The Crystal Structure of Some Hexakis(methyl cyanide)metal(II) Tetrachlorometallates(III), M(II)(NCCH₃)₆[M(III)Cl₄]₂

BY BEATRIJS A. STORK-BLAISSE, G. C. VERSCHOOR AND C. ROMERS

Chemical Department, X-ray and Electron Diffraction Section, University of Leiden, P.O. Box 75, Leiden, The Netherlands

(Received 6 December 1971)

Crystals of Fe^{II})NCCH₃)₆[Fe^{III}Cl₄]₂ are trigonal with space group P3. The lattice dimensions are a=11.682 (6) and c=6.134 (4) Å. Diffractometer data (Mo K α radiation) were used. After correction for twinning (twinning percentage 14.1) anisotropic refinement with 1650 observed reflexions resulted in an R_w value of 0.047. The structure is composed of rows of (FeCl₄)⁻ tetrahedra and Fe(NCCH₃)²₆ octahedra. A number of interatomic distances are given. The isomorphous complex Mg(NCCH₃)₆(AlCl₄)₂ (photographic Weissenberg data) is discussed and the related compound Ni(NCCH₃)₆(GaCl₄)₂ (precession data) is briefly mentioned.

Introduction

Complexes $M(II) (NCCH_3)_6 [M(III)Cl_4]_2$ [hereafter M(II)-M(III)], in which M(II) is Mg, Cd or a divalent metal of the first transition series and M(III) is B, Al, Fe, Ga, In or Tl, were investigated by Reedijk & Groeneveld (1968a). X-ray powder patterns show that, with the exception of Cu compounds (forming a class by themselves), three different types of structure (A, A)B, C) occur in this series. Mössbauer measurements, infrared spectra (Reedijk & Groeneveld, 1968b), magnetic susceptibilities and e.p.r. spectra (Reedijk, 1969) indicate that the M(II)(NCCH₃)²⁺ and M(III)Cl₄⁻ ions have octahedral and tetrahedral shapes respectively, but an exact assignment of the molecular symmetry could not be achieved with these techniques.

It was thought interesting to investigate the exact geometry and symmetry of these complex ions by means of X-ray diffraction, and to establish the relationship between the different polymorphs and the sizes and symmetries of the anions and cations. Since most of the complexes are highly sensitive to moisture, the choice of compounds suitable for X-ray work is limited. The analysis was started with $Mg(NCCH_3)_6$ $(AlCl_4)_2$ (type A), this complex containing relatively light metal atoms. Although its structure could be refined to a reasonable degree of accuracy (R = 0.18), we encountered a number of inconsistencies between calculated and observed structure factors, perhaps due to disorder phenomena (see below). Therefore we decided to analyse $Fe(NCCH_3)_6(FeCl_4)_2$, also belonging to type A.

As an example of a C-type structure we investigated crystals of Ni(NCCH₃)₆(GaCl₄)₂. Its structure is related to that of A, but so far no solution could be found. Closely related to type A is the structure of Fe(NCH)₆ (FeCl₄)₂ proposed by Constant, Daran & Jeannin (1970). Brief comments on the two structures in relation to the A-type structure are given in the present article. The B-type structure displays a very intricate powder diffraction pattern and has, so far, not been investigated by us.

Experimental

The complexes were obtained by dissolving stoichiometric amounts of the divalent and trivalent metal chlorides in an excess of methyl cyanide. The Mg-Al compound was prepared using the adduct

AlCl₃. 2CH₃CN instead of AlCl₃ (Reedijk, 1968). After cooling, the complexes crystallized. The type A Mg–Al and Fe–Fe compounds consist of white and greenyellow, hexagonally prismatic crystals respectively. The type C Ni–Ga compound consists of pale blue thin hexagonal plates. The crystals were filtered, washed with cold methyl cyanide and dried *in vacuo*. Because of their extreme sensitivity to moisture the crystals were inserted into glass capillaries. After immersion in liquid paraffin, which was dried several times with P₂O₅, the capillaries were sealed.

Cell dimensions of the Mg-Al compound were determined from zero-layer Weissenberg photographs taken about [010] and [001] with unfiltered copper radiation $(\lambda_{K\alpha 1} = 1.54051 \text{ Å}, \lambda_{K\alpha 2} = 1.54433 \text{ Å}, \lambda_{K\beta} = 1.39217 \text{ Å})$ superposed with aluminum powder lines (a = 4.0492 Å at 20°C) for calibration purposes. Non-integrated intensity data were obtained with the equi-inclination Weissenberg method (multiple-film technique) from crystals mounted about [001] and [010] using Ni-filtered Cu $K\alpha$ radiation. Intensities from six levels about [001] (l=0 up to 5) and ten levels about [010] (k=0 up to 5)to 9) were estimated visually and reduced to structurefactor moduli in the usual way. An absorption correction was applied to the c axis data, assuming a cylindrical cross-section for the crystal used ($r \simeq 0.02$ cm, $\mu r = 1.6$). On the basis of the *b*-axis data, the *c*-axis data comprising 821 symmetry-independent reflexions (including 126 non-observed ones) were put on a common scale. Non-observed reflexions were given intensity values equal to the lowest measured intensity.

The lattice parameters, as well as the X-ray intensity data of the Fe-Fe compound, were measured on a Nonius three-circle diffractometer using Zr-filtered Mo Ka radiation ($\lambda = 0.71069$ Å). According to the classification rules of Arndt & Willis (1966) the goniostat has normal-beam equatorial diffraction geometry, with γ -motion restricted between 0 and -90° . A hexagonally prismatic crystal with approximate dimensions $0.15 \times 0.15 \times 0.6$ mm was mounted about [001]. The intensities were collected by means of the θ -2 θ scan mode to a maximum θ value of 35°; high intensities were reduced by using attenuation filters. The background intensity was measured at each side of a reflexion for half the scanning time. A reflexion was considered significant if the net count exceeded twice the standard deviation. The number of observed symmetry-dependent reflexions having positive glancing angles was 2374 and that with negative values 341. An absorption correction was applied according to the Monte Carlo method as programmed by de Graaff (1972). The repeated measurements of a number of standard reflexions ensured the correction for the decrease in scattering power of the crystal by means of a polynomial function of the exposure time. An average was taken of the symmetry-dependent reflexions



Fig. 1. A simplified model for disorder or twinning: the orientation of AB_3 groups about the threefold rotation axis z in the Fe-Fe structure. The solid lines alone represent the ordered structure; the solid and dashed lines in statistical distribution the disorder; the solid lines in one part of the lattice and the dashed lines in another part of the crystal describe the twinned structure.

and all data were reduced to structure factors in the usual way. A total of 1755 observed reflexions remained including 266 pairs hkl and $h\bar{k}l$, and 595 non-observed ones including 31 pairs hkl and $h\bar{k}l$.

