

Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory

LBL Publications

Title

SYNTHESIS, CRYSTAL STRUCTURE, OPTICAL AND MAGNETIC PROPERTIES OF TRI(BIS(N,N'-DIMETHYLETHYLENEDIAMIDO) URANIUM(IV)),A TRIMERIC COMPLEX

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/1vs487b0>

Author

Reynolds, John G.

Publication Date

1976-08-01

0 0 4 0 4 6 0 0 0 2 4

Submitted to Inorganic Chemistry

LBL-5436
Preprint c. |

SYNTHESIS, CRYSTAL STRUCTURE, OPTICAL AND
MAGNETIC PROPERTIES OF
TRI(BIS(N, N' -DIMETHYLETHYLENEDIAMIDO)URANIUM(IV)),
A TRIMERIC COMPLEX

John G. Reynolds, Allan Zalkin, David H. Templeton, and
Norman M. Edelstein

August 1976

RECEIVED
LIBRARY
BERKELEY LABORATORY


SEP 20 1976

LIBRARY AND
DOCUMENTS SECTION

Prepared for the U. S. Energy Research and
Development Administration under Contract W-7405-ENG-48

For Reference

Not to be taken from this room



LBL-5436

e-1

DISCLAIMER

This document was prepared as an account of work sponsored by the United States Government. While this document is believed to contain correct information, neither the United States Government nor any agency thereof, nor the Regents of the University of California, nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by its trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise, does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government or any agency thereof, or the Regents of the University of California. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof or the Regents of the University of California.

-iii-

Synthesis, Crystal Structure, Optical and Magnetic Properties of
Tri(bis(N,N'-dimethylethylenediamido)uranium(IV)), a Trimeric Complex†

John G. Reynolds, Allan Zalkin,* David H. Templeton,* and Norman M. Edelstein*

Materials and Molecular Research Division
Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory
and
Department of Chemistry
University of California
Berkeley, California 94720

August 1976


ABSTRACT

The trimeric compound $U_3(CH_3NCH_2CH_2NCH_3)_6$ was synthesized by the reaction of tetrakis(diethylamido)uranium(IV) with dimethylethylenediamine in pentane in a dry argon atmosphere. The crystals are monoclinic, space group P2/a, with $a = 17.019$ Å, $b = 9.932$ Å, $c = 11.013$ Å, $\beta = 107.45^\circ$, $d_c = 2.302$ gm/cm³ for $Z = 2$. X-ray diffraction intensity data were collected by an automated diffractometer using graphite monochromated Mo K α radiation. For 1044 reflections with $F^2 > 3\sigma(F^2)$, $R_1 = 0.047$ and $R_2 = 0.036$. The three uranium atoms form a linear chain with the central one, which is on a center of symmetry, being linked by a triple nitrogen bridge to each of the terminal ones. The uranium-uranium distance is 3.543 Å. Each of the bridge nitrogen atoms comes from a different dimethylethylenediamine, and gives the central uranium atom an octahedron of six nitrogen nearest neighbors at an average distance of 2.37 Å. The terminal uranium atom is at the center of a distorted trigonal prism of

its neighbors; there are three bridge bonds and three single bonds with average distances of 2.57 Å and 2.21 Å respectively. Optical and near ir spectra of various solutions are reported; these data suggest the molecule is also trimeric in solution. The magnetic susceptibility of $U_3(CH_3NCH_2CH_2NCH_3)_6$ follows the Curie-Weiss law in the temperature range 4.6 - 100K with no evidence of magnetic ordering. This trimeric structure is novel in actinide structural chemistry.

INTRODUCTION

We recently reported the crystal structure, magnetic, and optical properties of uranium diethylamide,¹ the first well-characterized actinide dialkylamide.² This molecule in the solid state is dimeric and has an unusual five coordination about the U atoms. Other U amides had been synthesized but none had been isolated as pure compounds. The usual method of purification for d transition metal amides is by distillation or sublimation but this method has been unsuccessful for other uranium amides. We have speculated this is due to a greater degree of oligomerization for dialkylamides in the actinide series than in the d transition series. Generally, the synthesis of transition metal alkylamides is by the reaction of the transition metal halide with the corresponding lithium dialkylamide. This method was used by Jones, et al.,² to prepare U(NEt₂)₄. However, Bradley and coworkers have also used an aminolysis reaction



in some instances.³ We report in this paper the synthesis of uranium dimethylethylenediamine by this method, and its crystal structure, optical, and magnetic properties.

