# Journal of Organometallic Chemistry, 181 (1979) C7-C10 © Elsevier Sequoia S.A., Lausanne – Printed in The Netherlands

## **Preliminary communication**

#### **BASIC METALS**

# XXI\*. THE STRONG ELECTROPHILICITY OF COORDINATED $C_2H_4$ IN DICATIONIC ETHYLENE-RHODIUM(III) AND -RUTHENIUM(II) COMPLEXES

### H. WERNER\*, R. FESER and R. WERNER

Institut für Anorganische Chemie der Universität Würzburg, Am Hubland, D-8700 Würzburg (B.R.D.)

(Received August 13th, 1979)

#### Summary

The complexes  $[C_5H_5Rh(PMe_3)_2C_2H_4]X_2$  (X = PF<sub>6</sub>, BF<sub>4</sub>) and  $[C_6H_6Ru(PMe_3)_2-C_2H_4](PF_6)_2$  have been prepared by reaction of  $[C_5H_5RhC_2H_5(PMe_3)_2]X$  and  $[C_6H_6RuC_2H_5(PMe_3)_2]X$  with  $[CPh_3]X$ . The ethylene ligand in the dications is readily attacked by nucleophiles N, where N = NEt<sub>3</sub>, PR<sub>3</sub> (R = Me, i-Pr, Ph), P(OR)<sub>3</sub> (R = Me, Ph), SCN<sup>-</sup> and probably I<sup>-</sup>, to form complexes containing Rh--C<sub>2</sub>H<sub>4</sub>N and Ru-C<sub>2</sub>H<sub>4</sub>N bonds.

We recently prepared the monocationic ethylene complexes  $[C_6H_6RuR(PMe_3)-C_2H_4]^+$  with R = H or CH<sub>3</sub> and showed that the complex with R = CH<sub>3</sub> reacts with trimethylphosphine to give  $[C_6H_6RuCH_3(PMe_3)C_2H_4PMe_3]^+$ , which was isolated as the PF<sub>6</sub> salt [2]. The formally isoelectronic cation  $[C_5H_5RhCH_3 - (PMe_3)C_2H_4]^+$  behaves similarly, i.e. it reacts with PMe<sub>3</sub> to give  $[C_5H_5RhCH_3 - (PMe_3)C_2H_4PMe_3]^+$  [3].

In the light of the general variation of reactivity of metal complexes containing unsaturated hydrocarbon ligands [4] we expected the ethylene to be more electrophilic in the dication  $[C_5H_5Rh(PMe_3)_2C_2H_4]^{2+}$  than in  $[C_5H_5RhCH_3(PMe_3)-C_2H_4]^+$ . This dication was produced in quantitative yield by reaction of  $[C_5H_5RhC_2H_5(PMe_3)_2]PF_6$  [5] with  $[CPh_3]PF_6$  in nitromethane at room temperature.

 $[C_{5}H_{5}RhC_{2}H_{5}(PMe_{3})_{2}]PF_{6} + [CPh_{3}]PF_{6} \rightarrow$ 

$$[C_{5}H_{5}Rh(PMe_{3})_{2}C_{2}H_{4}](PF_{6})_{2} + CPh_{3}H$$
(1)

<sup>\*</sup>For Part XX see ref. 1.

The corresponding  $BF_4$  salt  $[C_5H_5Rh(PMe_3)_2C_2H_4](BF_4)_2$  (II) was obtained in quantitative yield from  $[C_5H_5RhC_2H_5(PMe_3)_2]I[5]$  and  $[CPh_3]BF_4$  (molar ratio 1/2.5) in nitromethane.

Complex II reacts with nucleophiles such as tertiary phosphines or amines  $(CH_3NO_2, 25^{\circ}C, 10 \text{ min})$  to form  $[C_5H_5Rh(PMe_3)_2C_2H_4N](BF_4)_2$ .

II + N 
$$\rightarrow$$
 [C<sub>5</sub>H<sub>5</sub>Rh(PMe<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub>C<sub>2</sub>H<sub>4</sub>N](BF<sub>4</sub>)<sub>2</sub>

(III:  $N = PMe_3$ ) (IV:  $N = P-i-Pr_3$ ) (V:  $N = NEt_3$ )

In the reaction with PMe<sub>3</sub> a small amount ( $\leq 10\%$ ) of  $[C_5H_5Rh(PMe_3)_3](BF_4)_2$ [3] is also formed. The Rh— $C_2H_4N$  bonds in the dications of III—V are remarkably stable, e.g. there is no ethylene elimination, accompanied by formation of  $[C_5H_5Rh(PMe_3)_3]^{2+}$ , on heating complex III at 60°C in nitromethane for 2 h.

