

Transition metal silyl complexes. 55 intramolecular Si–E (E = Si, Sn) oxidative addition of $\text{Ph}_2\text{P}(\text{CH}_2)_n\text{SiR}'_2\text{ER}_3$ ligands ($n = 1, 2$) to $\text{Pt}(0)^1$

Hilmar Gilges, Guido Kickelbick, Ulrich Schubert *

Institut für Anorganische Chemie, Technische Universität Wien, Getreidemarkt 9, A-1060 Wien, Austria

Received 8 November 1996; received in revised form 3 March 1997

Abstract

The complexes $(\text{Ph}_3\text{P})(\text{R}_3\text{E})\text{Pt}(\text{PPh}_2(\text{CH}_2)_n\text{SiR}'_2)$ ($n = 2$; $\text{R}' = \text{Me}$; $\text{ER}_3 = \text{SiPh}_3, \text{SiMePh}_2, \text{SnPh}_3$; $\text{R}' = \text{Ph}$; $\text{ER}_3 = \text{SiPh}_3, \text{SiMePh}_2$; $n = 1$, $\text{R}' = \text{Me}$, $\text{ER}_3 = \text{SiPh}_3$) are obtained by reaction of $\text{Ph}_2\text{P}(\text{CH}_2)_n\text{SiR}'_2\text{ER}_3$ with $(\text{Ph}_3\text{P})_2\text{Pt}(\pi\text{-C}_2\text{H}_4)$. The bis(silyl) complex $(\text{Ph}_3\text{P})(\text{Ph}_3\text{Si})\text{Pt}(\text{PPh}_2\text{CH}_2\text{SiMe}_2)$ was characterized by an X-ray structure analysis, which showed the two silyl groups to be *cis* (Pt–Si 236.8(1) and 237.4(1) pm). © 1997 Elsevier Science S.A.

Keywords: Platinum complexes; Silyl complexes; Oxidative addition; X-ray structure analysis

1. Introduction

Oxidative addition of Si–H bonds to coordinatively unsaturated transition metal complexes is one of most useful methods for the formation of metal–silicon bonds. Stable hydrido silyl complexes are formed with a great variety of metal complex fragments, and complexes of this type are intermediates in the catalytic hydrosilylation of unsaturated compounds. More recently, the palladium-catalyzed bissilylation of alkynes and olefins has emerged as another attractive route to organosilicon compounds [2–5]. These reactions proceed via initial oxidative addition of Si–Si bonds. However, there are relatively few examples for the formation of stable bissilyl complexes from disilanes. The same is true for the oxidative addition of Si–Sn bonds. The more common strategies to stabilize oxidative addition products, such as the use of electron-rich metal complex fragments or the substitution of silicon (tin) by electronegative groups, was only successful for a limited number of metal complex/disilane combinations. The use of strained cyclic compounds is also restricted to a few special cases, such as 1,2-disilacyclobutenes [6,7].

Oxidative addition of a bond can be promoted by its incorporation into a chelate system, as has been shown for the Si–H bonds of $\text{R}_2\text{P}(\text{CH}_2)_n\text{SiR}'_2\text{H}$ [8–10]. We

have quantified the magnitude of the chelate effect on the oxidative addition of Si–H bonds for (phosphinoethyl)silanes by comparison with that of electronic factors [11]. An A–B bond sometimes can only be added to a metal center by ‘chelate-assistance’. For example, while no stable complexes are obtained by addition of the Sn–C bonds of tetra(alkyl)- or tetra(aryl)stannanes to iron carbonyl derivatives, one of the Sn–R groups (R = methyl, phenyl) in $(\text{CO})_4\text{Fe}(\text{Ph}_2\text{PCH}_2\text{CH}_2\text{SnR}_3)$ readily adds intramolecularly to the iron center [12,13]. The resulting complex $(\text{CO})_3(\text{R})\text{Fe}(\text{Ph}_2\text{PCH}_2\text{CH}_2\text{SnR}_2)$ is stabilized by formation of the five-membered Fe–Sn–C–C–P ring. The Sn–R groups of $\text{Ph}_2\text{PCH}_2\text{CH}_2\text{SnR}_3$ ligands also add to the more reactive $\text{L}_2\text{Pd}(0)$ or $\text{L}_2\text{Pt}(0)$ fragments [14]. Facilitated oxidative addition of E–E bonds (E = Si, Sn) was also observed for $[\text{Ph}_2\text{P}(\text{CH}_2)_n\text{EMe}_2]_2$ [15–17]. A particularly high stabilization can be expected in this case, because *two* chelating (phosphinoalkyl)silyl or -stannyl ligands are simultaneously formed.


2. Results

In an extension of our studies on chelate-assisted oxidative additions of bonds between two main group 4 elements to transition-metal centers, we probed (phosphinoalkyl)disilanes and (phosphinoalkyl)silylstannanes which result in a terminal silyl or stannyl ligand and only *one* chelating ligand upon oxidative addition. The previously unknown compounds

* Corresponding author. Tel.: +43-1-5884633; fax: +43-1-5816668.

¹ For Part 54 see Ref. [1].

$\text{Ph}_2\text{PCH}_2\text{CH}_2\text{SiMe}_2\text{SiPh}_2\text{R}$ (**1a**, **b**),
 $\text{Ph}_2\text{PCH}_2\text{CH}_2\text{SiPh}_2\text{SiPh}_2\text{R}$ (**1c**, **d**) ($\text{R} = \text{Me}, \text{Ph}$),
 $\text{Ph}_2\text{PCH}_2\text{CH}_2\text{SiMe}_2\text{SnPh}_3$ (**1e**) and
 $\text{Ph}_2\text{PCH}_2\text{SiMe}_2\text{SiPh}_3$ (**1f**) were prepared by reaction of
 $\text{Ph}_2\text{P}(\text{CH}_2)_n\text{SiR}'_2\text{Cl}$ ($\text{R}' = \text{Me}, \text{Ph}$) [18] with LiSiPh_2R
 or LiSnPh_3 (Eq. (1)).





	n	R'	ER ₃
1a	2	Me	SiPh ₃
1b	2	Me	SiMePh ₂
1c	2	Ph	SiMePh ₂
1d	2	Ph	SiPh ₃
1e	2	Me	SnPh ₃
1f	1	Me	SiPh ₃

(1)