The cell dimensions of the Ni–Ga compound were determined with Mo $K\alpha$ radiation from hk0 and 0kl precession photographs. Film shrinkage was corrected for.

Both the symmetry relations in reciprocal space and the Patterson function of the compounds Mg-Al and Fe-Fe exclude all space groups except P3 and P3. For the present the space group P3 was assumed; an R_w -ratio test (Hamilton, 1965) justified this assumption. Crystals of the Mg-Al compound floated on CCl₄ (density of 1.6 g.cm⁻³). Hence the unit cell contains one formula unit Mg-Al.

The Ni-Ga complex has the space group P3 or P3. The cell volume is about six times that of the Fe-Fe compound $[a(Ni-Ga) \simeq a(Fe-Fe)|/3; c(Ni-Ga) \simeq 2c(Fe-Fe)]$. Reflexions with $h-k=3n\pm 1$ are not present if l=0 or l=2n+1, and are always weak; this indicates a subcell with dimensions of the Fe-Fe compound. Crystal data for the three compounds are given in Table 1.

Structure determination and refinement

The presence of one formula unit of the M(II)-M(III) compound in a unit cell with symmetry P3 requires that the three metal ions and two chlorine ions Cl(2) and Cl(4) be in the special positions $0,0,z, \frac{1}{3},\frac{2}{3},z$ and $\frac{2}{3},\frac{1}{3},z$. The remaining ions Cl(1), Cl(3) and the ligand atoms are accommodated in general positions. An approximate model for the structure of the Mg-Al compound was derived from a Patterson map and successive Fourier syntheses. The Patterson function of the Fe-Fe compound showed that the two structures were isomorphous.

During the least-squares refinement of the Fe–Fe and Mg–Al structures, the following scattering factors were used: (1) the values for Fe²⁺, Fe³⁺ and Cl⁻ ions evaluated by Cromer & Waber (1965), (2) those for Mg²⁺, Al³⁺, N and C (valence) from *International Tables for X-ray Crystallography* (1962), all values except those for nitrogen and carbon being corrected for the real part of the anomalous scattering. The imaginary part of the scattering factor was not taken into account.

Table 1. Unit-cell parameters of three compounds M(II)(NCCH₃)₆[M(III)Cl₄)₂

The numbers in brackets are estimated standard deviations in terms of the last decimal given.

M(II)-M(III)	Mg-Al	Fe–Fe	Ni–Ga
Space group	Р3	P3	$P3 \text{ or } P\overline{3}$
а	11.693 (5)	11.682 (6)	20·526 (4) Å
с	6.151 (3)	6.134 (4)	11·879 (3) Å
d(calc)	1.387	1.597	1.637 g.cm ⁻³
V	728.3	725.0	4334·4 Å ³
Ζ	1	1	6
μ	86 (Cu <i>K</i> α)	22·5 (Mo Kα)	33.4 cm ⁻¹ (Mo $K\alpha$)

I. The Fe–Fe compound

As a starting point for the Fe-Fe compound the Mg-Al model was used. The weights used during the refinements were $w(F_o) = [\sigma(F_o)]^{-2}$. Refining all atoms except hydrogen in four cycles with an overall temperature factor and in four cycles with individual isotropic temperature factors reduced the reliability index R to 0.110 (omitting non-observed reflexions) and the weighted index R_w to 0.138, where

$$R = |F_o - F_c/S| / \sum F_o$$

and

$$R_w = [\sum w(F_o) (F_o - F_c/S)^2 / \sum w(F_o)F_o^2]^{1/2}.$$

The scaling factor 1/S reduces F_c to the scale of F_o . A refinement with anisotropic temperature factors during 5 cycles was executed and the *R* index dropped to 0.079, and R_w to 0.097.

On inspection of the agreement between observed and calculated structure factors, large discrepancies were detected in some cases. For reflexions with $h \neq k$ we observed that $||F_o(hkl)| - |F_o(khl)|| < ||F_c(hkl)| - |F_c(hkl)||$. Accepting the model as essentially correct the discrepancies occurring may be due either to disorder or to twinning. The first case would involve a mixing of positions x, y, z and y, x, z, the second a mixing of reflexions *hkl* and *khl* (Fig. 1).

The disorder, or twinning, concerns atoms distributed over positions x, y, z and y, x, z. In the case of

Table 2. Observed (corrected for a twinning factor of 0.141) and calculated structure factors on an absolute scale $(\times 100)$

The non-observed reflexions are indicated by an asterisk. The reflexions treated as non-observed are indicated by negative F_o values. A complete list including the A and B parts is available

