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#### Abstract

 with $\lambda_{\max }=512-548 \mathrm{~nm}$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}$ at room temperature, attributed to Hush-type charge-transfer bands (transition  absorption with $\lambda_{\max }=1062-1199 \mathrm{~nm}\left(E_{\mathrm{op}}=26.9-29.3 \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}\right)$. The large difference in $E_{\mathrm{op}}$ is caused by innersphere reorganization energy differences, which are predicted well by AM1 semiempirical molecular orbital calculations. Hush analysis of the absorption bands produces electronic coupling matrix elements $J=3.5 \pm 0.5 \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}$ for these species, and Marcus-Hush theory predicts intramolecular electron-transfer rate constants which are consistent with the experimental observation that ET is slow on the ESR time scale for the hydrazines and fast for the hydrazyls. The bis-inner hydrazyl radical cation $13^{\circ+}$ exhibits a near-IR absorption band at $\lambda_{\max }=850 \mathrm{~nm}$ which is narrower than those of $\mathbf{2 0}^{+}$and $7^{++}$and is concluded not to be a Hush-type charge-transfer band.


## Introduction

The free energy barrier ( $\Delta G^{*}$ ) to thermal electron transfer (ET) in Marcus theory is one-quarter of the free energy barrier for vertical ET ( $\lambda$ ), in which the electron is transferred between the components without allowing any relaxation. ${ }^{1} \lambda$ is the sum of solvent reorganization ( $\lambda_{\text {out }}$ ) and internal geometry reorganization ( $\lambda_{\text {in }}$ ) terms (eq 1). We shall consider only the theoretically

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lambda=\lambda_{\text {out }}+\lambda_{\text {in }} \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

simple case of "self-ET" reaction between a neutral molecule and its own radical cation, for which $\Delta G^{\circ}=0$, and the electrontransfer rate constant $k_{\mathrm{ex}}$ is given by the product of a preexponential term and the exponential term containing $\lambda$ (eq 2). We

$$
\begin{equation*}
k_{\mathrm{ex}}=\operatorname{PRE} \exp (-\lambda / 4 R T) \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

have particularly studied self-ET reactions of hydrazines, which have an unusually large geometry change upon electron loss, causing a large $\lambda_{\text {in }}$ value and hence unusually small $k_{\text {ex }}$ values. ${ }^{2}$ However, $\lambda$ cannot be directly evaluated from intermolecular ET work, as several other quantities also go into determining $k_{\text {ex }}$. An important step in separating these quantities is measuring $\lambda$ for hydrazine ET reactions, which we hoped to do by making the self-ET intramolecular instead of intermolecular.

We recently reported a practical conversion of tetracyclic bis(azo) compound 1 to the bis(tert-butyldiazenium) salts 2 and
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bis(tert-butylmethylhydrazines) 3, as outlined in Scheme I. ${ }^{3}$ These compounds are of interest here as precursors to radical cations which are organic analogues of the mixed-valence transitionmetal complexes ${ }^{4}$ for which Hush theory ${ }^{5}$ has proven so successful in understanding electron-transfer properties. According to Hush theory, a charge-transfer (CT) optical absorption corresponding to vertical electron transfer (ET) between the redox centers will be observed if electronic interaction at the transition state is large enough. The transition energy for the charge-transfer band, $E_{\mathrm{op}}$, is the energy gap between the ground state, which has both redox centers and their solvation shells relaxed, and the CT state with an electron transferred but no relaxation. $E_{\text {op }}$ is an experimental measure of the Marcus $\lambda$ value. ${ }^{1}$
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(5) (a) Hush, N. S. Trans. Faraday Soc. 1961, 57, 557. (b) Allen, G. C.; Hush, N. S. Prog. Inorg. Chem. 1967, 8, 357; 391. (c) Hush, N. S. Coord. Chem. Rev. 1985, 64, 135. (d) Hush, N. S. In Mixed Valence Compounds; Brown. D. B., Ed., Reidel: Dordrecht, the Netherlands. 1980; p 151.

In this work we hoped to measure $\lambda$ using the Hush method for intramolecular ET in bis(hydrazine) radical cations, shown as $\mathbf{A}^{++}$below. Comparison of $\mathbf{A}^{\bullet+}$ with bis(hydrazyl) radical

$\mathbf{A}^{+}$

B.+
cations $\mathbf{B}^{++}$was also an important goal of this work. The spinbearing dinitrogen units of $\mathbf{A}^{\bullet+2}$ and $\mathbf{B}^{\bullet+6}$ are similar, with the odd electron in a $\pi^{*}$ (NN) orbital. Their diamagnetic dinitrogen units are very different, the hydrazine unit of $\mathbf{A}^{\bullet+}$ having pyramidal nitrogens and a long $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{N}$ single bond length and the diazenium cation unit of $\mathbf{B}^{\cdot+}$ a planar tert-butylated nitrogen and a short $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{N}$ double bond length. Clearly, smaller geometry change upon vertical ET occurs for $\mathbf{B}^{++}$than for $\mathbf{A}^{\bullet+}$. The geometry change in $\mathbf{B}^{\cdot+}$ ET ought to be more like the second (radical cation, dication) ET of hydrazines than the first ET, and $\lambda_{\text {in }}$ should be smaller for $\mathbf{B}^{\bullet+}$. We showed in an intermolecular case that the second ET for a sesquibicyclic hydrazine is faster than the first despite the work term necessary for approach of a dication to a cation. ${ }^{7}$ We hoped to establish whether the prediction of very different optical properties for $\mathbf{A}^{\bullet+}$ and $\mathbf{B}^{\bullet+}$ is true and to examine the application of Hush theory to these organic radical cations, which we expected to differ from mixed-valence transition-metal compounds by having much larger $E_{\text {op }}$ values (for $\mathbf{A}^{\bullet+}$ ) and higher frequency vibrational couplings. We previously investigated the oxidation of several bis(hydrazines), ${ }^{8}$ but the connecting links between the nitrogens in the compounds studied were too flexible to define the radical cation geometry very well, and these studies were plagued by short radical cation lifetimes. The rigidity of the double, four- $\sigma$-bond linkages of $\mathbf{2 0}^{++}$and $3^{++}$were expected to provide relatively long lifetimes. Here we study $2^{2+}$ and 3 and some analogues prepared from other bis(azo) compounds, comparing their ET thermodynamics measured by cyclic voltammetry and the spectral properties of their radical cation oxidation states with Marcus-Hush theory.

## Compound Preparation

As discussed previously, ${ }^{3}$ we prepared 1 by Shen's route, ${ }^{9}$ hydrogenating diene 4 (the basketene, bis(diethylazodicarboxylate) adduct, see Scheme II) before hydrolysis and oxidation. We also repeated Shen's $2+2$ photoclosure prior to azo compound formation, producing his hexacyclic bis(azo) compound 6, and converted 6 to the hexacyclic diazenium salts $7^{2+}$ and hydrazines 8 as outlined in Scheme II. Separation of the diazenium salts $\mathbf{7}^{\mathbf{2 +}}$ by crystallization proved more difficult than for the $\mathbf{2}^{2+}$ salts. ${ }^{3}$ Although a $7^{2+}$ free from the syn isomer by ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR was obtained by multiple crystallizations, our sample of $\mathbf{s}^{7+}$ contained about $15 \%$ of the ant $i$ isomer. Methylation of a $7^{2+}$ produces hexacyclic hydrazine a8, which in $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ is a mixture of two symmetrical conformations (eight carbons each by ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ ) and a minor, unsymmetrical one (two $t \mathrm{Bu} \mathrm{CCH} 3$ by ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR, several of the
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less intense of the 14 other carbons which must be present not clearly observed). Only trans-dialkylated hydrazine units are