The bis(silyl) complexes **2a**, **b** were obtained in high yields upon reaction of the (phosphinoethyl)silanes **1a**, **b** with an equimolar amount of $(\text{Ph}_3\text{P})_2\text{Pt}(\text{C}_2\text{H}_4)$ in benzene at room temperature (Eq. (2)). Although we did not investigate details of the mechanism, we suppose that in the first step of the reaction the phosphino group of the (phosphinoethyl)disilane substitutes the ethylene ligand. The Si–Si bond then oxidatively adds to the platinum center by replacement of a PPh_3 ligand. The reaction is not restricted to the SiMe_2 derivatives **1a**, **b**; the bulkier (diphosphinoethyl)tetraphenylmethylsilane **1c** also gives the corresponding metallacycle (**2c**) by oxidative addition of the Si–Si bond, but only after extended reaction times. However, in the reaction of the pentaphenyl derivative **1d**, the corresponding metallacycle **2d** was only spectroscopically observed, together with another complex, probably $(\text{Ph}_3\text{Si}_2\text{CH}_2\text{CH}_2\text{PPh}_2)\text{Pt}(\text{Ph}_2\text{PCH}_2\text{CH}_2\text{SiPh}_2)(\text{SiPh}_3)$ (**3**), as indicated by its two doublet resonances at 54.4 and

22.1 ppm in the ^{31}P -NMR spectrum. We were able to prove this assumption by reacting $(\text{Ph}_3\text{P})_3\text{Pt}(\text{C}_2\text{H}_4)$ with two equivalents of **1d** resulting in the formation of **3** and only a small amount of **2d**.

Complex **2e** was analogously obtained in the reaction of **1e**. It contains a terminal stannyl ligand and the same chelated (phosphinoethyl)silyl ligand as in **2a**.





2a-e

(2)

	R'	ER ₃
2a	Me	SiPh ₃
2b	Me	SiMePh ₂
2c	Ph	SiMePh ₂
2d	Ph	SiPh ₃
2e	Me	SnPh ₃

Unstrained five-membered metallacycles are formed from **1a**–**e**. In the reaction of the phosphinomethyl-substituted disilane **1f**, Si–Si oxidative addition would result in a more strained four-membered metallacycle. Alternatively, a five-membered metallacycle could be formed by oxidative addition of a Si–Ph bond, resulting in a terminal phenyl ligand and a chelated P–C–Si–Si ligand. Reaction of $\text{Ph}_2\text{PCH}_2\text{SiMe}_2\text{SiPh}_3$ (**1f**) with $(\text{Ph}_3\text{P})_2\text{Pt}(\text{C}_2\text{H}_4)$ gives the pale yellow crystalline complex **2f** in high yields. Since it is difficult to distinguish unequivocally between the two possibilities by NMR spectroscopy because of the large number of phenyl groups in the molecule, we performed an X-ray structure analysis of **2f** (Fig. 1). It clearly showed that the Si–Si bond and not the Si–C bond was added (Eq. (3)).



2f

(3)

The spectroscopic data of the new complexes are exemplarily discussed for **2a**. In the ^{31}P NMR spectrum, two doublets are observed at 57.8 and 29.9 ppm for the non-equivalent phosphorus nuclei, accompanied by Pt satellites. The value of $^2J_{\text{PPtP}} = 17.1$ Hz is typical for a *cis* arrangement of the phosphane ligands. Due to the significant low field shift of around 28 ppm, the doublet at 57.8 can be assigned to the phosphorus atom incorpo-




Fig. 1. The structure of **2f** and the labeling scheme used. The hydrogen atoms are omitted for clarity.

rated into the five-membered ring. The *cis* arrangement is confirmed by the ^{29}Si NMR spectrum showing two doublets of doublets. The resonance at lower field (32.5 ppm) is again assigned to the chelated silicon atom. It shows a J_{PSi} of 7.7 Hz and a $\text{trans-}^2J_{\text{PPiP}}$ of 130.9 Hz. The coupling SiPt constants of the SiPh_3 signal at 9.4 ppm are in the same range (12.9 and 140.5 Hz). The ^{13}C NMR spectrum shows a broad singlet at 4.4 ppm for the SiCH_3 group ($^2J_{\text{PtSiC}} = 72.5$ Hz), while the SiCH_2 resonance appears as a doublet at 18.1 ppm with a higher $^2J_{\text{PCC}}$ coupling constant (17.7 Hz) than in the uncoordinated ligand (10.7 Hz). The doublet at 27.6 ppm assigned to PCH_2 also has an increased $^1J_{\text{PC}}$ coupling constant (29.4 Hz) compared with the uncoordinated free ligand (14.6 Hz). All signals show the expected downfield shift caused by coordination. The ^1H NMR data are in agreement with the proposed structure, which was eventually confirmed by the X-ray structure analysis of **2f** (Fig. 1, Tables 1 and 2).

The four bulky groups bonded to the metal atom are accommodated in the square plane by distortion of the bond angles at Pt. The small $\text{P}(1)\text{--Pt--Si}(1)$ angle of the four membered metallacycle ($70.76(5)^\circ$) is compensated by the large angle $\text{Si}(2)\text{--Pt--P}(2)$. This enlargement is also due to the repulsion of the two bulky ligands PPh_3 and SiPh_3 . The Pt–P and Pt–Si distances of the terminal ligands and the chelated phosphinomethylsilyl ligand do not differ significantly, and the Pt–Si distances are comparable to those in other Pt(II) silyl complexes [19–24].

3. Discussion

Most of the known bis(silyl) complexes of Pt(II) were prepared by dehydrogenative addition of HSiR_3 to $(\text{R}_3\text{P})_2\text{Pt}$ fragments [25–32]. This includes the bis-chelated complex $\text{Pt}(\text{PPh}_2\text{CH}_2\text{CH}_2\text{SiR}_2)_2$ from $\text{Pt}(\text{COD})_2$ and $\text{PPh}_2\text{CH}_2\text{CH}_2\text{SiR}_2\text{H}$ [10]. The formation of bis(silyl) complexes $(\text{R}_3\text{P})_2\text{Pt}(\text{SiR}'_3)_2$ by oxidative addition of Si–Si bonds is favored by electronegative substituents at silicon. The earliest example is the preparation of $(\text{Ph}_3\text{P})_2\text{Pt}(\text{SiCl}_3)_2$ from $(\text{Ph}_3\text{P})_4\text{Pt}$ and Si_2Cl_6 [33,34]. Increasing the basicity of the metal fragment by PEt_3 ligands allows to add $\text{Si}_2\text{Me}_5\text{X}$ and $1,2\text{-Si}_2\text{Me}_4\text{X}_2$ ($\text{X} = \text{F}, \text{Cl}, \text{Br}$), but not $\text{Si}_2\text{Me}_4\text{R}_2$ ($\text{R} = \text{Me}, \text{Ph}$) [35]. Recently, double oxidative addition of the two Si–Si bonds of 2,2-bis(disilanyl)dithiane to Pt(0) was achieved. It was postulated that this reaction was facilitated by the appropriate orientation of the two Si–Si bonds [36].

