Etter, M. C., MacDonald, J. C. & Bernstein, J. (1990). Acta Cryst. B46, 256-262.

- Ferguson, G., Gallagher, J. F., Glidewell, C. & Zakaria, C. M. (1993a). J. Chem. Soc. Dalton Trans, pp. 3499–3506.
- Ferguson, G., Gallagher, J. F., Glidewell, C. & Zakaria, C. M. (1993b). Acta Cryst. C49, 967–971.
- Gabe, E. J., Le Page, Y., Charland, J.-P., Lee, F. L. & White, P. S. (1989). J. Appl. Cryst. 22, 384–387.
- Glidewell, C., Ferguson, G., Lough, A. J. & Zakaria, C. M. (1994). J. Chem. Soc. Dalton Trans, pp. 1971–1982.
- Glidewell, C., Zakaria, C. M. & Ferguson, G. (1996). Acta Cryst. C52. 1305–1309.
- Sheldrick, G. M. (1985). SHELXS86. Program for the Solution of Crystal Structures. University of Göttingen, Germany.
- Sheldrick, G. M. (1993). SHELXL93. Program for the Refinement of Crystal Structures. University of Göttingen, Germany.
- Spek, A. L. (1995a). PLATON. Molecular Geometry Program, July 1995 version. University of Utrecht, Utrecht, Holland.
- Spek, A. L. (1995b). PLUTON. Molecular Graphics Program, July 1995 version. University of Utrecht, Utrecht, Holland.

these molecules represent a novel three-dimensional type. The three-dimensional chromophoric system is constituted by two non-conjugated biphenylene subunits and a potential through-space charge-transfer (CT) subchromophore. To estimate the effectiveness of these interactions, which depend strongly on the inter-aryl angles and distances, and also to determine whether the substances crystallize in non-centrosymmetric space groups (a prerequisite for frequency doubling), we have embarked on a series of X-ray structure determinations (Jones, Grahn, Bahl & Reisner, 1995).



Compound (1) crystallizes in a centrosymmetric space group, which renders the crystals unsuitable for applications of quadratic non-linear optical effects. The two independent molecules, (1a) and (1b) [(1a) is shown in Fig. 1], display different conformations, the differences arising mostly from the relative orientation of the ring systems.



Fig. 1. One of the two independent molecules of the title compound in the crystal. Radii are arbitrary.

As is known from X-ray structures of other 1,8diarylnaphthalenes (Clough, Kung, Marsh & Roberts 1976; Wahl, Krieger, Schweitzer & Staab, 1984; Jones *et al.*, 1995; Tsuji *et al.*, 1993), the steric strain

## Acta Cryst. (1996). C52, 2014–2017

# 1-[3,5-Bis(trifluoromethyl)phenyl]-8-(4methoxyphenyl)naphthalene: a Novel Three-Dimensional Non-Linear Optical Chromophore

ANDRÉ BAHL,<sup>a</sup> Walter Grahn<sup>a</sup> and Peter G. Jones<sup>b\*</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Institut für Organische Chemie, Technische Universität Braunschweig, Hagenring 30, 38106 Braunschweig, Germany, and <sup>b</sup>Institut für Anorganische und Analytische Chemie, Technische Universität Braunschweig, Postfach 3329, 38023 Braunschweig, Germany. E-mail: jones@xray36.anchem.nat.tu-bs.de

(Received 21 May 1996; accepted 11 June 1996)

## Abstract

There are two molecules of  $C_{25}H_{16}F_6O$  in the asymmetric unit. The interplanar angles between the naphthalene moiety and the phenyl substituents are 51.7, 52.5 (1)° in the first molecule and 59.8, 58.1 (1)° in the second for the trifluoromethyl- and methoxy-substituted rings, respectively. Calculations indicate that these are 'soft' parameters.

