## The Crystal Structure of an Oxygen Analogue of a Thiathiaphthene, C<sub>15</sub>H<sub>12</sub>SO<sub>4</sub>

BY RICHARD D. GILARDI AND ISABELLA L. KARLE

Laboratory for the Structure of Matter, Naval Research Laboratory, Washington, D.C., 20390, U.S.A.

(Received 15 June 1970)

A colorimetric determination for residues of the fungicide, Captan, is based on the production of a stable red pigment of previously unknown structure. The X-ray diffraction analysis of a methoxy derivative of this pigment ( $C_{15}H_{12}SO_4$ ) has revealed its molecular structure,



The molecule has a twofold symmetry axis (not required by the space group) and is almost planar. Unusual features in the bonding are a planar sulfur environment, an almost linear  $[176\cdot1(\pm 1)^\circ]$  oxygen-sulfur-oxygen arrangement, and extremely long  $[1\cdot879(\pm 2)\text{Å}]$  sulfur-oxygen bonds. The heterocyclic nucleus of this compound has not been previously reported, but is related to the classes of polysulfur compounds known as thiathiaphthenes and thiafurophthenes. The derivative studied forms yellow crystals in space group  $P2_1/c$ , with cell parameters  $a=4\cdot005(\pm 5)$ ,  $b=24\cdot32(\pm 3)$ ,  $c=13\cdot64(\pm 2)$  Å,  $\beta=107\cdot05(\pm 5)$ , Z=4 and a density of  $1\cdot503$  g.cm<sup>-3</sup>. The 2190 X-ray diffraction intensities were measured with an automatic diffractometer and refined to an agreement factor, R, of  $5\cdot0\%$ . The structure was solved using the symbolic addition procedure for phase determination.

#### Introduction

The fusion of N-trichloromethylthio-4-cyclohexene -1,2-dicarboximide (Captan, I) with resorcinol (II) produces an intense red pigment. Captan is a common agricultural fungicide and this fusion reaction provides a colorimetric method for determining its residue on foods (Kittleson, 1952). The chromogenic product was reported to be very stable at the time of its discovery, but was not at that time isolated and characterized. The pigment was recently isolated and partially characterized by non-crystallographic means (Pomerantz, Miller, Lustig, Mastbrook, Hansen, Barron, Oates & Chen, 1969). A dimethylated derivative of the pigment, obtained by treatment with diazomethane, provided well-formed yellow crystals for a crystallographic investigation. The diffraction analysis was undertaken with no preliminary hypotheses concerning the possible structural arrangement. The resultant structure (Fig. 1) displayed a unique planar fused ring system consisting of two phenyl rings bridged by a pair of unusual five-membered heterocyclic rings.





The crystals used for the X-ray measurements were obtained from Dr I. Pomerantz of the Food and Drug Administration. They were yellow elongated prisms with well-formed faces. Precession and Weissenberg photographs indicated that the crystal was monoclinic. The systematic absences, h0l with l odd and 0k0 with kodd, fixed the space group to be  $P2_1/c$ . Cell constants and other physical data are in Table 1.

Table 1. Physical data

Molecular formula	$C_{15}H_{12}SO_4$
Molecular weight	288.32
Habit	Acicular prism
Crystal size	$1.0 \times 0.14 \times 0.24$ mm
	$(a \times b \times c)$
Space group	$P2_1/c$
a	4·005 ± 0·005 Å
b	$24.32 \pm 0.03$
c	$13.64 \pm 0.02$
ß	$107.05 + 0.05^{\circ}$
Volume	1270 Å <sup>3</sup>
Density (calc.)	1.503 g.cm <sup>-3</sup>
Radiation	Cu Ka (1.54178 Å)
Number of independent reflections	2190
Molecules per unit cell	4
Linear absorption coefficient	23 cm <sup>-1</sup>

Integrated intensities for the reflections were collected on a four-circle automatic diffractometer using the  $\theta$ ,  $2\theta$  scan technique with a  $2 \cdot 0^\circ + 2\theta(\alpha_2) - 2\theta(\alpha_1)$  scan over  $2\theta$ . Lorentz and polarization corrections were

# Table 2. Observed and calculated structure factors for $C_{15}H_{12}SO_4$

The columns are the index l,  $|F_o| \times 10$ , and  $F_c \times 10$ . Asterisks indicate those reflections omitted from final refinement (see text).

