced from the difference map, the R factors dropped only slightly to 5.2 and 5.8%. An additional cycle in which the hydrogen atoms (C-H = 1.08 A) were included as fixed atoms lowered the R factors to 4.8 and 4.9%.

For the reasons outlined in the previous paper,¹ a final cycle of least-squares refinement was based on F^2 ; that is, the function $\Sigma w(F_o{}^2 - F_c{}^2)^2$ was minimized, where the weights w were taken as $1/\sigma^2(F^2)$. In this final cycle the parameter shifts were small, with 12 parameters shifting by amounts greater than their standard deviations, the highest shift being 1.9σ . The final values of R_1 and R_2 (based on F^2) were 7.8 and 9.7%. These parameters (Table II) lead to a value of R_1 (based on F) of 4.8%. The estimated standard deviation of an observation of unit weight is 1.37, indicating that the standard deviations of the intensity data were underestimated only slightly. A difference map based on the final parameters contains no peaks higher than $1.4 \text{ e}^-/\text{A}^3$.

Comparison of the final values of F_{\circ} and F_{\circ} did not suggest that a correction for secondary extinction was needed.

The positional, thermal, and group parameters derived from the last cycle of least-squares refinement on F^2 are presented in Table II, along with the corresponding standard deviations in these parameters as derived from the inverse matrix. The corresponding positional parameters of the group carbon atoms arepresented in Table III. The final values of $10F_0$ and $10F_0$ (in electrons) are given in Table IV.

⁽⁷⁾ In addition to our various local programs for the CDC 3400, the programs used in this work were local modifications of Zalkin's FORDAP Fourier program and of the Busing-Levy ORFFE error function program.

⁽⁸⁾ J. A. Ibers, "International Tables for X-Ray Crystallography," Vol. 3, The Kynoch Press, Birmingham, England, 1962, Table 3.3.1A.
(9) D. T. Cromer and J. T. Waber, Acta Cryst., 18, 104 (1965).

⁽¹⁰⁾ J. A. Ibers and W. C. Hamilton, *ibid.*, **17**, 781 (1964).

⁽¹¹⁾ D. T. Cromer, ibid., 18, 17 (1965).

⁽¹²⁾ W. C. Hamilton, ibid., 18, 502 (1965).

1	ABLE	11	

Positional, Thermal, and Group Parameters for $ReNCl_2(P(C_6H_5)_3)_2$

Atom	x	У	z	β_{11}^a or B , A	λ ² β ₂₂		β83	β_{12}		$oldsymbol{eta}_{18}$		β23
Re	0.25	$0.26567(5)^{b}$	0.0	0.002551(2	6) 0.006471	(74) 0.001	226(14)	0.0		0.000361 (14)	0.0	
Cl	0.14683 (15)	0.34962 (23)	0.05463(10)	0.00360 (11) 0.01114 (30) 0.001	76 (6)	0.0016	5 (16)	0.00069 (6)	-0.00	014(11)
Р	0.36453 (14)	0.30334(22)	0.09443(10)	0.00273 (10	0.00686 (27) 0.001	43(5)	-0.0002	6 (14)	0.00042(6)	0.00	026(10)
N	0.25	0.09756(96)	0.0	2.8(2)								
Grou	p x₀°	Уc	z _c	δ	e	η	B_1 , A^2	B_{2}, A^{2}	<i>B</i> ₃, A	. ² B ₄ , A ²	B_5 , A^2	B_{6}, A^{2}
Ring 1	0.3413 (3)	0.1361 (4)	0.2156 (2)	1.911 (4)	-0.306(3)	-2.030(4)	2.8(2)	2.8(2)	3.8(2)) 4.5(2)	5.4(3)	4.9(2)
Ring 2	2 0.5546 (3)	0.1955(4)	0.0845(1)	-0.404(3)	0.085(4)	0.291(4)	2.6(2)	3.2(2)	4.4(2)) 3.8(2)	5.0(2)	4.0(2)
Ring 3	3 0.3745 (3)	0.6318(4)	0.1278(2)	2.316 (13)	1.274(4)	-0.793 (13)	2.7(2)	3.6(2)	5.0(2	5.0(2)	5.4(3)	4.2(2)