## Comment

As part of our continuing efforts to design materials for frequency doubling of diode laser sources, we are especially interested in donor(D)-acceptor(A)-substituted diarylnaphthalenes (Bahl *et al.*, 1995) such as the title compound (1). According to the classification introduced by Nalva, Watanabe & Miyata (1995) (one-and two-dimensional non-linear optical chromophores),

induced by the non-bonded interactions between the peri-phenyl groups strongly affects the geometry of the molecule. The two phenyl rings C9-C14 and C17-C22 display a face-to-face arrangement and subtend interplanar angles of 51.7 and 52.5 (1)°, respectively, in (1a) and 59.8 and 58.1 (1)°, respectively, in (1b) with the best naphthalene plane. The naphthalene moiety evades excessive steric stress in three main ways: (i) The bonds C1-C8A [1.443, 1.436(4) A for (1a) and (1b), respectively] and C8-C8A [1.438, 1.442(4) Å] are slightly lengthened with respect to the 'standard' value of 1.420 Å for naphthalenes (Allen et al., 1987); (ii) The atoms C1 and C8 undergo out-of-plane deformations [lying 0.133, -0.140(2) Å out of the best plane in (1a) and -0.094, 0.092(2) Å in (1b), which in turn renders the concept of the 'best' naphthalene plane less valid; the torsion angles C1...C4...C5...C8 are 7.8(1) and  $-5.1(1)^{\circ}$  in (1a) and (1b), respectively]; (iii) The bond angles C8A-C1-C9 [123.4, 122.8 (2)°], C8—C8A—C1 [124.7, 125.2 (2)°] and C8A—C8—C17 [123.2, 124.4 (2)°] are widened. The overall effect is to 'splay' the peri substituents.

It is noteworthy that the distance  $C9 \cdots C17$  [2.981, 2.962 (4) Å] is still significantly shorter than the van der Waals separation for parallel aromatic systems (*ca* 3.40 Å; Clough *et al.*, 1976) or the mean layer separation in  $\pi$ -donor/ $\pi$ -acceptor charge-transfer complexes (*ca* 3.3 Å; Foster, 1969). This close face-to-face arrangement is an important prerequisite for the throughspace CT interaction of the donor-(OMe)- and the acceptor-(3,5-CF<sub>3</sub>) phenyl rings. The contact distances C12...C20 are 4.323, 4.074 (4) Å.

Considering the severe steric interactions, the interplanar angles as discussed above are surprisingly low compared to 1,8-diphenyl-naphthalene ( $67^{\circ}$ ; Tsuji *et al.*, 1993). As this parameter is decisive in estimating the electronic interaction between the naphthalene and the phenyl moieties, we have calculated the potential-energy surface as a function of the interplanar angles. The *AM*1 Hamiltonian (Dewar, Zoebisch, Healy & Stewart, 1985) has proved to be a good approximation for this purpose in related cases (Annunziata, Ponzini & Raimondi, 1995; Boyer *et al.*, 1993; Kranz, Clark & von Ragué Schleyer, 1993). Fig. 2 shows the results of the semiempirical calculations (*AM*1, program *VAMPC*; Clark & Wiedel, 1992).

All main features of the X-ray structure are reproduced by the ground-state AM1 geometry. The only significant deviation occurs in the dihedral angles of the phenyl rings with respect to the naphthalene plane, which also represents the main difference between molecules (1*a*) and (1*b*). This could be explained by the shallow energy trough for dihedral angles between 50° and 140° (see Fig. 2). The AM1 energy difference of conformer (1*a*) and (1*b*) is only 12 kJ/mol [*MM*2 (Allinger & Yuh, 1977): 24 kJ/mol] so that crystal packing effects can exert a great influence on the con-



-240-235

Fig. 2. Calculated potential-energy surface as a function of the interring dihedral angles C8A—C1—C9—C10 or C8A—C8—C17— C22 (see *Comment*). 1 kcal = 4.184 kJ.

formation these molecules. These findings agree well with calculations of the internal rotational pathways of *peri*-diarylnaphthalenes by other methods (Tsuzuki, Tanabe, Nagawa & Nakanishi, 1990) and investigations of solvated molecules by dynamic NMR experiments (Annunziata *et al.*, 1995). Even in these cases the comparatively low rotational barrier is explained by the way the naphthalene moiety reduces the severe steric strain (see above): the out-of-plane deformation of the naphthalene spacer [*e.g.* dihedral angles C4—C4A—C8A—C1 - 8.0,  $5.7 (4)^{\circ}$ , C5—C4A—C8A—C8 -9.2,  $5.5 (4)^{\circ}$ ] plays the dominating role. Hence *peri*-diarylnaphthalenes without *ortho* substituents are flexible molecules with respect to the interplanar angles in the region of the equilibrium geometry.