$ \begin{bmatrix} 2 & 2 & -2 & -2 & -2 & -2 & -2 & -2 &$	$ \begin{array}{c} \bullet \bullet$		$ \begin{array}{c} 2 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ 2 $			$ \begin{array}{c} \mathbf{e} = 222, 2, 24, 6\\ \mathbf{e} = 24, 4, 5\\ \mathbf{e} = 24, 5\\ \mathbf$
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$ \begin{array}{c} -1 & 4, 0 & 4, 0 \\ 0 &$	$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	$\begin{array}{c} 7, 1 \\ 9, 9 \\ 9, 9 \\ 9, 1 \\ 1 \\ 12 \\ 2 \\ 1 \\ 12 \\ 2 \\ 1 \\ 12 \\ 2 \\ $	$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$\begin{array}{c} 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 2 \\ 1 \\ $	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$

## Table 2 (cont.)

-202+	120 204 115 27 185 89 1 12 43	115 207 116 -20 -147 -145 -11 -11 -47	-3	11 0 28 4H 162 174 167 167 167 167	31 -0 25 -54 153 -149 37 -40		89 34 73 75 175 109	-85 -37 -28 -76 -87 194 -117	-7 -5 -3 -2 -1 -1 -1	84H5556520	610 64 2 55 5 6 7	-7 -4 -7 -7 -7 -7 -7 -7 -7 -7 -7 -7 -7 -7 -7	H9 127 135 115 29 71 87 115	-92 128 118 -17 -74 -97	-7 - 5 - 3 - 2 - 1 0	36 70 337 71 71 71 71 71 71 71 71	-25 -74 37 -73 95 -54 138	2765472101	3046806969	1+ -26 107 -13 95 17 77 -2 -53 -32	-8 -7 -6 -5 -3 -2 -1 0	25 27 102 28 80 44 63 19 66	23 -23 1:0 -20 -21 -46 -46 -16 -73	A 765432101	20 - 1004 11 7 13 75 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	-16 103 -87 -31 1 8 -87 50 -26 34		77 45 35 144 67 10	-87 -69 4 6 36 161 -11 77 -1	-5	95 110 - 19 138 - 53 20 43 11	104 117 25 153 -59 26 -67 46 L	7 10 1 49 87 4 5	1+ 117 40 123 12 110 77	-21 121 -26 43 L 22 -3 -123 74	4 -97 -54 -32 -0	13 22 112 49 112 49 110	L 23 -51 119 11 -40 -80 -80 -95 -33 -115	-2 24 -1 53 -5 127 -6 27 -3 100	-30 3 56 5 L 7 133 2 -21 0 102	1 2 1 2 2
-10 -9 -8 -7 -6 -5 -4	72 28 30 31 31 118 63	74 28 30 25 -117 40	-12 -11 -10 -9 -7 -7	14 50 101 57 67	37 -55 79 -142 64 -47 -25	-12 -11 -10 -9	112 54 36 7 7	121 -515 -12 -26	2 3 -11 -10 -9	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	11 11 12 12 18	-11	115	-134 -134 -13 -13 -13 -13 -13 -13 -13 -13 -13 -13	1 2 -11 -10	53 153 14 10 14 24	-50 167 63 1 -11 -11 -28	1 2 3 -11 -10	29 807 2092	-32 -6 84 -22 115 24	1 3 -11 -10	66 119 75 55 51 147	-73 -130 -23 -44 -44 -140	10 -10 -9	10101010101010101010101010101010101010	14 -1 -99 L 70 108	-100 - 7	15 10 104 145 179 67	11 L 111 223 704 69 -71		18 • 3 • 7 • 7 12 17	-15 50 -19 54 -52 11 10	-432101	10 71 95 144 43 8 7	12 72 155 54 2	-76563	100 14 12 10 12 21 5	-115 -11 -11 -2 -24 -3			

applied and normalized structure factors, *E*, were calculated for use in the phase determination.

