H_2 remains preferentially in the same plane as the Ru-H(3) bond with a small rotational barrier of 3 kcal/mol. Remarkably the interaction between the metal d orbitals and σ^*_{HH} is similar for the in-plane and out-of-plane orientation of H_2 . The preference for a coplanar arrangement can be traced to a cis interaction between the Ru-H σ bond and the σ^*_{HH} orbital (4). This interaction is also responsible for the fact that the Ru-H is bent toward the H_2 ligand. As has been previously shown in an Fe-(II)-H/H₂ complex,^{4a} this interaction creates a nascent bond between the hydride and the closest H center of H₂. This nascent bond should facilitate the exchange process between the hydrogens.



A possible path for exchanging the H centers is shown in 5 (perpendicular phosphine ligands removed for clarity). The transition structure between two equivalent square pyramids (5a) is a distorted trigonal bipyramid with an acute angle between H_2 and H and the I ligand trans to it (5b). Such a structure, which is calculated to be very close in energy to the minimum and which has even been observed as a stable structure in the case of an Ru(II) and two Ir(III) complexes (with R and H at the acute angle),^{13,14} should facilitate the exchange process by favoring the proximity between H and H₂.



Compound 2 is unusual for several reasons. Firstly, it is the first well-characterized 16-electron dihydrogen derivative, which demonstrates that electron saturation is not a necessary condition for the stabilization of coordinated H₂; there is no evidence for an agostic interaction between the cyclohexyl group and the metal. Secondly, the molecule adopts an octahedral type structure with a vacant coordination site. The dihydrogen molecule lies in the I-Ru-H(3) plane and not along the P(1)-Ru-P(2) axis, which is shown to be a manifestation of the cis interaction. Finally the H(1)-H(2) distance (1.03 (7) Å) is one of the longest reported so far in nonclassical H₂ complexes.¹⁵ whereas the H(1)-H(3) distance (1.66 (6) Å) is short, a structure that should facilitate hydride/dihydrogen exchange.

Acknowledgment. The Laboratoire de Chimie Théorique is associated with the CNRS, URA 506, and is a member of the ICMO and IPCM. We thank the EEC for a postdoctoral fellowship (S.A.J.). We are grateful to Pr. Javier Züniga from Pais Vasco University (Bilbao, Spain) for data collection at 100 K.

Supplementary Material Available: Experimental data of the X-ray diffraction study of compound 2 including full experimental details and tables of atomic coordinates and thermal parameters (8 pages); table of observed and calculated structure factors for 2 (27 pages). Ordering information is given on any current masthead page.

Synthesis and Structure of $[{Ru(CO)_2(Cp)}_2(\mu-C=C)]$: An Ethynediyl Complex Formed during Tungsten-Catalyzed Alkyne Metathesis

George A. Koutsantonis and John P. Selegue*

Department of Chemistry, University of Kentucky Lexington, Kentucky 40506-0055

Received October 31, 1990

Metal complexes with all-carbon ligands provide interesting models for the carbide fragments formed as reactive intermediates during carbon monoxide and acetylene conversion reactions on heterogeneous catalyst surfaces.¹ There are several bicarbide clusters which fall into two classes, those with encapsulated C_2 ligands² and those with two separate C_1 ligands.³ Generally, the carbide ligands tend to be unreactive because they are "buried" in the clusters. Complexes with C_2 ligands bonded to only two or three metals are quite rare.^{4,5} We are interested in using metal ethynediyls ($L_nMC \equiv CML_n$) as an approach to reactive metal bicarbide complexes.

We previously reported that the stoichiometric reaction of $[Ru(C = CMe)(CO)_2(Cp)]$ with $[W(=CEt)(OCMe_3)_3]$ leads to the μ -carbide complex $[(Cp)(CO)_2RuC = W(OCMe_3)_3]$ by alkyne metathesis, with elimination of MeC = CEt.⁶ While optimizing this procedure, we realized that the direct reaction of $[Ru(C = CMe)(CO)_2(Cp)]$ with $[W_2(OCMe_3)_6]$ should be equally capable of forming the carbide complex, since the initial reaction of these complexes should give equimolar amounts of $[(Cp)(CO)_2RuC = W(OCMe_3)_3]$ and $[W(=CMe)(OCMe_3)_3]$, ultimately leading to only $[(Cp)(CO)_2RuC = W(OCMe_3)_3]$ by loss of volatile MeC = CMe (Scheme I). Although this is the case in toluene solvent, carrying out the reaction in isooctane solution leads to the formation of a yellow precipitate of $[[Ru(CO)_2(Cp)]_2(\mu-C = C)]$ (1) in 52% yield.⁷ The compounds remaining in solution (NMR) are $[(Cp)(CO)_2RuC = W(OCMe_3)_3]$, $[W(= CMe)(OCMe_3)_3]$,