reasonable conformations for $\mathbf{a 8} .^{3}$ The unsymmetrical conformation can only be $\mathrm{Oi}, \mathrm{Io}$ (and its enantiomer $\mathrm{Io}, \mathrm{Oi}$ ), while the symmetrical ones are the bis-tert-butyl "Out" and "In" conformations OiOi and IoIo. Integrations of the ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\mathrm{NCH}_{3}$ and $\mathrm{CCH}_{3}$ signals were consistent with mole fractions $0.56_{5}: 0.29_{0}$ : $0.14_{5} \pm 0.005$, making their relative free energies $0.0,0.4$, and $1.2 \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}$. These conformational isomers of a8 are much closer in energy than are those of $\mathbf{a 3}$, where only $\mathrm{OiO} i$ is detectably occupied by NMR, ${ }^{3}$ doubtless because ring torsion is less in the hexacyclic a8 than in the tetracyclic a3. MM2 molecular mechanics calculations ${ }^{10}$ for these conformations give the following relative strain energies: for $\mathrm{a} 3, \mathrm{Oi}, \mathrm{Oi} 0.0$, $\mathrm{Io}, \mathrm{Io} 1.6$, and $\mathrm{Io}, \mathrm{Oi} 4.3$ $\mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}$; and for $\mathrm{a8}, \mathrm{Oi}, \mathrm{Oi} 0.0$, Io,Io 0.4 , and Io, Oi $1.8 \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}$, in apparent excellent agreement with experiment. ${ }^{11}$ We failed to separate pure enough $\mathbf{s 8}$ from the methylation product of the $85 \% \mathrm{~s}^{7^{2+}}$ mixture for meaningful spectral measurements.
$\mathbf{2}^{2+} / 3$ and $7^{2+} / 8$ share the dinitrogen units being substituted outer on the bicyclo[2.2.2]octane units fused at the central $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{C}$ bond. We used Prinzbach's proceedure to convert Vogel's methano-bridged cyclodecapentene ${ }^{12} 9$ to the bis(inner azo) compound $12,{ }^{13}$ which was tert-butylated to the anti bis(diazenium) salt $13^{2+}$ (see Scheme III). We did not observe NMR peaks attributable to either syn isomer of $13^{2+}$, and we
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## Scheme III




were unsuccessful in attempts to isolate a hydrazine from the reaction of $\mathbf{1 3}^{2+}$ with methyllithium.

## Results and Discussion

Cyclic Voltammetry. The thermodynamics for electron removal from $A$ and $B$ were studied by cyclic voltammetric determination of their formal redox potentials, $E^{\circ}$. Although the hydrazines were scanned through two oxidations followed by two reductions and the diazenium salts through two reductions followed by two oxidations, it is most convenient to compare them starting from the neutral forms. The electron transfers are all chemically reversible, exhibiting equal oxidation and reduction currents for both waves. They are electrochemically quasireversible, the hydrazines exhibiting $60-80 \mathrm{mV}$ peak-to-peak separations ( $\Delta E_{\mathrm{pp}}$ ) and the diazenium salts $60-85-\mathrm{mV}$ separations in acetonitrile at slow scan rates. The $E^{\circ}$ values reported are $\left(E_{\mathrm{p}}^{0 \mathrm{x}}+E_{\mathrm{p}}^{\text {red }}\right) / 2$ for cases exhibiting well-separated waves and were determined by comparing the experimental curves with simulations of overlapping quasireversible waves when $\Delta E^{\circ}$ was under 0.2 V . The CV data in acetonitrile are summarized in Table I, and data in dimethyl sulfoxide (for B) and methylene chloride (for $\mathbf{A}$ ) are discussed in the supplementary material.

A compound with two equivalent, noninteracting redox sites shows a cyclic voltammogram having a single wave of the same $\Delta E_{\mathrm{pp}}$ and shape but twice the current as that for a compound with only one redox site at the same concentration. The observed wave is caused by the overlap of two one-electron waves having a statistically determined $\Delta E^{\circ}=E_{2}{ }^{\circ}-E_{1}{ }^{\circ}$ of 35.6 mV at 25 ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C} .1^{15.16}$ We therefore tabulate values of $\Delta E_{1}{ }^{\circ}$ (eq 3) in Table

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Delta E_{1}{ }^{\circ}, \mathrm{V}=E_{1}{ }^{\circ}-E^{\circ}(\text { mono })+0.018 \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

I to allow proper comparison of the ease of removal of the first electron from the bis systems with that for the "monomeric" single redox site compounds, hydrazine 14 and hydrazyl $15^{\circ} 0$. The $\Delta E_{1}{ }^{\circ}$ values are small and negative for the tetracyclic hydrazines s3 and $\mathbf{a} 3$, but the hexacyclic hydrazine $\mathbf{a 8}$ is $1.4 \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}$ harder to oxidize than 14, possibly because the hexacyclic framework

[^4]Table I. Cyclic Voltammetry Data in Acetonitrile

| compd | $E_{1}{ }^{\circ}, E_{2}{ }^{\circ}{ }^{\text {a }}(\mathrm{V})$ | $\begin{gathered} \Delta E_{1} \circ b \\ (\mathrm{kcal} / \\ \mathrm{mol}) \end{gathered}$ | $\Delta E^{\circ \prime}{ }^{\circ}$ <br> (kcal/ mol) | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{N}$ distanced (A), AM1[X-ray] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hydrazines |  |  |  |  |
| 14 ("mon") | +0.10, - |  |  |  |
| s3 (tet) | +0.06, +0.21 | -0.5 | +2.6 | 4.89 [4.85]/4.91 |
| a3 (tet) | +0.04, +0.18 | -0.9 | +2.6 | 4.88 [4.81]/4.87 |
| a8 (hex) | +0.14, +0.36 | +1.4 | +4.3 | 5.01/4.98 |
| Hydrazyls |  |  |  |  |
| 15 ("mon") | -0.795, - | $\equiv 0$ |  |  |
| 16 | -0.645, - | +3.5 |  |  |
| $\mathbf{s} 2$ (tet) | -0.74s, -0.40 | +1.6 | +7.1 | 4.85/4.83 |
| a2 (tet) | -0.75s, -0.41 | +1.4 | +7.1 | 4.85 [4.74]/4.84 |
| $s 7$ (hex) ${ }^{\text {e }}$ | $-0.765,-0.37$ | +1.2 | +8.3 | 4.95/4.94 |
| a7 (hex) | -0.77, -0.395 | +1.0 | +8.2 | 4.95/4.95 |
| 13 (tet inner) | -0.76, -0.04 | +1.3 | +15.8 | 2.92/2.84 |

${ }^{a}$ In acetonitrile containing $0.1 \mathrm{M} n-\mathrm{Bu}_{4} \mathrm{NClO}_{4}, \mathrm{Pt}$ electrode, room temperature, vs a saturated calomel electrode. ${ }^{b}$ Difference in $E_{1}{ }^{\circ}$ from "monomeric" compound, corrected for statistical effect using eq 3 of the text. ${ }^{c}$ Difference in $E^{\circ}$ values for second and first electron removal, corrected for statistical effect using eq 4 of text. ${ }^{d}$ Average of closest $\mathbf{N}-\mathbf{N}$ distances in neutral hydrazines and diazenium dications; after slash, in the radical cations. ${ }^{e} 15 \%$ a7 in sample.
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$15^{+}$

$16^{+}$
restricts torsion. $\Delta E_{1}{ }^{\circ}$ values are all positive for the bis(hydrazyls) and similar in size for the tetracyclic and hexacyclic compounds. A smaller $\Delta E^{\circ \prime}$ range seems reasonable because the hydrazyl/ diazenium cation electron loss causes less of a geometry change than the hydrazine/hydrazine radical cation oxidation, so differences in flexibility of the polycyclic compounds should be less important. The neutral tetracyclic and hexacyclic bis(hydrazyls) differ from $15^{\circ 0}$ by having hydrazyl nitrogens four $\sigma$ bonds away from the hydrazyl being oxidized. That detectable effects can be transmitted through four $\sigma$ bonds is indicated by the $3.5 \mathrm{kcal} /$ mol more positive $E^{\circ}$ value for the azo-substituted monohydrazyl derived by reduction of $16^{+}$than for $15^{\circ}$. The more planar hydrazyl nitrogens may be more electron-withdrawing than hydrazine nitrogens and also contribute to the observed more positive $\Delta E_{1}{ }^{\circ}$ values for bis(hydrazyls) than for bis(hydrazines). The differences between the two oxidation potentials, corrected for the statistical effect, which we will call $\Delta E^{\circ \prime}$ (see eq 4), are

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Delta E^{\circ \prime}, \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}=23.06\left(E_{2}{ }^{\circ}-E_{1}^{\circ}-0.036\right) \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

also given in Table I. $\Delta E^{\circ \prime}$ ought to be affected by electrostatics (removal of the second electron requires a "through space" electrostatic work term, $\Delta E_{\mathbf{w}}{ }^{\circ}$, because the oxidized dinitrogen unit bears a positive charge), "through bond" effects ( $\Delta E_{\mathrm{tb}}{ }^{\circ}$; the charges in the dication will also interact through the $\sigma$-bonds connecting the dinitrogen units), and ion pairing/solvation effects, $\Delta E_{\text {ip }}{ }^{\circ}$ (see eq 5 ).

