Control of Si–C Bond Cleavage at Carbon α to Phosphorus. Suppression of Facile Protodesilylation of PPh₂CH₂SiMe₂H by Complexation through Phosphorus to Ruthenium and the X-Ray Crystal and Molecular Structure of [Ru(η^{6} -p-cymene)Cl₂(PPh₂CH₂SiMe₂OH)]

Ron D. Brost, Gregg C. Bruce, and Stephen R. Stobart*

Department of Chemistry, University of Victoria, British Columbia, Canada V8W 2Y2

Facile cleavage of the Si–C bond α to P in Ph₂PCH₂SiMe₂H which is induced by HY (Y = OH, OMe, or Cl) is suppressed on complexation at Ru in [Ru(η^6 -cym)Cl₂(PPh₂CH₂SiMe₂H)] (cym = *p*-cymene); instead the latter reacts where Y = OH to afford the silanol complex [Ru(η^6 -cym)Cl₂(PPh₂CH₂SiMe₂OH)] which has been structurally characterized by *X*-ray diffraction.

Designing synthetic strategy around organosilicon chemistry^{1,2} relies on control of silicon-carbon bond-cleavage reactions. Facile silyl-group cleavage from a carbon atom α to phosphorus has recently been reported by Eaborn and coworkers,³ who have suggested that initial protonation at P is followed by nucleophilic attack at Si to generate an ylidic intermediate via silvl loss, i.e. steps which are reminiscent of the protodesilylation of arylsilanes⁴ and the fracture of the Si-C bond in ylides⁵ like Me₃P=CHSiMe₃ respectively. We offer a new perspective on such mechanistic arguments, which follows from a fundamental disparity between the reactivity of the phosphino(silyl)methane⁶ PPh₂CH₂SiMe₂H (1) in its uncomplexed state and as a ligand in the transition-metal derivative [Ru(η^{6} -cym)Cl₂L] (2) [cym = p-cymene, L = (1)]. Thus while compound (1) is desilylated even by traces of water, complex (2) undergoes Si-H bond hydrolysis to afford

a stable product $[Ru(\eta^6-cym)Cl_2(PPh_2CH_2SiMe_2OH)]$ (3) which has been structurally characterized using X-ray diffraction.

Preparative routes to phosphinoalkylsilanes including compound (1) and its analogue PPh₂(CH₂)₂SiMe₂H (4) have been described elsewhere.⁶ Further examination of the properties of these molecules has revealed that the methane derivative (1) rapidly and completely reverts to its precursor⁶ PMePh₂ in the presence of protic reagents like H₂O, HCl, or MeOH. By contrast the corresponding ethane (4) is stable under similar conditions. Protodesilylation of compound (1) according to equation (1) was characterized by use of *in situ* ¹H n.m.r. spectroscopy: the silyl products⁷ SiMe₂HY are those expected to be generated by nucleophilic attack at Si, while with ²H₂O the isotopomer P(CH₂²H)Ph₂ was formed exclusively. Compounds (1) and (4) behaved similarly on treatment with MeI,



Figure 1. Molecular geometry of compound (3). Selected bond distances and angles: Ru-Cl(1), 2.407(3); Ru-Cl(2), 2.410(3); Ru-P, 2.353(3); P-C(A), 1.820(12); C(A)-Si, 1.866(12); Si-O, 1.591(8); Si-C(B), 1.878(15); Si-C(C), 1.861(16) Å. P-Ru-Cl(1), 87.2(1); P-Ru-Cl(2), 84.2(1); Cl(1)-Ru-Cl(2), 88.2(1); P-C(A)-Si, 121.2(7); C(A)-Si-O, 110.2(7); C(B)-Si-O, 105.5(6); C(C)-Si-O, 109.2(7); C(B)-Si-C(C), 111.2(8)°.

however, with quantitative conversion to the phosphonium species $[PPh_2Me(CH_2)_nSiMe_2H]I$ (n = 1 or 2).

$$PPh_2CH_2SiMe_2H + HY \rightarrow PPh_2Me + SiMe_2HY \quad (1)$$
(1)
$$Y = OH, Cl, \text{ or OMe}$$

Addition of the silane (1) to a solution in dry tetrahydrofuran (THF) of the binuclear species $[Ru(\eta^6-cym)Cl_2]_2$ led to immediate precipitation of an orange complex. This product was identified as $[Ru(\eta^6-cym)Cl_2(PPh_2CH_2SiMe_2H)]$ (2) from its ¹H n.m.r. spectrum, which as well as cym and Ph resonances showed signals attributable to a SiMe₂H group,† and by its i.r. spectrum which included a strong absorption due to v(Si-H) (2120 cm⁻¹). Refrigeration (-20 °C) of a solution in acetone of compound (2) led to very slow (~120 days) deposition of ruby-red crystals: an X-ray crystal structure determination‡ established that substitution at Si had taken