EXPERIMENTALReagents and Syntheses

All solvents were dried by refluxing the Na-benzophenone in an argon atmosphere. Materials were handled in an argon atmosphere glove box or on a vacuum line.

$U(NEt_2)_4$. This compound was prepared as described previously.¹

Dimethylethylenediamine (b.p. 119°C, density .828). This compound was purchased from the Aldrich Chemical and dried over CaH_2 then distilled and degassed before use.

Reaction of $U(NEt_2)_4$ with N,N'-dimethylethylenediamine. 3.5 grams of $U(NEt_2)_4$ were placed in a 250 ml Schlenk flask. Approximately 100 ml of dry pentane was vacuum-distilled into the flask at 77°K. After the addition of the pentane was complete, the dimethylethylenediamine was added under vacuum. The reaction mixture was allowed to warm to room temperature while being stirred. After approximately 24 hours the ppt was filtered and vacuum-dried. Crystals were grown from the filtrate. The major fraction of the crystals obtained were monoclinic and yellow in color and are shown below to be the trimer, $U_3(CH_3NCH_2CH_2NCH_3)_6$ or $(U_3(dmed)_6)$. However, it was possible to isolate a minor fraction which were orthorhombic and red-brown in color. A saturated solution of the ppt in pentane was prepared from which additional yellow crystals were obtained which were identical with the yellow crystals obtained from the filtrate. No red-brown crystals were obtained from solutions prepared from the ppt.

Physical Measurements

For optical measurements a weighed amount of $U_3(dmed)_6$ was dissolved in benzene to form a ~.02M solution. A saturated solution of $U_3(dmed)_6$ was obtained in diethylether. The solution was put in .5 cm cells in an inert atmosphere box and sealed with wax. All measurements were obtained on a Cary 17 spectrophotometer containing only the solvent in

a .5 cm cell in the reference compartment.

Magnetic susceptibility measurements were obtained with a PAR Model 155 vibrating sample magnetometer used with a homogeneous magnetic field produced by a Varian Associates 12 inch electromagnet capable of a maximum field strength of 12.5 kG. The magnetometer was calibrated with $\text{HgCo}(\text{CNS})_4$.⁴ A variable temperature liquid helium dewar produced sample temperatures in the range 4.2 - 100K which were measured by a calibrated GaAs diode placed approximately one-half inch above the sample.

X-Ray Diffraction

A tungsten needle was used to insert a few crystals into quartz capillaries in an inert atmosphere box and the capillaries were then fire sealed under vacuum. A sealed capillary was mounted on a Picker FACS-I automated diffractometer equipped with a graphite monochromator and molybdenum tube. The cell dimensions were obtained by a least-squares-refinement procedure from the angular positions of 12 manually centered reflections for which $K\alpha_1$ peaks were resolved. The space group and cell dimensions are given in Table I with some other details of the experiment. Omega scans of several low angle reflections showed widths of half-peak height of about $1/8^\circ$. A total of 4983 scans were measured and later averaged to give a set of 2342 unique reflections. Three standard reflections were measured after each 200th scan to monitor for crystal decay, instrumental stability, and crystal alignment. After eight days of data-taking the standards exhibited no measurable decay in intensity, and fluctuated by about one percent from their average values.

Absorption corrections were calculated using an analytical algorithm.⁵ The measurement of the physical dimensions of the crystal was somewhat hampered by its containment inside a capillary. The crystal shape was described by six surface planes. Azimuthal scans of integrated intensity were performed for seven different reflections in as diverse a region of reciprocal space as the instrument would allow, and the dimensions of the crystal were adjusted to give the best consistency of corrected intensities for these scans. The data were processed, averaged, and given estimated standard deviations using formulae presented in the Supplementary Material. The factor $p = 0.02$ was used in the calculation of $\sigma(F^2)$.