^a The form of the anisotropic thermal ellipsoid is $\exp[-(\beta_{11}h^2 + \beta_{22}k^2 + \beta_{33}l^2 + 2\beta_{12}hk + 2\beta_{13}hl + 2\beta_{23}kl)]$. ^b Numbers in parentheses here and in succeeding tables are estimated standard deviations in the least significant digits. ^c x_o, y_o, and z_o are the fractional coordinates of the ring centers. The angles δ , ϵ , and η (in radians) which bring about alignment (except for translation) of an internal coordinate system within the ring with a fixed external coordinate system have been defined in previous papers: S. J. La Placa and J. A. Ibers, *Acta Cryst.*, **18**, 511 (1965); R. Eisenberg and J. A. Ibers, *Inorg. Chem.*, **4**, 773 (1965). *B_i* is the isotropic thermal parameter of atom *i* in a given ring. The rings are numbered so that C₁ is attached to P; C₄ is *para* to C₁.



		Ring 1	
C_1	$0.3510(4)^{a}$	0.2103(6)	0.1636(2)
C_2	0.2752(3)	0.1330(6)	0.1615(2)
C_3	0.2655(4)	0.0588(6)	0.2136(3)
Č,	0.3316(5)	0.0619(6)	0.2677(2)
C ₅	0.4073(4)	0.1392(7)	0.2697(2)
C_6	0.4170(3)	0.2134(7)	0.2177(3)
		Ring 2	
C_1	0.4735(3)	0.2472(6)	0.0891(2)
C_2	0.5449(4)	0.3371(4)	0.0965(3)
C_3	0.6260(3)	0.2854(6)	0.0920(3)
C₄	0.6357(3)	0.1438(6)	0.0800(3)
Ca	0.5643(4)	0.0539(4)	0.0726(3)
C_6	0.4831 (3)	0.1056 (5)	0.0771(3)
		Ring 3	
C_1	0.3722(6)	0.4891 (5)	0.1144(5)
C_2	0.3564(4)	0.5354(6)	0.1703 (3)
C_3	0.3586(4)	0.6781(6)	0.1837(3)
C₄	0.3767(6)	0.7745(5)	0.1413(5)
C ₅	0.3926(5)	0.7282(6)	0.0854(4)
C ₆	0.3903(4)	0.5855(6)	0.0719(3)

^a The estimated standard deviations are derived from those of the group parameters and are meant to be used in error analyses on inter-ring distances. Intra-ring distances, of course, are fixed (C-C = 1.392 A).

Description of the Structure

The unit cell dimensions, symmetry operations, and parameters of Table II lead to a crystal structure made up of loosely packed monomeric molecular units. In Figure 1 the over-all molecular structure is displayed; in Figure 2 only the inner coordination about the Re atom is shown. Principal intramolecular distances and angles and their estimated standard deviations, as derived from the data of Table II and the correlation matrix, are given in Table V. Only the closest intermolecular approaches to Re and N are tabulated in Table V. The packing of the molecules is almost entirely dictated by intermolecular interactions of the bulky phenyl groups: the volume per triphenylphosphine group is 404 A³, approximately 10% higher than in triphenylphosphine itself.13 All intermolecular interactions appear to be normal.

The molecule itself, by virtue of the imposed crystal-



Figure 1.—A perspective drawing of the molecular structure of $ReNCl_2(P(C_6H_5)_3)_2$.



Figure 2.—A perspective drawing of the inner coordination sphere in $ReNCl_2(P(C_6H_5)_3)_2$.

lographic twofold axis, has symmetry C_2 . This symmetry is consistent with either of the two idealized fivecoordinate geometries: the trigonal bipyramid or the tetragonal pyramid. In the present case the molecule has an intermediate geometry, and it is a matter of taste whether one wishes to describe the coordination around Re as that of a distorted trigonal bipyramid or a distorted tetragonal pyramid. The distortions from trigonal-bipyramidal geometry are: the apical P atoms are displaced so that the P-Re-P angle, rather than being 180°, is 163°; the angles about Re in the basal plane, rather than being 120°, are 110, 110, and 140°.