										u u	ponii	oquost.										
н	K L	FU FC	н	ĸι	F-)	FC H 1	ιi	FC FC	нк	L F) FC	нк	L FO	FC P	н к ь	. F'3	۴C	11 K	L FC	FC 9	с ю	f C
22334495667788911112223322445538744895678001111223322453387489567800111122332453324749332445332453324453	٩ + 4 • 4 8 0 0 0 2 2 4 + 6 6 8 1 1 7 2 7 2 7 3 3 7 + 4 + 4 5 6 6 6 7 8 8 8 9 0 2 + 6 0 0 1 1 2 7 2 7 2 7 3 3 4 + 4 5 6 8 0 0 2 + 2 + 2 + 2 + 2 + 2 + 2 + 2 + 2 +	1500 1778 1500 1778 1500 1778 1500 1778 1770 1770 1770 1770 1770 1770 1770 1770 1770 1770 1770 1770 1770 1770 1770 1770 1770 1777 1770 1777 1770 1777 1770 1777 1771 1470 1771 1470 1771 1470 1771 1470 1771 1470 1771 1470 1771 1470 1771 1470 1771 1470 1772 1470 1773 1470 1775 2007 1775 2007 1775 2007 1775 2007 1775 2007 1777 <td>טטסססססססססססססססססטסטאינינין-סטאיניין-סטאיניין-סטאיניין-סטאיניין-סטאיניין-סטאיניין-סטאיניין-סטאיניין-סטאיניין איזייקייייין נייייין ניייייין אינייייין אינייייין איניייייין איניייייין איניייייין איניייייין איניייייייייי</td> <td>5 6 6 7 4 8 J2 4 6 6 J 2 7 3 4 4 5 6 6 7 8 7 0 7 4 6 0 1 7 7 3 4 4 5 6 6 7 8 0 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7</td> <td>6684 - 7111 1928 - 919 192</td> <td>TCE C 1 TCE C 1 1 TCE C 1 1 1 TCE C 1 1 1 TCE C 1 1 1 1 TCE C 1 1 1 1 1 TCE C 1 1 1 1 1 1 TCE C 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 TCE C 1<td></td><td>374. +08 408 +08 408 +08 10-7 1000 10-7</td><td>ههه ، ۵۰ مرد ۲۰۰۰ ما ۲۰۰۰ ما ۲۰۰۰ ما ۲۰۰۰ ما ۲۰۰۰ مرده ۲۰۰۰ مرده ۵۰ مه ۵۰ مه ۵۰ مرده ۵۰ ما ۲۰۰۰ مه ۵۰ مه ۵۰ م ۲۰۰۰ ما ۲۰۰۰ ما ۲۰۰۰ ما ۲۰۰۰ مال ۲۰۰۰ مال ۲۰۰۰ مال ۲۰۰۰ مال ۲۰۰۰ مه ۲۰۰۰ مال ۲۰۰۰ مال ۲۰۰۰ مه ۲۰۰۰ مه ۲۰۰۰ م</td><td></td><td></td><td>,, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,</td><td></td><td>1460 - 1 1377 1477 -</td><td>۵</td><td>1104 233 233 233 233 233 233 233 233 233 23</td><td>12030</td><td>,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,</td><td>$\begin{array}{c} 1\\ 1\\ 1\\ 1\\ 1\\ 1\\ 1\\ 1\\ 1\\ 1\\ 1\\ 1\\ 1\\$</td><td>1184</td><td>1 317 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1</td><td>2149 419 140 140 140 1322 1322 120 120 120 120 120 120 120 120 120 1</td></td>	טטסססססססססססססססססטסטאינינין-סטאיניין-סטאיניין-סטאיניין-סטאיניין-סטאיניין-סטאיניין-סטאיניין-סטאיניין-סטאיניין איזייקייייין נייייין ניייייין אינייייין אינייייין איניייייין איניייייין איניייייין איניייייין איניייייייייי	5 6 6 7 4 8 J2 4 6 6 J 2 7 3 4 4 5 6 6 7 8 7 0 7 4 6 0 1 7 7 3 4 4 5 6 6 7 8 0 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7	6684 - 7111 1928 - 919 192	TCE C 1 TCE C 1 1 TCE C 1 1 1 TCE C 1 1 1 TCE C 1 1 1 1 TCE C 1 1 1 1 1 TCE C 1 1 1 1 1 1 TCE C 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 TCE C 1 <td></td> <td>374. +08 408 +08 408 +08 10-7 1000 10-7</td> <td>ههه ، ۵۰ مرد ۲۰۰۰ ما ۲۰۰۰ ما ۲۰۰۰ ما ۲۰۰۰ ما ۲۰۰۰ مرده ۲۰۰۰ مرده ۵۰ مه ۵۰ مه ۵۰ مرده ۵۰ ما ۲۰۰۰ مه ۵۰ مه ۵۰ م ۲۰۰۰ ما ۲۰۰۰ ما ۲۰۰۰ ما ۲۰۰۰ مال ۲۰۰۰ مال ۲۰۰۰ مال ۲۰۰۰ مال ۲۰۰۰ مه ۲۰۰۰ مال ۲۰۰۰ مال ۲۰۰۰ مه ۲۰۰۰ مه ۲۰۰۰ م</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>,, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,</td> <td></td> <td>1460 - 1 1377 1477 -</td> <td>۵</td> <td>1104 233 233 233 233 233 233 233 233 233 23</td> <td>12030</td> <td>,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,</td> <td>$\begin{array}{c} 1\\ 1\\ 1\\ 1\\ 1\\ 1\\ 1\\ 1\\ 1\\ 1\\ 1\\ 1\\ 1\\$</td> <td>1184</td> <td>1 317 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1</td> <td>2149 419 140 140 140 1322 1322 120 120 120 120 120 120 120 120 120 1</td>		374. +08 408 +08 408 +08 10-7 1000 10-7	ههه ، ۵۰ مرد ۲۰۰۰ ما ۲۰۰۰ ما ۲۰۰۰ ما ۲۰۰۰ ما ۲۰۰۰ مرده ۲۰۰۰ مرده ۵۰ مه ۵۰ مه ۵۰ مرده ۵۰ ما ۲۰۰۰ مه ۵۰ مه ۵۰ م ۲۰۰۰ ما ۲۰۰۰ ما ۲۰۰۰ ما ۲۰۰۰ مال ۲۰۰۰ مال ۲۰۰۰ مال ۲۰۰۰ مال ۲۰۰۰ مه ۲۰۰۰ مال ۲۰۰۰ مال ۲۰۰۰ مه ۲۰۰۰ مه ۲۰۰۰ م			,, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		1460 - 1 1377 1477 -	۵	1104 233 233 233 233 233 233 233 233 233 23	12030	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	$ \begin{array}{c} 1\\ 1\\ 1\\ 1\\ 1\\ 1\\ 1\\ 1\\ 1\\ 1\\ 1\\ 1\\ 1\\ $	1184	1 317 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	2149 419 140 140 140 1322 1322 120 120 120 120 120 120 120 120 120 1

disorder the distribution is statistical and would result in the symmetry P31m for a 1:1 arrangement. The twinned structure arises from the configuration x, y, z in one part of the lattice and the configuration y, x, z in another part. In this case (100) acts as mirror plane for the separate individuals. The justification for these assumptions can be seen in Fig. 2, the ultimate structure. All atoms in general positions are located near one of the planes $\{30\overline{3}0\}$ and only small rotations are required to obtain the mirror configuration. In both models an extra parameter, the occupation number p $(0 \le p \le 1)$, is introduced for occupation of position x, y, z with contribution 1-p and position y, x, z with contribution p.