Lee, G.; Ponec, V. Catal. Rev.—Sci. Eng. 1987, 29, 183–218. (2) (a) Examples of μ_7 -C₂: Arrigoni, A.; Ceriotti, A.; Pergola, R. D.; Longoni, G.; Manassero, M.; Sansoni, M. J. Organomet. Chem. 1985, 296, 243. (b) Example of μ_4 -C₂: Bruce, M. I.; Snow, M. R.; Tiekink, E. R. T.; Williams, M. L. J. Chem. Soc., Chem. Commun. 1986, 701–702.

(3) Example of (μ₆-C)₂: Hayward, C.-M. T.; Shapley, J. R.; Churchill, M. R.; Bueno, C.; Rheingold, A. L. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1982, 104, 7347-7349.

(4) (a) Neithamer, D. R.; LaPointe, R. E.; Wheeler, R. A.; Richeson, D. S.; Van Duyne, G. D.; Wolczanski, P. T. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1989, 111, 9056-9072. (b) Listemann, M. L.; Schrock, R. R. Organometallics 1985, 4, 74-83. (c) Blau, R. J.; Chisholm, M. H.; Folting, K.; Wang, R. J. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1987, 109, 4552-4560.

(5) μ_2 -Ethynediyls. (a) W-Ru, W-Fe: Frank, K. G.; Selegue, J. P. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1990, 112, 6414-6416. (b) Fe: Akita, M.; Terada, M.; Oyama, S.; Moro-oka, Y. Organometallics 1990, 9, 816-825. (c) Re: Appel, M.; Heidrich, J.; Beck, W. Chem. Ber. 1987, 120, 1087-1089. (d) Re: Beck, W.; Niemer, B.; Breimair, J.; Heidrich, L. J. Organomet. Chem. 1989, 372, 79-83. (e) Re: Heidrich, J.; Steimann, M.; Appel, M.; Beck, W.; Phillips, J. R.; Trogler, W. C. Organometallics 1990, 9, 1296. (f) W: Ustynyuk, N. A.; Vinogradova, V. N.; Kravtsov, D. N.; Oprunenko, Y. F.; Piven, V. A. Metalloorg. Khim. 1988, 1, 884-888; Chem. Abstr. 1989, 111, 233074c. (g) Cr, W: Ustynyuk, N. A.; Vinogradova, V. N.; Kravtsov, D. N. Metalloorg. Khim. 1988, 1, 85-88; Chem. Abstr. 1980, 160, 51-55. (i) Pt, Pd: Ogawa, H.; Onitsuka, K.; Joh, T.; Takahashi, S.; Yamamoto, Y.; Yamazaki, H. Organometallics 1988, 7, 2257-2260. (j) Au: Nast, R.; Schneller, P.; Hengefeld, A. J. Organomet. Chem. 1981, 214, 273-276. (k) Au: Cross, R. J.; Davidson, M. F.; McLennan, A. J. J. Organomet. Chem. 1984, 265, C37-C39.

(6) Latesky, S. L.; Selegue, J. P. J. Am. Chem. Soc. **1987**, 109, 4731-4733. (7) A mixture of $[Ru(C=CMe)(CO)_2(Cp)]$ (187 mg, 0.716 mmol) and $[W_2(OCMe_3)_6]$ (20 mg, 0.025 mmol) in isooctane (30 mL) was stirred at ambient temperature for 2 h. The pale yellow precipitate was collected on a glass frit to give 1 (90 mg). The filtrate was further stirred for 12 h to give a second crop of 1 (20 mg, total yield 66%). A stoichiometric reaction of $[Ru(C=CMe)(CO)_2(Cp)]$ (450 mg, 1.72 mmol) and $[W_2(OCMe_3)_6]$ (693 mg, 0.86 mmol) in isooctane (50 mL) gave a precipitate of 1 (211 mg, 52%) in addition to $[(Cp)(CO)_2RuC=W(OCMe_3)_3]$ (365 mg, 33%) which was recovered from the solution.