Contrary to the latter reaction, the electronically equivalent, but chelating analogues of $\text{Si}_2\text{Me}_4\text{R}_2$, i.e. the (phosphinoalkyl)disilyl and silyl stannyl derivatives **1a–f**, readily add to the Pt center. The extended reaction times that were observed for **1c**, as well as the fact that the use of pentaphenyl substituted derivative **1d** did

Table 1

Atomic coordinates ($\times 10^4$) and equivalent isotropic displacement parameters ($\text{pm}^2 \times 10^6$) for **2f**. $U(\text{eq})$ is defined as one third of the trace of the orthogonalized U_{ij} tensor

	<i>x/a</i>	<i>y/b</i>	<i>z/c</i>	<i>U</i> (eq)
Pt	8750(1)	9440(1)	7467(1)	34(1)
P(1)	10222(1)	11174(1)	7151(1)	45(1)
Si(1)	10676(1)	9049(1)	7353(1)	44(1)
P(2)	6778(1)	9702(1)	7173(1)	37(1)
Si(2)	7993(1)	7635(1)	7955(1)	35(1)
C(100)	10535(5)	7518(5)	6710(3)	68(2)
C(101)	11924(4)	9371(5)	8165(3)	61(1)
C(102)	11216(4)	10312(5)	6790(3)	57(1)
C(110)	10029(5)	12172(5)	6531(3)	59(1)
C(111)	10568(8)	12196(8)	5897(4)	128(3)
C(112)	10424(10)	13000(10)	5450(5)	151(4)
C(113)	9710(9)	13719(8)	5616(5)	123(3)
C(114)	9177(6)	13715(6)	6238(4)	87(2)
C(115)	9342(5)	12961(5)	6699(3)	63(2)
C(120)	11250(4)	12342(4)	7964(3)	45(1)
C(121)	11111(5)	12195(5)	8677(3)	62(1)
C(122)	11955(5)	13041(6)	9281(3)	79(2)
C(123)	12931(6)	14045(6)	9181(4)	80(2)
C(124)	13082(5)	14220(6)	8482(4)	71(2)
C(125)	12250(5)	13379(5)	7877(3)	58(1)
C(200)	6762(4)	10070(5)	6256(2)	43(1)
C(201)	7230(6)	9421(7)	5714(3)	88(2)
C(202)	7262(7)	9676(8)	5014(3)	107(3)
C(203)	6860(6)	10614(7)	4856(3)	82(2)
C(204)	6417(5)	11263(6)	5378(3)	74(2)
C(205)	6352(5)	10993(5)	6072(3)	59(1)
C(210)	6479(4)	11009(4)	7773(2)	40(1)
C(211)	7501(5)	11968(5)	8253(2)	49(1)
C(212)	7303(6)	12980(5)	8705(3)	64(2)
C(213)	6123(6)	13044(6)	8690(3)	71(2)
C(214)	5101(6)	12109(6)	8233(3)	69(2)
C(215)	5265(5)	11093(5)	7763(3)	55(1)
C(220)	5250(4)	8375(4)	7053(3)	44(1)
C(221)	4704(4)	8123(5)	7677(3)	49(1)
C(222)	3620(5)	7096(5)	7604(3)	61(2)
C(223)	3082(5)	6315(6)	6926(4)	75(2)
C(224)	3597(6)	6545(6)	6299(4)	83(2)
C(225)	4692(5)	7591(6)	6364(3)	62(2)
C(300)	6966(4)	6204(4)	7199(3)	44(1)
C(301)	6210(5)	5058(5)	7322(3)	70(2)
C(302)	5483(6)	4072(6)	6749(4)	89(2)
C(303)	5466(6)	4148(6)	6024(4)	84(2)
C(304)	6230(6)	5238(6)	5879(3)	79(2)
C(305)	6967(5)	6255(5)	6461(3)	59(1)
C(310)	9146(4)	7050(4)	8461(2)	39(1)
C(311)	9420(4)	5973(5)	8149(3)	58(1)
C(312)	10276(5)	5587(6)	8535(3)	73(2)
C(313)	10867(5)	6235(6)	9242(3)	73(2)
C(314)	10617(5)	7284(6)	9563(3)	66(2)
C(315)	9766(4)	7687(5)	9178(3)	50(1)
C(320)	7087(4)	8020(4)	8742(2)	39(1)
C(321)	6150(4)	7145(5)	8990(3)	55(1)
C(322)	5531(5)	7492(6)	9561(3)	68(2)
C(323)	5821(5)	8708(6)	9917(3)	64(2)
C(324)	6756(5)	9595(6)	9705(3)	66(2)
C(325)	7379(4)	9263(5)	9122(2)	48(1)

not result in a straightforward reaction, shows that an increased steric bulk renders the reaction more difficult. The by-product (**3**) in the stoichiometric reaction of **1d**

Table 2
Selected bond lengths (pm) and angles (°) for **2f**

Pt–P(1)	236.6(1)
Pt–Si(2)	236.8(1)
Pt–P(2)	237.3(1)
Pt–Si(1)	237.4(1)
P(1)–C(102)	180.7(4)
P(1)–C(110)	182.3(5)
P(1)–C(120)	182.9(5)
Si(1)–C(100)	187.5(5)
Si(1)–C(101)	186.6(5)
Si(1)–C(102)	182.7(5)
P(2)–C(200)	182.9(4)
P(2)–C(210)	182.8(4)
P(2)–C(220)	186.6(5)
Si(2)–C(300)	190.4(5)
Si(2)–C(310)	190.5(4)
Si(2)–C(320)	190.8(4)
P(1)–Pt–Si(2)	158.65(4)
P(1)–Pt–P(2)	103.34(4)
Si(2)–Pt–P(2)	97.84(4)
P(1)–Pt–Si(1)	70.76(5)
Si(2)–Pt–Si(1)	89.74(4)
P(2)–Pt–Si(1)	162.14(4)
C(102)–P(1)–C(110)	109.1(2)
C(102)–P(1)–C(120)	103.3(2)
C(110)–P(1)–C(120)	101.5(2)
C(102)–P(1)–Pt	95.0(2)
C(110)–P(1)–Pt	131.7(2)
C(120)–P(1)–Pt	113.1(2)
Pt–P(1)–Si(1)	54.75(4)
C(101)–Si(1)–C(100)	108.2(2)
C(101)–Si(1)–C(102)	109.6(2)
C(100)–Si(1)–C(102)	105.8(2)
C(101)–Si(1)–Pt	123.2(2)
C(100)–Si(1)–Pt	115.7(2)
C(102)–Si(1)–Pt	91.6(1)
C(210)–P(2)–Pt	117.2(2)
C(200)–P(2)–Pt	106.5(1)
C(220)–P(2)–Pt	121.4(1)
C(300)–Si(2)–Pt	111.4(2)
C(310)–Si(2)–Pt	120.5(1)
C(320)–Si(2)–Pt	108.1(2)