Inorganic Chemistry

TABLE IV: Observed and Calculated Structure Amplitudes ($\times 10$) (in Electrons) for $ReNCl_2(P(C_6H_5)_3)_2$

H L OBS CALC	H L DBS CALC	H L OBS CALC	H L OBS CALC	H 1 DES CALC	H L DBS CALC	H L OBSCAL	C H L OBS CALC	H L OBS CALC	H L DBS CALC	H L OBS CALC
N L Cost Column O Cost Column Cost Column Cost Column O Cost Cost Column Cost Cost Column Cost Cost Cost Column O Cost Cost Cost Cost Cost Cost Cost Cost		H L OBS CALL Composition Composition <thcomposition< th=""> Composition <thc< td=""><td>L C 085 CALC C 085 CALC C 085 CALC C 085 <thc 085<="" th=""> C 085 <thc 085<="" th=""> <thc 085<="" th=""> <thc 085<="" th=""></thc></thc></thc></thc></td><td>H L Des c4.0 10 5.0 5.0 5.0 10 -10 10.5 10.5 10 -10 10.5 10.5 10 -10 10.5 10.5 10 -10 10.5 10.5 10 -10 10.5 10.5 10 -10 10.5 10.5 10 -10 10.5 10.5 10 -10 10.5 10.5 11 -10 10.5 10.5 11 -10 10.5 10.5 11 -10 10.5 10.5 11 -10 10.5 10.5 11 -10 10.5 10.5 11 -10 10.5 10.5 11 -10 10.5 10.5 11 -10 10.5 10.5 11 -10 10.5 10.5 11 -10 10.5 10.5<td>x .</td><td>H L 0.88 C41 8 1.4 1.4 0.88 C41 8 1.4 1.4 0.88 C41 8 0.8 0.1 <th0.1< th=""> <th0.1< th=""> <th0.1< th=""></th0.1<></th0.1<></th0.1<></td><td>$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$</td><td>H L 0085 CALL 1 L 0085 CALL CALL 1 L CALL CALL CALL 1 L CALL CALL CALL 1 L CALL CALL CALL 1 CALL CALL</td><td>4 L 055 CAL 100 - 4 0.05 CAL 100 - 0.05 CAL 0.05 100 - 0.05 CAL 0.05 100 - 0.05 CAL 0.05 100 - 1.05 0.05 0.05 100 - 1.05 0.05 0.05 100 - 1.05 0.05 0.05 101 - 1.05 0.05 0.05 111 - 1.05 0.05 0.05 111 - 1.05 0.05 0.05 111 - 1.05 0.05 0.05 111 - 1.05 0.05 0.05 111 - 1.05 0.05<!--</td--><td>H L 0.055 CLIC CLIC</td></td></td></thc<></thcomposition<>	L C 085 CALC C 085 CALC C 085 CALC C 085 C 085 <thc 085<="" th=""> C 085 <thc 085<="" th=""> <thc 085<="" th=""> <thc 085<="" th=""></thc></thc></thc></thc>	H L Des c4.0 10 5.0 5.0 5.0 10 -10 10.5 10.5 10 -10 10.5 10.5 10 -10 10.5 10.5 10 -10 10.5 10.5 10 -10 10.5 10.5 10 -10 10.5 10.5 10 -10 10.5 10.5 10 -10 10.5 10.5 11 -10 10.5 10.5 11 -10 10.5 10.5 11 -10 10.5 10.5 11 -10 10.5 10.5 11 -10 10.5 10.5 11 -10 10.5 10.5 11 -10 10.5 10.5 11 -10 10.5 10.5 11 -10 10.5 10.5 11 -10 10.5 10.5 <td>x .</td> <td>H L 0.88 C41 8 1.4 1.4 0.88 C41 8 1.4 1.4 0.88 C41 8 0.8 0.1 <th0.1< th=""> <th0.1< th=""> <th0.1< th=""></th0.1<></th0.1<></th0.1<></td> <td>$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$</td> <td>H L 0085 CALL 1 L 0085 CALL CALL 1 L CALL CALL CALL 1 L CALL CALL CALL 1 L CALL CALL CALL 1 CALL CALL</td> <td>4 L 055 CAL 100 - 4 0.05 CAL 100 - 0.05 CAL 0.05 100 - 0.05 CAL 0.05 100 - 0.05 CAL 0.05 100 - 1.05 0.05 0.05 100 - 1.05 0.05 0.05 100 - 1.05 0.05 0.05 101 - 1.05 0.05 0.05 111 - 1.05 0.05 0.05 111 - 1.05 0.05 0.05 111 - 1.05 0.05 0.05 111 - 1.05 0.05 0.05 111 - 1.05 0.05<!--</td--><td>H L 0.055 CLIC CLIC</td></td>	x .	H L 0.88 C41 8 1.4 1.4 0.88 C41 8 1.4 1.4 0.88 C41 8 0.8 0.1 <th0.1< th=""> <th0.1< th=""> <th0.1< th=""></th0.1<></th0.1<></th0.1<>	$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	H L 0085 CALL 1 L 0085 CALL CALL 1 L CALL CALL CALL 1 L CALL CALL CALL 1 L CALL CALL CALL 1 CALL CALL	4 L 055 CAL 100 - 4 0.05 CAL 100 - 0.05 CAL 0.05 100 - 0.05 CAL 0.05 100 - 0.05 CAL 0.05 100 - 1.05 0.05 0.05 100 - 1.05 0.05 0.05 100 - 1.05 0.05 0.05 101 - 1.05 0.05 0.05 111 - 1.05 0.05 0.05 111 - 1.05 0.05 0.05 111 - 1.05 0.05 0.05 111 - 1.05 0.05 0.05 111 - 1.05 0.05 </td <td>H L 0.055 CLIC CLIC</td>	H L 0.055 CLIC CLIC
10 - 2 1012 24007 2 1012 24007 2 1012 24007 2 1012 24007 2 1012 24007 2 1012 24007 2 1012 2407 2 1012	- 6 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	* 2 2 455 2 2 * 2 2 455 2 2 2 * 2 2 555 1 2 </td <td>$\begin{array}{c} 4 & 1 \\ 4 & -1 \\ 0 & 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1$</td> <td>0 0</td> <td></td> <td>$\begin{array}{c} \bullet & 1:3 \\ \bullet & 1:4$</td> <td>$\begin{array}{c} 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 2 \\ 1 \\ 2 \\ 1 \\ 2 \\ 1 \\ 2 \\ 1 \\ 2 \\ 1 \\ 2 \\ 2$</td> <td>4 4 4 4 4 4 5 3 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5</td> <td>B # # B # 5 8 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>	$\begin{array}{c} 4 & 1 \\ 4 & -1 \\ 0 & 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1$	0 0		$ \begin{array}{c} \bullet & 1:3 \\ \bullet & 1:4 $	$ \begin{array}{c} 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 2 \\ 1 \\ 2 \\ 1 \\ 2 \\ 1 \\ 2 \\ 1 \\ 2 \\ 1 \\ 2 \\ 2$	4 4 4 4 4 4 5 3 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	B # # B # 5 8 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0
20 -10 /22 /102 	4-100	$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$

