## Formation of novel conjugated polycarbon-metal systems *via* metal migration on a $M-C\equiv C-C\equiv C-M$ linkage

## Munetaka Akita,\* Min-Chul Chung, Aizoh Sakurai and Yoshihiko Moro-oka

Chemical Resources Laboratory, Tokyo Institute of Technology, 4259 Nagatsuta, Midori-ku, Yokohama 226-8503, Japan. E-mail: makita@res.titech.ac.jp

Received (in Cambridge, UK) 9th May 2000, Accepted 1st June 2000

Reactions of butadiynediyldimetal complexes,  $Fp^*-C=C-C=C-M(\eta^5-C_5R_5)(CO)_2 1$  [M = Fe, Ru; R = Me, H; Fp\* = FeCp\*(CO)\_2], with group 8 metal carbonyls result in migration of a  $\sigma$ -bonded metal fragment along the C<sub>4</sub> rod to form novel highly conjugated polycarbon-metal systems; the zwitterionic  $\mu$ -but-2-yn-1-ylidene-4-ylidyne complex Ru<sub>3</sub>(CO)<sub>10</sub>( $\mu_3$ -C-C=C- $\mu$ -C)Fe<sub>2</sub>Cp\*<sub>2</sub>(CO)<sub>3</sub> 2, and the dimerized product with a cumulenic  $\mu$ -C<sub>8</sub> ligand (Cp\*Fe)<sub>4</sub>-Ru<sub>2</sub>(CO)<sub>13</sub>[ $\mu_6$ -C<sub>8</sub>-C(=O)] 3, via 1,4-migration and the zwitterionic acetylide cluster-type product Fp\*+[Cp(CO)<sub>2</sub>Ru-( $\eta^2$ -C=C)-( $\mu_3$ -C=C)Fe<sub>3</sub>(CO)<sub>9</sub>]<sup>-</sup> 4, via 1,3-migration.

Increasing attention focused on polycarbon–transition metal complexes stems originally from their relevance to surface bound carbide intermediates<sup>1</sup> and recently from their intriguing chemical and physical properties which are potentially applicable to new molecular devices.<sup>2</sup> However, neither interaction modes nor synthetic methods have been thoroughly exploited. During the course of our synthetic study of polycarbon cluster compounds derived from polyynediyldimetal complexes M–(C=C)<sub>n</sub>–M [n = 1-6; M = Fe or Ru( $\eta^5$ -C<sub>5</sub>R<sub>5</sub>)(CO<sub>2</sub>],<sup>3</sup> we observed formation of novel highly conjugated polycarbon–transition metal systems resulting from migration of a  $\sigma$ -bonded metal fragment along the carbon rod. Herein we report results of interaction of butadiynediyl complexes **1** (n = 2) with group 8 metal carbonyl species.

Reaction of the butadiynediyldiiron complex **1a** [Scheme 1,  $Fp^* = FeCp^*(CO)_2$ ;  $Cp^* = \eta^{5} \cdot C_5Me_5]^{3b}$  with  $Ru_3(CO)_{12}$  in refluxing  $CH_2Cl_2$  gave a mixture of products, from which two compounds **2** and **3a** were isolated after TLC separation (silica gel). For the purple red product **2**,<sup>†</sup> the single  $Cp^*$  NMR signal and the highly deshielded <sup>13</sup>C NMR signal ( $\delta_C$  347.1) suggested formation of a symmetrical cluster compound **2'** bearing a cumulenic > C=C=C=CFe\_2 fragment but X-ray crystallography of its  $\eta^5$ -C<sub>5</sub>Me<sub>4</sub>Et derivative **2**<sup>#</sup><sup>‡</sup> [Fig. 1(a)] revealed a mirror symmetrical zwitterionic but-2-yne-1-ylidene-4-ylidyne structure<sup>5</sup> with (i) a C<sub>4</sub> bridge showing long–short–long bond alternation and (ii)  $\mu_3$ -coordination of the C4 and C23 atoms. Contribution of the neutral butatrienetetrayl structure **2'**,





