J. A. Howard,* R. Jones, and M. Tomietto

Steacie Institute for Molecular Sciences, National Research Council, Ottawa, Canada K1A 0R6

H. A. Joly*

Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry, Laurentian University, Sudbury, Ontario, Canada P3E 2C6

Received November 30, 1994

Introduction

Previous infrared¹⁻³ and electron paramagnetic resonance $(EPR)^{4.5}$ spectroscopic studies have established that reaction of ground-state aluminum atoms $({}^{2}P_{1/2})$ with CO at temperatures ≤ 77 K gives the mononuclear complex Al(CO)₂. The intermediate monoligand species AlCO has not been positively identified by either of these spectroscopic techniques, although if it were linear, the unpaired electron could possess appreciable unquenched angular momentum and be EPR silent. It should, however, be visible to IR spectroscopy.

Al(CO)₂ has a ²B₁ ground state in the point group $C_{2\nu}$ with an angle of *ca*. 110° between the two CO ligands. There have been no corresponding studies of the reaction of Al atoms with PF₃, a ligand that has σ -donor and π -acceptor properties similar to those of CO.⁶ The characteristics of the bonding of CO and PF₃ to Cu and Ag atoms in the mononuclear monoligand complexes have, however, recently been compared.^{7.8}

In this note we report the results of a matrix isolation EPR spectroscopic study of the reaction of Al atoms with PF₃ in adamantane at 77 K, which demonstrates the formation of Al- $(PF_3)_2$ but not AlPF₃. The magnetic parameters of this new aluminum species are determined and compared with those of Al(CO)₂.

Experimental Section

Reactions of ground-state Al atoms with PF_3 were carried out at 77 K in an adamantane matrix in a rotating cryostat,^{9,10} a technique that has been used successfully to prepare and stabilize a wide variety of transient organic, inorganic, and organometallic species.^{9,11,12} Al atoms were produced by resistively heating aluminum wire (Alpha) in a tungsten basket (No. 12070, Ernest F. Fullam, Schenectady, NY)

[†] Issued as NRCC No. 39040.

- Hinchcliffe, A. J.; Ogden, J. S.; Oswald, D. D. J. Chem. Soc., Chem. Commun. 1972, 338.
- (2) McIntosh, D.; Ozin, G. A. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1976, 98, 3167-3175.
 (3) Chenier, J. H. B.; Hampson, C. A.; Howard, J. A.; Mile, B. J. Chem.
- Soc., Chem. Commun. 1986, 730-732. (4) Kasai, P. H.; Jones, P. M. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1984, 106, 8018-8020.
- (4) Rusal, 1. H., Jones, T. M. J. Ann. Chem. Soc. 1964, 100, 8018 8020.
 (5) Chenier, J. H. B.; Hampson, C. A.; Howard, J. A.; Mile, B.; Sutcliffe,
- R. J. Phys. Chem. **1986**, 90, 1524–1528. (6) Chatt, J.; Williams, A. A. J. Chem. Soc. **1951**, 3061–3067.
- (7) Histed, M.; Howard, J. A.; Jones, R.; Tomietto, M. J. Phys. Chem. 1992, 96, 1141-1143.
- (8) Histed, M.; Howard, J. A.; Jones, R.; Tomietto, M.; Joly, H. A. J. Phys. Chem. 1992, 96, 1144-1146.
- (9) Bennett, J. E.; Mile, B.; Thomas, A.; Ward, B. Adv. Phys. Org. Chem. 1970, 8, 1-77.
- (10) Buck, A. J.; Mile, B.; Howard, J. A. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1983, 105, 3381-3387.
- (11) Howard, J. A.; Mile, B. Electron Spin Reson. 1989, 11B, 136-174.
- (12) Mile, B.; Howard, J. A., Histed, M.; Morris, H.; Hampson, C. A. Faraday Discuss. Chem. Soc. 1992, 129-145.