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Delta E^{\circ \prime}=\Delta E_{\mathrm{w}}^{\circ}+\Delta E_{\mathrm{tb}}^{\circ}+\Delta E_{\mathrm{ip}}^{\circ} \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

The distances between the dinitrogen units of these compounds are constrained by the polycyclic connecting units, and the $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{N}^{\prime}$ distances d estimated by AM1 semiempirical molecular orbital calculations are compared with X-ray geometric data for the three available cases in the last column of Table I. The AM1 distances are slightly larger than the X-ray distances, but the differences are rather small, and the relative sizes of the d values should be reliable. The dinitrogen units are held nearly parallel to each other, and it makes no significant difference in estimating


Figure 1. (Top) ESR spectrum of the anli hexacyclic hydrazine radical cation $\mathbf{a 8 \cdot +}$ in $1: 1$ acetonitrile/butyronitrile at $87^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, and (bottom) a simulation for a slow exchange spectrum (see text).
the work term whether full charges at the average dinitrogen distance quoted or contributions of charges of $1 / 2$ at each nitrogen are summed. We use the averaged AM1 $d$ values in this work. The electrostatic work term for two point charges separated at a distance $d(\AA)$ in a medium of dielectric constant $\epsilon$ is given by eq 6. It has been traditional to use the solvent dielectric constant

$$
\begin{equation*}
W=\mathrm{e}^{2} / d \epsilon=332.1 / d \epsilon \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

$\epsilon_{\mathrm{g}}$ and the distance between centers when the molecules touch in the work term for electron-transfer considerations, as for example in the Rehm-Weller equation ${ }^{16}$ and in Marcus theory. ${ }^{1}$ The $\epsilon_{\mathrm{g}}\left(25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)$ value for $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}$ is 35.94 D . As Suppan has pointed out for CT ion pairs, ${ }^{17}$ it seems unrealistic to expect that an
intermolecular electrostatic work term would be as small as that obtained using the bulk solvent $\epsilon_{\mathrm{g}}$, because if the molecules touch, there is no solvent between them. Suppan suggests employing the much larger number obtained by using a hydrocarbon $\epsilon_{s}$ value, about 2 D , as the effective dielectric constant, $\epsilon_{\text {eff }}$, for use in eq 6 to estimate the work term. This appears unrealistic to us because solvent is present to mediate the interaction between the charges, although not directly between the charged units. The large $\Delta E^{\circ \prime}$ for $\mathbf{1 3}$ is presumably principally caused by the close proximity of the inner diazenium cation units in the dication, which is only consistent with an $\epsilon_{\text {eff }}$ value significantly lower than that for bulk acetonitrile. Because the connecting $\sigma$ bonds are not in the favorable anti arrangement for strongest through bond inter-


Figure 2. (Top) ESR spectrum of the anii hexacyclic hydrazyl radical cation a $7^{++}$in acetonitrile at $-13^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, with (bottom) a simulation for fast exchange $[a(4 \mathrm{~N})=5.5 \mathrm{G}$, line width 1.0 G$]$.
action, ${ }^{5 \mathrm{c}}$ the contribution of $\Delta E_{\mathrm{tb}}{ }^{\circ}$ to $\Delta E^{\circ \prime}$ cannot reasonably be larger than that for $\mathbf{a}^{2 \cdot+}$, and the minimum $\Delta E_{w}{ }^{\circ}$ contribution ought to be ca. $11.3 \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}$. The minimum effective distance between the dinitrogen units reasonable to use is the $2.84-\AA$ value of $d$, so use of eq 6 to estimate the effective $\epsilon$ value in acetonitrile produces $\epsilon_{\text {eff }} \leq 10.3 \mathrm{D}$, or $<29 \%$ of the $\epsilon_{\mathrm{s}}$ of acetonitrile.

ESR Studies. Results. The "monomeric" hydrazine radical cation $14^{++}$was generated by $\mathrm{NOPF}_{6}$ oxidation in acetonitrile. Its ESR spectrum is complex, but the large splittings by two different nitrogens and a methyl group produce a pattern of eight overlapping multiplets of lines with an average separation of about 12 G . The spectrum at $-40^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ was approximately fit by a simulation employing $a(\mathrm{~N})=14.3, a\left(\mathrm{~N}^{\prime}\right)=13.2$, and $a(3 \mathrm{H})=$ 10.5 G , as well as a smaller splitting of $a(4 \mathrm{H})$ of $2.1_{\mathrm{s}} \mathrm{G}$ (which represents an average of the two different exo $\mathrm{CH}_{2}$ spittings present), and a line width of 1.2 G . Study of analogous compounds shows that the endo $\mathrm{CH}_{2}$ splitting should be smaller (it is 0.6 G for the 2,3-dimethyl-2,3-diazabicyclo[2.2.2]octane radical cation ${ }^{63}$ ) and the bridgehead splitting far too small to resolve.

Oxidation of $\mathbf{3}$ and $\mathbf{8}$ produces purplish solutions which, as expected from previous work on bis(hydrazine) radical cations, ${ }^{8}$ have ESR spectra for which ET is slow on the ESR time scale.

Both $\mathbf{s 3 \cdot +}$ and $\mathbf{a 8}^{\circ++}$ give spectra having eight complex multiplets with about $12-\mathrm{G}$ peak separation. Heating a sample of $\mathbf{a 8}^{\bullet+}$ in 1:1 acetonitrile:butyronitrile to $87^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ resulted in loss of the complex fine structure observed at $-23^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, but did not change the relative intensities of the large splitting pattern. The spectrum resembles that simulated for splittings of $13.9(1 \mathrm{~N}), 13.2(1 \mathrm{~N})$, and $10.6(3 \mathrm{H}) \mathrm{G}$, with a large line width simulated by a $2-\mathrm{G}$ Lorentzian line width plus added smaller splittings (see Figure 1). Although some line broadening occurs as the temperature is raised, there is no evidence from relative peak intensities that the broadening arises from intermolecular ET, and the intramolecular ET rate constant is concluded to be small on the ESR time scale.
"Monomeric" hydrazyl radical $15^{-0}$ gives similar ESR spectra when prepared by electrochemical reduction ${ }^{6}$ and by treatment with tetramethylammonium thiophenoxide ( $\mathrm{Me}_{4} \mathrm{~N}^{+} \mathrm{PhS}^{-}$), which proved to be a convenient reagent for this purpose. The room temperature ESR spectrum of $15^{\circ 0}$ consists of five groups of badly overlapping signals, which were reasonably simulated using splittings of $11.00(1 \mathrm{~N})$ and $10.6_{2}(1 \mathrm{~N}) \mathrm{G}$, with ill-determined small splittings of $2.8_{2}(2 \mathrm{H}), 1.8_{2}(2 \mathrm{H}), 0.8_{6}(2 \mathrm{H})$, and $0.57(2 \mathrm{H})$ G , and a line width of 1.4 G .