#### Experimental

The title compound (1) was prepared similarly to our published reaction sequence (Bahl *et al.*, 1995) involving two consecutive Suzuki couplings (full details are given by Bahl, 1996). The cross-coupling between the boronic acid (2) and 1bromo-3,5-bis(trifluoromethyl)-benzene [3% Pd(PPh<sub>3</sub>)<sub>4</sub>, 2 eq. Na<sub>2</sub>CO<sub>3</sub>, toluene/EtOH/H<sub>2</sub>O, 24 h reflux] gave the monoarylC14

C15

C16

C17

C18

C19

F6'

C1—C2 C1—C8A C2-C3 C3—C4 C4---C4A

C4A-C5

C8-C8A

C2-C1-C8A

C2-C1-C9 C8A-C1-C9

C1-C2-C3 C4---C3---C2

C3-C4--C4A

C5-C4A-C4

C5-C4A-C8A C4---C4A---C8A

C6-C5-C4A

C5-C6-C7

C8-C7-C6

C7-C8-C8A

C7-C8-C17

C4A—C8A C5-C6 C6—C7 C7—C8

0.6480(2)

0.3645 (2)

0.5414 (2)

0.4992 (2)

0.2493 (2)

0.3127(2)

0.3743 (2)

0.2552 (2)

0.4350 (2)

0.1626 (2)

0.3570(2)

0.3928 (2)

0.3499 (2)

0.2696 (2)

0.2334 (2)

0.2771 (2)

0.1505(2)

0.23235 (13)

0.49746 (10)

0.3267 (2)

0.2861 (2)

0.3592 (2)

0.1206(2)

0.0849 (2)

0.0555 (2)

0.0599 (2)

0.0943 (2)

0.1240(2)

0.0324 (2)

0.02874 (13)

0.33166 (12)

0.0295 (6)

0.0370(7)

0.0408(7)

0.0292 (6)

0.0350(7)

0.0373 (7)

0.0334 (7)

0.0325 (7)

0.0324 (7)

0.0546 (9)

0.0466 (6)

0.0545 (5)

0.0559 (5)

0.0606 (6)

0.0556(5)

0.0699 (6)

0.0702 (6)

0.0284 (6)

0.0332(7)

0.0366(7) 0.0355 (7)

0.0303 (6)

0.0363 (7)

0.0386(7)

0.0342 (7)

0.0273 (6)

0.0268 (6)

0.0294 (6)

0.0306 (6)

0.0323 (7)

0.0375 (7)

0.0371 (7)

0.0345 (7)

0.0438 (8)

0.0549 (9)

0.0282 (6)

0.0322 (7)

0.0370(7)

0.0368 (7)

0.0341(7)

0.0310(6)

0.0560(10)

0.0499 (6)

0.0787(7)

0.0649 (6)

0.0756(7)

0.0735(7)

0.0967 (9)

0.1018 (10)

ated compound (3) (52% yield). The second Suzuki reaction (conditions as above) with 4-(methoxyphenyl)boronic acid resulted in (1) (65 % yield), which was recrystallized by slow evaporation from chloroform.