(a) Disorder

The contributions to the calculated structure factor F'_c are coherent and have to be added according to

$$F'_{c} = F_{c}(x, y, z) + F_{c}(y, x, z)$$

= (1-p) $\sum_{J, \pm}^{N} f_{J} \exp \left[2\pi i(hx_{J} + ky_{j} + lz_{j})\right]$
+ p $\sum_{J}^{N} f_{J} \exp \left[2\pi i(hy_{J} + kx_{J} + lz_{j})\right]$. (1)

Corresponding to the choice of origin $(0,0,0,\frac{2}{3},\frac{1}{3},0)$, or $\frac{1}{3},\frac{2}{3},0$) there are three possibilities for introducing disorder by means of a pseudo-mirror plane: through the Fe(NCCH₃)₆ octahedron, or through either one of the two FeCl₄ tetrahedra. Difference maps calculated after isotropic and anisotropic 'ordered' refinements indicated that the first possibility (exchange of the two FeCl₄ tetrahedra) was unlikely.

The refinement was executed with coupled atoms at x, y, z and y, x, z, having equal isotropic thermal par-

			()		
M K L FO FC H K 1 3 2 2110 2117 2 -7 -1 -3 -2 2054 2117 -4 7 3 -3 -2 605 5520 4 -7 3 -3 -2 5939 5800 -1 7 0 -3 2 4028 4751 3 -7 -2 -3 -2 1930 3800 -15 7 -2 -3 -2 1930 3800 -14 8	L F.J FC H K -2 3148 3116 -8 11 -2 1406 1424 -3 11 -2 1406 1424 -7 11 -2 1320 1405 -4 11 -2 1320 1405 -4 11 -2 1314 1405 -4 11 -2 2351 429 -5 11 -2 251 429 -5 11 -2 251 10 -18 12 -2 477 54 0 12	$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	н к L F0 FC н к 1 -6 7 3 1255 1315 -2 13 -7 7 3 925 26 -3 13 -7 7 3 1925 26 -3 11 -7 7 3 1946 1349 -7 13 -6 7 3 1448 1349 -7 11 -6 7 3 946 972 -4 11 -1 7 3 226 978 -3 11 -2 7 3 2278 2978 -77 12	FU FC H K 3 301 361 -9 16 5 38 303 -7 16 1 115* 104* -1 1 13* 104* 1 1 13* 13* 1 1 161 103* U -1 3 516 5** -3 2 3 3*5 3*5 3	L FC FC H K L FU FC 3 174 116* 1 3 * 36 60 3 128 152* 6 8 * 451 533 4 1177 116 U 8 * 156 152 4 1173 116 U 8 * 156 152 4 1193 1140 - 7 8 * 156 157 5 1276 1273 - 1 8 * 156 1197 - 2756 1273 - 2 8 * 164 119 - 2756 1273 - 2 8 * 164 119 - 3 1908 174 - 2 8 * 0 000
$ \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -3 & -2 & 2136 & 2136 & -13 & 5 \\ -4 & -2 & 2136 & 2136 & -13 & 5 \\ 3 & -4 & -2 & 2603 & 2606 & -18 & 5 \\ -3 & -4 & -2 & 2266 & 2466 & -18 & 6 \\ -5 & -4 & -2 & 2166 & 2211 & -2 & 5 \\ -2 & -4 & -2 & 2116 & 2211 & -2 & 5 \\ -2 & -4 & -2 & 2116 & 2211 & -2 & 5 \\ -2 & -4 & -2 & 2116 & 2211 & -2 & 5 \\ -2 & -4 & -2 & 2116 & 2211 & -2 & 5 \\ -2 & -4 & -2 & 2116 & 2211 & -2 & 5 \\ -1 & -4 & -2 & 2136 & 3156 & -2 & -4 \\ -1 & -4 & -2 & 3156 & 3156 & -2 & -6 & 8 \\ -1 & -4 & -2 & 3157 & 3176 & -1 & 6 \\ 0 & -4 & -2 & 3768 & 3176 & -1 & 6 \\ 0 & -4 & -2 & 3768 & 3176 & -1 & -3 \\ 0 & -4 & -2 & 3768 & 3176 & -1 & -1 \\ -1 & -4 & -2 & 3768 & 3176 & -1 & -1 \\ -1 & -4 & -2 & 3768 & 3176 & -1 & -1 \\ -1 & -4 & -2 & 3768 & 3176 & -1 & -1 \\ -1 & -4 & -2 & 3768 & 3176 & -1 & -1 \\ -1 & -4 & -2 & 3768 & 3176 & -1 & -1 \\ -1 & -2 & 3768 & 3176 & -1 & -1 \\ -1 & -2 & 3768 & 3176 & -1 & -1 \\ -1 & -2 & 3768 & 3176 & -1 & -1 \\ -1 & -2 & 3768 & 3176 & -1 & -1 \\ -1 & -2 & 3768 & 3176 & -1 & -1 \\ -2 & 3768 & 3176 & -1 & -1 \\ -2 & 3768 & 3176 & -1 & -1 \\ -2 & 3768 & 3176 & -1 & -1 \\ -2 & 3768 & 3176 & -1 & -1 \\ -2 & 3768 & 3176 & -1 & -1 \\ -2 & 3768 & 3176 & -1 & -1 \\ -2 & 3768 & 3176 & -1 & -1 \\ -2 & 3768 & 3176 & -1 & -1 \\ -2 & 3768 & 3176 & -1 & -1 \\ -2 & 3768 & 3176 & -1 & -1 \\ -2 & 3768 & 3176 & -1 & -1 \\ -2 & 3768 & 3176 & -1 & -1 \\ -2 & -2 & 3768 & 3176 & -1 & -1 \\ -2 & -2 & 3768 & 3176 & -1 & -1 \\ -2 & -2 & 3768 & 3176 & -1 & -1 \\ -2 & -2 & 3768 & 3176 & -1 & -1 \\ -2 & -2 & -2 & -2 & -2 & -2 \\ -2 & -2 &$	$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$

Table 2 (cont.)

ameters, thus introducing only one new parameter, the occupation number *p*.

