## **Restricted P-N Rotation in Dimethylhydroxylaminohalogenophosphines**

By **ANTHONY HUNG** and **JOHN** W. **GILJE\*** 

(Department *of* Chemistry, University *of* Hawaii, Honolulu, Hawaii **96822)** 

Summary Variable temperature n.m.r. spectra are consistent with hindered rotation about the P-N bond in bis- **(1,2-dimethylhydroxylamino)** halogenophosphines.

**SUBSTANTIAL** P-N rotational barriers, which have been detected in amino-<sup>1</sup> and hydrazino-phosphines,<sup>2</sup> have been attributed, in part, to  $p_{\pi}$ - $d_{\pi}$  bonding of the nitrogen atoms' lone pair electrons,<sup>1</sup> and the rotational or inversional barriers, which occur in hydroxylamines, are thought to reflect interactions which also involve a nitrogen lone pair.<sup>3,4</sup> **The** incorporation of P-N and N-0 bonds into a single P-N-0 unit should, thus, drastically alter the behaviour of the N-0 bond, since delocalization of nitrogen electrons into d-orbitals on phosphorus should alter the character of the nitrogen lone pair. To investigate the possible existence of such an effect we have examined the n.m.r. spectra of number of **1,2-dirnethylhydroxylaminohalogenophosphines,**  and report the detection of a stereochemical exchange process, which we ascribe to slow P-N rotation.

 $F_2$ PNMeOMe, FP(NMeOMe)<sub>2</sub>, Cl<sub>2</sub>PNMeOMe, and ClP- $(NMeOMe)_2$  were prepared by literature methods,<sup>5</sup> and  $Br_2$ PNMeOMe, and  $BrP(NMeOMe)_2$  were synthesized by hydroxylaminolysis of  $PBr<sub>3</sub>$  using the same procedures.<sup>5</sup> Variable temperature 1H n.m.r. spectra were recorded on  $CF<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub>$  solutions of these compounds using a Varian HA-100 spectrometer and an n.m.r. specialities HD-60 31P spin decoupler. Chemical shifts are relative to internal Me<sub>4</sub>Si.

At ambient temperature the <sup>1</sup>H spectrum of ClP(NMe-OMe)<sub>2</sub>, taken while decoupling <sup>31</sup>P, consists of single N-CH<sub>3</sub>  $(8 \t2.92)$  and OCH<sub>3</sub> (3.58) resonances. On cooling, these peaks broaden and by  $-130^\circ$  each have reappeared as two new signals each of about the same intensity (for NCH,: *Tc*   $-106^{\circ}$ ,  $\Delta v$  22 Hz; for OCH<sub>3</sub>:  $T_c - 112^{\circ}$ ,  $\Delta v$  9 Hz).  $\Delta G_c^t$ , calculated using  $k_c = \pi \Delta v \sqrt{2}$  and the Eyring equations, is  $8.3$  kcal mol<sup>-1</sup> as determined from both the NCH<sub>3</sub> and OCH<sub>3</sub> resonances. Without <sup>31</sup>P double irradiation PNCH coupling is observed; at  $-130^{\circ}$  J<sub>PNCH</sub> is 23 Hz and 9 Hz coupling is observed; at  $-130^{\circ}$   $J_{\text{PNCH}}$  is 23 Hz and 9 Hz for the splitting of the high and low field N-CH<sub>3</sub> signals, respectively. Similarly, the single NCH, (8 **2.87)** and OCH, **(3.49)** resonances, observed in the spectrum of BrP-  $(NMeOMe)_2$  while decoupling  $^{31}P$ , broadened as temperature was decreased. By  $-150^{\circ}$  N-CH<sub>3</sub> had reappeared as two new peaks  $(T_c -127^\circ, \Delta v 25 \text{ Hz})$  with intensity ratio **<sup>7</sup>**: **3** of the low to high field peaks. At this temperature the OCH, signal also had resharpened but to an unsymmetric single peak, which could be simulated by a superposition of a low field, intensity **7,** signal with a high field one of intensity 3, separated by  $ca. 3-4$  Hz. The NCH<sub>3</sub> peaks are further split if 31P double resonance is not used; however, because these still partially broadened peaks overlap, the coupling constants could not be extracted with confidence. The simple equations used above to calculate  $\Delta G_c^{\dagger}$  do not apply when two conformers are unequally populated and, as a line shape analysis has not yet been completed, we