The reaction of II with  $P(OMe)_3$  yields a mixture of two products. The <sup>1</sup>H NMR spectrum of the reaction solution shows two signals in the  $C_5H_5$  region at  $\delta$  5.62 and 5.67 ppm, which are assigned to the complexes VI and VII. Stirring of the nitromethane solution with NaI (25°C, 15 min) gives VII quantitatively.

$$II + P(OMe)_{3} \rightarrow [C_{5}H_{5}Rh(PMe_{3})_{2}C_{2}H_{4}P(OMe)_{3}](BF_{4})_{2}$$
(3)
(VI)

VI + NaI → 
$$[C_5H_5Rh(PMe_3)_2C_2H_4P(O)(OMe)_2]BF_4$$
 + MeI + NaBF<sub>4</sub> (4)  
(VII)

Complex II also reacts with anionic nucleophiles N, but in this case the products of nucleophilic addition of N to the coordinated ethylene are more labile. With KSCN (CH<sub>3</sub>OH, 25°C, 1 h) the product of the reaction is  $[C_5H_5Rh(PMe_3)_2-C_2H_4SCN]BF_4$  (VIII), and on warming in nitromethane this slowly looses ethylene to give either  $[C_5H_5Rh(PMe_3)_2NCS]^+$  or  $[C_5H_5Rh(PMe_3)_2SCN]^+$ . The re-

$$\begin{bmatrix} C_{6}H_{6}RuC_{2}H_{5}(PMe_{3})_{2}\end{bmatrix} PF_{6} \xrightarrow{(CPh_{3}]PF_{6}} \xrightarrow{-CPh_{3}H} \\ \begin{bmatrix} C_{6}H_{6}Ru(PMe_{3})_{2}C_{2}H_{4}\end{bmatrix} (PF_{6})_{2} \xrightarrow{PR_{3}} \begin{bmatrix} C_{6}H_{6}Ru(PMe_{3})_{2}C_{2}H_{4}PR_{3}\end{bmatrix} (PF_{6})_{2} \\ (IX) \qquad (X: R = Me) \\ (XI: R = i \cdot Pr) \\ P(OR)_{3} \qquad (XII: R = Ph) \\ \begin{bmatrix} C_{6}H_{6}Ru(PMe_{3})_{2}C_{2}H_{4}P(OR)_{3}\end{bmatrix} (PF_{6})_{2} \\ (XIII: R = Ph) \\ NaI \qquad (R = Me) \\ (XIV: R = Ph) \\ NaI \qquad (R = Me) \\ \end{bmatrix}$$

 $[C_6H_6Ru(PMe_3)_2C_2H_4P(O)(OMe)_2]PF_6 + MeI + NaPF_6$ 

SCHEME 1

(2)

action of II with NaI in methanol at 55°C after 5 h yields only  $[C_5H_5Rh(PMe_3)_2I]^+$ [5], but at room temperature and shorter reaction times the <sup>1</sup>H NMR spectrum of the reaction mixture shows, in addition to the signals of II and  $[C_5H_5Rh-(PMe_3)_2I]^+$ , a multiplet (I = 5H) at  $\delta$  5.67 and a virtual triplet (I = 18H) at 1.67 ppm which we tentatively attribute to the cation  $[C_5H_5Rh(PMe_3)_2C_2H_4I]^+$ . It seems that at low temperatures nucleophilic addition of the anion to the olefin is the preferred reaction, whereas at higher temperatures the cations  $[C_5H_5Rh-(PMe_3)_2Y]^+$  (Y = NCS, I) are formed, either by direct replacement of ethylene by the anion or by a  $\beta$ -elimination route.

The PF<sub>6</sub> salt of the dication  $[C_6H_6Ru(PMe_3)_2C_2H_4]^{2+}$  has also been prepared (Scheme 1). It is interesting to note that the difference in reactivity between  $C_5H_5Rh(PMe_3)_2$  [5] and  $C_6H_6Ru(PMe_3)_2$  [6] towards electrophiles is reflected in the chemical behaviour of the corresponding ethylenebis(phosphine) dications.

TABLE 1

<sup>1</sup>H NMR SPECTRA OF COMPLEXES II—XV IN CD<sub>3</sub>NO<sub>2</sub> (δ in ppm, J in Hz; d, doublet; t, triplet; q, quartet; m, multiplet; vt, virtual triplet)