The Patterson function revealed the uranium atom positions, and the subsequent electron density Fourier map, phased by the uranium atoms, gave the positions of all of the nitrogen and carbon atoms. The structure was refined by full-matrix least squares where the function $\sum w | |F_o| - |F_c| |^2$ was minimized. About 20 reflections below $\sin\theta/\lambda$ of 0.125 were given zero weight because a few of them had excessively large discrepancies; these discrepancies were mainly in the region where the background peaked due to scattering from the quartz capillary. No correction for extinction was indicated, and none was made.

In the final least squares refinements, only the two U atoms were given anisotropic thermal parameters. Earlier attempts to treat the carbon and nitrogen atoms anisotropically did not result in any significant improvements of the R factors, and some of the thermal tensors did not remain positive-definite. The intensities are relatively weak due to the very small crystal size, and the anisotropic description of

the light atoms is not feasible with this data set. A difference Fourier map calculated after the last least squares cycle showed peaks of $2.8 \text{ e}/\text{\AA}^3$ or less. The final R factor, $\Sigma |F_o| - |F_c| / \Sigma |F_o|$, was 0.047 for 1044 data where $F^2 > 3\sigma(F_o^2)$, and 0.135 for all 2342 data. The weighted R_w factor, $(\Sigma w(\Delta F)^2 / \Sigma w F_o^2)^{1/2}$, was 0.036. The standard deviation of an observation of unit weight was 1.09.

Final positional and thermal parameters are given in Table II; a table of observed structure factor amplitudes is given in the Supplementary Material; and distances and angles are listed in Tables III and IV.

DISCUSSION

The structure analysis shows that the U(IV) complex with dimethylethylenediamine is a cluster containing three uranium atoms in a line bridged by nitrogen atoms; see Figs. 1 and 2. The central uranium atom is on a center of symmetry and is 3.543 Å from the terminal atoms. The uranium atoms are joined by triple nitrogen bridge bonds, each of which is from a different dimethylethylenediamine ligand. This trimer type structure is novel in actinide structural chemistry, and even dimeric complexes are relatively rare for uranium.

The two uranium atoms in this compound have considerably different environments. The central uranium atom is on a center of symmetry with six chemically equivalent nitrogen atoms about it in a distorted octahedron; the average U(1) - N distance is 2.37 Å, and the distortion from an ideal octahedron is $\sim 12^\circ$. The terminal uranium atom, U(2), is at the center of a distorted trigonal prism of six nitrogen atoms, including both nitrogen atoms of each of three dimethylethylenediamine

ligands. The six nitrogen neighbors of the terminal uranium atom define a figure which is closer to a trigonal prism than to a regular octahedron. Atoms N(1), N(3), and N(5) are nearly at the corners of an equilateral triangle of edge 2.98 Å, while N(2), N(4), and N(6) nearly define a similar triangle of edge 3.55 Å. These two triangles are rotated about 8° from parallel orientations. For each ligand one nitrogen is bridging and the other is terminal. The average bridge and terminal bond distances are 2.57 Å and 2.22 Å, respectively. As is expected, the U - N distances are greater for bridging nitrogen atoms than for terminal nitrogen atoms. The bridge bond lengths found in this compound and in the dimer of uranium(IV) diethylamide¹ have a considerable range of values. This variation may be understood if one considers the bond orders assigned on the basis of electrostatic bonding. Assuming that each uranium is involved in a total of four bonds, then each U(1) - N is a two-thirds bond, the U(2) - N bridges are each one-third, and the U(2) - N terminal bonds are each one bond. With this assignment the average single bond is 2.21 Å, a two-thirds bond is 2.37 Å, and a one-third bond is 2.57 Å. In $U_2(Et_2N)_8$ ² the bridge is a half-bond and has an average distance of 2.51 Å, while the terminal single bonds average 2.22 Å.