The model with Cl(4) instead of Cl(2) at the origin showed the best agreement: $R_w = 0.111$ against 0.138. This conclusion was also sustained by difference maps. In both cases an occupation number $p \simeq \frac{1}{6}$ was found. The refinement of the best model was continued with coupled anisotropic thermal parameters, and ultimately resulted in R = 0.073, $R_w = 0.087$ and p = 0.133.

Using Hamilton's R_w -ratio test (1965) and accepting the anisotropic 'disordered' model as zero hypothesis we find that the anisotropic 'ordered' structure can be rejected on a 0.005 significance level: R_w (ratio)= 0.097/0.087 = 1.115 while R (1, 1664, 0.005)=1.003. Nctwithstanding this encouraging result, we encountered a number of gross discrepancies between observed and calculated structure factors. Notably the reflexion 012 behaved badly during these refinements, having the values $F_c = 13.5$ and $F_o = 25.4$ after the final cycle.

(b) Twinning

A twinned crystal with (100) as twinning plane produces a diffraction pattern in which reflexions hkland khl coincide. Designating F'_o and F_o as observed structure factors for the twinned and untwinned structures respectively, one finds that

$$F_{o}^{\prime 2}(hkl) = (1-p)F_{o}^{2}(hkl) + pF_{o}^{2}(khl) , \qquad (2)$$

where p is the twinning parameter. Instead of considering positions x, y, z and y, x, z we now add contributions $F_c^2(hkl)$ and $F_c^2(khl)$ according to the equations

$$F_{o}^{'2}(hkl) \simeq (1-p)F_{c}^{2}(hkl) + pF_{c}^{2}(khl)$$

$$F_{o}^{'2}(khl) \simeq pF_{c}^{2}(hkl) + (1-p)F_{c}^{2}(khl) .$$
(3)

			Table 2	2 (cont.)			
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$ \begin{bmatrix} F(- 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 1$	$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	L 54, 74 5 1995 71 5	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$

The twinning parameter is calculated from

$$p = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2} \frac{F_o^2(hkl) - F_o^2(khl)}{F_c^2(hkl) - F_c^2(khl)}.$$
 (4)

It must be pointed out that equations (3) and (4) are only good approximations if p is small, since the initially calculated structure factors based upon an ordered model are biased by the twinning. From the foregoing treatment of assumed disorder p is expected to be smaller than, say, 0.20.

Using (4) we are now able to determine F'_c for the twinned structure:

$$F'_{c}(hkl) = [(1-p)F^{2}_{c}(hkl) + pF^{2}_{c}(khl)]^{1/2}.$$
 (5)

Assuming that there are no errors whatsoever in F_o and F_c , the following expression applies

$$F_{o} - F_{o}' = F_{c} - F_{c}', \qquad (6)$$

and, accordingly, the observed structure factor can be corrected for twinning by adding the difference $F_c - F'_c$ to its observed value. With the new set of F_o values, the refinement of the structure was continued to obtain a better model. Repeating the procedure, p was redetermined using (4) and better values of F'_c and F_o were obtained using (5) and (6). The twinning parameter converged after five cycles to p=0.156.

According to a procedure explained in the Appendix all symmetry-averaged reflexions were corrected for twinning and given new weights. It was now possible to resume the least-squares refinement. Comparison of F_o and F_c after three cycles with isotropic temperature factors gave an indication that the twinning ratio was too high. After a few trials we accepted p = 0.141 as the best value.

The refinement was continued with anisotropic vibrational parameters. It indicated that the strongest 16 reflexions had too high weights. These reflexions were assigned standard errors three times their original values. The refinement converged towards R=0.049 (omitting non-observed reflexions) and $R_w=0.047$.

With two exceptions, shifts were smaller than 0.4 times the standard errors. The shifts for C(3) and C(4) equalled the standard deviations.

Hitherto the choice of space group was not settled. We inspected the centrosymmetric structure with Fe(II) at the origin and average positions for the other atoms. Strictly speaking, we should have redetermined the parameter p, but we accepted the value 0.141, since the centric structure differs slightly from the acentric one and, moreover, p merely showed minor variations during the trials with the various disorder and twinning models. The anisotropic refinement converged for P3towards R=0.054 and $R_w=0.066$. It can be seen (Table 6) that the centrosymmetric structure can be rejected on a 0.005 significance level.

As a result of twinning, part of the structure passes into its enantiomorphic form. A determination of the absolute configuration was, therefore, not carried out.

The observed structure factors corrected for a twinning factor of 0.141 and their corresponding calculated



Fig. 2. Projection on (001) plane.

structure factors are listed in Table 2. The positional parameters and their standard deviations are given in Table 3 and the vibrational parameters, U_{ij} , in Table 4.

 Table 3. Atomic parameters (in fractions of cell edges)
 and their standard deviations (Å)

	x	$\sigma(x)$	у	$\sigma(y)$	Z	$\sigma(z)$
Fe(1)	ł	0.0	2	0.0	-0.0420	0.006
Fe(2)	2	0.0	1	0.0	0.0442	0.006
Fe(3)	Ŏ∙0	0.0	Ŏ∙0	0.0	0.0	0.0
CIÙÍ	0.5201	0.004	0.6888	0.003	0.0631	0.006
Cl(2)	ł	0.0	2 3	0.0	-0.4011	0.006
Cl(3)	Õ∙4872	0.005	Õ·3290	0.004	-0.0740	0.006
Cl(4)	23	0.0	13	0.0	0.3997	0.007
N(1)	–Õ•0124	0.010	Ō·1460	0.010	<i>−</i> 0·1843	0.010
N(2)	0.0081	0.012	-0.1452	0.012	0.2289	0.012
$\mathbf{C}(1)$	-0.0103	0.012	0.2258	0.013	-0·2914	0.014
C(2)	0.0219	0.012	-0.2192	0.011	0.3069	0.010
C(3)	-0·0183	0.016	0.3307	0.014	-0.4320	0.015
C(4)	0.0271	0.016	-0.3266	0.013	0.4229	0.012

Table 4. Vibrational parameters U_{ij} (Å²) (×10³) in the temperature factor exp $[-2\pi^2 \pi^2 U_{ij}a_i^*a_j^*h_ih_j]$

The estimated standard deviations in digits of the last figure are given in parentheses.