Figure 3. (Top) ESR spectrum of the syn tetracyclic hydrazyl radical cation $\mathbf{s}^{2+}$ in butyronitrile at $-73^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, with (bottom) a simulation for fast exchange $[a(4 \mathrm{~N})=5.5 \mathrm{G}$ and a large line width, see text].

Reduction of $\mathbf{2}^{\mathbf{2 +}}$ and $\mathbf{7 ²}^{\mathbf{2 +}}$ isomers gives blue-green solutions. a7•+ , which lacks any large $a(\mathrm{H})$ exo hydrogens, shows a simple nine-line ESR pattern at $-13^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ which is well simulated using $a(4 \mathrm{~N})=5.5 \mathrm{G}$ with a line width of 1.0 G (see Figure 2). ET between the dinitrogen units is fast on the ESR time scale, and neither the difference between the di- and trisubstituted nitrogens nor any hydrogen hyperfine splitting has been resolved. The spectrum of $\mathbf{s} 2^{+}$also shows a nine-major line pattern, but the lines are much broader, and there are ill-resolved splittings in the range of $1.5-1.8 \mathrm{G}$ in the outer lines at room temperature. Cooling $\mathbf{5 2 \cdot}{ }^{+}$generated by phenylthiolate reduction in butyronitrile slightly increases broadening, and the smaller splittings are no longer evident. The ESR spectrum at $-73^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ is reasonably well fit by a simulation using $a(4 \mathrm{~N})=5.5 \mathrm{G}$, with a broad line width introduced by including splitting of $1.7(4 \mathrm{H})$ and $0.6(4 \mathrm{H}) \mathrm{G}$ along with a line width of 1.7 G (see Figure 3) . At still lower temperatures, the outer lines broaden greatly, presumably caused by the nonuniform line width effects induced by slow tumbling when spin 1 atoms bearing significant spin are bonded, which cause the $M_{\mathrm{N}} \neq 0$ lines of several hydrazine radical cations to
disappear entirely at low temperature. ${ }^{18}$ We have not observed the line alternation expected for ET between the two dinitrogen units becoming slow on the ESR time scale at any temperature. We conclude that even at $-73^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, \mathbf{s} 2^{\circ}+$ shows rapid intramolecular ET.
Reduction of $\mathbf{1 3}{ }^{2+}$ gives a blue-green solution having an ESR spectrum showing many ill-resolved lines, which we have not been able to interpret (the four different N and five different exo splittings in principle lead to 2592 lines). The $g$-factor and total width are similar to those of the spectra from $\mathbf{2}^{2+}$ and $7^{2+}$, and we assign this species as $13^{\circ+}$.
ESR Studies. Discussion. The most important result of the ESR studies is that the four $-\sigma$-bond-linked examples of $\mathrm{B}^{\boldsymbol{+}}$ show much faster intramolecular ET than the corresponding $\mathrm{A}^{\bullet+}$ compounds, which is consistent with the large difference in $\lambda_{\text {in }}$ expected. These ESR studies demonstrate that long-lived hydrazine radical cations and hydrazyls are generated and allow limits to be placed on intramolecular ET rate constants. Intramolecular electron exchange in $\mathbf{B}^{\mathbf{+}}$ interconverts a pair of
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Figure 4. connecting slow and fast exchange spectra for a system exchanging pairs of nitrogens of splitting $a(2 \mathrm{~N})=A$ and $a\left(2 \mathrm{~N}^{\prime}\right)=0$.

Table II. Alternating Line Width Effect for $A(2 \mathrm{~N})=11 \mathrm{G}, A\left(2 \mathrm{~N}^{\prime}\right)$ $=0$ Exchange

|  | first derivative peak heights |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| region | 0 | $\pm 1 / 2 A$ | $\pm A$ | $\pm^{3} / 2 A$ | $\pm 2 A$ | $k_{\mathrm{ex}}\left(\mathrm{s}^{-1}\right)$ |
| fast limit | 1 | 0.84 | 0.58 | 0.21 | 0.05 | $>3 \times 10^{8}$ |
| coalescence | 1 |  | 0.44 |  | 0.11 | $6.8 \times 10^{7}$ |
| slow limit | 1 |  | 0.67 |  | 0.33 | $<6 \times 10^{7}$ |

nitrogens with $a(2 \mathrm{~N}) \sim 11 \mathrm{G}$ with one having $a(2 \mathrm{~N})=0 \mathrm{G}$. Stick spectra at slow and fast exchange for an idealized case with $a(2 \mathrm{~N})=A$ and $a\left(2 \mathrm{~N}^{\prime}=0\right.$ are illustrated in Figure 4. The five lines of the slow-exchange spectrum (top) appear at $0, \pm A$, and $\pm 2 A \mathrm{G}$ from the center of the spectrum, with the degeneracies shown circled (relative intensities $3: 2: 1$ reading from the center line out), while at fast exchange, the spectrum shows nine lines, with degeneracies for four equivalent nitrogens (intensities 19: 16:10:4:1) and a line separation of $A / 2$. At intermediate exchange rates, an alternating line width effect ${ }^{19}$ will be observed because the components of the lines move as illustrated upon electron exchange. The intermediate lines (at $\pm n A / 2$ in Figure 4) will be extremely broadened at the temperature of maximum broadening (the coalescence temperature), and only the components which do not move upon electron exchange (the 9:4:1 quintet shown circled) will remain unbroadened. The intensities of the outer lines relative to the center for this case are summarized in Table II. Although our spectra are mostly complicated by partially resolved hydrogen splittings and the nitrogen splittings are not identical but only close, $k_{\mathrm{ex}}$ is fast enough for a7 ${ }^{++}$(Figure 2) and for $\mathbf{s 2}^{++}$(Figure 3) to show fast-exchange-limit spectra, while it is slow enough for the bis(hydrazines) to show slow-exchange-limit spectra.

Russell and co-workers ${ }^{20}$ pointed out that the coalescence spectrum will be observed when $k_{\text {ex }}=6.22 \times 10^{6}(\Delta A, G)$ or 6.8 $\times 10^{7} \mathrm{~s}^{-1}$ for $A=11 \mathrm{G}$ and that above the coalescence temperature, where broadened intermediate lines are observed, if $\Delta W$ is the difference in peak-to-peak line width measured in the firstderivative ESR spectrum between the unbroadened outer line and the next intermediate, broadened line in gauss, $k_{\mathrm{ex}}=2.54$ $\times 10^{6}(\Delta A)^{2} / \Delta W$ or $3.07 \times 10^{8} / \Delta W$. The qualitative criteria for observation of fast- and slow-exchange spectra for our case are shown in Table II.

Optical Spectra of Radical Cation Oxidation States. The purplish solutions showing ESR spectra of hydrazine radical
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Figure 5. spectrum of $\mathbf{a 3}{ }^{++}$in acetonitrile at room temperature.
cations which are produced by oxidation of bis(hydrazines) 3 and 8 to their radical cations have maxima of broad absorption bands between 512 and 548 nm . The use of 1 equiv of silver nitrate as the oxidant produces significantly higher yields of the visibleabsorbing radical cation than does the use of the far less soluble and more powerful oxidant nitrosonium hexafluorophosphate, as shown by the $\epsilon_{\min }$ values calculated assuming a $100 \%$ yield of the absorbing species (Table III,s3.+ entries). We suppose that use of $\mathrm{NO}^{+}$as oxidant results in extensive decomposition, possibly caused by formation of the dication. Figure 5 shows the spectrum of $\mathbf{a 3} \mathbf{3}^{+}$. The monomeric hydrazine radical cation $\mathbf{1 4}^{\boldsymbol{+}+}$ has its optical maximum at $312 \mathrm{~nm}(\epsilon 1700)$, and the presence of the visible band can only be reasonably attributed to the presence of the second, reduced hydrazine in the molecule. We assign these visible bands to Hush-type charge-transfer bands of the monocations and summarize the data in Table III. Extraction of the bandwidth from experimental spectra is frequently difficult because of band overlap problems, which we have for $A^{++}$, where the CT band overlaps on the high-energy side with other, more intense absorptions. Values of the frequency where absorption has fallen to one-half that at the maximum on the low-energy side of the band ( $\nu_{\max }-\nu_{1 / 2,10}$ ) are not obscured. It also appears from inspection of the high-energy side of the CT band that ( $\nu_{1 / 2 . \mathrm{bi}}-\nu_{\text {max }}$ ) is slightly larger than ( $\nu_{\text {max }}-\nu_{1 / 2.10}$ ); observed CT band shape appears to be non-Gaussian, with larger width at the high-energy side of the band. Values of bandwidth estimated as twice ( $\nu_{\max }-\nu_{1 / 2,10}$ ) and as ( $\nu_{1 / 2, \text { hi }}-\nu_{1 / 2,10}$ ) appear in Table III.