The symbolic addition procedure for centrosymmetric crystals (Karle & Karle, 1963; 1966) was used to determine the phases for 267 reflections of high |E|value. The  $\sum_2$  relationship was used to expand a starting set of six reflections, all of whose |E| values exceeded 2.7. Three reflections were assigned zero phases to fix the origin (254, 123, 2,22,1) and three were assigned symbolic phases (266, 255, 178). The phase determination indicated that the three symbolic phases were probably zero. An *E* map computed with this assumption revealed the 20 non-hydrogen atoms of the structure.

The atomic coordinates and thermal vibration parameters for the 20 atoms were refined by full-matrix least-squares methods. The atomic scattering factors used were those listed in *International Tables for X-ray Crystallography* (1952). Initially, each reflection intensity was given a weight of unity, and the function minimized was  $\sum w(F_o-F_c)^2$ . Anisotropic refinement brought the agreement factor, *R*, down to 0.09. At this point, a difference map revealed all of the 12 hydrogen atoms of the molecule. A statistical examination of the magnitude of the remaining discrepancies suggested the weighting function

$$\frac{1}{W} = 1.0 + \left(\frac{|F_o| - 8}{16}\right)^2,$$

which gives a distribution of weights consistent with the distribution of errors expected in counter diffractometry. Such errors include instrumental factors which limit the reliability of very intense and also very weak intensity measurements. At this point in the refinement systematic errors which were probably due to secondary extinction were apparent. To minimize the effects of this error source, the 16 reflections with  $|F_o| > 65.0$ were removed, leaving 2174 reflections in the refinement. This type of treatment can significantly diminish the slight structural errors attributable to extinction (Åsbrink & Werner, 1966). Errors due to absorption are negligible for low values of the index h because of the small cross-section of the needle-shaped crystal ( $\mu r \simeq$ 0.25 for h=0). The h index runs only to 4 in this data set, and the slight errors which may be present for the higher h values would primarily affect the reliability of the  $B_{11}$  parameters. No distortion of the thermal ellipsoids in this direction was apparent.

After the elimination of some of the secondary extinction errors, further refinement led to an R of 4.6% including 'unobserved' (zero intensity) reflections. Recalculation of the R value on the full data set *including* those reflections with secondary extinction errors gave a value of 5.0%. The positions of the hydrogen atoms were allowed to vary, and all converged satisfactorily. The thermal vibration of each hydrogen atom was set equal to that of the carbon to which it was attached.

Table 3(a). Fractional coordinates and thermal parameters\*

Standard deviations are in parentheses.

$T = \exp \left[-\frac{1}{2}(B_{11}h^2a^{*2})\right]$	$+ B_{22}k^{2}b^{*2} + B_{22}l^{2}c^{*2} +$	$2B_{12}hka^*b^* + 2B_{12}$	$hla^*c^* + 2B_{23}klb^*c^*)$
$I = c_{A}p_{1} + d_{1}p_{1}$	1 0 2 2 1 0 1 0 3 3 1 0 1	<b>D</b> 12	,