TABLE V						
Selected Distances (A) and Angles (degrees)						

Intramole	cular distance	Ang	1e
Re-Cl	2.377(2)	Cl–Re–P	88.14(7)
Re–P	2.448(2)	Cl-Re-N	109.69(6)
Re-N ^a	1.602(9)	Cl-Re-Clid	140.63(11)
Cl-P	3.357(3)	Cl-Re-P1d	86,20(7)
$C1-P_1$	3.297(3)		
ClN	3.283(7)	P–Re–P1	163.13(10)
P–N	3.117(6)	P-Re-N	98.44(5)
$P-R_1C_1^b$	1.826(6)	R_1C_1 -P- R_2C_1	101.9(3)
$P-R_2C_1$	1.823(6)	$R_1C_1 - P - R_3C_1$	106.4(3)
$P-R_3C_1$	1.822(6)	R_2C_1 -P- R_3C_1	106.9(3)
-Intermolec	ular distances—		
Re-Re	>9.04		

 $Re-P_1H_2 = 3.09^{\circ}$

M = 112 = 0.03

 $N-R_2H_4$ 2.80°

^a The Re–N distance corrected for thermal motion is 1.606 A for the riding model. Corrections to other distances are correspondingly small. For further comments on this problem see the remarks at the end of ref 1. ^b R_1C_1 refers to carbon atom 1 of phenyl ring 1. ^c Closest intermolecular distance to the first named atom. ^d The subscripts "1" on P and Cl refer to atoms related to those given in Table II by the twofold symmetry operation.