As previously described, ${ }^{6}$ electrolytic reduction of the monomeric diazenium salt $\mathbf{1 5}^{\circ 0}$ produces hydrazyl radical $\mathbf{1 5}^{\circ}$, which is stable in solution in the absence of oxygen. ${ }^{6 c}$ Reduction of the tetracyclic and hexacyclic bis(diazenium) salts $\mathbf{2}^{\mathbf{2 +}}$ and $\mathbf{7}^{\mathbf{2 +}}$ by either treatment with thiophenylate or electrolytic reduction produces blue-green solutions which contain the ESR signals of hydrazyl radicals and show absorptions in the near-IR region having two partially resolved maxima, a much broader band in the 1050-1200 nm-region, and an ill-resolved narrower second maximum on the long-wavelength (low-energy) side, as illustrated in Figure 6 for $\mathbf{s 2}^{\mathbf{o}^{++}}$and $\mathbf{a} 7^{\bullet+}$. There is likely to be an additional unresolved structure in each band, as indicated by the $-25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ spectrum in pyridine illustrated in Figure 7. The near-IR bands exhibit similar solvent and temperature dependence, although the narrower, low-energy band is only a shoulder in some solvents and has a higher absorption than the broader, higher energy band(s) in others. The resence of these bands is attributed to Hushtype charge-transfer bands for the radical cations, and the data for $\mathbf{B}^{++}$are summarized in Table IV. The low-energy band is clearly narrower than the higher energy envelope. Because both sets of bands move significantly when the solvent is changed, we believe they are all caused by CT absorption, and the total bandwidth at half-height of the near-IR region appears in the $W_{1 / 2}$ column of Table IV after the $1050-1200$-nm band position and intensity information and is used in the discussion. See the

Table III. Bis(hydrazine) Radical Cation Optical Data

| compd | conditions ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | $\begin{gathered} \lambda_{\mathrm{m}}=E_{\mathrm{op}} \\ \left(\mathrm{~nm}\left(\times 10^{3} \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}\right)\right) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \epsilon(\min )^{b} \\ \left(\mathrm{M}^{-1} \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}\right) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} W_{1 / 2} \\ \left(\times 10^{3} \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}\right) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \nu_{12}(\mathrm{HTL}) \\ \left(\times 10^{3} \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}\right) \end{gathered}$ | $W_{1 / 2} / \nu_{1 / 2} \mathrm{HTL}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| s3*+ | $\mathrm{Ag}, \mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}^{*}$ | 512 (19.53) | 610 | $8.2,{ }^{\text {c }} 8.7^{\text {d }}$ | 6.70 | $1.22,{ }^{\text {c }} 1.30^{d}$ |
|  | $\mathrm{NO}, \mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}$ | 520 (19.23) | (46) | 7.76 | 6.65 | $1.16{ }^{\text {c }}$ |
|  | $\mathrm{NO}, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ | 556 (17.99) | (23) | 6.9 c | 6.43 | $1.07{ }^{\text {c }}$ |
|  | $\mathrm{NO}, \mathrm{CHCl}_{3}$ | 522 (19.16) | (-) | $7.4{ }^{\text {c }}$ | 6.70 | $1.10^{c}$ |
| a3 ${ }^{+}$ | ${\mathrm{Ag}, \mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}^{*}}$ | 514 (19.40) | 560 | $8.8,{ }^{\text {c } 9.7}{ }^{\text {d }}$ | 6.68 | $1.32,{ }^{\text {c }} 1.45^{d}$ |
|  | $\mathrm{El}, \mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}$ | 520 (19.23) | 590 | 8.6,c 9.9d |  |  |
| a8*+ | $\mathrm{Ag}, \mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}^{*}$ | 548 (18.25) | 540 | 7.9, $8.3{ }^{\text {d }}$ | 6.48 | $1.22,{ }^{c} 1.18^{d}$ |

${ }^{a}$ Oxidant: $\mathrm{Ag}=\mathrm{AgNO}_{3}$ oxidation; $\mathrm{NO}=\mathrm{NOPF}_{6}$ oxidation; $\mathrm{El}=$ electrochemical oxidation ( 0.1 M tetrabutylammonium perchlorate as supporting electrolyte). An asterisk means Hush analysis of the data appears in Table VIII. ${ }^{b}$ є calculated assuming a $100 \%$ yield of radical cation. Numbers in parentheses for $\mathrm{NO}^{+}$oxidation obviously indicate low yield. ${ }^{c}$ Bandwidth estimated as $2\left(\nu_{\max }-\nu_{1 / 2.10}\right)$ (see text). ${ }^{d}$ Bandwidth estimated from ( $\nu_{1 / 2, \text { hi }}$ - $\nu_{1 / 2,10}$ ) (see text).

 ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$.
supplementary material for additional details about the partially resolved longer wavelength bands.

The inner tetracyclic bis(diazenium) salt $\mathbf{1 3}^{\mathbf{2 +}}$ also reduces to give a blue-green solution, but its near-IR spectrum is quite different from that of its outer bis(diazenium) analogues. A single absorption maximum at 850 nm , which is both more intense and narrower, is observed for $13^{\circ+}$. We attribute this band to an electronic absorption and not a charge-transfer band. We were unable to find a band broad enough to attribute to a CT band in the near-IR or IR regions.
$\lambda$ Values from Optical Spectra. Assuming that the bands reported in Tables III and IV are CT bands, $E_{\text {op }}=\lambda$ for intramolecular ET. $E_{\text {op }}$ in acetonitrile at $25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ is $52-56 \mathrm{kcal} /$


Figure 7. spectra of $\mathbf{s} \mathbf{2}^{++}$in pyridine at +25 (top) and $-25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ (bottom).
mol for the four- $\sigma$-bond-linked $\mathrm{A}^{++}$examples and $24-27 \mathrm{kcal} /$ mol for the corresponding $\mathrm{B}^{\bullet+}$. The $E_{\text {op }}$ values for the anti tetracyclic systems are larger than those for the hexacyclic ones, both for the hydrazine radical cations (tetracyclic a3 ${ }^{\circ+}, 55.5 \mathrm{kcal} /$ mol ; hexacyclic a8 $8^{+}, 52.2 \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}$ ) and for the hydrazyl radical cations (tetracyclic a2.+, $26.4 \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}$; hexacyclic a7 ${ }^{++}, 23.9$ $\mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}$ ). This is reasonable if it is assumed that the tetracyclic systems have more twist at their CNNC units, which should raise $E_{\text {op }}$ because twist at the CNNC bond in the oxidized dinitrogen vertical ET form is particularly costly in energy. The observed sensitivity of $E_{\text {op }}$ to torsion of the polycyclic frameworks suggests to us that $E_{\text {op }}$ is responding properly to a rather subtle structural change. $E_{\text {op }}$ includes $\lambda_{\text {out }}$ as well as $\lambda_{\text {in }}$, but $\lambda_{\text {out }}$ ought to be very similar for $\mathbf{A}^{\bullet+}$ and $\mathbf{B}^{\bullet+}$ with the same connecting links, because the distances between the dinitrogen units are so similar. As expected because the $\lambda_{\text {out }}$ values should be similar, the differences in $E_{\text {op }}$ for $\mathbf{A}^{++}$and $\mathbf{B}^{\bullet+}$ of the same systems are quite constant, $28.8 \pm 0.5 \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}$ (last column of Table V).