While the bonds for the bridging nitrogen atom are approximately tetrahedral, those of the terminal ones are very nearly coplanar. Each terminal nitrogen atom is within 0.1 Å of the plane defined by uranium and the two alpha carbon atoms. Although at first glance there appears to be a large range of values for the N-C bond lengths, the variation from maximum to minimum values are 3 to 4 e.s.d.'s and are not experimentally significant.

The rod-shaped molecules pack in this crystal in a manner similar to that found in the tetragonal structure of dimethylacetylene⁶ and krypton difluoride.⁷ Molecules with centers at $x = 0$ lie in a nearly square array with their axes all oriented approximately along one of the diagonals. The next layer (at $x = 1/2$) is similar, but the molecular axes are nearly perpendicular to those in the first layer. The molecular centers are arranged according to the pattern of cubic closest packing, but with considerable distortion from ideal cubic geometry.

The aminolysis reaction (1) can be considered an acid-base reaction where the HNR'_2 is considered to be the acid, and the amide on the metal is the base. If the two amide groups make equally strong bonds to uranium, the driving force for the reaction would then depend on the difference between the pK_a 's of the amines. Unfortunately, there are no quantitative measurements for the pK_a 's of the amines discussed in this paper and involved in reaction (1), but qualitatively, it appears the second nitrogen in the dimethylethylenediamine acts as an electron-withdrawing group which lowers the first pK_a of dimethylethylenediamine with respect to diethylamine. The second significant factor in this reaction is the chelate effect which results in the enhanced stability of the complex which contains chelate rings when compared to a similar system without rings.⁸ The driving force for the formation of this U trimer is probably due to some combination of the above effects.

The optical and near ir spectrum of $\text{U}_3(\text{dmed})_6$ in benzene is shown in Fig. 3. The extinction coefficients of the peaks are listed in Table V. Although we did not obtain quantitative optical data on $\text{U}_3(\text{dmed})_6$ in

diethylether we can calculate approximate values for the extinction coefficients by assuming the extinction coefficient for the strongest peak is the same as in benzene and then calculate the other extinction coefficients relative to the strongest peak. These values are also listed in Table V. The general features of the spectra in benzene or in diethylether are identical unlike the spectra of $U(NEt_2)_4$ in these two solvents. In the latter case we attributed the differences between the optical and pmr spectra in the two solvents to the complexing of monomeric $U(NEt_2)_4$ by the coordinating ether solvent. Since the spectra of $U_3(dmed)_6$ in the two solvents are essentially identical it suggests the molecule is trimeric in solution with the coordination sites on the U atoms filled or effectively blocked by the ligands.

The inverse of the gram magnetic susceptibility of $U_3(dmed)_6$ in the temperature range 4.6 K - 100 K is shown in Fig. 4. The susceptibility follows the Curie-Weiss law

$$\chi_M = \frac{C_M}{T + \Theta}$$

with $C_M = .78$, μ_{eff} (per U atom) = 2.50BM, and $\Theta = 30.5$ K, throughout the measured temperature range. The magnetic data can be explained empirically by a doublet crystalline field level as the ground state with the splitting of this doublet (if any) less than ~ 5 cm^{-1} . Let us consider only the symmetry about each of the U ions as determined by the neighboring U ions and the N atoms. The axis determined by the line joining the three U atoms is a three-fold axis with the center U atoms at a site of D_{3d} symmetry and the terminal U atoms (equivalent by symmetry)

at sites of approximately C_{3v} symmetry. For the 3H_4 (LS coupling) ground term of U^{4+} , each of the above symmetries will split a $J = 4$ term into three doublets and three singlets.⁹ We consider the empirical magnetic susceptibility as the sum of the susceptibilities of each of the ions. The measured results are consistent with a doublet state being lowest for each of the two inequivalent sites. There is no indication of magnetic ordering in this trimeric molecule in the measured temperature range.