probably results from an interchange of phosphane ligands in the stage of the intermediate $\text{Pt}(\text{PR}_3)_3$ complexes, favored by the significantly prolonged reaction times (5 days for **1d** vs. 30 h for **1c**). The complex $\text{Pt}(\text{PPh}_3)(\text{PPh}_2\text{CH}_2\text{CH}_2\text{Si}_2\text{Ph}_5)_2$ obviously is only formed to a significant extent if oxidative addition of the Si–Si bond is slowed down by steric effects. The validity of this assumption is also supported by the observation that raising the reaction temperature to 60°C in the stoichiometric reaction of **1d** results in an increased amount of **3**.

The complexes **2a–e** are stable towards reductive elimination, i.e. no decomposition with reformation of the Si–Si or Si–Sn bond was observed. There was no indication for a competing Si–C or Sn–C oxidative addition.

4. Experimental

All operations were performed in an atmosphere of dry and oxygen-free argon with standard Schlenk-tube techniques, using dried and argon-saturated solvents. Instrumentation: Melting points, Shimadzu DSC-50; NMR spectra, Bruker AC250 (^1H NMR 250.13 MHz, ^{13}C NMR 62.90 MHz, ^{29}Si NMR 49.69 MHz, ^{119}Sn NMR 93.28 MHz, ^{31}P NMR 101.25 MHz).

4.1. Preparation of $\text{Ph}_2\text{PCH}_2\text{CH}_2\text{SiMe}_2\text{SiR}_3$ (**1a, b**)

Finely cut lithium (0.40 g, 57.6 mmol) was added to a solution of 6.13 g (14.0 mmol) of Ph_3SiCl [4.19 g (18.0 mmol) of Ph_2MeSiCl] in 50 ml of THF. The deep brown reaction mixture was stirred for 12 (18 h), filtered through glass wool and then added to a solution of 4.30 g (14.0 mmol) [5.52 g (18.0 mmol)] of $\text{Ph}_2\text{PCH}_2\text{CH}_2\text{SiMe}_2\text{Cl}$ in 60 ml of THF within 20 min. The solution was stirred for 1 h. Then the solvent was evaporated in vacuo and the obtained oil dissolved in 60 ml of toluene.

1a: The toluene solution was treated with 50 ml of degassed water. The toluene layer was separated and the water phase extracted two times with 30 ml of toluene each. The united toluene phases were dried over Na_2SO_4 . After filtration, all volatiles were removed in vacuo, and the residue was washed two times with 10 ml of petroleum ether each. Yield 5.6 g (75%), white solid, m.p. 113°C. Anal. Calcd. for $\text{C}_{33}\text{H}_{35}\text{PSi}_2$: C, 76.90; H, 6.65. Found C, 76.41; H, 6.70. ^{31}P NMR (D_6 -acetone): δ –8.8 ($^3J_{\text{SiCCP}} = 21.3$ Hz). ^{29}Si NMR (D_6 -acetone): δ –15.1 (d, SiMe_2 , $^3J_{\text{PCCSi}} = 21.8$ Hz), –21.3 (s, SiPh_3). ^{13}C NMR (D_6 -acetone): δ –2.6 (s, SiMe), 12.2 (d, SiCH_2 , $^2J_{\text{PCC}} = 10.7$ Hz), 22.8 (d, PCH_2 , $^1J_{\text{PC}} = 14.6$ Hz), 128.0–140.1 ppm (Ph). ^1H NMR (D_6 -acetone): δ 0.24 (s, 6 H, SiMe), 0.77–0.88 (m, 2 H, SiCH_2), 1.87–1.94 (m, 2 H, PCH_2), 7.20–7.64 (m, 25 H, Ph).

1b: The solution was filtered, and then all volatiles were removed in vacuo. The colorless oil remained was chromatographed on 10 cm of silica with petroleum ether. The product was eluted with toluene. Yield 5.2 g (62%), opaque oil. ^{31}P NMR (D_6 -acetone): δ –8.9. ^{29}Si NMR (D_6 -acetone): δ –15.3 (d, SiMe_2 , $^2J_{\text{PCCSi}} = 21.3$ Hz), –22.4 (s, SiPh_2Me). ^{13}C NMR (CDCl_3): δ –4.2 (s, SiPh_2Me), –3.2 (s, SiMe_2), 11.2 (d, SiCH_2 , $^2J_{\text{PCC}} = 16.8$ Hz), 22.6 (d, PCH_2 , $^1J_{\text{PC}} = 22.7$ Hz), 128.1–139.0 (Ph). ^1H NMR (CDCl_3): δ 0.25 (s, 6 H, SiMe_2), 0.69 (s, 3 H, SiMe), 0.75–0.90 (m, 2 H, SiCH_2), 1.91–2.14 (m, 2 H, PCH_2), 7.25–7.78 (m, 20 H, Ph).

1c: The reaction was carried out as described for **1a, b** using 1.25 g (5.4 mmol) SiPh_2MeCl and 2.33 g (5.4 mmol) of $\text{Ph}_2\text{PCH}_2\text{CH}_2\text{SiPh}_2\text{Cl}$. After removal of all

volatiles from the toluene phase, the remaining yellow oil was dissolved in 30 ml of petroleum ether and filtered over glass wool/celite. All volatiles were removed from the filtered solution. Yield 2.20 g (69%), opaque oil. ^{31}P NMR (CDCl_3): δ -8.3 (s). ^{29}Si NMR (CDCl_3): δ -19.7 (d, SiPh_2 , $^3J_{\text{PCCSi}} = 28.3$ Hz), -23.8 ppm (s, SiPh_2Me). ^1H NMR (CDCl_3): δ 0.71 (s, 3 H SiCH_3), 1.27–1.37 (m, 2 H, SiCH_2), 1.90–2.20 (m, 2 H, PCH_2), 7.20–7.77 (m, 30 H, Ph).