Table IV. Bis(hydrazyl) Radical Cation Optical Data

| compd | conditions ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | $\begin{gathered} \lambda_{\mathrm{m}}=E_{\mathrm{op}}^{b} \\ \left(\mathrm{~nm}\left(\times 10^{3} \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}\right)\right. \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \epsilon(\min )^{b . c} \\ \left(\mathrm{M}^{-1} \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}\right) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} W_{1 / 2} \\ \left(\times 10^{3} \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}\right) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \nu_{1 / 2}(\mathrm{HTL}) \\ \left(\times 10^{3} \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}\right) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $W_{1 / 2} / \nu_{1 / 2}$ (HTL) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| s2*+ | PhS ${ }^{-}, \mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}$ | $108^{0}$ (9.26) | 1110 |  |  |  |
|  | El, $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}^{e}$ * | 1062 (9.42) | 1450 | 6.50 | 4.65 | 1.40 |
|  | $\mathrm{El}, \mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}\left[-25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right]$ | $104_{4}$ (9.58) | 1550 | 6.54 | 4.69 | 1.39 |
|  | El, f | 1082 (9.24) | 580 | 7.06 | 4.61 | 1.52 |
|  | El, DMSO | 1027 (9.74) | 965 | 7.46 | 4.73 | 1.58 |
|  | $\mathrm{El}, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ | 1056 (9.47) | 1200 |  | 4.67 |  |
|  | $\mathrm{El}, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\left[-25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right]$ | 1049 (9.53) | 1300 |  |  |  |
|  | El, pyridine | 1189 (8.41) | 1100 | 6.73 | 4.40 | 1.53 |
|  | El, pyridine [ $-25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ] | 116s (8.59) | 1200 | 6.73 | 4.44 | 1.52 |
| a2-+ | PhS,$- \mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}$ | 1090 (9.17) |  |  |  |  |
|  | $\mathrm{El}, \mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}^{\text {al }}$ * | 1081 (9.25) | 930 | 7.03 | 4.61 | 1.52 |
|  | $\mathrm{El}, \mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}^{\text {a }}$ | 1082 (9.24) | 943 | 6.90 |  |  |
| a7•+ | $\mathrm{El}, \mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}^{*}$ | $119^{9}(8.34)$ | 1350 | 6.80 | 4.38 | 1.55 |
|  | $\mathrm{El}, \mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}\left[-25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right]$ | $113_{1}(8.84)$ | 1400 | 6.28 | 4.51 | 1.39 |
|  | $\mathrm{El}, f$ | 1242 (8.05) | 1255 | 6.67 | 4.30 | 1.55 |
|  | $\mathrm{El}, f\left[-25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right]$ | 1171 (8.54) | 1215 | 6.67 | 4.43 | 1.51 |
|  | El, DMF | 1126 (8.88) | 1225 | 7.31 | 4.52 | 1.62 |
|  | El, DMF [ $-25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ] | 1080 (9.26) | 1225 | 7.56 | 4.61 | 1.64 |
|  | El, DMSO | 1069 (9.35) |  |  |  |  |
| 13*+ | PhS ${ }^{-}, \mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}$ | $850(11.77)^{8}$ | 2300 | 4.08 | 5.20 | 0.78 |

${ }^{a}$ Reductant: $\mathrm{PhS}{ }^{-}$(used as $\mathrm{Me}_{4} \mathrm{~N}^{+}$salt); El, electrolytic reduction using 0.1 M tetrabutylammonium perchlorate as supporting electrolyte, unless otherwise noted ( $\mathrm{a}, 0.04 \mathrm{M}$; a2, 0.4 M supporting electrolyte). Data recorded at room temperature ( $23-25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ), except where noted at $-25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ in brackets. An asterisk means Hush analysis of the data appears in Table VIII. ${ }^{b}$ For the broad, higher energy absorption envelope. See supplementary material for more information on the partially resolved, narrower, lower energy bands. ${ }^{c} \epsilon$ calculated assuming a $100 \%$ yield of radical cation. ${ }^{d}$ Estimated using the entire width of the near-IR absorption at half-peak absorption. e Repetition of this experiment gave $\lambda_{\mathrm{m}} 1063 \mathrm{~nm}, \epsilon 1450$. $f$ Solvent used is propylene carbonate. ${ }^{g}$ Not attributed to a charge-transfer band (see text).

Table V. AM1 Calculations of $\lambda_{\text {in }}{ }^{\prime}$ for Bis(hydrazine) and Bis(hydrazyl) Radical Cation and Comparison with $\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{op}}{ }^{a}$

| hydrazines |  |  |  |  | hydrazyls |  |  |  |  | $\Delta \lambda^{\prime}{ }_{\text {in }}{ }^{\text {d }}$ | $\Delta E_{\text {Op }}{ }^{\text {c,e }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| compd | $\lambda_{\text {in }}{ }^{\text {b }}$ | $J^{\prime \prime}$ | $E_{\text {op }}{ }^{\text {c }}$ | $\left(E_{\text {op }}-\lambda_{\text {in }}^{\prime}\right)$ | compd | $\lambda_{\text {in }}{ }^{\text {b }}$ | $J^{\prime \prime}$ | $E_{\text {Op }}{ }^{\text {c }}$ | $\left(E_{\text {op }}-\lambda^{\prime}{ }_{\text {in }}\right)$ |  |  |
| 140/•+ | 46.5 |  |  |  | ${ }_{15 \cdot 0 /+}^{\text {"Mor }}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { eric" } \\ & 18.0 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| s3-+ a3-+ | 45.4 46.4 | 0.7 | $\begin{aligned} & 55.8 \\ & 55.5 \end{aligned}$ | 10.4 9.1 |  | clic $18.5$ $17.1$ | (0.7) 1.1 | 26.9 26.4 | 8.4 9.3 | $\begin{aligned} & 26.9 \\ & 29.3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 28.9 \\ & 29.1 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { s8•+ } \\ & \text { a8ㅇ+ } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 44.8 \\ & 45.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} (1.2) \\ 1.4 \end{gathered}$ | 52.2 | 7.2 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Hex } \\ & \mathbf{s 7}^{\text {He+ }} \\ & \mathbf{a 7} 7^{\circ+} \end{aligned}$ | clic 17.3 16.8 | 1.4 | 23.9 | 7.1 | $\begin{aligned} & 27.5 \\ & 28.2 \end{aligned}$ | 28.3 |

${ }^{a}$ Units: $\mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}$. ${ }^{b}$ See text for definition of these quantities. ${ }^{c}$ Using $E_{\text {op }}$ values in $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}$ at room temperature from Tables V and VI.