Complex	$\delta(\mathbf{C}_n\mathbf{H}_n)$	<i>J</i> (PH)	J(RhH)	$\delta(PMe_3)$	J(RhH)	$\delta(\mathbf{C_2H_4})$	δ(N)	J(PH)
II	6.33 d of t	1.0	0.4	2.03 d of vt	0.9	4.23 "q" <sup>a</sup>		
111	5.67 m			1.70 d of vt	0.9	2.6; 1.9 m <sup>b</sup>		14.0
IV	5.70 t	1.1		1.70 d of vt	0.9		1.47 d of d 2.90 m	15.0 <sup>c</sup>
v	5.70 t	1.0		1.70 d of vt	0.9	3.3; 1.7 m <sup>b</sup>	1.17 t <sup>d</sup> 3.30 q <sup>d</sup>	
VI	5.62 m			1.68 d of vt	0.9	е	4.22 d	11.0
VII	5.67 m			1.70 d of vt	0.9	1.9 m <sup>b</sup>	3.77 d	10.5
VIII	5.67 d of t	1.1	0.4	1.70 d of vt	0.9	3.7; 1.9 m <sup>b</sup>		
IX <sup>a</sup>	6.88 t	0.6		1.89 vt		3.49 t <sup>f</sup>		
x	6.01 t	0.85		1.59 vt		2.7 m <sup>g</sup>	1.88 d	13.8
XI	6.09 t	0.95		1.66 vt		h	1.50 m	
							2.65 m	
XII	6.09 t	0.85		1.39 vt		3.45 m	7.92 m	
XIII	6.01 t	0.85		1.59 vt		2.8 m <sup>g</sup>	4.21 d	10.8
XIV	5.88 t	0.9		1.44 vt		3.2 m	7.52 m	
xv	5.97 t	0.85		1.58 vt		3.3 m	3.75 d	10.6

<sup>a</sup> J(PH) = J(RhH) = 2.0. <sup>b</sup> Partial overlap with the Rh-PMe<sub>3</sub> signal. <sup>c</sup> J(HH) = 7.0. <sup>d</sup> J(HH) = 7.0. <sup>e</sup> Overlap with the C<sub>2</sub>H<sub>4</sub> signal of VII; see text. <sup>f</sup> J(PH) = 4.0. <sup>g</sup> Partial overlap with the Ru-PMe<sub>3</sub> signal. <sup>h</sup> Assignment not possible due to overlap with the Ru-PMe<sub>3</sub> and the CHMe<sub>2</sub> signals.

TABLE 2

<sup>31</sup> P NMR SPECTRA OF COMPLEXES III, IV, VII, IX-XV IN CD<sub>3</sub>NO<sub>2</sub> ( $\delta$  in ppm, H<sub>3</sub>PO<sub>4</sub> ext., J in Hz; s, singlet; d, doublet; t, triplet)

Complex	$\delta(PMe_3)$	J(RhP)	J(PP)	δ(N)	J(RhP)	<i>J</i> (PP)
III	5.2 d of d	142.3	2.5	22.7 d of t	9.9	2.5
IV	5.9 d of d	141.5	2.5	39.2 d of t	8.8	2.5
VII	6.2 d of d	145.5	1.2	29.0 d of t	8.1	1.2
IXa	10.53 s					
x <sup>a</sup>	4.83 d		3.3	23.45 t		3.3
XI	4.20 d		3.0	38.34 t		3.0
XII	3.94 d		3.3	18.46 t		3.3
XIII	4.21 d		3.0	43.52 t		3.0
XIV	3.76 d		4.5	28.77 t		4.5
xv	4.47 d		3.0	30.73 t		3.0

<sup>a</sup> In acetone- $d_6$ .

Like the neutral ruthenium complex  $C_6H_6Ru(PMe_3)_2$ , the dication  $[C_6H_6Ru-(PMe_3)_2C_2H_4]^{2+}$  is much more selective than the rhodium analogue and reacts with tertiary phosphines and phosphites, but not with tertiary amines, to form products containing  $Ru-C_2H_4N$  bonds.

The <sup>1</sup>H and <sup>31</sup>P NMR data for  $[C_n H_n M(PMe_3)_2 C_2 H_4]X_2$  (II, IX) and the complexes obtained by nucleophilic addition to the ethylene ligand are summarised in Tables 1 and 2.

### Acknowledgements

We thank the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft and the Fonds der Chemischen Industrie for financial support, the BASF AG and the DEGUSSA for gifts of chemicals, and Dr. W. Buchner and P. Kneis for spectroscopic measurements. R.W. is grateful to the Verband der Chemischen Industrie for the award of a predoctoral fellowship.

#### References

- 2 H. Werner and R. Werner, J. Organometal. Chem., 174 (1979) C63.
- 3 H. Werner and R. Feser, unpublished results; see: H. Werner and R. Feser, Angew. Chem., 91 (1979) 171; Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. Engl., 18 (1979) 157.
- 4 S.G. Davies, M.L.H. Green and D.M.P. Mingos, Tetrahedron, 34 (1978) 3047.
- 5 H. Werner, R. Feser and W. Buchner, Chem. Ber., 112 (1979) 834.
- 6 H. Werner and R. Werner, Angew. Chem., 90 (1978) 721; Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. Engl., 17 (1978) 683.

<sup>1</sup> H. Werner and R. Werner, J. Organometal. Chem., 174 (1979) C67.