1d: The reaction and purification was carried out as described for **1a** using 2.56 g (8.7 mmol) SiPh_3Cl and 3.75 g (8.5 mmol) $\text{Ph}_2\text{PCH}_2\text{CH}_2\text{SiPh}_2\text{Cl}$. Yield 3.95 g (70%), colorless solid, m.p. 175°C. Anal. Calcd. for $\text{C}_{44}\text{H}_{39}\text{PSi}_2$: C, 80.69; H, 6.00. Found: C, 79.24; H, 6.15. ^{31}P -NMR (C_6D_6): δ -8.8 ppm (s). ^{29}Si -NMR (C_6D_6): δ -19.8 ppm (d, $^3J_{\text{PCCSi}} = 24.0$ Hz, SiPh_2), -23.4 ppm (s, SiPh_3). ^{13}C -NMR (C_6D_6): δ 9.9 ppm (d, $^2J_{\text{PCC}} = 12.5$ Hz, SiCH_2), 23.9 ppm (d, $^1J_{\text{PC}} = 15.3$ Hz, PCH_2), 128.3–139.8 ppm (Ph). ^1H -NMR (C_6D_6): δ 1.72–1.83 ppm (m, 2 H, SiCH_2), 2.19–2.36 ppm (m, 2 H, PCH_2), 7.10–7.75 ppm (m, 35 H, Ph).

4.2. Preparation of $\text{Ph}_2\text{PCH}_2\text{CH}_2\text{SiMe}_2\text{SnPh}_3$ (**1e**)

A solution of freshly prepared LiSnPh_3 in 25 ml of THF (from 5.38 g (13.9 mmol) of SnPh_3Cl) was added to a solution of 3.79 g (13.9 mmol) $\text{Ph}_2\text{PCH}_2\text{CH}_2\text{SiMe}_2\text{Cl}$ in 20 ml of THF at 0°C during 20 min. After warming to room temperature and additional stirring for 2 h, the solvent was removed in vacuo from the green-brown solution leaving. The resulting brown oil was treated with 60 ml of toluene, and the solution filtered over glasswool/celite. After removal of the toluene, the yellow oil (containing some Sn_2Ph_6) was extracted three times with 25 ml of petroleum ether each. From the combined solutions the solvent was removed in vacuo. The resulting white solid was recrystallized from 10 ml of petroleum ether at -30°C. Yield 1.28 g (15%), m.p. 56°C (dec.). Anal. Clc. for $\text{C}_{34}\text{H}_{35}\text{SiPSn}$: C, 65.70; H, 5.68. Found: C, 65.12; H, 5.81. ^{31}P NMR (CDCl_3): δ -9.2 (s). ^{29}Si NMR (C_6D_6): δ 0.2 (d, $^3J_{\text{PCCSi}} = 22.5$ Hz). ^{119}Sn NMR (C_6D_6): δ -137.2 (s). ^{13}C -NMR (CDCl_3): δ -0.3 (s, SiMe), 13.7 (d, SiCH_2 , $^2J_{\text{PCC}} = 14.3$ Hz), 23.1 (d, PCH_2 , $^1J_{\text{PC}} = 14.33$ Hz), 128.0–140.2 (Ph). ^1H NMR (CDCl_3): δ 0.50 (s, 6 H, SiMe , $^3J_{\text{SnSiCH}} = 32.8$ Hz), 0.97–1.08 (m, 2 H, SiCH_2), 2.00–2.07 (m, 2 H, PCH_2), 7.22–7.66 (m, 25 H, Ph).

4.3. Preparation of $\text{Ph}_2\text{PCH}_2\text{SiMe}_2\text{SiPh}_3$ (**1f**)

The compound **1f** was prepared from $\text{Ph}_2\text{PCH}_2\text{SiMe}_2\text{Cl}$ (1.21 g, 4.1 mmol) and LiSiPh_3 (from 1.20 g (4.1 mmol) Ph_3SiCl in THF) as described for **1a**, except for the use of benzene instead of THF as the solvent for $\text{Ph}_2\text{PCH}_2\text{SiMe}_2\text{Cl}$. The reaction solution

was treated with 50 ml of degassed water. The organic layer was separated and the water phase was extracted two times with 30 ml of toluene each. The combined organic phases were dried over Na_2SO_4 . After filtration, all volatiles were removed in vacuo, and the residue was washed two times with 10 ml of petroleum ether each. Yield 1.22 g (58%), white solid, m.p. 132°C. Anal. Calcd. for $\text{C}_{33}\text{H}_{33}\text{PSi}_2$: C, 76.70; H, 6.44. Found C, 76.25; H, 6.59. ^{31}P NMR (C_6D_6): δ -22.3. ^{29}Si NMR (C_6D_6): δ -16.9 (d, SiMe_2 , $^2J_{\text{PCCSi}} = 14.8$ Hz), -19.7 (d, SiPh_3 , $^3J_{\text{PCCSi}} = 8.3$ Hz). ^{13}C NMR (C_6D_6): δ -1.4 (d, SiMe , $^3J_{\text{PCSiC}} = 6.0$ Hz), 13.1 (d, CH_2 , $^1J_{\text{PC}} = 34.2$ Hz), 128.6–142.0 ppm (Ph). ^1H NMR (C_6D_6): δ 0.34 (s, 6 H, SiMe), 1.74 (s. br, 2 H, CH_2), 7.08–7.76 (m, 25 H, Ph).

4.4. Preparation of $(\text{Ph}_3\text{P})(\text{R}_3\text{E})\text{Pt}(\overline{\text{PPh}_2}(\overline{\text{CH}_2})_n\overline{\text{Si}}^{\text{R}})$ (**2a–c,d,f**)

The solution of **1a–f** in 5 ml of benzene was added to a solution of $(\text{Ph}_3\text{P})_2\text{Pt}(\text{C}_2\text{H}_4)$ in 15 ml of benzene. The color of the solution immediately changed to deep yellow, and gas was evolved. After about 30 min the gas evolution ceased. The reaction mixture was stirred for additional 16 h during which the color slowly changed to bright yellow. Then the benzene was removed in vacuo. On washing the remaining yellow oil three times with 3–5 ml of petroleum ether each resulted in pale yellow solids.