	U_{11}	U_{22}	U_{33}	$2U_{12}$	$2U_{23}$	$2U_{13}$
Fe(1)	47 (1)	47 (1)	39 (2)	47 (1)	0	0
Fe(2)	45 (1)	45 (1)	40 (2)	45 (1)	0	0
Fe(3)	37 (1)	37 (1)	49 (1)	37 (1)	0	0
Cl(1)	43 (1)	91 (2)	73 (2)	71 (3)	-45 (3)	-31 (3)
Cl(2)	86 (3)	86 (3)	30 (3)	86 (3)	0	0
Cl(3)	70 (2)	94 (2)	54 (2)	103 (4)	10 (3)	-11 (3)
Cl(4)	76 (3)	76 (3)	39 (3)	76 (3)	0	0
N(1)	46 (5)	31 (4)	36 (3)	32 (7)	15 (6)	-8(6)
N(2)	63 (6)	52 (5)	58 (6)	73 (9)	5 (8)	37 (8)
C(1)	25 (4)	54 (6)	80 (8)	10 (8)	-80 (12)	1 (9)
C(2)	41 (5)	46 (5)	40 (5)	52 (8)	46 (7)	9 (7)
C(3)	76 (9)	56 (8)	94 (10)	100 (14)	9 (13)	-12 (14)
C(4)	63 (8)	64 (8)	55 (6)	42 (12)	87 (12)	23 (12)

In the space group P3 one atom must have a fixed z parameter. As a result this atom, Fe(3), will have zero standard deviation in its z parameter if full-matrix refinement is applied.

II. The Mg–Al compound

In the anisotropic refinement of the ordered structure (space group P3) disappointingly high indices R = 0.18 and $R_w = 0.21$ were attained. Several models for disorder were examined. The best model is a disordered arrangement with Cl(4) at 0,0,0 and a partial exchange of Mg(NCCH₃)₆ and AlCl₄ groups. The iteration with anisotropic vibrational parameters for the chlorine atoms resulted in R = 0.150, $R_w = 0.166$ and p = 0.322. The stumbling block, 012, still showed bad agreement and a number of large *B* values in the range between 7 and 11 Å² were observed for a number of atoms. Nevertheless, the overall agreement had increased substantially. Accepting this model as zero hypothesis, the ordered structure is rejected on a 0.005 significance level.

Since no improvement was obtained with the twinned model as investigated for the Fe-Fe compound, we accepted the disordered model with Cl(4) at 0,0,0 and p=0.322. Its geometrical entities are listed in Table 5.

Table 5. Distances (Å) and angles (°) in Me(III)Cl₄ tetrahedra and Me(II) (NCCH₃)₆ octahedra

Estimated standard deviations in digits of the last decimal are given in parentheses. a: Fe-Fe compound with twinning parameter p=0.141; b: the same as a but with constraint of equal Fe(3)-N distances; c: disordered Mg-Al compound with occupation number p=0.322.

Fe(1)/Al(1) tetrahedu	ron a	b	с
$\begin{array}{l} Fe(1)-Cl(1) \\ Fe(1)-Cl(2) \\ Cl(1)-Cl(1') \\ Cl(1)-Cl(2) \\ Cl(1)-Fe(1)-Cl(1') \\ Cl(2)-Fe(1)-Cl(1') \\ Cl(2)-Fe(1)-Cl(1) \end{array}$	2·163 (4) 2·203 (6) 3·575 (6) 3·517 (6) 111·5 (1) 107·4 (1)	2.164 (4) 2.228 (7) 3.584 (7) 3.532 (7) 111.8 (1) 107.1 (1)	2.15 (2) 2.13 (4) 3.55 (3) 3.45 (3) 111.4 (8) 107.5 (8)
Fe(2)/Al(2) tetrahedu	on		
$\begin{array}{l} Fe(2)-Cl(3) \\ Fe(2)-Cl(4) \\ Cl(3)-Cl(3') \\ Cl(3)-Cl(4) \\ Cl(3)-Fe(2)-Cl(3) \\ Cl(4)-Fe(2)-Cl(3') \end{array}$	2·195 (4) 2·180 (6) 3·588 (7) 3·568 (6) 109·7 (2) 109·3 (1)	2.194 (4) 2.153 (7) 3.578 (7) 3.554 (7) 109.3 (1) 109.7 (1)	2.14 (1) 2.07 (2) 3.45 (1) 3.47 (1) 107.9 (4) 111.0 (4)
Fe(3)/Mg octahedron	n		
Fe(3)-N(1) Fe(3)-N(2)	2·111 (9) 2·240 (11)	2.163 (3)	
N(1) - Fe(3) - N(2)	173.5 (5)	180 (ass)	
N(1) - Fe(3) - N(1') N(2) - Fe(3) - N(2')	94·0 (4) 84·9 (4)	89.7 (1)	
N(1) - Fe(3) - N(2')	91·2 (4)	90.3 (1)	
$N(1) - Fe(3) - N(2^{-1})$ N(1) - N(1') N(2) - N(2')	3.09(2) 3.09(2)	3.050 (5)	3.18(7)
N(1) - N(2') N(1) - N(2')	3.02(2) 3.11(1) 3.07(1)	3.067 (5)	3.00 (4) 3.07 (4)
······································	(I)		- • · (•)

For neither the Fe-Fe nor the Mg-Al compound were indications of macroscopic twinning found. An alternative description is the occurrence of polysynthetic microtwins or twinning domains as described recently by Müller (1971). The domains seem to be very small in the Mg-Al compound resulting in an OD structure (Dornberger-Schiff & Grell-Niemann, 1961). Apparently these domains are larger in the Fe-Fe compound. Nevertheless, the different e.s.d.'s of reflexions *hkil* and *hh2hl* (see Appendix) might be an indication that the structure of the Fe-Fe compound cannot be accepted as a pure case of twinning.