cannot report accurate values **for** the barrier in BrP(NMe-OMe)<sub>2</sub>. However, this barrier is probably lower than that in CIP(NMeOMe)<sub>2</sub>, since  $T_c$  for the bromo-compound occurs about **20"** below where it does in the chloro-derivative, while  $\Delta v$  is nearly the same between the two.

Since P inversion would be slow $\dagger$  while N inversion should remain rapid<sup>t</sup> in these compounds the stereochemical exchange, which is observed in these spectra, may be either P-N or 0-N rotation. A choice can be made between these since the two conformers of CIP(NMeOMe)<sub>2</sub> which are observed at low temperature possess quite different PNCH coupling constants. Similar behaviour has previously been noted in aminophosphines where the differences in  $J_{\text{PNCH}}$  arise from differences in the orientation **of** the N-CH, group about the P-N bond. Since slow 0-N rotation would not affect the relative conformation of nitrogen to phosphorus, P-N rotation must be the ratelimiting stereochemical process. Given thie assignment,  $\Delta G_c^{\dagger}$  for P-N rotation in ClP(NMeOMe)<sub>2</sub> is in the range of  $8-9$  kcal mol<sup>-1</sup> previously observed<sup>1</sup> in aminophosphines where *two* of the groups bonded to phosphorus are the same.

The low temperature spectra of the related FP(NMe-OMe)<sub>2</sub>,  $F_2$ PNMeOMe, Cl<sub>2</sub>PNMeOMe, and Br<sub>2</sub>PNMeOMe were also recorded. No changes, except slight broadening in some cases, were observed in any **of** these spectra to at least **-130'.** There may, however, be substantial barriers in these compounds and the temperature independence of their spectra may arise from accidental chemical shift equivalences since the <sup>19</sup>F spectrum of at least  $F_2$ PNMeOMe is temperature dependent.

We thank the Petroleum Research Fund administered by the American Chemical Society for support *of* this research.

*(Received, 5th April* **1972;** *Corn.* **575.)** 

 $\dagger$  Energetic arguments which demonstrate that phosphorus inversion would not be observed under the conditions used in this study have already been made.<sup>1</sup>

 $\sharp$  In systems in which  $p_{\pi}-d_{\pi}$  bonding can stabilize a planar conformation nitrogen inversion remains rapid even at very low temperature.<sup>1,6,7</sup>

<sup>1</sup> A. H. Cowley, M. J. S. Dewar, W. R. Jackson, and W. B. Jennings, *J. Amer. Chem. Soc.*, 1970, 92, 5306 and references therein. <sup>2</sup> T. T. Bopp, M. D. Havlicek, and J. W. Gilje, *J. Amer. Chem. Soc.*, 1971, 93, 3051.

- 
- **3 M.** Raban and G. W. J. Kenney, jun., *Tetrahedron Letters,* **1969, 1295.**  J. R. Fletcher and I. 0. Sutherland, *Chem. Comm.,* **1970,** *687.*
- 
- *<sup>5</sup>***A.** E. Goya, **M.** D. Rosario, and J. W. Gilje, *Inorg. Chem.,* **1969,** *8,* **725.**
- **6 M. Raban and F. B. Jones, J. Amer. Chem. Soc., 1971, 93, 2692 and references therein.**<br><sup>8</sup> M. Raban and F. B. Jones, J. Amer. Chem. Soc., 1971, 93, 2692 and references therein.<br><sup>7</sup> A. Rauk, L. C. Allen, and K. Mislow,
-