2a: 100 mg (0.134 mmol) of $(\text{Ph}_3\text{P})_2\text{Pt}(\text{C}_2\text{H}_4)$ and 75 mg (0.134 mmol) of **1a**. Yield: 112 mg (85%), m.p. 78°C (dec.). Anal. Calc. for $\text{C}_{52}\text{H}_{50}\text{Si}_2\text{P}_2\text{Pt}$: C, 63.2; H, 5.10. Found C, 63.7; H, 5.41. ^{31}P NMR (C_6D_6): δ 57.8 (d, Ph_2PCH_2 , $^2J_{\text{PPiP}} = 17.1$ Hz, $^1J_{\text{PiP}} = 1647.9$ Hz), 29.9 (d, Ph_3P , $^2J_{\text{PPiP}} = 17.1$ Hz, $^1J_{\text{PiP}} = 1762.7$ Hz). ^{29}Si NMR (C_6D_6): δ 32.5 (dd, SiMe_2 , $^2J_{\text{PPiSi}} = 7.7$ Hz, $^2J_{\text{PPiSi}} = 130.9$ Hz), 9.38 (dd, SiPh_3 , $^2J_{\text{PPiSi}} = 12.9$ Hz, $^2J_{\text{PPiSi}} = 140.5$ Hz). ^{13}C -NMR (C_6D_6): δ 4.74 (s, br, SiMe , $^2J_{\text{PtiSiC}} = 72.5$ Hz), 18.1 (d, SiCH_2 , $^2J_{\text{PCC}} = 17.7$ Hz), 27.6 (d, PCH_2 , $^1J_{\text{PC}} = 29.4$ Hz), 127.0–138.2 (m, Ph). ^1H NMR (C_6D_6): δ 0.52 (s, 6 H, SiCH_3 , $^3J_{\text{PtiSiCH}} = 23.2$ Hz), 0.58–1.03 (m, 2 H, SiCH_2), 2.23–2.32 (m, 2 H, PCH_2), 6.80–7.79 (m, Ph).

2b: 145 mg (0.194 mmol) of $(\text{Ph}_3\text{P})_2\text{Pt}(\text{C}_2\text{H}_4)$ and 91 mg (0.194 mmol) of **1b**. Yield 145 mg (81%), m.p. 85°C (dec.). Anal. Calc. for $\text{C}_{47}\text{H}_{48}\text{Si}_2\text{P}_2\text{Pt}$: C, 60.95; H, 5.22. Found C, 60.87; H, 4.94. ^{31}P NMR (C_6D_6): δ 60.5 (d, Ph_2PCH_2 , $^2J_{\text{PPiP}} = 19.5$ Hz, $^1J_{\text{PiP}} = 1641.3$ Hz), 29.5 (d, Ph_3P , $^2J_{\text{PPiP}} = 20.7$ Hz, $^1J_{\text{PiP}} = 1598.0$ Hz). ^{29}Si NMR (C_6D_6): δ 31.7 (d, br, SiMe_2 , $^2J_{\text{PPiSi}} = 135.0$ Hz), 1.1 (dd, SiPh_2Me , $^2J_{\text{PPiSi}} = 143.3$ Hz, $^2J_{\text{PPiSi}} = 14.8$ Hz). ^{13}C NMR (C_6D_6): δ 4.9 (s, br, SiMe , $^2J_{\text{PtiSiC}} = 59.1$ Hz), 7.4 (s, br, SiPh_2Me , $^2J_{\text{PtiSiC}} = 52.2$ Hz), 19.9 (d, br, SiCH_2 , $^2J_{\text{PCC}} = 31.1$ Hz), 32.6 (d, br, PCH_2 , $^1J_{\text{PC}} = 35.2$ Hz), 127.0–139.2 (Ph). ^1H NMR (C_6D_6): δ 0.54 (d, 6 H, SiMe_2 , $^4J_{\text{PPiSiCH}} = 2.4$ Hz,

$^3J_{\text{PtSiCH}} = 23.2$ Hz), 0.62 (d, 3 H, SiMe, $^4J_{\text{PPtSiCH}} = 2.45$ Hz, $^3J_{\text{PtSiCH}} = 24.4$ Hz), 0.64–0.95 (m, 2 H, SiCH₂), 2.14–2.24 (m, 2 H, PCH₂), 6.85–7.95 (m, Ph).

2c: 135 mg (0.181 mmol) of (Ph₃P)₂Pt(C₂H₄) and 107 mg (0.181 mmol) of **1c**. Yield 112 mg (59%) m.p. 69°C (dec). Anal. Calc. for C₅₇H₅₂P₂Si₂Pt: C, 65.2; H, 4.99. Found: C, 63.1; H, 4.99. ^{31}P NMR (C₆D₆): δ 56.4 (d, Ph₂PCH₂, $^2J_{\text{PPtP}} = 20.8$ Hz, $^1J_{\text{PtP}} = 1500.2$ Hz), 28.7 (d, Ph₃P, $^2J_{\text{PPtP}} = 20.8$ Hz, $^1J_{\text{PtP}} = 1783.4$ Hz). ^{29}Si (C₆D₆): δ 28.2 (dd, SiPh₂, $J_{\text{PSi}} = 9.2$ Hz, $^2J_{\text{PPtSi}} = 143.8$ Hz), -1.7 (dd, SiPh₂Me, $^2J_{\text{PPtSi}} = 12.9$ Hz, $^2J_{\text{PPtSi}} = 137.8$ Hz). ^{13}C NMR (C₆D₆): δ 6.9 (s, br, SiMe) 19.7 (d, br, SiCH₃, $^2J_{\text{PCC}} = 30.3$ Hz), 30.4 (d, br, PCH₂, $^1J_{\text{PC}} = 38.2$ Hz), 127.6–141.3 (Ph). ^1H NMR (C₆D₆): δ 1.01 (d, 3 H, SiCH₃, $J_{\text{PH}} = 2.45$ Hz, $^3J_{\text{PtSiCH}} = 27.3$ Hz), 1.29–1.44 (m, 2 H, SiCH₂), 2.19–2.28 (m, 2 H, PCH₂), 6.81–8.08 (m, Ph).