Crystal data		C20	0.3737 (2)
Crystal adda		C21	0.3109 (2)
$C_{25}H_{16}F_{6}O$	Mo $K\alpha$ radiation	C22	0.2495 (2)
$M_r = 446.38$	$\lambda = 0.71073 \text{ Å}$	C23	0.4382 (2)
Monoclinic	Cell parameters from 48	0	0.43/16(14)
$\mathcal{D}$ /-	cen parameters nom 40	FI ED	0.53857(13)
$P_{2_1/c}$	renections	F2 E2	0.03208 (11)
a = 14.817(3) A	$\theta = 10 - 11.5^{\circ}$	F3 F4	0.31332 (14)
b = 17.322(4) Å	$\mu = 0.124 \text{ mm}^{-1}$	F5	0.43923(13)
c = 16.788(3) Å	T = 143 (2)  K	F6	0.5296 (2)
$\beta = 107.24(2)^{\circ}$	Lath	C1'	1.0110(2)
$V = 4115 A (15) Å^3$	$0.80 \times 0.35 \times 0.15$ mm	C2′	1.0355 (2)
V = 4115.4(15)  A		C3′	1.1223 (2)
Z = 8	Colourless	C4′	1.1833 (2)
$D_x = 1.441 \text{ Mg m}^{-3}$		C4A'	1.1640 (2)
$D_m$ not measured		C5′	1.2285 (2)
		C6′	1.2109 (2)
		C7′	1.1299 (2)
Data collection		. C8'	1.0649 (2)
Stop Stadi 4 diffrantameter	B 0.0242	C8A'	1.0777 (2)
Sloe Sladi-4 diffractometer	$R_{int} = 0.0342$	C9 <sup>,</sup>	0.9110 (2)
$\omega/\theta$ -scans	$\theta_{\rm max} = 25.04^{\circ}$		0.8541 (2)
Absorption correction:	$h = -17 \rightarrow 16$		0.7603 (2)
none	$k = -20 \rightarrow 9$	C12 C13'	0.7219(2)
11741 measured reflections	$l = 0 \rightarrow 10$	C13	0.779(2) 0.8716(2)
7260 independent reflections	$t = 0 \rightarrow 17$	C15'	0.3710(2)
7200 independent reflections	3 standard renections	C16'	0.7385(2)
4/23 observed reflections	frequency: 60 min	C17'	0.9890(2)
$[I > 2\sigma(I)]$	intensity decay: 4%	C18'	0.9297(2)
		C19′	0.8612(2)
		C20′	0.8506 (2)
Refinement		C21′	0.9100 (2)

Refinement on $F^2$	$(\Delta/\sigma)_{\rm max} < 0.001$
$R[F^2 > 2\sigma(F^2)] = 0.0535$	$\Delta \rho_{\rm max} = 0.245 \ {\rm e} \ {\rm \AA}^{-3}$
$wR(F^2) = 0.1365$	$\Delta \rho_{\rm min} = -0.270 \ {\rm e} \ {\rm \AA}^{-3}$
S = 1.078	Extinction correction: none
7225 reflections	Atomic scattering factors
579 parameters	from International Tables
H atoms: rigid methyl	for Crystallography (1992,
groups, others riding	Vol. C, Tables 4.2.6.8 and
$w = 1/[\sigma^2(F_o^2) + (0.0387P)^2]$	6.1.1.4)
+ 2.2152 <i>P</i> ]	
where $P = (F_o^2 + 2F_c^2)/3$	