	x	V	z	$B_{11}$	B <sub>22</sub>	B <sub>33</sub>	$B_{12}$	B <sub>13</sub>	B <sub>23</sub>
S	1.30992 (14)	0.16952(2)	0.56235(4)	3.63(3)	3.41 (3)	1.94 (2)	-0.07 (2)	0.04 (2)	0.46 (2)
$\tilde{\mathbf{O}}(1)$	1.08430(42)	0.10131 (6)	0.53036 (11)	4.23 (7)	3.56 (7)	2.56 (6)	-0.28(6)	0.20 (5)	0.70 (5)
$\tilde{O}(2)$	0.25089 (45)	0.01975 (7)	0.23979 (13)	4.79 (8)	3.43 (7)	3.72 (7)	- 1.01 (6)	0.74 (6)	-0.38(6)
Č(3)	0.87146 (54)	0.10139 (9)	0.43595 (15)	3.27 (8)	3.45 (9)	2.53 (8)	0.39 (7)	0.79 (7)	0.35 (7)
C(4)	0.86398 (50)	0.15069 (8)	0.38110 (15)	2.93 (8)	2.77 (8)	2.47 (8)	0.21 (6)	0.76 (6)	0.02 (6)
C(5)	0.63947 (54)	0.15416 (9)	0.27963 (16)	3.56 (9)	3.23 (9)	2.47 (8)	0.17 (7)	0.59 (7)	0.22 (7)
C(6)	0.44400 (56)	0.10966 (9)	0.23725 (17)	3.53 (9)	3.62 (10)	2.66 (9)	-0·22 (7)	0.43 (7)	-0.14(7)
C(7)	0.45929 (57)	0.06031 (9)	0.29315 (17)	3.41 (9)	3.15 (9)	3·24 (9)	-0·19 (7)	1.07 (7)	-0.38(7)
C(8)	0.66996 (56)	0.05576 (9)	0.39246 (17)	3.71 (9)	3.09 (9)	3·25 (9)	0.02 (7)	1.00 (7)	0.27 (7)
<b>C</b> (9)	0.23832 (81)	-0.03113 (10)	0.29158 (24)	5.16 (13)	3.38 (10)	5.06 (13)	<i>−</i> 0·87 (9)	1.29 (11)	) 0.05 (9)
C(10)	1.09262 (48)	0.19093 (8)	0.44004 (14)	2.84 (7)	3.17 (8)	2·05 (7)	0.50 (6)	0.57 (6)	0.04 (6)
O(11)	1.51847 (42)	0.23941 (7)	0.58550 (11)	4.32 (7)	3.81 (7)	2.13 (6)	<i>−</i> 0·35 (6)	-0.28(5)	0.25(5)
O(12)	1.49131 (42)	0.40481 (6)	0.39181 (12)	4·29 (7)	3.04 (7)	3.70 (7)	-0.52(5)	0.34 (6)	0.07(5)
C(13)	1.41572 (51)	0.27008 (9)	0.50257 (15)	3.02 (8)	3·45 (9)	2.15 (8)	0.39 (7)	0.35 (6)	-0.02(6)
C(14)	1.17491 (49)	0.24482 (8)	0.41752 (15)	2.90 (7)	2·88 (8)	2.24 (8)	0.41 (6)	0.50 (6)	-0.17(6)
C(15)	1.05811 (56)	0·27518 (9)	0.32509 (16)	3.60 (9)	3.09 (9)	2.25 (8)	0.18 (7)	0.22 (7)	-0.03(7)
C(16)	1.17106 (58)	0.32738 (9)	0.32069 (17)	3.84 (9)	3.31 (9)	2.51 (9)	0.28(7)	0.27(7)	0.14(7)
C(17)	1.40942 (52)	0.35201 (8)	0·40796 (16)	3.11 (8)	2.97 (8)	3.07 (9)	0.10 (6)	0.82(7)	-0.25(7)
C(18)	1.53290 (55)	0.32386 (9)	0.49827 (17)	3.10 (8)	3.47 (9)	2.67 (9)	-0.13(7)	0.31(7)	-0.51(7)
C(19)	1.73515 (71)	0.43304 (11)	0.47388 (22)	4.39 (11)	3.61 (11)	4.63 (12)	<i>−</i> 0·92 (9)	0.76 (9)	-0./1(9)

Tables 3(a) and 3(b) list the coordinates and thermal parameters of each atom; the observed and calculated structure factors are compared in Table 2.