‡ Crystal data for (3): C₂₅H₃₃RuCl₂PSiO, M = 579.6, space group $P2_1/c$, a = 10.2580(7), b = 14.2058(8), c = 18.055(1) Å, $\beta = 98.592(5)^\circ$, U = 2601.50(8) Å³, Z = 4, $D_c = 1.48$ g cm⁻³; Enraf-Nonius CAD4 diffractometer, Mo- K_{α} radiation ($\lambda = 0.71069$ Å), $\mu = 6.32$ cm⁻¹; 2349 observed reflections refined to a conventional R = 0.044 ($R_w = 0.049$). Atomic co-ordinates, bond lengths and angles, and thermal parameters have been deposited at the Cambridge Crystallographic Data Centre. See Notice to Authors, Issue No. 1, 1986.

place affording the silanol derivative $[Ru(\eta^6-cym)Cl_2-(PPh_2CH_2SiMe_2OH)]$ (3) of (2), the molecular geometry of which is shown in Figure 1. The silane : silanol transformation (2):(3) is slow in wet solvents and may conveniently be monitored by using either ¹H or ³¹P n.m.r. spectroscopy: solvolysis by MeOH is even slower but by contrast gaseous HCl induces immediate chlorination, equation (2).

$$[\operatorname{Ru}(\eta^{6}\operatorname{-cym})\operatorname{Cl}_{2}(\operatorname{PPh}_{2}\operatorname{CH}_{2}\operatorname{SiMe}_{2}\operatorname{H})]$$

$$(2)$$

$$\xrightarrow{HY} [\operatorname{Ru}(\eta^{6}\operatorname{-cym})\operatorname{Cl}_{2}(\operatorname{PPh}_{2}\operatorname{CH}_{2}\operatorname{SiMe}_{2}\operatorname{Y})] \quad (2)$$

$$(3: \operatorname{Y} = \operatorname{OH})$$

A comparison between equations (1) and (2) reinforces the mechanistic proposition³ referred to initially: elimination of lone-pair availability at P by electron donation to Ru leads to suppression of Si-C bond cleavage in a way which may be useful in controlling such reactions, and substitution at Si is indeed slow in the stabilized P-C-Si configuration. Compound (3), which is formed from (2) by hydrolysis at Si, is structurally unremarkable except for the widening of the P-C-Si angle to 121.2°, an effect which we assume is sterically induced. There is no evidence for intra- or inter-molecular bonding contacts with the silanol function although both were evident in the structure⁸ of the related complex $[Ru(PPh_2CH_2SiMe_2OH)(CO)_2(CO_2CF_3)_2 \cdot Et_2O].$ Ringopening of the latter occurs9 with pyridine, leading to 'dangling' silanol co-ordination at Ru^{II} closely resembling that displayed in (3).

$$PPh_2(CH_2)_2SiMe_2H$$
(4)

We thank the N.S.E.R.C., Canada for financial support, Imperial Oil Ltd. for provision of a University Research Grant, Dr. Mark A. Williams for helpful comments, Dr. Gordon Bushnell for advice regarding crystallography, and Petra Keizer for assistance with some experiments.

Received, 15th May 1986; Com. 651

References

- C. Eaborn and R. W. Bott in 'Organometallic Compounds of the Group IV Elements,' vol. 1, part 1, ed. A. G. MacDiarmid, Dekker, New York, 1968; I. Fleming, in 'Comprehensive Organic Chemistry,' vol. 3, eds. D. H. R. Barton and W. D. Ollis, Pergamon, Oxford, 1979, p. 541-686; K. P. C. Vollhardt, Acc. Chem. Res., 1977, 10, 1.
- 2 I. Fleming, Chem. Soc. Rev. 1981, 10, 83.
- 3 C. Eaborn, N. Retta, and J. D. Smith, J. Chem. Soc., Dalton Trans., 1983, 905.
- 4 C. Eaborn, J. Organomet. Chem., 1975, 100, 43.
- 5 H. Schmidbaur and W. Tronich, *Chem. Ber.*, 1967, **100**, 1032; H. Schmidbaur, H. Stuhler, and W. Buchner, *ibid.*, 1973, **106**, 1238.
- 6 R. D. Holmes-Smith, R. D. Osei, and S. R. Stobart, J. Chem. Soc., Perkin Trans. 1, 1983, 861.
- 7 These species were identified by ¹H n.m.r. spectroscopy: for Y = OMe, see T. Y. Gu and W. P. Weber, J. Organomet. Chem., 1980, 184, 7; for Y = Cl, D. E. Webster, J. Chem. Soc., 1960, 5132. For Y = OH, condensation to (SiMe₂H)₂O was observed: V. P. Mileshkevich, V. O. Reikhsfel'd, A. I. Suprunenko, V. A. Pestunovich, M. F. Larin, and M. G. Voronkov, Dokl. Akad. Nauk. SSSR, 1976, 231, 1134.
- 8 M. J. Auburn, R. D. Holmes-Smith, S. R. Stobart, M. J. Zawarotko, T. S. Cameron, and A. Kumari, J. Chem. Soc., Chem. Commun., 1983, 1523.
- 9 M. J. Auburn, S. R. Stobart, and M. J. Zaworotko, unpublished results.

[†] Compound (2): ¹H n.m.r., $\delta -0.43$ (d, SiMe₂H), 3.45 (septet, SiMe₂H, J 3.5 Hz), 0.71 (d, CHMe₂), 2.45 (septet, CHMe₂, J 7.2 Hz). ³¹P n.m.r., $\delta -117$ p.p.m. Satisfactory microanalytical data were obtained for this complex and also for compound (3).