3208 (11) 0.30392 (13) 0.41503 (11) 1552 (14) 0.45836(11) 0.20650(11) 3925 (13) 0.11249 (10) 0.37591 (13) 7535 (13) 0.16330 (12) 0.42638 (14) 296 (2) 0.13100 (11) 0.29912 (14) 110(2) 0.3371 (2) 0.7423 (2) 355 (2) 0.3267 (2) 0.8273 (2) 223 (2) 0.3521 (2) 0.8808 (2) 0.3901 (2) 833 (2) 0.8485 (2) 640 (2) 0.4009 (2) 0.7611 (2) 285 (2) 0.4410(2) 0.7291 (2) 109 (2) 0.4516(2) 0.6460(2) 299 (2) 0.5904 (2) 0.4185 (2) 0.3769 (2) 649 (2) 0.6170(2) 777 (2) 0.3707 (2) 0.7053 (2) 110 (2) 0.3208 (2) 0.6939 (2) 541 (2) 0.3799(2)0.6505(2) 603 (2) 0.3664 (2) 0.6065 (2) 219 (2) 0.2933 (2) 0.6052(2) 779 (2) 0.2344 (2) 0.6491 (2) 0.6940 (2) 716(2) 0.2479 (2) 001 (2) 0.4307 (2) 0.5613 (2) 385 (2) 0.1546 (2) 0.6439(2) 890 (2) 0.3366 (2) 0.5514 (2) 0.3781 (2) 0.4853 (2) 297 (2) 0.3418 (2) 8612 (2) 0.4225 (2) 506 (2) 0.2626 (2) 0.4241 (2) 100 (2) 0.2197 (2) 0.4881 (2) C22′ 0.2572 (2) 0.9785 (2) 0.5509(2)C23' 0.7712(2) 0.1505 (2) 0.3537(2) 0. 0.77960 (14) 0.23210 (14) 0.35929 (13) F1'0.74999 (13) 0.48978 (12) 0.5458 (2)  $F2^{\prime}$ 0.64325 (13) 0.40880 (12) 0.48720 (12) F3' 0.64321 (15) 0.45879 (13) 0.60177 (14) F4' 0.7816(2) 0.71060 (13) 0.11186 (12) F5' 0.7509(2)0.11567 (13) 0.5786(2)

## Table 2. Selected geometric parameters (Å, °)

0.15211 (15)

0.6348 (2)

Table 1. Fractional atomic coordinates and equivalent isotropic displacement parameters ( $Å^2$ )

$$U_{\rm eq} = (1/3) \sum_i \sum_j U_{ij} a_i^* a_i^* \mathbf{a}_i \cdot \mathbf{a}_j.$$

	x	у	z	$U_{eq}$
C1	0.2262 (2)	0.3458 (2)	0.2975 (2)	0.0293 (6)
C2	0.1963 (2)	0.3262 (2)	0.3649 (2)	0.0339(7)
C3	0.1083 (2)	0.3511 (2)	0.3722 (2)	0.0403 (8)
C4	0.0534 (2)	0.3988 (2)	0.3140 (2)	0.0393 (7)
C4A	0.0793 (2)	0.4194 (2)	0.2421 (2)	0.0358 (7)
C5	0.0220(2)	0.4704 (2)	0.1826 (2)	0.0466 (8)
C6	0.0459 (2)	0.4899 (2)	0.1128 (2)	0.0505 (9)
C7	0.1231 (2)	0.4543 (2)	0.0961 (2)	0.0423 (8)
C8	0.1800(2)	0.4022 (2)	0.1505 (2)	0.0327 (7)
C8A	0.1639 (2)	0.3888 (2)	0.2297 (2)	0.0303 (6)
C9	0.3263 (2)	0.3283 (2)	0.3034 (2)	0.0277 (6)
C10	0.3857 (2)	0.3862 (2)	0.2912 (2)	0.0283 (6)
C11	0.4805 (2)	0.3709 (2)	0.3006 (2)	0.0288 (6)
C12	0.5175(2)	0.2984 (2)	0.3227 (2)	0.0321 (7)
C13	0.4589 (2)	0.2409 (2)	0.3362 (2)	0.0299 (6)