III. The Ni-Ga compound

Since reflexions hkl with h-k=3n are much stronger than those with $h-k=3n\pm 1$, we first attempted to solve the structure of the subcell c'=c, $a'=b'=a/\sqrt{3}$, $\alpha'=\beta'=90^{\circ}$, $\gamma'=120^{\circ}$. So far, no solution has been found. The Patterson function indicates that its structure is closely related to that of the Fe–Fe compound.

Discussion of the structures

Relevant interatomic distances and valence angles of the compounds Fe-Fe and Mg-Al together with the estimated standard deviations are listed in Table 5. It must be emphasized that these standard errors are grossly underestimated and do not reflect the uncertainties due to twinning or disorder. A projection of the structure on (001) is given in Fig. 2. Two independent FeCl₄ tetrahedra are present at $\frac{1}{3}$, $\frac{2}{3}$, z and $\frac{2}{3}$, $\frac{1}{3}$, z. Each FeCl₄ tetrahedron is repeated in the direction [001], giving rise to rows of tetrahedra. An approximate centre of symmetry relating the two tetrahedra exists on the position of Fe(II). Around this Fe(II) ion we notice an octahedron of six N-C-CH₃ groups.

A ligand-field spectrum of the compound Mg–Fe (type A) was measured by Reedijk & Groeneveld (1968a) and interpreted in terms of $FeCl_4^-$ ions in tetrahedral configuration (Balt, 1967). In agreement with this conclusion two quite regular FeCl₄ tetrahedra are found in the Fe–Fe structure (see Table 5).

A Mössbauer spectrum (Reedijk & Groeneveld, 1968*a*) has indicated that the Fe-Fe compound contains high-spin Fe(II) and Fe(III) ions. The small isomer shift of Fe(III) points to covalent bonds between Fe(III) and the Cl⁻ ions. The average Fe-Cl distance $(2\cdot18 \text{ Å})$ agrees nicely with the value of $2\cdot19 \text{ Å}$ found in the structure of Fe(NCH)₆(FeCl₄)₂ (Constant, Daran & Jeannin, 1970).

The average Al–Cl distance (2·13 Å) in the Mg–Al compound agrees very well with the average of Al–Cl distances (2·13 Å) in the AlCl₄ tetrahedra of the compound AlSeCl₇ (Stork-Blaisse & Romers, 1971).

Inspection of Table 5(a) shows that the octahedral coordination of Fe(II) is distorted. We notice three long and three short Fe-N distances (2.24 and 2.11 Å) and unequal N-C distances (Table 7). Far-infrared spectra were, however, interpreted by Reedijk & Groeneveld (1968b) in terms of equal Fe-N modes of vibration. Moreover, infrared measurements (Reedijk, Zuur & Groeneveld, 1967) could be explained on the assumption of a regular octahedral coordination of M(II). The measured magnetic susceptibility of the compound Fe-In (type A) (Reedijk, 1969) indicates a fairly regular octahedral configuration for the Fe(II) ion, while the small quadrupole splitting in the Mössbauer spectrum (Bancroft, Mays & Prater, 1969) of the Fe-Fe complex suggests that only small deviations from cubic symmetry are present.

We have inspected the presence of a more regular octahedron by carrying out a refinement with constraints: equal Fe(3)-N(1) and Fe(3)-N(2) distances. The atoms N(1) and N(2) kept their separate thermal parameters, but were given positions x, y, z and \bar{x} , \bar{y} , \bar{z} . After each cycle, the positional shifts of these atoms were Δx , Δy , Δz and $-\Delta x$, $-\Delta y$, $-\Delta z$ respectively. This refinement resulted in $R_w = 0.048$ and R = 0.050. On account of the R_w -ratio test the model with constraints (Table 6) should be rejected.

Table 6. Numerical data for R_w -ratio tests

The symbols are explained in Hamilton (1965), significance level $\alpha = 0.005$.

Investigated are twinned structures with p = 0.141.

	I	II	III
Acent	tric model P3	Centric model P3	Acentric model with equal Fe-N distance
R_w	0.0467	0.0656	0.0482
n	1650	1650	1650
т	87	45	84
$R_w(II)$ $R_{42.1}$	$R_w(I) = 1.405$ 563. 0.005 = 1.022	$\begin{array}{c} R_w \\ R_{3}, \end{array}$	$(III)/R_w(I) = 1.032$ 1563, 0.005 = 1.004

In view of the uncertainties due to twinning, however, we are of the opinion that in this instance no definite choice between the two models can be made. Interatomic distances occurring in the model with constraints are likewise given in Table 5(b).

The Fe-N distance of the second model agrees very well with the value 2.16 Å found for the compound $Fe(NCCH_3)_6(FeCl_4)_2$. The longest Fe-N distance (2.24 Å) of the first model is in accord with the Fe-N length (2.25 Å) observed in the complex (HEDTA) FeOFe (HEDTA) ²⁻(Lippard, Schugar & Walling, 1967).

Disregarding the carbon atoms, the molecular symmetry of the coordination about Fe(II) is C_3 for the model without constraints and S_6 otherwise. In view of the nearly right angles between the Fe-N bonds, the approximate symmetry of the constrained model is the cubic one O_h .

The relevant distances and angles involving the ligand atoms for models with and without equal Fe(3)-N distances are summarized in Table 7. Although the predicted standard errors for C-C and C-N bonds are about 0.015 Å, we believe that the true errors are at least 0.03 Å, since their positions near pseudo-mirror planes introduce large correlations. In both models the average values for chemically equivalent distances are C-C = 1.51 Å and C-N = 1.10 Å. Constant, Daran & Jeannin (1970) found the value 1.10 Å for the C-N distance in Fe(NCH)₆(FeCl₄)₂. In gaseous CH₃CN (Danford & Livingston, 1955) these values are 1.47 (2) and 1.16 (3) Å, respectively. Reedijk, Zuur & Groeneveld (1967) observed a positive shift for the C-N stretching frequency in several M(II) (NCCH₃)₆ ions, which is consistent with an increase of the C-N force constant (Purcell & Drago, 1966). According to Purcell (1967) the shortening of the C-N bond is in agreement with the increased force constant for the C-N stretching vibration.