The distortion from a tetragonal pyramid results from the facts that the P and Cl atoms do not lie in the same plane and that the N-Re-P angle (98°) differs from the N-Re-Cl angle (110°).

The Re–P distance of 2.448 A compares favorably with those of 2.442, 2.469, and 2.490 found in ReNCl₂(P- $(C_2H_5)_2C_6H_5)_3^1$ and with those of 2.45 and 2.48 A found in ReOCl₃(P(C₂H₅)₂C₆H₆)₂,¹⁴ but all of these distances are somewhat long when compared with a variety of second- and third-row transition metal–phosphine distances found in other complexes. (See the discussion in ref 1 for specific examples.) On the other hand, the Re–Cl distance of 2.377 A found here is considerably shorter than those of 2.454 and 2.563 A found in ReNCl₂(P(C₂H₅)₂C₆H₅)₃¹ and is more in keeping with the usual M–Cl distance, for example in the Re₂OCl₁₀^{4–} ion¹⁵ (2.38 A).

The P–C distances and C–P–C angles are well within the range that has been observed in a number of complexes of triphenylphosphine. Again it is evident from Figure 1 that the dihedral angles between adjacent phenyl rings can vary greatly.

Cotton and Lippard¹⁶ have derived a Re(V) radius of 1.38 A in the bromorhenates, with the use of Pauling's¹⁷ value of 1.11 A for the Br radius. On this basis, again using Pauling's radii tables, they suggest that the Re-O single-bond length should be 2.04 A. They further suggest that the Re-O bond length of 1.86 A found in the Re₂OCl₁₀⁴⁻ ion¹⁵ should be a typical Re=O double-bond length. It turns out that these two values fit Pauling's empirical rule that D(n) = D(1) - 0.6log *n*, where D(n) is the length of the bond of order *n*. On this basis one is tempted to suggest that the Re=O

(17) L. Pauling, "The Nature of the Chemical Bond," 3rd ed, Cornell University Press, Ithaca, N. Y., 1960.

triple-bond length should be 1.75 A, a value close to that found by Cotton and Lippard.¹⁶ If we assume that the covalent radius for N is 0.04 A longer than for O¹⁷ and if we neglect possible corrections for electronegativity differences, then the theoretical values of the Re-N bond lengths are: single, 2.08 A; double, 1.90 A; triple, 1.79 A. The last value is essentially what we observed in $ReNCl_2(P(C_2H_5)_2C_6H_5)_3$. The question then arises as to the possible factors which lead to the Re-N bond length of 1.60 A in the present five-coordinated compound ReNCl₂($P(C_{6}H_{5})_{3}$)₂. Clearly, one does not expect, again using the language of Pauling, a bond of order greater than 3 between Re and N. One possible suggestion is that the same nonbonded interactions can be achieved in the six-coordinate structure only at the expense of longer Re-ligand distances. In Table VI we give a comparison of the comparable nonbonded interligand distances in the two complexes. It seems to us that the agreement is remarkably good, despite the large variations in bonded Re-ligand distances. Thus we conclude that metal-ligand distances can be shorter in five-coordinate than in six-coordinate structures, and yet the nonbonded interligand distances can be the same. Unfortunately, we are unaware of any other examples, such as those presented here, where the structures of closely related five- and six-coordinate compounds with the metal in the same formal oxidation state are known to high accuracy. The obvious next step in this series of investigations is to examine closely related five- and six-coordinate structures containing the Re-N- C_6H_5 grouping; we anticipate that the Re-N distance will again be considerably longer in the sixcoordinate than in the five-coordinate complex.