1.374 (4)	C1'-C2'	1.377 (4)
1.443 (4)	C1'—C8A'	1.436 (4)
1.412 (4)	C2'—C3'	1.403 (4)
1.352 (4)	C3'—C4'	1.354 (4)
1.417 (4)	C4'—C4A'	1.421 (4)
1.413 (4)	C4A'—C5'	1.411 (4)
1.430 (4)	C4A'—C8A'	1.440 (4)
1.362 (5)	C5'—C6'	1.354 (4)
1.401 (4)	C6'—C7'	1.406 (4)
1.380 (4)	C7'—C8'	1.379 (4)
1.438 (4)	C8'—C8A'	1.442 (4)
119.3 (2)	C2'-C1'-C8A'	119.8 (2)
117.0 (2)	C2'_C1'_C9'	117.0 (2)
123.4 (2)	C8A'-C1'-C9'	122.8 (2)
121.8 (3)	C1'-C2'-C3'	122.2 (3)
119.8 (3)	C4'-C3'-C2'	119.3 (3)
120.8 (3)	C3'—C4'—C4A'	121.5 (3)
120.1 (3)	C5'—C4A'—C4'	120.4 (3)
119.9 (3)	C5'—C4A'—C8A'	120.1 (3)
120.0 (3)	C4'—C4A'—C8A'	119.5 (3)
120.5 (3)	C6'—C5'—C4A'	120.9 (3)
120.0 (3)	C5'—C6'—C7'	119.6 (3)
122.0 (3)	C8'—C7'—C6'	122.6 (3)
118.8 (3)	C7'—C8'—C8A'	118.7 (2)
117.8 (3)	C7'C8'C17'	116.8 (2)

C8AC8C17	123.2 (2)	C8A'C8'C17'	124.4 (2
C4AC8AC8	117.9 (3)	C1'C8A'C4A'	117.2 (2
C4AC8AC1	117.4 (3)	C1'C8A'C8'	125.2 (2
C8C8AC1	124.7 (2)	C4A'C8A'C8'	117.6 (2

Data collection: *DIF4* (Stoe & Cie, 1991). Cell refinement: *DIF4*. Data reduction: *REDU4* (Stoe & Cie, 1991). Program(s) used to solve structure: *SHELXS86* (Sheldrick, 1990). Program(s) used to refine structure: *SHELXL93* (Sheldrick, 1993). Molecular graphics: *XP* (Siemens, 1994). Software used to prepare material for publication: *SHELXL93*.

This work forms part of the PhD thesis of A. Bahl. We gratefully acknowledge financial support by the Volkswagen-Stiftung and the Fonds der Chemischen Industrie. Mr A. Weinkauf provided technical assistance.

Lists of structure factors, anisotropic displacement parameters, Hatom coordinates and complete geometry have been deposited with the IUCr (Reference: FG1206). Copies may be obtained through The Managing Editor, International Union of Crystallography, 5 Abbey Square, Chester CH1 2HU, England.

#### References

- Allen, F. H., Kennard, O., Watson, D. G., Brammer, L., Orpen, A. G. & Taylor, R. (1987). J. Chem. Soc. Perkin Trans. 2, pp. S1–S19.
- Allinger, N. L. & Yuh, Y. (1977). MM2. QCPE No. 3951. Department of Chemistry, Indiana University, USA.
- Annunziata, R., Ponzini, F. & Raimondi, L. (1995). Magn. Reson. Chem. 33, 297-307.
- Bahl, A. (1996). PhD thesis (in preparation), Technical University of Braunschweig, Germany.
- Bahl, A., Grahn, W., Stadler, S., Feiner, F., Bourhill, G., Bräuchle, C., Reisner, A. & Jones, P. G. (1995). Angew. Chem. 107, 1587–1590; Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. Engl. 34, 1485–1488.
- Boyer, G., Claramunt, R. M., Elguero, J., Fathalla, M., Foces-Foces, C., Jaime, C. & Llamas-Saiz, A. L. (1993). J. Chem. Soc. Perkin Trans. 2, pp. 757-766.
- Clark, T. & Wiedel, B. (1992). VAMPC 4.41 Program Package. University of Erlangen, Germany.
- Clough, R. L., Kung, W. J., Marsh, R. E. & Roberts, J. D. (1976). J. Org. Chem. 41, 3603-3609.
- Dewar, M. J. S., Zoebisch, E. G., Healy, E. F. & Stewart J. J. P. (1985). J. Am. Chem. Soc. 107, 3902–3909.
- Foster, R. (1969). In Organic Charge-Transfer Complexes. London: Academic Press.
- Jones, P. G., Grahn, W., Bahl, A. & Reisner, A. (1995). Z. Kristallogr. 210, 229–230.
- Kranz, M., Clark, T. & von Ragué Schleyer, P. (1993). J. Org. Chem. 58, 3317–3325.
- Nalva, H. S., Watanabe, T. & Miyata, S. (1995). Adv. Mater. 7, 754-758.
- Sheldrick, G. M. (1990). Acta Cryst. A46, 467-473.
- Sheldrick, G. M. (1993). SHELXL93. Program for the Refinement of Crystal Structures. University of Göttingen, Germany.
- Siemens (1994). XP. Molecular Graphics Program. Version 5.03.
- Siemens Analytical X-ray Instruments, Madison, Wisconsin, USA. Stoe & Cie (1991). *DIF4. Diffractometer Control Program.* Version 7.08. Stoe & Cie, Darmstadt, Germany.
- Stoe & Cie (1991). REDU4. Data Reduction Program. Version 7.08. Stoe & Cie, Darmstadt, Germany.
- Tsuji, R., Komatsu, K., Takeuchi, K., Shiro, M., Cohen, S. & Rabinovitz, M. (1993). J. Phys. Org. Chem. 6, 435–444.
- Tsuzuki, S., Tanabe, K., Nagawa, Y. & Nakanishi, H. (1990). J. Mol. Struct. 216, 279-295.
- Wahl, P., Krieger, C., Schweitzer, D. & Staab, H. A. (1984). Chem. Ber. 117, 260–276.