^{(13) (}a) Jean, Y.; Eisenstein, O. Polyhedron 1988, 7, 405. (b) See references in the following: Rachidi, I. E.-I.; Eisenstein, O.; Jean, Y. Nouv. J. Chim. 1990, 14, 671.

⁽¹⁴⁾ Werner, H.; Hohn, A.; Dziallas, M. Angew. Chem., Int. Ed. Engl.
(1986, 25, 1090. Fryzuk, M. D.; MacNeil, P. A.; Ball, R. G. J. Am. Chem.
Soc. 1986, 108, 6414. Mezzetti, A.; Del Zotto, A.; Rigo, P.; Bresciani Pahor,
N. J. Chem. Soc., Dalton Trans. 1989, 1045.

⁽¹⁵⁾ Kim, Y.; Deng, H.; Meek, D. W.; Wojcicki, A. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1990, 112, 2798.

^{(1) (}a) Somorjai, G. A. Chemistry in Two Dimensions: Surfaces; Cornell University Press: Ithaca, NY, 1981; pp 494-499. (b) Anderson, R. B. The Fischer-Tropsch Synthesis; Academic Press: New York, 1984. (c) van der Lee, G.; Ponec, V. Catal. Rev.—Sci. Eng. 1987, 29, 183-218.

Scheme I



and a small amount of $[{Ru(CO)_2(Cp)}_2(\mu-C=C)]$. A catalytic amount of $[W_2(OCMe_3)_6]$ (3 mol %) leads more slowly to a precipitate of 1 in 66% yield, with ca. 9 turnovers per W. In support of the mechanism proposed in Scheme I, [Ru(C= CMe)(CO)₂(Cp)] reacts with [(Cp)(CO)₂RuC=W(OCMe₃)₃] in isooctane to give a precipitate of 1 (60% yield) and 1 equiv of $[W(\equiv CMe)(OCMe_3)_3]$, which remains in solution. Physical properties of 1, in particular a ¹³C NMR singlet resonance at 74.7 ppm, are consistent with the ethynediyl formulation.⁸ The appearance of four $\nu(CO)$ absorptions in the infrared spectrum suggests that both syn and anti isomers are present in solution at room temperature. Compound 1 has no infrared-active carbon-carbon triple bond stretch.

The structure of 1 was confirmed by an X-ray diffraction study (Figure 1).⁹ The Rul-Cl-C2-Ru2 chain is linear, with Ru-C distances of 2.05 (1) and 2.04 (1) Å and a C1-C2 distance of 1.19 (1) Å, consistent with the localized canonical form $Ru - C \equiv$ C-Ru. The cyclopentadienyl ligands are oriented anti to one another in the solid-state structure of 1. Overall $[Ru(CO)_2(Cp)]$ geometries are similar to related structures.¹⁰⁻¹³

This preparation of an ethynediyl complex by using metalcatalyzed alkyne metathesis is unprecedented, although alkyne metathesis products were formed in reactions of [Pt(C=CR)₂- $(PMe_2Ph)_2$ with $[W_2(OCMe_3)_6]$ or $[W_2(OCHMe_2)_6(py)_2]$. Conceptually simpler attempts to prepare ethynediyls by reactions of C222 salts with metal complexes are rarely successful, 5f,h apparently due to redox side reactions.¹⁴ Deprotonations of cationic µ-ethynyl complexes^{5a-e} and reactions of ClC≡CCl with [M- $(CO)_3(Cp)^{-}$ (M = Cr, W)^{5g} have led to ethynediyls in a few cases.



Figure 1. Plot of the structure of 1 showing 50% probability ellipsoids. Selected bond distances (Å) and angles (deg): Ru1-C4 1.87 (1), Ru1-C3 1.88 (1), Ru1-C1 2.05 (1), Ru2-C6 1.84 (1), Ru2-C5 1.86 (1), Ru2-C2 2.04 (1), C1-C2 1.19 (1); C4-Ru1-C3 90.7 (5), C4-Ru1-C1 86.6 (4), C3-Ru1-CI 90.5 (4), C6-Ru2-C5 90.1 (5), Co-Ru2-C2 88.1 (5), C5-Ru2-C2 88.4 (4), C2-C1-Ru1 178.1 (9), C1-C2-Ru2 179.6 (9).