The most striking feature of $U_3(\text{dmed})_6$ is the linear array of three U atoms bridged by six dimethylethylenediamine groups. Only one amide nitrogen atom of each dimethylethylenediamine is bridging, the other terminal nitrogen atom forming a planar bond between an uranium atom and a carbon atom. Further evidence for the tendency to bridge in the uranium amides is given by the preliminary x-ray diffraction results for the minor red-brown product. This compound forms a puckered rectangle of four U atoms with U-U distances of approximately 3.6 Å. The U atoms in this structure are also bridged by the dimethylethylenediamine groups. The evidence to date suggests that for the U amides, if the R groups of the amide are not bulky enough to prevent bridging through steric hinderance as, for example, found in $U(\text{NPh}_2)_4$,¹⁰ oligomers of the U amides will be formed. We have suggested previously¹ that bridging through the amide nitrogen more readily takes place in the actinide series than in the early d transition series because of a reduced ligand $p\pi$ to metal-orbital π interaction in the f series. This reduction allows the amide nitrogen atom to more easily become tetrahedral

and act as a bridging atom. Consequently the actinide amides may tend to oligomerize and/or be more thermally unstable than analogous d transition compounds. The recent report of the isolation of $\text{Zr}(\text{NPr}_2^i)_4$ by sublimation at $120^\circ\text{C}/10^{-3}\text{ mm Hg}$ ¹¹ supports this suggestion since the analogous U compound was not isolated by Jones, et al.² nor by our group to date. However, much work remains to be done on these compounds both in the f and d transition series.

Supplementary Material Available.

A listing of structure factors and formulae used in data reduction (10 pages). Ordering information is given on any current masthead page.

REFERENCES

[†]This work was done with support from the U.S. Energy Research and Development Administration.

1. J. G. Reynolds, A. Zalkin, D. H. Templeton, N. M. Edelstein, and L. K. Templeton, *Inorg. Chem.* (in press).
2. R. G. Jones, G. Karmas, G. A. Martin, Jr., and H. Gilman, *J. Amer. Chem. Soc.* 78, 4285 (1956).
3. For a review of metal diakylamides and the methods of synthesis see D. C. Bradley, *Adv. in Inorg. Chem. and Radiochem.* 15, 259 (1972).
4. H. St. Råde, *J. Phys. Chem.* 77, 424 (1973).
5. L. K. Templeton and D. H. Templeton, *Abstracts, American Crystallographic Association Proceedings, Series 2, Vol. 1, 1973*, p. 143.
6. E. Pignataro and B. Post, *Acta Crystallogr.* 8, 672 (1955).
7. R. D. Burbank, W. E. Falconer, and W. A. Sunder, *Science* 178, 1285 (1972).
8. F. A. Cotton and G. Wilkinson, "Advanced Inorganic Chemistry", Third Edition, Interscience Publishers, New York, 1972, p. 650.
9. G. F. Koster, J. O. Dimmock, R. G. Wheeler, H. Statz, "Properties of the Thirty-Two Point Groups", M.I.T. Press, Cambridge, 1963.
10. J. G. Reynolds, A. Zalkin, D. H. Templeton, and N. M. Edelstein, to be published.
11. C. Airoidi and D. C. Bradley, *Inorg. Nucl. Chem. Letters* 11, 155 (1975).

TABLE I. Summary of Crystal Data and Intensity Collection.

Compound	$U_3(CH_3NCH_2CH_2NCH_3)_6$
Formula Weight	1230.9
a	17.019(7) Å
b	9.932(4) Å
c	11.013(5) Å
β	107.45(5)°
V	1776 Å ³
Z	2
Density (calc)	2.302 g/cm ³
Space Group ^a	P2/a (alternate setting of P2/c)
Crystal Shape and Size	Approximate parallelepiped of 6 faces; 020, 0 $\bar{2}$ 0, 00 $\bar{2}$, 200, 201, 00 $\bar{2}$. Dimensions - .04 × .05 × .09 mm.
Crystal Volume	0.000182 mm ³
Temperature	23°
Radiation	Mo K α (λ 0.70926 and 0.71354 Å), monochromated from (002) face of mosaic graphite
Transmission factor	0.32 - 0.60
μ	131 cm ⁻¹
Data Collection Method	θ -2 θ scan (1°/min along 2 θ)
Scan Range	0.7° below K α_1 to 0.7° above K α_2
Background Counts	8 sec. Backgrounds offset from scan limits by 0.5°
2 θ Limits	3 - 45°
Final No. of Variables	91
Unique Data Used	1044
	$F_0^2 > 3\sigma(F_0^2)$; $\sin \theta/\lambda > .125$

^a The general positions are $\pm(x, y, z; 1/2 + x, -y, z)$.