Table 3(b). Fractional coordinates, hydrogen atoms

	x	У	z
H(5)	0.617	0.188	0.241
H(6)	0.282	0.109	0.168
H(8)	0.694	0.021	0.436
H(9a)	0.152	-0.021	0.356
H(9b)	0.072	-0.057	0.239
H(9c)	0.462	-0.052	0.312
H(15)	0.909	0.257	0.266
H(16)	1.113	0.320	0.264
H(18)	1.686	0.340	0.551
H(19a)	1.962	0.411	0.493
H(19b)	1.667	0.436	0.534
H(19c)	1.776	0.471	0.448
Standard de	eviations		
	0.010	0.0013	0.0025

### Discussion

A striking feature of this molecule is its planarity to within  $\pm 0.06$  Å, Fig. 3, except for the hydrogen atoms on the CH<sub>3</sub> groups. The characteristic geometry of sulfur, bonded to three substituents, is pyramidal (Abrahams, 1956). This is usually the case even if one of the substituents is doubly bonded to the sulfur atom as in  $\beta$ -thianthrene dioxide which is a markedly non-planar molecule with pyramidal sulfur atoms (Hosoya, 1966):



The unusual environment about the sulfur atom in this molecule can be related to structural results reported for two special classes of polysulfur compounds, the thiathiaphthenes and the thiafurophthenes, which have been discussed in a recent review article (Salmond, 1968). The structure of the thiathiaphthene skeleton was discovered through X-ray diffraction studies (Bezzi, Mammi & Garbuglio, 1958; Mammi, Bardi, Garbuglio & Bezzi, 1960) on a substance found to be 2,5-dimethylthiathiaphthene:



The thiathiaphthene system is planar and exhibits an approximately linear arrangement of the three sulfur atoms. The S-S bond lengths for the above thiathiaphthene system were reported to be 2.35 Å, about 0.25 Å longer than any previously reported S-S single bonds. The corresponding S-O bond lengths reported in this work are  $\hat{1}\cdot 879(\pm 2)$  Å (Fig. 1), about  $\hat{0}\cdot 28$  Å longer than a normal S-O single bond. The 2,5-dimethylthiathiaphthene molecule was reported to be symmetrical by the early investigators, but this was questioned later (Johnson, Newton, Paul, Beer & Cartwright, 1967), with the suggestion that a disordered asymmetric molecule might also be consistent with the limited two-dimensional data observed by Bezzi et al. (1958). An anisotropic refinement of a complete three-dimensional data set has recently corroborated the earlier results (Leung & Nyburg, 1969). The molecule reported in this investigation has no symmetry imposed on it by the crystal-



Fig. 1. Numbering scheme and bond distances for  $C_{15}H_{12}SO_4$ . Estimates of the standard deviations of the individual bond lengths are obtained solely from the least-squares refinement of the structural parameters. These estimates are:  $\pm 0.002$  Å for bonds involving sulfur;  $\pm 0.003$  to 0.004 Å for all bonds involving carbon or oxygen atoms, and  $\pm 0.05$  Å for the hydrogen-hydrogen nonbonded distance illustrated.

lographic space group, but displays a twofold axis of symmetry which is virtually exact to within the limits of error (see Figs. 1 and 2).

The C-C ring bonds of 2,5-dimethylthiathiaphthene are 1.37 and 1.38 Å, within the range of aromatic bonds. In the present molecule, the C(4)-C(10) distance of  $1.418(\pm 4)$  Å is also more typical of an aromatic bond than a normal single or double bond. The C(3)-C(4)bond is, of course, part of a benzene ring and displays a typical aromatic distance. The C(3)-O(1) distance, as well as the C(13)–O(11) distance, is  $1.318(\pm 4)$  Å, which could also be called an 'aromatic' type distance, for it lies between the normal single(1.40-1.45 Å) and double.  $(1 \cdot 18 - 1 \cdot 25 \text{ Å})$  bond ranges. The bond lengths of 2,5-dimethylthiathiaphthene have been discussed by several authors from a theoretical point of view (Giacometti & Rigatti, 1959; Maeda, 1960, 1961a,b; Gleiter & Hoffmann, 1968) and their conclusions would seem to apply. at least qualitatively, to the system reported here. However, structures have been reported since these publications which may disrupt some of their conclusions. Johnson & Paul (1969a) described the structure of 3,4diphenylthiathiaphthene, which is symmetrically sub-