	TABLE VI					
Interligand Distances in $ReNCl_2(P(C_2H_5)_2C_6H_5)_3$						
	AND RENCl ₂ ($P(C_6H_5)$)	3)2				
	,Distance, A	, in				
Interaction	$\operatorname{ReNCl}_2(\operatorname{P}(\operatorname{C}_2\operatorname{H}_5)_2\operatorname{C}_6\operatorname{H}_5)_3$	$ReNCl_2(P(C_6H_5)_3)_2$				
$N \cdot \cdot \cdot C1$	3.26	3.29^{a}				
$N \cdots P$	3.02, 3.11, 3.16	3.12				
$Cl_1 \cdots P$	3.35,3.35	3 . 36,3 . 3 0				
$Cl_2 \cdots P^b$	3.55,3.25,3.58	<i>.</i>				

^a There are two of each such interactions in this compound. ^b Cl_2 is *trans* to N in the six-coordinate structure and has no direct counterpart in the five-coordinate structure.

Thermal Motions of the Atoms

In Table VII we list the mean-square amplitudes of vibration of those atoms which were refined anisotropically. The directions of vibration can be seen in Figure 2. The vibrations here are somewhat less than they are in ReNCl₂(P(C_2H_5)₂ C_6H_5)₃,¹ and this is consistent

	5	Table VII				
Root-Mean-Square Amplitudes of Vibration $(A)^{\alpha}$						
Atom	Minimum	Intermediate	Maximum			
Re	0.169(1)	0.173(1)	0.176(1)			
C1	0.179(4)	0.205(3)	0.246(3)			
Р	0.170(4)	0.180(3)	0.192(3)			

^{*a*} Figure 2 provides an indication of the directions of these principal axes of vibration.

⁽¹⁴⁾ H. W. W. Ehrlich and P. G. Owston, J. Chem. Soc., 4368 (1963).

⁽¹⁵⁾ J. C. Morrow, Acta Cryst., 15, 851 (1962).

⁽¹⁶⁾ F. A. Cotton and S. J. Lippard, Inorg. Chem., 5, 416 (1966).

with the difference in melting points $(220^{\circ} \text{ for the present compound } vs. 153^{\circ} \text{ for ReNCl}_2(P(C_2H_5)_2C_6H_5)_3^4).$

Acknowledgment.—We are indebted to Professor J. Chatt and Miss R. J. Paske for supplying the crystals. We have enjoyed several useful discussions with our colleagues Professors F. Basolo and R. G. Pearson and Dr. P. W. R. Corfield. The support of the National Institutes of Health, GM-12985, and the National Science Foundation is gratefully acknowledged.

CONTRIBUTION FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY, BRANDEIS UNIVERSITY, WALTHAM, MASSACHUSETTS

Crystal Structure of Bis(*p*-toluidinium) Hexachlororhenate(IV)

BY ELINOR ADMAN AND T. N. MARGULIS

Received August 1, 1966

The structure of bis(*p*-toluidinium) hexachlororhenate(IV) has been determined. The space group is monoclinic P2₁/c with four molecules per unit cell; the cell dimensions are $a = 7.01 \pm 0.02$, $b = 25.04 \pm 0.05$, $c = 11.54 \pm 0.02$ A; $\beta = 90.0 \pm 0.1^{\circ}$. Octahedral ReCl₆ anions are packed with planar *p*-toluidinium cations such that the octahedra form layers alternated with organic groups, and the usual bond lengths and angles are maintained. The compound is apparently not magnetically dilute.

Introduction

The magnetic susceptibility of some simple Re(IV) salts, including K_2ReCl_6 , Cs_2ReCl_6 , and K_2ReF_6 , has been reported by Figgis, Lewis, and Mabbs.¹ The interpretation of these measurements is complicated by the possibility of magnetic exchange. In an attempt to dilute the ReCl₆ ions with relatively large organic species and thereby reduce the exchange interaction, Figgis, *et al.*, also measured the susceptibility of bis(*p*-toluidinium) hexachlororhenate(IV) [(TH)₂ReCl₆], bis(pyridinium) hexachlororhenate(IV), and bis(quino-linium) hexachlororhenate(IV). We have determined the crystal structure of (TH)₂ReCl₆ in order to observe the nature of this dilution and to provide structural data to facilitate the interpretation of the magnetic measurements.