TABLE II. Positional and Thermal Parameters.^a

	x	y	z	B
U(1)	0	0	0	
U(2)	.04705(6)	.2295(1)	.2582(1)	
N(1)	.073(1)	.206(2)	.039(2)	2.5(4)
N(2)	.137(1)	.387(3)	.239(2)	3.7(5)
N(3)	-.081(1)	.134(2)	.095(2)	2.6(5)
N(4)	-.064(1)	.332(2)	.278(2)	3.4(5)
N(5)	.073(1)	-.019(2)	.220(2)	2.9(4)
N(6)	.104(1)	.131(2)	.441(2)	3.3(5)
C(1)	.035(2)	.308(3)	-.065(3)	4.5(7)
C(2)	.164(1)	.239(3)	.085(2)	2.9(5)
C(3)	.183(2)	.376(3)	.151(3)	3.7(6)
C(4)	.155(2)	.511(4)	.313(3)	6.5(8)
C(5)	-.134(2)	.042(3)	.143(3)	3.5(6)
C(6)	-.123(1)	.266(3)	.060(2)	3.2(5)
C(7)	-.146(2)	.328(3)	.170(3)	3.9(7)
C(8)	-.078(2)	.387(4)	.394(3)	6.2(9)
C(9)	.156(2)	-.073(3)	.230(3)	3.6(6)
C(10)	.050(1)	-.074(3)	.330(3)	3.2(6)
C(11)	.107(1)	-.024(3)	.465(2)	3.7(7)
C(12)	.152(1)	.207(3)	.564(3)	4.2(6)

	B ₁₁	B ₂₂	B ₃₃	B ₁₂	B ₁₃	B ₂₃
U(1)	1.81(7)	2.5(1)	2.04(8)	-.05(7)	.66(5)	-.34(9)
U(2)	2.11(4)	2.54(7)	2.17(5)	.06(5)	.36(3)	-.46(6)

^aThe anisotropic temperature factor has the form
 $\exp(-0.25(B_{11}h^2a^{*2} + 2B_{12}hka^*b^* + \dots))$.

TABLE III. Interatomic Distances ^a

ATOM	ATOM	DIST.(Å)
U(1)	- U(2)	3.543(1)
	- N(1)	2.37(2)
	- N(3)	2.37(2)
	- N(5)	2.38(2)
U(2)	- N(2)	2.24(2)
	- N(4)	2.21(2)
	- N(6)	2.19(2)
	- N(1)	2.60(2)
	- N(3)	2.55(2)
	- N(5)	2.57(2)
N(1)	- C(1)	1.52(3)
	- C(2)	1.51(3)
N(2)	- C(3)	1.43(3)
	- C(4)	1.46(4)
N(3)	- C(5)	1.48(3)
	- C(6)	1.49(3)
N(4)	- C(7)	1.54(3)
	- C(8)	1.47(4)
N(5)	- C(9)	1.48(3)
	- C(10)	1.49(3)
N(6)	- C(11)	1.57(4)
	- C(12)	1.54(3)
C(2)	- C(3)	1.53(4)
C(6)	- C(7)	1.51(3)
C(10)	- C(11)	1.58(4)

^aUncorrected for thermal motion.