Fig. 1 Molecular structures of  $2^{#}$  (a) and 3a (b) drawn at the 30% probability level. Selected parameters:  $2^{#}$ : Fe–C1 1.906(6), 1.885(9), C1–C2 1.31(1), C2–C3 1.25(1), C3–C4 1.34(1), C4–Ru 2.093–2.120(9), Ru–Ru 2.749–2.781(1), Fe1–Fe2 2.530(2) Å; Fe–C1–C2 137.4(6), 138.8(7), C1–C2–C3 179(1), C2–C3–C4 177.4(8), Ru1–C4–C3 133.4(6), Ru2–C4–C3 132.3(7), Ru3–C4–C3 126.0(6)°. **3a**: C1–C2 1.202(8), C2–C3 1.443(8), C3–C4 1.408(7), C3–C9 1.538(8), C4–C5 1.415(7), C5–C6 1.315(8), C6–C7 1.308(7), C7–C8 1.285(7), Fe1–C1 1.912(6), Ru2–C3 2.291(5), Fe2–C4 2.024(5), Ru2–C4 2.279(5), Ru1–C5 2.228(5), Ru2–C5 2.128(5), Ru1–C6 2.458(5), Fe3–C8 1.934(6), Fe4–C8 1.924(6), Ru1–C9 2.118(6), Ru1–Ru2 2.7453(7), Fe3–Fe4 2.542(1) Å; Fe1–C1–C2 176.4(5), C1–C2–C3 168.7(6), C2–C3–C4 128.2(5), C2–C3–C9 114.7(4), C4–C3–C9 113.0(4), C3–C4–C5 112.5(5), C4–C5–C6 144.1(5), Ru1–C5–Ru2 78.1(2), C5–C6–C7 168.4(6), C6–C7–C8 176.4(6), Ru1–C9–C3 110.3(3)°.

however, is evident, since (i) the C<sub>4</sub> rod is slightly tilted toward Ru3 as indicated by the C3–C4–Ru angles and (ii) the C–C distances of the  $\mu$ -C–C≡C–C moiety are averaged to some extent. It should be noted that the ( $\mu$ -C<sub>4</sub>)Fe<sub>2</sub>Cp\*<sub>2</sub>(CO)<sub>3</sub> structure results from 1,4-migration of the iron fragment along the C<sub>4</sub> rod, *i.e.* the FeCp\*(CO)<sub>n</sub> fragment is shifted from one end of the C<sub>4</sub> bridge to the other upon interaction with Ru<sub>3</sub>(CO)<sub>12</sub>. The NMR spectrum of the other deep purple red complex **3a**<sup>†</sup> contained four sets of Cp\* signals indicating oligomerization of **1a**, and X-ray crystallography<sup>‡</sup> [Fig. 1(b)] revealed a hexanuclear structure with a dimerized C<sub>8</sub> skeleton. Again, formation of the new C<sub>8</sub> carbon linkage involves 1,4-migration (C5 → C8) of the iron fragment. The migration induces a change of part of the polyyne structure into a cumulenic moiety (C8=C7=C6=C5) with similar C–C distances. Although the pentatetraenylidene structure **3a**'  $\pi$ -bonded to the two ruthenium atoms is a possible canonical structure of **3a**, the bent C5–



Chart 1

C4–C3 moiety with similar C–C and Ru2–C distances reveals  $\eta^3$ -allyl coordination to Ru2. The linear C3–C2–C1–Fe1 moiety is a normal  $\eta^1$ -acetylide structure. Coordination of the perpendicularly projected, adjacent cumulenic  $\pi$  orbitals of the C6–C5 and C5–C4 bonds to the two ruthenium atoms connected by a Ru–Ru bond<sup>6</sup> leads to strain, which is relieved by formation of a larger membered ring structure *via* CO-insertion [CO(9)]. The C<sub>8</sub> bridge was also characterized by <sup>13</sup>C NMR spectroscopy.† Except for the deshielded C8 signal ( $\delta_C$  254.7), the other signals appeared in a rather narrow range ( $\delta_C$  157–107).