Experimental Section

Bright yellow-green crystals of bis(p-toluidinium) hexachlororhenate [(CH₃C₆H₄NH₃)₂ReCl₆] were prepared by combining 0.25 g of p-toluidinium hydrochloride with 0.25 g of potassium hexachlororhenate in 30 ml of concentrated HCl, heating to dissolve, and evaporating on a steam bath until crystals appeared. After standing overnight at room temperature the crystals were filtered on a sintered-glass funnel, washed twice with ethanol and twice with ether, and suction dried. K₂ReCl₆ was made by reduction of KReO₄ with H₂PO₃ in concentrated HCl.²

A single crystal approximately $0.5 \times 0.05 \times 0.005$ mm was mounted on a glass fiber with the long dimension as the axis of rotation. Cell dimensions were obtained from rotation and Weissenberg photographs using Cu K α radiation (λ 1.5418 A). Multiple-film equiinclination Weissenberg photographs were taken for layers h = 0-4, yielding 1812 independent nonzero reflections. The intensities were estimated by visual comparison with a calibrated film strip, corrected for spot size elongation and contraction,³ and converted to structure factors in the usual way. Absorption corrections were not made. Interlayer scaling was done according to exposure time.

Unit Cell and Space Group

The crystals are monoclinic with $a = 7.01 \pm 0.02$, $b = 25.04 \pm 0.05$, $c = 11.54 \pm 0.02$ A; $\beta = 90.0 \pm 0.1^{\circ}$. There are four formula weights per unit cell giving a calculated density of 2.02 g/cc. The density measured by flotation is 1.99 g/cc. The systematic absence of h0l reflections when l is odd and of 0k0 reflections when k is odd suggests P2₁/c as the space group. The successful structure determination confirms this choice.

Determination of the Structure

A three-dimensional Patterson map yielded the rhenium and chlorine atom coordinates; four cycles of least-squares refinement⁴ with these coordinates gave a value of 0.24 for $R = \Sigma ||F_o| - |F_c||/\Sigma |F_o|$. An electron density map with signs based on rhenium and chlorine coordinates revealed the light-atom positions except for hydrogen which was ignored throughout the structure determination. Nitrogen atoms were distinguished from carbon atoms on chemical grounds only, as being closest to the hexachlororhenate octahedra. Seven cycles of full-matrix, least-squares refinement, using isotropic temperature factors for each atom, reduced R to 0.16. In these and subsequent least-squares calculations the function minimized was $\Sigma w (F_{\rm o} - F_{\rm c})^2$ where the weights, w, were assigned according to Hughes.⁵ Atomic scattering factors for neutral atoms were obtained from the listing of Ibers.⁶ The layers were rescaled by making $\Sigma F_{o} = \Sigma F_{c}$. Introduction of anisotropic temperature factors in the form $\exp[-(\beta_{11}h^2 + \beta_{22}k^2 + \beta_{33}l^2 + \beta_{12}hk + \beta_{13}hl +$ $\beta_{23}kl$ for rhenium and chlorine and removal of 14 intensities which either suffered from extinction or were

⁽¹⁾ B. N. Figgis, J. Lewis, and F. E. Mabbs, J. Chem. Soc., 3138 (1961).

⁽²⁾ G. W. Watt and R. J. Thompson, Inorg. Syn., 7, 190 (1963).

⁽³⁾ K. Lonsdale, Acta Cryst., 17, 308 (1964).

⁽⁴⁾ Fourier calculations were carried out with the FORDAP program of Dr. Allan Zalkin; least-squares calculations were done with the Gantzel-Sparks-Trueblood program.

⁽⁵⁾ E. W. Hughes, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 63, 1737 (1941).

⁽⁶⁾ J. A. Ibers, "International Tables for X-Ray Crystallography," Vol. III, The Kynoch Press, Birmingham, England, 1962, p 212.