2e: 102 mg (0.135 mmol) of (Ph₃P)₂Pt(C₂H₄) and 84 mg (0.135 mmol) of **1e**. Yield: 97 mg (67%), m.p. 69°C. Anal. Calc. for C₅₂H₅₀P₂SiSnPt: C, 57.9; H, 4.67. Found: C, 58.0; H, 4.80. ^{31}P NMR (C₆D₆): δ 28.8 (d, $^2J_{\text{PPtP}} = 17.1$ Hz, $^1J_{\text{PtP}} = 1659.5$ Hz, $^2J_{\text{SnPtP}} = 186.1$ Hz), 62.1 (d, $^2J_{\text{PPtP}} = 17.1$ Hz, $^1J_{\text{PtP}} = 2692.7$ Hz, $^2J_{\text{117SnPtP}} = 1491.6$ Hz, $^2J_{\text{119SnPtP}} = 1560.6$ Hz). ^{119}Sn NMR (C₆D₆): δ -32.6 (dd, *trans*- $^2J_{\text{PPtSn}} = 1561.5$, *cis*- $^2J_{\text{PPtSn}} = 188.2$ Hz). ^{29}Si NMR (C₆D₆): δ 31.9 (dd, $J_{\text{PSi}} = 8.3$ Hz, $^2J_{\text{PPtSi}} = 131.3$ Hz). ^{13}C NMR (C₆D₆): δ 5.5 (d, SiMe, $J_{\text{PC}} = 6.5$ Hz, $^3J_{\text{SnPtSiC}} = 74.5$ Hz), 19.6 (dd, SiCH₂, $^2J_{\text{PCC}} = 28.9$ Hz, $J_{\text{PC}} = 6.5$ Hz), 33.1 (dd, PCH₂, $^1J_{\text{PC}} = 37.5$ Hz, $J_{\text{PC}} = 9.7$ Hz), 126.5–150.7 (m, Ph). ^1H NMR (C₆D₆): δ 0.75 (d, 6 H, SiMe, $^4J_{\text{PPtSiCH}} = 2.4$ Hz, $^3J_{\text{PtSiCH}} = 22.0$ Hz), 0.70–0.99 (m, 2 H, SiCH₂), 2.15–2.25 (m, 2 H, PCH₂), 6.71–7.90 (m, Ph).

2f: 102 mg (0.136 mmol) of (Ph₃P)₂Pt(C₂H₄) and 70 mg of **1f**. Yield: 115 mg (87%), m.p. 69°C (dec). Anal. Calc. for C₅₁H₄₈P₂Si₂Pt: C, 62.88; H, 4.97. Found: C, 62.86; H, 4.90. ^{31}P NMR (C₆D₆): δ 32.4 (d, $^2J_{\text{PPtP}} = 29.3$ Hz, $^1J_{\text{PtP}} = 1533.2$ Hz), -12.6 (d, $^2J_{\text{PPtP}} = 29.3$ Hz, $^1J_{\text{PtP}} = 1150.5$ Hz). ^{29}Si NMR (C₆D₆): δ -26.4 (dd, SiMe₂, *trans*- $^2J_{\text{PPtSi}} = 134.3$ Hz, $J_{\text{PSi}} = 47.6$ Hz, $^1J_{\text{PtSi}} = 927.7$ Hz), 2.7 ppm (dd, SiPh₃, $^2J_{\text{PPtSi}} = 159.5$ Hz, $^2J_{\text{PPtSi}} = 11.0$ Hz, $^1J_{\text{PtSi}} = 1411.1$ Hz). ^{13}C NMR (C₆D₆): δ 4.3 (s, br, SiMe), 30.3 (d, br, CH₂, $^1J_{\text{PC}} = 18.7$ Hz), 127.6–146.5 (m, Ph). ^1H NMR (C₆D₆): δ 0.31 (d, 6 H, SiMe, $^4J_{\text{PPtSiCH}} = 3.6$ Hz, $^3J_{\text{PtSiCH}} = 24.4$ Hz), 2.66 (dd, 2 H, CH₂, $^2J_{\text{PCH}} = 11.9$ Hz, $J_{\text{PH}} = 3.6$ Hz, $^3J_{\text{PtPCH}} = 57.9$ Hz), 6.79–8.17 (m, Ph).

4.5. Reaction of (Ph₃P)₂Pt(C₂H₄) with one equivalent of **1d**

83 mg (0.111 mmol) of (Ph₃P)₂Pt(C₂H₄) and 73 mg (0.111 mmol) of **1d** were allowed to react as described for **2a**. After stirring for 5 d at room temperature and removal of the solvent, the ^{31}P -NMR spectrum indi-

cated the formation of a mixture of **2d** and **3** in an approximate 2:1 ratio, and some Pt(PR₃)₃ species.

2d: ^{31}P NMR (C₆D₆): δ 53.9 (d, $^2J_{\text{PPtP}} = 20.8$ Hz, $^1J_{\text{PtP}} = 1532.2$ Hz), 29.1 (d, $^2J_{\text{PPtP}} = 20.8$ Hz, $^1J_{\text{PtP}} = 1750.5$ Hz).

4.6. Reaction of (Ph₃P)₂Pt(C₂H₄) with two equivalents of **1d**

50 mg (0.067 mmol) of (Ph₃P)₂Pt(C₂H₄) were reacted with 88 mg (0.134 mmol) of **1d** in 10 ml of benzene for 4 d. The solvent was then removed from the light yellow solution. A ^{31}P - and ^{29}Si -NMR spectrum of the resulting pale yellow, slightly oily solid proved the formation of **3** and a small amount (about 5% as indicated by ^{31}P -NMR) of **2d**.

3: ^{31}P NMR (C₆D₆): δ 54.4 (d, $^2J_{\text{PPtP}} = 22.0$ Hz, $^1J_{\text{PtP}} = 1533.2$ Hz) 22.1 (d, $^2J_{\text{PPtP}} = 22.0$, $^1J_{\text{PtP}} = 1622.5$ Hz). ^{29}Si NMR (C₆D₆): 27.8 (dd, $^2J_{\text{PPtSi}} = 140.1$ Hz, $J_{\text{PSi}} = 10.2$ Hz), 3.7 (dd, $^2J_{\text{PPtSi}} = 146.6$ Hz, $^2J_{\text{PPtSi}} = 14.8$ Hz), -23.0 (d, $^3J_{\text{PCCSi}} = 30.5$ Hz), -23.6 (s). ^1H NMR (C₆D₆): 1.00–1.53 (overlapping m, SiCH₂, 4H), 2.11–2.47 (overlapping m, PCH₂, 4H), 6.89–7.98 (m, Ph).