The isostructural C<sub>8</sub> complex **3b**<sup>†</sup> was obtained from the Fe, Ru-mixed metal butadiynediyl complex, Fp\*-C=C-C=C-RuCp\*(CO)<sub>2</sub> **1b**,<sup>4</sup> upon treatment with Ru<sub>3</sub>(CO)<sub>12</sub>.§ Complex **3b** consisted of a mixture of two inseparable isomers, **3b'** and **3b''** (Chart 1), as indicated by NMR data containing two sets of signals as well as the successful X-ray structural analysis taking into account a disordered structure containing two components. It should be noted that no homometallic complexes (M1 = M2 = Ru or Fe) were detected by NMR and FD-MS analyses suggesting an intramolecular mechanism for the migration.

Another example of metal migration was observed for reaction of Fp\*–C=C–RuCp(CO)<sub>2</sub> **1c** [Cp( $\eta^5$ -C<sub>5</sub>H<sub>5</sub>) derivative of **1b**] with Fe<sub>2</sub>(CO)<sub>9</sub>, a group 8 metal carbonyl.§ The deshielded <sup>13</sup>C NMR signal ( $\delta_C$  193.7) of the resultant purple Fe<sub>3</sub>-adduct **4** (Chart 1)† suggested formation of a  $\mu$ -acetylide cluster compound,<sup>7</sup> and X-ray crystallography‡ revealed a pentanuclear structure consisting of a cationic dinuclear  $\mu$ – $\eta^1$ : $\eta^2$ -acetylide complex part and an anionic trinuclear  $\mu_3$ -acetylide cluster type structure. The structure of each component is normal, and the diamagnetic nature of **4** can be interpreted in terms of the zwitterionic structure, each metal center in which is coordinatively saturated.

In conclusion, interaction of the butadiynediyl complexes 1 with group 8 metal carbonyls results in the formation of novel highly conjugated polycarbon-metal cluster systems. The structures of 2 and 3 suggest the occurrence of stepwise metal migration along the carbon rod, and the C<sub>8</sub> linkage in 4 is formed via 1,4-migration on a ruthenacyclopentadiene intermediate 5 resulting from oxidative metallacyclization of 1 (Chart 1).8 Noteworthy features of the present system are as follows. The formation of zwitterionic structures such as 2 and 4 are regarded as typical of electron transfer through unsaturated carbon rods. Another feature is the flexible coordination mode of the  $C(sp)_n$  system. For example, in the case of interaction with trimetallic species, the C4 ligand can behave as a three-  $(\mu_3 - \eta^1 - C_4 \text{ like C4 in } 2)$  to seven-electron donor  $(\mu - \eta^3 - \eta^3$ propargylidene-ketene).<sup>3c</sup> When combined with coordination of CO ligands, which can act as either one- or two-electron donors, various intermediates have many opportunities to attain coordinative saturation by switching coordination modes of the C<sub>4</sub> and/or CO ligands.

We are grateful to the Yamada Science Foundation for financial support of this research.