We find non-linear Fe–N–C and N–C–C angles. Judged by statistical criteria, the deviation from linearity is, at least for the second type of angles, not significant, the standard deviations of these angles being about 2° .

Table 7. Distances (Å) and angles (°) involving carbon and nitrogen atoms in the Fe-Fe compound (p=0.141)

Values are given for the model without constraints (a) and the model with equal Fe(3)-N distances (b).

Columns 2 and 4 refer to average values.

		а		b
N(1)-C(1) N(2)-C(2)	1·13 1·07	1.10	1·09 1·11	1.10
C(1) -C(3) C(2)C(4)	1∙54 1∙47	1.51	1·51 1·51	1.21
Fe(3)-N(1)-C(1) Fe(3)-N(2)-C(2)	175 167	171	173 177	175
N(1)-C(1)-C(3) N(2)-C(2)-C(4)	176 174	175	176 174	175

The observed deviations may be attributed to packing effects.

It is interesting to note that non-linear C–C–N angles are found in tetracyanoethylene oxide (Stucky, 1971). This author argues that both packing effects and bonding-electron distributions are responsible for the observed distortions.

The space group of $Fe(NCH)_6(FeCl_4)_2$ (Constant, Daran & Jeannin, 1970) is $P\overline{3}$ and the lattice constants are a=10.29 and c=6.28 Å. A comparison of Fig. 4 in their article (used is a left-handed coordinate system) with Fig. 2 reveals that the two structures are not isomorphous.

For one thing the ligands and chlorine atoms of the hydrogen cyanide compound are not located near the planes $\{3030\}$. Moreover the relative z parameters of the atoms in the two FeCl₄ tetrahedra differ considerably from ours.

All calculations were performed on the IBM 360/50 computer of the Central Computing Laboratory of the University of Leiden. We acknowledge the contributions of Mr H. P. Zoetmulder during the beginning of the investigations on the Fe–Fe compound. We appreciate stimulating discussions with Mr R. A. G. de Graaff and Dr J. Reedijk. We thank Mr A. Verhoorn (Geological Institute, University of Leiden) for taking the precession photographs. The investigations were supported with financial aid by the Netherlands Organization for the Advancement of Pure Research (ZWO).

APPENDIX

Using equation (2) we derived the following expressions:

$$F_{o}(hkl) = \left\{ \frac{1-p}{1-2p} F_{o}^{\prime 2}(hkl) - \frac{p}{1-2p} F_{o}^{\prime 2}(khl) \right\}^{1/2} = A^{1/2}$$
(7)

$$\sigma[F_{o}(hkl)] = \left[\left\{ \frac{1-p}{1-2p} \sigma[F'_{o}(hkl)]F'_{o}(hkl) \right\}^{2} + \left\{ \frac{p}{1-2p} \sigma[F'_{o}(khl)]F'_{o}(khl) \right\}^{2} \right]^{1/2} / F_{o}(hkl) .$$
(8)

These equations were used for correction of *all* observed reflexions and the assignment of new weights. Due to errors in the measured values of F'_o , expression A can assume negative values. A boundary $A \ge 5.30$ was used in the program. For A < 5.30 the reflexion was treated as a non-observed one and assigned the value $(|A|)^{1/2}$. The non-observed reflexions were not changed.

Accepting trigonal symmetry and disregarding the small anomalous scattering, mean values and e.s.d.'s for a number of reflexions *hkil*, *ihkl*, *kihl*, *hkīl*, *ihkl* and *kīhl* were computed. The e.s.d.'s of these reflexions were compared with the individual standard errors resulting from counting statistics, absorption and the applied polynomial expression. The e.s.d.'s are 1.65 times the standard errors for reflexions with $h \neq k$ and 1.25 times the standard errors for reflexions with h=k.

References

- ARNDT, U. W. & WILLIS, B. T. M. (1966). Single Crystal Diffractometry, p. 37. Cambridge Univ. Press.
- BALT, S. (1967). Rec. Trav. Chim. Pays-Bas, 86, 1025.
- BANCROFT, G. M., MAYS, M. J. & PRATER, B. E. (1969). Chem. Phys. Letters, 4, 248.
- CONSTANT, G., DARAN, J. C. & JEANNIN, Y. (1970). J. Solid State Chem. 2, 421.
- CROMER, D. T. & WABER, J. T. (1965). Acta Cryst. 18, 104.
- DANFORD, M. D. & LIVINGSTON, R. L. (1955). J. Amer. Chem. Soc. 77, 2944.
- DORNBERGER-SCHIFF, K. & GRELL-NIEMANN, H. (1961). Acta Cryst. 14, 167.
- GRAAFF, R. A. G DE (1972). Submitted for publication.
- HAMILTON, W. C. (1965). Acta Cryst. 18, 502.
- International Tables for X-ray Crystallography (1962). Vol. III, p. 202. Birmingham: Kynoch Press.
- LIPPARD, S. J., SCHUGAR, H. & WALLING, C. (1967). *Inorg. Chem.* **6**, 1825
- Müller, U. (1971). Acta Cryst. B27, 1997.
- PURCELL, K. F. (1967). J. Amer. Chem. Soc. 89, 247.
- PURCELL, K. F. & DRAGO, R. S. (1966). J. Amer. Chem. Soc. 88, 919.
- REEDIJK, J. (1968). Thesis, Univ. of Leiden.
- REEDIJK, J. (1969). Rec. Trav. Chim. Pays-Bas, 88, 86.
- REEDIJK, J. & GROENEVELD, W. L. (1968a). Rec. Trav. Chim. Pays-Bas, 87, 513.
- REEDIJK, J. & GROENEVELD, W. L. (1968b). Rec. Trav. Chim. Pays-Bas, 87, 1079.
- REEDIJK, J., ZUUR, A. P. & GROENEVELD, W. L. (1967). Rec. Trav. Chim. Pays-Bas, 86, 1127.
- STORK-BLAISSE, B. A. & ROMERS, C. (1971). Acta Cryst. B27, 386.
- STUCKY, G. D. (1971). Personal communication.