supported between the molybdenum electrodes of a furnace located in one of the ports in the outer housing of the cryostat. PF₃ was prepared by reaction of NaF with PCl₃ in dry acetonitrile and was deposited at 0.05 Torr. Total deposition times were about 10 min at a pressure $<10^{-5}$ Torr. Deposits were transferred at 77 K and under reduced pressure to a quartz tube (4 mm o.d.) for EPR analysis with a Bruker ESP 300 spectrometer. Samples were annealed in the cavity of the spectrometer with the aid of a variable-temperature controller. Magnetic fields and microwave frequencies were measured with a Varian NMR gaussmeter and Systron-Donner frequency counter. A computer program, adapted by Dr. K. F. Preston (NRCC) for a PC, was used to simulate isotropic EPR spectra.

Results

The EPR spectrum of Al atoms and PF₃ in adamantane at 77 K consisted of a broad featureless absorption centered at $g \sim$ 2.004 and less intense lines from Al₃.¹³ When the sample was warmed slowly in the cavity of the spectrometer, the central feature began to resolve and the multilined spectrum shown in Figure 1a was obtained at 215 K. The lines from Al₃ became broader and eventually disappeared as the temperature was raised. Computer simulation of the experimental spectrum proved difficult, but a simulation that predicted the line positions but not their exact relative intensities is shown in Figure 1b. The magnetic parameters obtained by this method are $a_{Al}(1) =$ 87 MHz, $a_P(2) = 160$ MHz, $a_F(6) = 16.8$ MHz, and g = 2.004, and the carrier of the spectrum is the mononuclear diligand complex $Al(PF_3)_2$. The difficulties experienced in obtaining an exact simulation of Figure 1a may have been associated with the presence of lines from other free radical species in the sample, but there was no evidence for transitions from AlPF₃, PF₂,¹⁴ F₂PAIF, or 1- or 2-adamantyl.¹⁵ There were, however, lines from a carrier that was most probably PF_3^- (a(1P) ~ 180 MHz, $a(2F) \sim 110$ MHz, $a(1F) \sim 75$ MHz, and $g \sim 2.005$). This species is isoelectronic with SF_3^{14} and AsF_3^{-16} and will be discussed in a future publication. It should also be noted that there is an m_l effect on the width of the six components of the Al hyperfine interaction of the EPR spectra of mononuclear Al(0) complexes that is not adequately allowed for in the simulation program.

Discussion

The major components of the EPR spectrum given by Al atoms and PF₃ deposited into adamantane at 77 K are consistent with the formation of Al(PF₃)₂. Unfortunately the powder spectrum of this complex does not resolve to give values of $|a_{\parallel}|$ and $|a_{\perp}|$ for any of the magnetic nuclei. Consequently, the p orbital contributions to the singly occupied molecular orbital cannot be estimated by comparing a_{aniso} with P in the usual way.¹⁷

Dividing the isotropic Al hyperfine interaction of $Al(PF_3)_2$

- (13) Kolui, H.-O., Laige, F., Lubbe, F., Muller, W., Selder, M., Sustmann, R. J. Chem. Soc., Perkin Trans. 2 1989, 1293.
- (16) Subramanian, S.; Rogers, M. T. J. Chem. Phys. 1972, 57, 4582–4589.
 (17) Morton, J. R.; Preston, K. F. J. Magn. Reson. 1978, 30, 577–582.

⁽¹³⁾ Howard, J. A.; Sutcliffe, R.; Tse, J. S.; Dahmane, H.; Mile, B. J. Phys. Chem. 1985, 89, 3595-3598.