## Notes and references

† Selected spectroscopic data: **2** (7%):  $\delta_{H}(CD_{2}Cl_{2})$  1.71 (Cp\*).  $\delta_{C}(CD_{2}Cl_{2}, -90$  °C) 347.1 (C1), 216.7 (C4), 119.0, 118.4 (C3≡C4); 269.1 (µ<sub>3</sub>-CO), 268.3 (µ-CO), 211.1 (Fe–CO), 196.9 (Ru–CO). IR(CH<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub>)  $\nu$ (C≡C) 2081;  $\nu$ (CO) 2047, 2008, 1961, 1903;  $\nu$ (µ-CO) 1801;  $\nu$ (µ<sub>3</sub>-CO) 1700 cm<sup>-1</sup>. **3a** (10%)  $\delta_{H}(CDCl_{3})$  1.92, 1.86, 1.73, 1.68 (Cp\*).  $\delta_{C}(CDCl_{3})$  254.7 (µ-C=); 157.3, 134.0, 129.0, 128.9, 111.5, 108.8, 106.8 (C1–C7); 274.9 (µ-CO); 225.7 (>C=O); 218.0, 216.0, 215.6, 214.5, 213.2, 200.0, 198.6, 197.1, 193.7 (CO). IR(CH<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub>)  $\nu$ (C≡C) 2060;  $\nu$ (CO) 2030, 1801, 2015, 1996, 1961, 1954, 1895,  $\nu$ (µ-CO) 1780,  $\nu$ (>C=O) 1575 cm<sup>-1</sup>. **3b** (12%):§  $\delta_{H}(CDcl_{3})$  5.56 (Cp), 1.97 (Cp\*).  $\delta_{C}(CDCl_{3})$  193.7, 144.0, 123.3, 104.8 (C4); 216.0, 215.0, 1968 (CO). IR(CH<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub>)  $\nu$ (CC) 2047, 2036, 1995, 1982, 1962, 1939;  $\nu$ (C=C) 1606 cm<sup>-1</sup>.

<sup>‡</sup> X-Ray diffraction measurements were made on a Rigaku RAXIS IV imaging plate area detector with graphite-monochromated Mo-Kα radiation ( $\lambda = 0.71069$  Å) at -60 °C. *Crystal data*: **2**<sup>#</sup>: C<sub>42</sub>H<sub>41</sub>O<sub>13</sub>Fe<sub>2</sub>Ru<sub>3</sub>, M = 1168.7, monoclinic, space group P2<sub>1</sub>/c, a = 15.445(1), b = 16.481(2), c = 18.873(3) Å,  $\beta = 112.60(1)^\circ$ , V = 4435.2(10) Å<sup>3</sup>, Z = 4,  $D_c = 1.75$  g cm<sup>-3</sup>,  $\mu = 17.0$  cm<sup>-1</sup>, R1 = 0.068 for the 8584 unique data with  $F > 4\sigma(F)$  (wR2 = 0.212 for all 9332 data) and 552 parameters. **3a**: C<sub>68</sub>H<sub>74</sub>O<sub>14</sub>Fe<sub>4</sub>Ru<sub>2</sub>, M = 1540.9, monoclinic, space group P2<sub>1</sub>/n, a = 13.323(2), b = 18.681(9), c = 26.420(4) Å,  $\beta = 93.023(7)^\circ$ , V = 6566(2) Å<sup>3</sup>, Z = 4,  $D_c = 1.56$  g cm<sup>-3</sup>,  $\mu = 13.7$  cm<sup>-1</sup>, R1 = 0.064 for the 10696 unique data with  $F > 4\sigma(F)$  (wR2 = 0.173 for all 11815 data) and 815 parameters. Details of **4** are included in the supplementary material. CCDC 182/1669.

§ Other products: from **1b**: Fp\*–C=C–( $\mu_4$ -C=C)Ru\_4Cp\*(CO)\_{11} **6** (43%); from **1c**: Fp\*–C=C–( $\mu_3$ -C=C)Fe\_2RuCp\*(CO)\_97 (7%) and (CO)\_2Cp\*Ru–( $\mu$ - $\eta^3$ -C\_3)[Fe\_2(CO)\_6]–C(=C=O)–Fp\* **8** (15%). Complexes **6** and **7** are acetylide cluster-type compounds and complex **8** contains a  $\mu$ - $\eta^3$ -propargylidene-ketene ligand.<sup>3c</sup> No characterizable product was obtained from Fp\*–C=C–C=C–FeCp(CO)\_2.