Fig. 2. Bond angles for  $C_{15}H_{12}SO_4$ . Standard deviations estimated from the least-squares refinement are  $0.10^\circ$  for the angles surrounding the sulfur atom, and  $0.15^\circ$  to  $0.20^\circ$  for all other angles.



Fig. 3. Deviations from a least-squares plane.

stituted with phenyl groups. The thiathiaphthene nucleus is planar but asymmetric, with S–S distances of 2.23 and 2.43 Å. A smaller but probably significant asymmetry has also been reported for the structure of symmetrically substituted 2,5-diphenylthiathiaphthene (Hordvik, 1968).

It is possible to replace one of the end S atoms of thiathiaphthene with an oxygen atom. This system, called the dithiafurophthene (also referred to in the literature as thiafurophthene and furothiaphthene) system, is structurally dissimilar to the symmetric 2,5-dimethylthiathiaphthene and the di-oxygenated molecule under discussion. The symmetry of the doubly heterocyclic system is apparently easily disrupted, as in 2,5-dimethyldithiofurophthene (Mammi, Bardi, Traverso & Bezzi, 1961):



The carbonyl bond is 1.27 Å, which is essentially a double bond, and the S–S bond has a fairly typical single bond value. However, the S $\cdots$ O approach is extremely short for a non-bonded distance. The sum of the van der Waals radii would be about 3.2 Å for these two atoms.

Johnson & Paul (1969b) have reported the structure of a nitroso-disulfide compound in which a still shorter  $S \cdots O$  contact (2.034) is observed between the nitroso oxygen and one of the disulfide sulfurs. The disulfide single bond was lengthened (2.178 Å) to a value intermediate between the S-S bonds of the dithiafurothene and the thiathiaphthene mentioned above. Several examples of abnormally short (2.4 to 2.7 Å) approaches between formally nonbonded S and O atoms were discussed by Kapecki, Baldwin & Johnson (1968). All of these systems are characterized by a planar sulfur environment and the presence of conjugation in neighboring regions of the molecule, in common with the molecule reported in this investigation.

A best least-squares plane was fitted to the four rings of the molecule, omitting the methoxyl substituents.



Fig. 4. A stereoview down the c axis of the unit cell. Two unit cells are displayed to illustrate the stacking along the a direction. Parallel planes containing the molecules are separated by 3.53 Å.

The deviations from this plane are illustrated in Fig. 3 and indicate a small torsion of the two benzene rings in opposite directions. The primary reason for this is probably the repulsion between the hydrogen atoms on C(5) and C(15). Even with the torsion, the two hydrogen atoms are separated by only  $2 \cdot 02(\pm 5)$  Å, Fig. 1. The usual intermolecular approach between hydrogen atoms is approximately 2.35 Å. Fused ring hydrocarbons often exhibit similar intramolecular crowding. A recent reinvestigation of the crystal structure of phenanthrene (Kay, Okaya & Cox, 1969) reports nonbonded hydrogen atoms only 2.04 Å from each other and a similar torsion of the fused-ring skeleton.