⁽¹⁴⁾ Colussi, A. J.; Morton, J. R.; Preston, K. F.; Fessenden, R. W. J. Chem. Phys. 1974, 61, 1247-1248.
(15) Korth, H.-G.; Lange, F.; Lubbe, F.; Müller, W.; Seidel, M.; Sustmann,



Figure 1. (a) EPR spectrum given by Al atoms and PF₃ in adamantane at 215 K. (b) Simulated spectrum of $Al(PF_3)_2$ produced by using the parameters given in the text.

by $A = 3911 \text{ MHz}^{17}$ gives an unpaired 3s spin population $(\varrho_{3s})^{18} = 0.022$, which is larger than the corresponding value of 0.018 for Al(CO)₂.⁵ This unpaired s spin population for Al(CO)₂ is the result of spin polarization of the Al s electrons by the unpaired spin population in the Al 3p_x orbital $(\varrho_{3p} = 0.44)$ and is negative. We therefore conclude that ϱ_{3p} of Al(PF₃)₂ is larger than the value for Al(CO)₂ and could be as large as 0.54. This suggests that back-donation of unpaired electron density from the Al 3p_x orbital to the π -acceptor orbitals of the ligands is less important for Al(PF₃)₂ than it is for Al(CO)₂. SCF-X α molecular orbital calculations¹⁹ have shown that the π -acceptor orbital on PF₃ with the correct symmetry to accept electron backdonation from the semioccupied Al p_x orbital is the 7e orbital, which has 44% P 3p and 23% P 3d character.

Dividing the isotropic P hyperfine interaction of Al(PF₃)₂ (160 MHz) by A = 13306 MHz¹⁷ gives $\rho_{3s}(P) = 0.012$ compared to $\rho_{2s}(C) = 0.004$ for Al(CO)₂. This is consistent with more unpaired s spin population on the P of Al(PF₃)₂ than there is on the C of Al(CO)₂. This spin population arises either by bond polarization from the unpaired s spin population on the Al nucleus or by core polarization from the unpaired spin population in the π -acceptor orbitals of the phosphorus nuclei.

Dividing the F hfi of 16.8 MHz by $A = 52870 \text{ MHz}^{17}$ gives $\rho_{2s}(F) = 0.00032$ and a total 2s population of 0.0019. This is smaller than the unpaired 2s spin population on the two oxygen atoms of Al(CO)₂ where $\Sigma \rho_{2s} = 0.0046$ and must be related to the high electronegativity of the fluorine nuclei.

It has been established by IR and EPR spectroscopy that Al-(CO)₂ is a planar π radical belonging to the ²B₁ representation in $C_{2\nu}$ symmetry with most of the unpaired spin population on the Al nucleus in the 3p_x orbital. The magnetic parameters of Al(PF₃)₂ are consistent with its having a structure similar to that of Al(CO)₂ and the same electronic ground state as Al-(CO)₂. Thus the Al 3s and 3p orbitals have undergone sp² hydridization. The Al lone pair is located in one of these orbitals, and the electrons from the 8a₁ orbitals of the two PF₃ ligands are donated to the other two orbitals. The unpaired electron is located in the p_x orbital perpendicular to the molecular framework. The slightly different orbital distributions of the unpaired s spin populations in these two complexes are probably associated with slightly different σ -electron donor and π -acceptor properties of the CO and PF₃ ligands.

The isotropic g factor of Al(PF₃)₂ is larger than the free spin value ($\Delta g = 0.0017$). This deviation is probably the result of spin orbital coupling between the semifilled p_x orbital and the sp² orbital containing the Al lone-pair electrons.

Acknowledgment. R.J. thanks the BP Venture Research Fund and H.A.J. thanks the NSERC for financial support.

IC941366D

⁽¹⁸⁾ When estimates of unpaired s spin population are made from a_{iso} and A,¹⁷ it is usual to assume that the unpaired spin is located in the outer s orbital. A reviewer has pointed out that there is also polarization of the inner s electrons and for Al $\rho_s = \sum (\rho_{3s} + \rho_{2s} + \rho_{1s})$. The contribution from the inner s electrons is, however, small, and the three contributions cannot be separated by the EPR spectroscopic technique.

⁽¹⁹⁾ Xiao, S.-X.; Trogler, W. C.; Ellis, D. E.; Berkovitch-Yellin, Z. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1983, 105, 7033-7037.