X-ray structure analysis of 2f: Pale yellow crystals (0.22 × 0.11 × 0.07 mm³). Cell parameters: triclinic, $a = 1128.1$ (2), $b = 1152.4$ (2), $c = 1851.9$ (3) pm, $\alpha = 101.36$ (1), $\beta = 94.69$ (1), $\gamma = 108.60$ (1)°, $V = 2209.6$ (6) × 10⁶ pm³, space group $P - 1$ ($Z = 2$), $d_{\text{calc}} = 1.466$ g/cm³. Data collection: The crystals were mounted on a Siemens SMART diffractometer (area detector) in a sealed capillary. Mo-K α radiation ($\lambda = 71.069$ pm, graphite monochromator) was used for all measurements. The data collection at 293 K covered over a hemisphere of the reciprocal space, by a combination of three sets of exposures. Each set had a different ϕ angle for the crystal, and each exposure took 20s and covered 0.3° in ω . The crystal-to-detector distance was 3.85 cm. The data was collected in the range $1.14 \leq \phi \leq 30.51^\circ$, $-14 \leq h \leq 16$, $-16 \leq k \leq 11$, $-22 \leq l \leq 26$. 19131 reflections were collected. 13238 unique reflections ($R_{\text{int}} = 0.0381$) were obtained after correction for polarization and Lorentz effects ($\mu = 33.36$ cm⁻¹) and used for calculations. The structure was solved by direct methods (SHELX86). The positions of the hydrogen atoms were calculated according to an idealized geometry. Refinement was performed by the full-matrix least-squares method based on F^2 (SHELX93) with anisotropic thermal parameters for all non-hydrogen atoms. The parameters of the hydrogen atoms were not refined. $R = 0.046$, $R_w = 0.061$ for 8198 reflections with $I > 2\sigma(I)$; $w = 1/[\sigma^2(F_0^2) + (0.0097P)^2]$. The largest residual electron density was 0.836 e/Å³. Further details of the crystal structure investigations are available from the Fachinformationszentrum Karlsruhe, D-76344 Eggenstein-Leopoldsha-

fen (Germany), on quoting the depository number CSD-405992.

References

- [1] R. Karch, U. Schubert, *Inorg. Chim. Acta. Part 54*, 259 (1997) 151.
- [2] H.K. Sharma, K.H. Pannell, *Chem. Rev.* 95 (1995) 1351.
- [3] H. Yamashita, M. Tanaka, *Bull. Chem. Soc. Jp.* 68 (1995) 403.
- [4] U. Schubert, *Angew. Chem.* 106 (1994) 435.
- [5] U. Schubert, *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. Engl.* 33 (1994) 419, and references cited therein.
- [6] C.Y. Huang, C.S. Liu, *J. Organomet. Chem.* 373 (1989) 353.
- [7] K.M. Hornig, S.L. Wang, C.S. Liu, *Organometallics* 10 (1991) 631.
- [8] R.D. Holmes-Smith, S.R. Stobart, T.S. Cameron, K. Jochem, *J. Chem. Soc. Chem. Commun.* (1981) 937.
- [9] M.J. Auburn, S.R. Stobart, *Inorg. Chem.* 24 (1985) 318.
- [10] S.L. Grundy, R.D. Holmes-Smith, S.R. Stobart, M.A. Williams, *Inorg. Chem.* 30 (1991) 3333.
- [11] U. Schubert, H. Gilges, *Organometallics* 15 (1996) 2373.
- [12] U. Schubert, S. Grubert, U. Schulz, S. Mock, *Organometallics* 11 (1992) 3165.
- [13] U. Schubert, S. Grubert, *Organometallics* 15 (1996) 4707.
- [14] C. Müller, U. Schubert, *Chem. Ber.* 124 (1991) 2181.
- [15] M. Murakami, T. Yoshida, Y. Ito, *Organometallics* 13 (1994) 2900.
- [16] M. Murakami, T. Yoshida, Y. Ito, *Chem. Lett.* (1996) 13.
- [17] H. Weichmann, *J. Organomet. Chem.* 238 (1982) C49.
- [18] R.D. Holmes Smith, R.D. Osei, S.R. Stobart, *J. Chem. Soc. Perkin Trans.* (1983) 861.
- [19] R.D. Holmes-Smith, S.R. Stobart, T.S. Cameron, K. Jochem, *J. Chem. Soc. Chem. Comm.* (1981) 937.
- [20] E.K. Pham, R. West, *Organometallics* 9 (1990) 1517.
- [21] D.F. Mullica, E.L. Sappenfield, M.J. Hampden-Smith, *Polyhedron* 10 (1991) 867.
- [22] L.S. Chang, M.P. Johnson, M.J. Fink, *Organometallics* 10 (1991) 1219.
- [23] M.J. Michalczyk, C.A. Recatto, J.C. Calabrese, M.J. Fink, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 114 (1992) 7955.
- [24] F. Ozawa, T. Hikida, T. Hayashi, 1994, 116, 2844.
- [25] J. Chatt, C. Eaborn and P.N. Kapoor, *J. Chem. Soc. A.* (1970) 881.
- [26] C. Eaborn, A. Pidcock, B. Ratcliff, *J. Organomet. Chem.*, 43 (1972) C5.
- [27] W. Fink, A. Wenger, *Helv. Chim. Acta*, 54 (7) (1971) 2186.
- [28] C. Eaborn, B. Ratcliff, A. Pidcock, *J. Organomet. Chem.*, 65 (1974) 181.
- [29] C. Eaborn, T.N. Metham, A.J. Pidcock, *J. Organomet. Chem.*, 63 (1973) 107.
- [30] C. Eaborn, T.N. Metham, A. Pidcock, *J. Organomet. Chem.*, 131 (1977) 377.
- [31] M. Tanaka, Y. Uchimarui, H.J. Lautenschlager, *Organometallics*, 10 (1991) 16.
- [32] C. Eaborn, R. Ratcliff, A. Pidcock, *J. Chem. Soc. Dalton Trans.* (1975) 2212.
- [33] G. Schmid, H.J. Balk, *Chem. Ber.* 103 (1970) 2240.
- [34] F. Glockling and R.E. Houston, *J. Organomet. Chem.* (1973) C31.
- [35] H. Yamashita, T. Kobayashi, T. Hayashi, M. Tanaka, *Chem. Lett.* (1990) 1447.
- [36] M. Suginome, H. Oike, P.H. Shuff, Y. Ito, *J. Organomet. Chem.* 521 (1996) 405.