The observed $E_{\text {op }}$ values thus behave qualitatively as predicted in the Introduction, significantly larger values being observed for $\mathbf{A}^{\bullet+}$ than for $\mathbf{B}^{\boldsymbol{+}}$. We shall now consider how well quantitative predictions of $\lambda_{\text {in }}$ from semiempirical AM1 calculations, which we have argued work well for the closely structurally related sesquibicyclic hydrazines, ${ }^{7}$ compare with the observed $E_{\text {op }}$ values. The ground state for an intermolecular, neutral, radical cation self-ET reaction may be represented as $\left[\mathrm{n}^{0}, \mathrm{c}^{+}\right.$], where n and c refer to the geometry-relaxed reduced and oxidized compounds, respectively, including both internal geometry and the solvent shell around them, and the superscripts represent the charges present. The vertical ET state is then [ $\mathbf{n}^{+}, \mathbf{c}^{0}$ ], where neither internal geometry nor solvent shell had relaxed when charge was transferred, and the Marcus $\lambda$ value is the free energy difference between them. The enthalpy contribution to $\lambda_{\text {in }}$ is the difference in heats of formation for $\left[\mathbf{n}^{+}, \mathbf{c}^{0}\right]$ and $\left[\mathbf{n}^{0}, \mathbf{c}^{+}\right]$, which we call $\lambda_{\text {in }}^{\prime}{ }^{7} \lambda_{\text {in }}^{\prime}$ may be written as the sum of the relaxation energies of the cation radicals and neutral compounds (eq 7). The intramo-

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lambda_{\mathrm{in}}^{\prime}\left(\mathrm{A}^{\cdot+}\right)=\left\{\Delta H_{\mathrm{f}}\left(\mathrm{n}^{+}\right)-\Delta H_{\mathrm{f}}\left(\mathrm{c}^{+}\right)\right\}+\left\{\Delta H_{\mathrm{f}}\left(\mathrm{c}^{0}\right)-\Delta H_{\mathrm{f}}\left(\mathbf{n}^{0}\right)\right\} \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

lecular ET of $\mathrm{A}^{\boldsymbol{+}}$ uses this equation if charge is really localized on one dinitrogen unit, i.e., if the species is a candidate for a Hush theory analysis. For $\mathbf{B}^{\bullet+}$ the reduced species is a cation (relaxed form $\mathbf{c}^{+}$) and the oxidized one a dication (relaxed form $\mathrm{d}^{2+}$ ), so $\lambda_{\text {in }}^{\prime}$ uses eq 8 .
$\lambda_{\mathrm{in}}^{\prime}\left(\mathrm{B}^{\bullet+}\right)=\left\{\Delta H_{\mathrm{f}}\left(\mathrm{c}^{2+}\right)-\Delta H_{\mathrm{f}}\left(\mathrm{d}^{2+}\right)\right\}+\left\{\Delta H_{\mathrm{f}}\left(\mathrm{d}^{+}\right)-\Delta H_{\mathrm{f}}\left(\mathrm{c}^{+}\right)\right\}$
The results of AM1 calculations using geometry optimized structures and UHF energies for the open-shell radical cationic species are summarized in Table V. AM1 calculations get the charge to be strongly localized at one dinitrogen unit in the four $-\sigma$-bond-linked examples of both $\mathbf{A}^{\cdot+}$ and $\mathbf{B}^{\boldsymbol{+}}$, as shown both by the geometries and $\lambda_{\mathrm{n}}^{\prime}$ values calculated. The calculated differences in $\lambda_{\text {in }}^{\prime}$ (averaging $28.0 \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}$ ) are rather close to the observed differences in $E_{\text {op }}$ for these systems (averaging 28.8 $\mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}$ ). The decrease in $E_{\mathrm{op}}$ for closing the tetracyclic compounds to hexacyclic ones is, however, significantly underestimated by $\Delta \lambda_{\text {in }}^{\prime}$ of the AM1 calculations: $\Delta E_{\text {op }}$ for the anti hydrazines and hydrazyls are 2.7 and $2.5 \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}$, respectively, while the corresponding $\Delta \lambda_{\mathrm{in}}^{\prime}$ values are 0.6 and $0.3 \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}$, respectively. These errors are probably caused by the fact that AM1 calculations underestimate the amount of bicyclic torsion in 2,3-diazabicyclo[2.2.2]octane rings of hydrazines. ${ }^{3.7 .10 \mathrm{~b}} \mathrm{Be}-$ cause AM1 calculations fail to predict enough torsion for tetracyclic systems, we suggest that the best comparisons to make in considering how well the calculated $\lambda_{\text {in }}^{\prime}$ values correlate with experimental $\lambda_{\text {in }}$ values should be for the hexacyclic systems, for which $E_{\text {op }}\left(\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}, 25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)-\lambda_{\text {in }}^{\prime}$ values are 7.2 and $7.1 \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}$ for $\mathbf{a 8} 8^{++}$and $\mathbf{a} 7^{++}$, repectively, and, if $\lambda_{\text {in }}^{\prime}$ were equal to $\lambda_{\text {in }}$, would be $\lambda_{\text {out }}$ values (for $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}$ at room temperature). As discussed below, these numbers appear to us to be close to $\lambda_{\text {out }}$.

Solvent effects on $E_{\text {op }}$ have been important in the study of mixed-valence complexes. Plots of $E_{\text {op }}$ versus the solvent parameter $\gamma^{21}$ (see eq 9) are linear for many mixed-valence

$$
\begin{equation*}
\gamma=\left(n_{\mathrm{D}}^{2}\right)^{-1}-\left(\epsilon_{\mathrm{s}}\right)^{-1} \tag{9}
\end{equation*}
$$

complexes and often have been discussed using Marcus's simple $\lambda_{\text {out }}$ evaluation (eq 10). ${ }^{4} n_{\mathrm{D}}$ is the refractive index at the sodium

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lambda_{\text {out }}=\mathrm{e}^{2} g(r, d) \gamma \tag{10}
\end{equation*}
$$

D line, and $g(r, d)$ is a distance parameter, for which $\left[r^{-1}-d^{-1}\right]$ is often employed for mixed-valence complexes, with $r$ the assumed radius of a "monomeric" center and $d$ the metal-metal distance in the complex. Use of distances in angstroms with $e^{2}$ of 332.1 produces $\lambda_{\text {out }}$ in $\mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}$. The general predictions of eq 10 , seeing decrease in $\lambda_{\text {out }}$ and hence in $E_{\text {op }}$ with an increase in $\gamma$ or a decrease in $d$, are certainly seen, but simple application of eq 10 appears insufficient to separate $\lambda_{\text {in }}$ and $\lambda_{\text {out }}$. Two well-studied mixed-valence transition-metal complexes are $17^{22}$ and $18,{ }^{23}$ which


17


18
give linear $E_{\text {op }}$ vs $\gamma$ plots, but for which $\lambda_{\text {out }} \propto \gamma$ produces intercepts which are larger than is consistent with independent estimates of $\lambda_{\text {in }}$ for the monomeric systems. Braunschweig and co-workers ${ }^{24}$ discuss in detail the solvent sensitivity of $E_{\text {op }}$ for rutheniumcentered complexes, including 17. They point out that $E_{\text {op }}$ is not simply $\lambda_{\text {in }}+\lambda_{\text {out }}$ for such complexes, because excited states are produced by irradiation into the CT band, and conclude that to a reasonable approximation, the spin-orbit coupling, $\lambda_{\text {so }}$, which is $1250 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}(3.6 \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol})$ for trivalent ruthenium, should also contribute to $E_{\text {op }}$. More complex ellipsoidal models for estimation of $g(r, d)$ are employed, and it is concluded that the observed $E_{\text {op }}$ can indeed be reconciled with the estimated $\lambda_{\text {in }}=4.7 \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}$ for the monomer using one of the $g(r, d)$ models and that the experimental slope is explained at least for ligands larger than the pyrazine of 17; the decreased solvent dependence observed for a closely related system with the chlorides of 17 replaced by pyridine ligands remains unrationalized even with a larger bridging ligand. ${ }^{24}$ Weaver and co-workers estimate $\lambda_{\text {in }}$ for ferrocene (the "monomer" corresponding to 18 ) at $2 \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}\left(0.7 \times 10^{3} \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}\right)$, ${ }^{25}$ and employ $E_{\text {op }} / 4$ for 18 as an estimate of the solvent-dependent thermal barrier for self-ET of ferrocene.

Plots of $E_{\text {op }}$ vs $\gamma$ are not linear for our data, as shown in Figure 8. As indicated by the thermodynamic results, ion pairing becomes increasingly important in less polar solvents, and the increase in $E_{\text {op }}$ observed for chloroform compared to methylene chloride for bis(hydrazine) ${ }^{++} \mathbf{s}^{3^{\bullet+}}$ may well have its origin here. The barrier for intermolecular self-ET for a sesquibicyclic hydrazine was
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Figure 8. op vs $\gamma$ plots for $\mathbf{s}^{3^{++}}, \mathbf{s} 2^{\circ+}$, and $\mathbf{a 7}^{++}$at $25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$.
also observed to be "too high" in chloroform. ${ }^{26}$ We have not properly tested the solvent dependence for $\mathrm{A}^{++}$because of lifetime problems. We hope to do this in the future, when we have prepared an isolable example which can be purified and dissolved in various solvents.