- M. Tachikawa and E. L. Muetterties, *Prog. Inorg. Chem.*, 1981, 28, 203;
  J. S. Bradley, *Adv. Organomet. Chem.*, 1983, 22, 1; D. F. Shriver and
  M. J. Sailor, *Acc. Chem. Res.*, 1988, 21, 374; W. Beck, B. Niemer and M. Wieser, *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed. Engl.*, 1993, 32, 923; H. Lang, *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed. Engl.*, 1994, 33, 547; U. Bunz, *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed. Engl.*, 1996, 35, 969; A. L. Balch and M. M. Olmstead, *Chem. Rev.*, 1998, 98, 2133; M. I. Bruce, *Chem. Rev.*, 1998, 98, 2797.
- R. Dembinski, T. Bartik, B. Bartik, M. Jaeger and J. Gladysz, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 2000, 122, 810; M. Brady, R. Dembinski and J. A.Gladysz, Angew. Chem., Int. Ed. Engl., 1996, 35, 414; M. Brady, W. Weng, Y. Zhou, J. W. Seylet, A. J. Amoroso, A. M. Arif, M. Böhme, G. Frenking and J. A. Gladysz, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 1997, 119, 775; T. Bartik, W. Weng, J. A. Ramsden, S. Szafert, S. B. Falloon, A. M. Arif and J. A. Gladysz, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 1998, 120, 11071; M. Guillemot, L. Toupet and C. Lapinte, Organometallics, 1998, 17, 1928; M. I. Bruce, B. D. Kelly, B. W. Skelton and A. H. White, J. Chem. Soc., Dalton Trans., 1999, 847.
- 3 Reviews: for C<sub>2</sub> complexes: (a) M. Akita and Y. Moro-oka, Bull. Chem. Soc. Jpn., 1995, **68**, 420; C<sub>4</sub>-C<sub>12</sub> complexes: (b) M. Akita, M.-C. Chung, A. Sakurai, S. Sugimoto, M. Terada, M. Tanaka and Y. Moro-oka, Organometallics, 1997, **16**, 4882; (c) M. Akita, M.-C. Chung, M. Terada, M. Miyauti, M. Tanaka and Y. Moro-oka, J. Organomet. Chem., 1998, **565**, 49; (d) M. Akita, A. Sakurai and Y. Moro-oka, Organometallics, 1999, **10**; (e) A. Sakurai, M. Akita and Y. Moro-oka, Organometallics, 1999, **18**, 3241; (f) M.-C. Chung, A. Sakurai, M. Akita and Y. Moro-oka, Organometallics, 1999, **18**, 4684.
- 4 Fp#–C<sub>4</sub>–Fp# [Fp# = Fe(η<sup>5</sup>-C<sub>5</sub>Me<sub>4</sub>Et)(CO)<sub>2</sub>] and **1b**,c were prepared by Cu-catalyzed coupling between Fp\*– or Fp#–C<sub>4</sub>H and the appropriate metal chloride according to ref. 3(b).
- 5 Zwitterionic complexes formed by electron transfer through C<sub>x</sub> bridges have been reported: S. B. Falloon, A. M. Arif and J. A. Gladysz, *Chem. Commun.*, 1997, 629.
- 6 Related structurally characterized μ-η<sup>2</sup>: η<sup>2</sup>-allene complexes: E. L. Hoel, G. B. Ansell and S. Leta, *Organometallics*, 1986, 5, 585.
- 7 E. Sappa, A. Tiripicchio and P. Braunstein, *Chem. Rev.*, 1983, 83, 203;
  P. R. Raithby and M. J. Rosales, *Adv. Inorg. Chem. Radiochem.*, 1985, 29, 169.
- 8 R. J. Haines, in *Comprehensive Organometallic Chemistry II*, ed. E. W. Abel, F. G. A. Stone and G. Wilkinson, Pergamon, Oxford, 1995, vol. 7, ch. 11.2.3.