The methoxyl groups are coplanar with the ring skeleton (Fig. 3). This has been observed previously in several aromatic methoxy compounds (Yonemitsu, Nakai, Kanaoka, Karle & Witkop, 1969; Karle & Karle, 1968; Corbin, Karle & Karle, 1970; Karle&Karle, to be published). In each of these compounds, the methoxyl groups adopt a preferred orientation with respect to the neighboring phenyl or quinoidol ring. The methyl group turns toward the shorter bond in the neighboring ring and rotates to minimize methyl hydrogen interaction with the neighboring ring. The methyl hydrogen atoms of this compound were well defined in difference maps and are illustrated in Fig. 1. One hydrogen is coplanar with but directed away from the benzene ring, while the other two are staggered above and below the plane of the benzene ring. The  $C(8) \cdots C(9)$  separation, as well as the  $C(18) \cdots C(19)$  separation, are only 2.82 Å, and similar distances occur in molecules in the above references.

The packing of the molecules is illustrated in Fig. 4. The nearest intermolecular approaches are usual van der Waals distances involving molecules stacked along the short *a* axis (Fig. 4). The shortest of these contacts are S-C(3'), 3.61Å, C(10)-C(4'), 3.55Å, and C(4)-C(6'), 3.59Å (primed atoms are translated by +a).

#### References

- ABRAHAMS, S. C. (1956). Quart. Rev. 10, 407.
- BEZZI, S., MAMMI, M. & GARBUGLIO, C. (1958). Nature, Lond. 182, 247.
- CORBIN, J. L., KARLE, I. L. & KARLE, J. (1970). Chem. Comm. p. 186.
- GIACOMETTI, G. & RIGATTI, G. (1959). J. Chem Phys. 30, 1633.
- GLEITER, R. & HOFFMANN, R. (1968). Tetrahedron 24, 5899.
- HORDVIK, A. (1968). Acta Chem. Scand. 22, 2397.
- HOSOYA, S. (1966). Acta Cryst. 21, 21.
- International Tables for X-ray Crystallography (1962). Vol. III. Birmingham: Kynoch Press.
- JOHNSON, P. L. & PAUL, I. C. (1969a). Chem. Comm. p. 1014.
- JOHNSON, P. L. & PAUL, I. C. (1969b). J. Amer. Chem. Soc. 91, 781.
- JOHNSON, S. M., NEWTON, M. G., PAUL, I. C., BEER, R. J. S. & CARTWRIGHT, D. (1967). Chem. Comm. p. 1170.
- KAPECKI, J. A., BALDWIN, J. E. & PAUL, I. C. (1968). J. Amer. Chem. Soc. 90, 5800.
- KARLE, I. L. & KARLE, J. (1963). Acta Cryst. 16, 969.
- KARLE, I. L. & KARLE, J. (1968). Acta Cryst. B24, 81.
- KARLE, J. &. KARLE, I. L. (1966). Acta Cryst. 21, 849.
- KAY, M. I., OKAYA, Y. & COX, D. T. (1969). Acta Cryst. A25, s147.
- KITTLESON, A. R. (1952). Anal. Chem. 24, 1173.
- LEUNG, F. & NYBURG, S. C. (1969). Chem. Comm. p. 137.
- MAEDA, K. (1960). Bull. Chem. Soc. Japan, 33, 1466.
- MAEDA, K. (1961a). Bull. Chem. Soc. Japan, 34, 785.
- MAEDA, K. (1961b). Bull. Chem. Soc. Japan, 34, 1166.
- MAMMI, M., BARDI, R., GARBUGLIO, C. & BEZZI, S. (1960). Acta Cryst. 13, 1048.
- MAMMI, M., BARDI, R., TRAVERSO, G. & BEZZI, S. (1961). Nature, Lond. 192, 1282.
- POMERANTZ, I., MILLER, L., LUSTIG, E., MASTBROOK, D., HANSEN, E., BARRON, R., OATES, N. & CHEN, J. -Y. (1969). Tetrahedron Letters. 5307.
- SALMOND, W. G. (1968). Quart. Rev. 22, 253 (see p. 272).
- YONEMITSU, O., NAKAI, H., KANAOKA, Y., KARLE, I. L. & WITKOP, B. (1969). J. Amer. Chem. Soc. 91, 4591.
- ÅSBRINK, S. & WERNER, P. E. (1966). Acta Cryst. 20, 407.

1078