Except for a report of the structure, protonation, and redox behavior of $[{Re(CO)_5}_2(\mu-C \equiv C)]$, ^{5e} very little is known about the chemical properties of ethynediyls. In the cyclic voltammogram of 1, two irreversible electrochemical oxidation waves are observed at 308 and 834 mV,15 consistent with oxidation at the ethynediyl bridge as suggested for $[{Re(CO)_{5}}_{2}(\mu-C \equiv C)]$. The ethynediyl bridge of 1 is quite reactive. For example, 1 reacts with $[Fe_2(CO)_9]$ in THF at room temperature to give $[Ru_2Fe_2 (C_2)(CO)_9(Cp)_2]$, which is currently under investigation.

Acknowledgment. We are grateful to the U.S. Department of Energy (DE-FG05-85ER13432), the Kentucky EPSCoR program (NSF Grant RII-8610671), and the Ashland Oil Foundation for financial support, to the University of Kentucky Major Research Instrumentation Bond Program for equipment, and to Johnson-Matthey, Inc., for a loan of ruthenium trichloride.

Supplementary Material Available: Complete experimental and spectroscopic details for compound 1 and listings of crystal structure data, positional and thermal parameters, bond distances and angles, torsion angles, and least-squares planes (9 pages); listing of experimental and calculated structure factors for 1 (15 pages). Ordering information is given on any current masthead page.

(10) [RuR(CO)₂(Cp)] structures: $R = CH_2Ru(CO)_2(Cp), \tilde{d}(Ru-C) = 2.18 Å;^{11} R = COC_{10}H_{13}, d(Ru-C) = 2.090 (6) Å;^{12} R = CONH_{2}, d(Ru-C) = 2.084 (7) Å;^{13} R = C W(OCMe_3)_3, d(Ru-C) = 2.09 (2) Å.⁶$ (11) Lin, Y. C.; Calabrese, J. C.; Wreford, S. S. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1983,

105, 1679.

(12) Eisenstadt, A.; Frolow, F.; Efraty, A. J. Chem. Soc., Dalion Trans. 1982, 1013.

 (13) Wagner, H.; Jungbauer, A.; Thiele, G.; Behrens, H. Z. Naturforsch., Anorg. Chem., Org. Chem. 1979, 34B, 1487.
 (14) Manning, M. C.; Trogler, W. C. Inorg. Chim. Acta 1981, 50, **B**:

247-250.

(15) Conditions for cyclic voltammetry: acetonitrile, $Bu^{n}_{4}NClO_{4}$, room temperature, Pt disk working electrode, 150 mV·s⁻¹. Peak potentials are reported vs internal ferrocene(0/+).

(16) Beurskens, P. T.; Bosman, W. P.; Doesburg, H. J.; Gould, R. O.; van den Hark, T. E. M.; Prick, P. A. J.; Noordik, J. H.; Beurskens, G.; Partha-sarthi, V.; Bruins Slot, H. J.; Haltiwanger, R. C.; Strumpel, M.; Smits, J. M. M. DIRDIF. Technical Report 1984/1; Crystallography Laboratory: Toernooiveld, 6525 ED Nijmegen, The Netherlands, 1984.

⁽⁸⁾ Properties of 1: mp 148 °C dec; ¹H NMR (200 MHz, C₆D₆) $\delta_{\rm H}$ 4.63 (s, Cp); ¹³Cl¹H} NMR (101 MHz, C₆D₆) $\delta_{\rm H}$ 74.7 (s, C=C), 83.0 (s, Cp), 199.8 (s, CO); IR (ν (CO), toluene) 2048 (m), 2031 (s), 2024 (sh), 1980 (s). Anal. Calcd for C₁₆H₁₀O₄Ru: C, 41.03; H, 2.15. Found: C, 41.05; H, 2.15. (9) Crystal data for 1: yellow needle, CAD4 diffractometer, Mo K α radiation, 3003 unique reflections, 2337 with (F_0)² $\geq 3\sigma(F_0)^2$ for refinement, $PI, Z = 2, \rho_{calcd} = 2.008 \text{ g-cm}^3, a = 9.786$ (3) Å, b = 13.822 (2) Å, c = 5.915(2) Å, $\alpha = 102.11$ (2)°, $\beta = 97.96$ (2)°, $\gamma = 87.81$ (2)°, V = 774.7 (3) Å³ $\mu = 19.255$ cm⁻¹, no absorption or extinction corrections, solved by using Patterson, DIRDIF,¹⁶ and difference Fourier methods, H atoms idealized, non-hydrogen atoms refined with anisotropic thermal parameters to R = 5.9%, $R_{\rm w} = 7.8\%$ with 199 variables.