TABLE IV. Selected Angles

ATOMS	DEG.
U(2) - U(1) - U(2)'	180.0
N(1) - U(1) - N(3)	77.2(7)
N(1) - U(1) - N(5)	78.4(8)
N(3) - U(1) - N(5)	78.0(7)
N(1) - U(1) - N(3)'	102.8(7)
N(1) - U(1) - N(5)'	101.6(8)
N(3) - U(1) - N(5)'	102.0(7)
N(1) - U(1) - N(1)'	180.0
N(3) - U(1) - N(3)'	180.0
N(5) - U(1) - N(5)'	180.0
N(1) - U(2) - N(3)	70.1(6)
N(1) - U(2) - N(5)	71.1(7)
N(3) - U(2) - N(5)	71.3(6)
N(1) - U(2) - N(2)	70.2(7)
N(3) - U(2) - N(4)	70.6(7)
N(5) - U(2) - N(6)	70.8(7)
N(1) - U(2) - N(4)	121.5(7)
N(1) - U(2) - N(6)	131.7(7)
N(3) - U(2) - N(2)	130.8(7)
N(3) - U(2) - N(6)	122.3(8)
N(5) - U(2) - N(2)	120.0(7)
N(5) - U(2) - N(4)	130.8(7)
N(2) - U(2) - N(4)	108.3(9)
N(2) - U(2) - N(6)	105.6(8)
N(4) - U(2) - N(6)	105.9(8)
U(1) - N(1) - U(2)	90.9(6)
U(1) - N(3) - U(2)	92.1(6)
U(1) - N(5) - U(2)	91.5(7)
U(1) - N(1) - C(1)	111(2)

TABLE IV. (Continued)

U(1) - N(1) - C(2)	133(2)
U(1) - N(3) - C(5)	108(2)
U(1) - N(3) - C(6)	133(2)
U(1) - N(5) - C(9)	107(2)
U(1) - N(5) - C(10)	133(2)
U(2) - N(1) - C(1)	119(2)
U(2) - N(1) - C(2)	96(1)
U(2) - N(3) - C(5)	117(2)
U(2) - N(3) - C(6)	96(2)
U(2) - N(5) - C(9)	123(2)
U(2) - N(5) - C(10)	97(2)
C(1) - N(1) - C(2)	106(2)
C(5) - N(3) - C(6)	109(2)
C(9) - N(5) - C(10)	106(2)
U(2) - N(2) - C(3)	123(2)
U(2) - N(2) - C(4)	125(2)
C(3) - N(2) - C(4)	112(2)
U(2) - N(4) - C(7)	121(2)
U(2) - N(4) - C(8)	128(2)
C(7) - N(4) - C(8)	110(2)
U(2) - N(6) - C(11)	125(2)
U(2) - N(6) - C(12)	124(2)
C(11) - N(6) - C(12)	111(2)
N(1) - C(2) - C(3)	114(2)
N(3) - C(6) - C(7)	112(2)
N(5) - C(10) - C(11)	115(2)
N(2) - C(3) - C(2)	108(2)
N(4) - C(7) - C(6)	104(2)
N(6) - C(11) - C(10)	100(2)

TABLE V. Optical Spectra of $U_3(\text{dmed})_6$ in C_6H_6 and Et_2O

$U_3(\text{dmed})_6$ in C_6H_6		$U_3(\text{dmed})_6$ in Et_2O	
λ (microns)	ϵ	λ (microns)	ϵ^*
.631	74	.630	52
.661	67	.661	49
.699	79	.699	65
.935	29	.931	25
1.065	134	1.060	134
1.111	127	1.105	127
1.145	99	—	—
1.153	104	1.150	104
1.300	50	1.300	53
1.431	47	1.438	51

* Calculated assuming the intensity of the peak at 1.06μ is the same in C_6H_6 and Et_2O .

FIGURE CAPTIONS

Fig. 1. Molecular structure of $U_3(dmed)_6$.

Fig. 2. Stereo view of the complex.

Fig. 3. Optical spectrum of $U_3(dmed)_6$ in C_6H_6 .

Fig. 4. Inverse gram susceptibility of $U_3(dmed)_6$ vs temperature. The straight line is the calculated inverse gram susceptibility in that temperature range with the parameters obtained from a least-squares fit as given in the text.




Fig. 1

NBL 763-682

00004603035






Fig. 2



XBL 767-3144

Fig. 3



XBL 767-3145

Fig. 4

This report was done with support from the United States Energy Research and Development Administration. Any conclusions or opinions expressed in this report represent solely those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of The Regents of the University of California, the Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory or the United States Energy Research and Development Administration.

TECHNICAL INFORMATION DIVISION
LAWRENCE BERKELEY LABORATORY
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA 94720