© 1996 International Union of Crystallography Printed in Great Britain – all rights reserved Acta Cryst. (1996). C52, 2017-2020

## Methyl {4-[8-(4-Trifluoromethylphenyl)naphthalen-1-yl]phenyl} Selenide

ANDRÉ BAHL,<sup>a</sup> WALTER GRAHN<sup>a</sup> AND PETER G. JONES<sup>b</sup>\*

<sup>a</sup>Institut für Organische Chemie, Technische Universität Braunschweig, Hagenring 30, 38106 Braunschweig, Germany, and <sup>b</sup>Institut für Anorganische und Analytische Chemie, Technische Universität Braunschweig, Postfach 3329, 38023 Braunschweig, Germany. E-mail: jones@xray36.anchem.nat.tu-bs.de

(Received 28 May 1996; accepted 11 June 1996)

#### Abstract

The phenyl rings of the title compound,  $C_{24}H_{17}F_3Se$ , make an angle of 21.1 (2)° to each other and 59.1 (1)° (CF<sub>3</sub>-substituted) and 59.6 (1)° (SeMe-substituted) with the naphthalene plane. The major distortion of the naphthalene ring system is seen in the angles C8a— C1—C9, C8—C8a—C1 and C8a—C8—C16, which are all *ca* 125°; there is little out-of-plane distortion.

#### Comment

We have prepared selected 1,8-diarylnaphthalenes, including the title compound (1), to study the effects of through-space  $\pi$ - $\pi$  interactions on linear and non-linear optical properties. We have shown that donor-acceptor (*D/A*)-substituted 1,8-diarylnaphthalenes possess similar or even higher first hyperpolarizabilities ( $\beta$ ) than compounds of analogous transparency (Bahl *et al.*, 1995); *e.g.* for 1-(4-methoxyphenyl)-8-(4-trifluoro-methylphenyl)naphthalene, (2),  $\beta$  is determined to be  $35 \times 10^{-30}$  e.s.u. (electrostatic units) by hyper-Rayleigh scattering (HRS) in chloroform solution (*cf.* paranitro-aniline  $\beta = 17 \times 10^{-30}$  e.s.u.). In an attempt to improve this value further, the sulfide, (3), and selenide, (1), derivatives have been prepared.



Aromatics with two (or more) potential leaving groups (e.g. I, Br) cause the formation of bis- or oligosubstitution products during C—C-crosscoupling reactions. Even with equimolar amounts, statistical product distributions are usually obtained. In the case of 1,8diiodo- or dibromonaphthalene, a further complication is the facile dehalogenation, so that 1-arylnaphthalenes