Although our $\mathbf{B}^{\mathbf{+}+}$ data do not include very nonpolar solvents, the $E_{\text {op }}$ vs $\gamma$ plots of Figure 8 exhibit too much scatter to discern the negative slope predicted by eq 10 . The near-IR region for $\mathrm{B}^{\bullet+}$ probably consists of several overlapping components whose relative intensity may change with solvent; this is certainly true for the intensity of the partially resolved lower energy band relative to the higher energy envelope. Quantitative application of eq 10 to estimate $\lambda_{\text {out }}$ for organic species is difficult. The atom positions for $\mathbf{B}^{\bullet+}$ are rather well defined, but because charge is delocalized, neither $r$ nor $d$ is precisely known. For six bis-bicyclic hydrazines, the $r$ values calculated from $X$-ray structures are $1.17_{s} \pm 0.006$ times the $r$ calculated from the volume occupied by the AM1 structure. ${ }^{26 a}$ Using $r$ for $\mathbf{a}^{2 \cdot+}$ as 1.175 times the $3.26-\AA$ AM1 radius of "monomer" 21, i.e., $3.83 \AA$, and $d$ as the $4.84-\AA \mathrm{N}-\mathrm{N}^{\prime}$ distance (from Table III) gives $\left[r^{-1}-d^{-1}\right]$ of $0.0545 \AA^{-1}$, for which eq 10 predicts $\lambda_{\text {out }}\left(\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}\right)$ of $9.6 \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}$. Analyses to be published separately for solvent effects on the self-ET rate constants for hydrazines ${ }^{26 \mathrm{~b} . \mathrm{c}}$ are also consistent with a $10 \mathrm{kcal} /$ mol $\lambda_{\text {out }}\left(\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}\right)$ for the compounds studied here, and we shall employ this value for the calculations discussed below. As noted in Table V, the assumption that the AM1-calculated $\lambda_{\text {in }}^{\prime}=\lambda_{\text {in }}$ produces $\lambda_{\text {out }}\left(\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}\right)$ values of $7.1-10.4 \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}$ for the compounds studied, which is in surprisingly good agreement with the above estimate.

JValues from Optical Spectra. We shall next examine a Hush analysis of our $25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, acetonitrile data to see if our assignments of the visible bands of $\mathbf{A}^{++}$and all the near-IR bands of $\mathbf{B}^{++}$as CT bands are quantitatively reasonable. We employ eq 11 (eq

$$
\begin{equation*}
J, \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}=\left(2.06 \times 10^{-2} / d\right)\left(\epsilon \nu_{1 / 2} h \nu_{\max }\right)^{1 / 2} \tag{11}
\end{equation*}
$$

25 in ref 5c) to estimate the electronic coupling matrix element $J$ (which is half the separation of the ground-state and excitedstate energy surfaces at the ET transition state). The values obtained (see Table VI) correspond to $J=3.5 \pm 0.5 \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}$ for both $\mathbf{A}^{\bullet+}$ and $\mathbf{B}^{\bullet+}$. We expect similar values of $J$ because the structures are sosimilar and believe that obtaining similar $J$ values from such different-appearing bands in different optical regions is an encouraging indication that Hush's eq 11 works for these compounds. The $J$ quoted is comparable to the $3.7 \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}$ evaluated by Paddon-Row, Hush, and co-workers for the doubly

[^8]Table VI. Hush Analysis of Optical Data at $25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ in Acetonitrile ${ }^{\text {a }}$

| bis(hydrazine) radical cations |  |  |  |  |  | bis(hydrazyl) radical cations |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| compd | $J^{b}\left(\mathrm{~cm}^{-1}\right)$ | $h \nu_{\text {in }}\left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right)$ | $K_{\text {el }}{ }^{\text {c }}$ | $\Gamma_{\mathrm{n}}{ }^{\text {d }}$ | $k_{\mathrm{el}}{ }^{e}\left(\mathrm{~s}^{-1}\right)$ | compd | $J^{b}\left(\mathrm{~cm}^{-1}\right)$ | $h \nu_{\text {in }}\left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right)$ | $K_{\text {el }}{ }^{\text {c }}$ | $\Gamma_{\mathrm{n}}{ }^{\text {d }}$ | $k_{\text {el }}{ }^{e}\left(\mathrm{~s}^{-1}\right)$ |
| s3*+ | 1350 | 800 | 1.00 | 80 | $1.8 \times 10^{5}$ | s2*+ | $\begin{aligned} & 1270 \\ & (3.6) \end{aligned}$ | 1400 | 1.00 | 24 | $9.4 \times 10^{9}$ |
|  | (3.9) | 1000 | 1.00 | 380 | $6.0 \times 10^{5}$ |  |  | 1600 | 1.00 | 37 | $1.6 \times 10^{10}$ |
|  |  | 1200 | 1.00 | 1600 | $3.0 \times 10^{6}$ |  |  | 1800 | 1.00 | 52 | $2.5 \times 10^{10}$ |
| a3*+ | 1370 | 800 | 1.00 | 80 | $1.1 \times 10^{5}$ | a2 ${ }^{\text {+ }}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1050 \\ & (3.0) \end{aligned}$ | 1400 | 1.00 | 14 | $5.7 \times 10^{9}$ |
|  | (3.9) | 1000 | 1.00 | 370 | $6.7 \times 10^{5}$ |  |  | 1600 | 1.00 | 22 | $1.0 \times 10^{10}$ |
|  |  | 1200 | 1.00 | 1500 | $3.4 \times 10^{6}$ |  |  | 1800 | 1.00 | 32 | $1.7 \times 10^{10}$ |
| 98•+ | 1180 | 800 | 1.00 | 60 | $3.3 \times 10^{5}$ | a7•+ | $1150$ <br> (3.3) | 1400 | 1.00 | 14 | $1.8 \times 10^{10}$ |
|  | (3.4) | 1000 | 1.00 | 240 | $1.7 \times 10^{6}$ |  |  | 1600 | 0.99 | 19 | $2.9 \times 10^{10}$ |
|  |  | 1200 | 1.00 | 900 | $7.8 \times 10^{7}$ |  |  | 1800 | 0.99 | 25 | $4.5 \times 10^{10}$ |

${ }^{a}$ The data sets used are those marked with asterisks in Tables III and VI. The larger $W_{1 / 2}$ estimates were used for $\nu_{1 / 2}$ of the hydrazines. $\lambda_{\text {out }}=$ $10.0 \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}$ was employed. ${ }^{26 \mathrm{~b}}{ }^{b}$ Calculated using eq 11 . Numbers in parentheses are $J$ in $\mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}$. ${ }^{c}$ Calculated using eqs 12 a and 12 b , ref 29 . ${ }^{d}$ Calculated using eq 13. ${ }^{\circ}$ Calculated using eq 12.
four- $\sigma$-bond-linked dimethoxynaphthalene/dicyanoethylene radical anion 19-- by analysis of its CT band. ${ }^{27 a}$ It is larger than


19


20
the $J$ of $1.1 \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}$ obtained for electronically excited neutral $19,{ }^{27 b}$ but it has been pointed out that larger $J$ values are expected for a radical ion than a neutral compound. ${ }^{27 a}$ A larger $J$ of 10.0 $\mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}^{5 \mathrm{c}}$ has been obtained in the gas phase by analysis of the PE spectum of doubly four- $\sigma$-bond-linked bis(alkene) 20, ${ }^{28}$ but the PE method, which deals with gas-phase, presumably delocalized radical cations, appears to consistently give larger $J$ values than those for solvated, charge localized species. These doubly linked systems seem to be those most comparable to ours for which $J$ has been estimated in the literature. We conclude that the $J$ values obtained from eq 11 are consistent with our band assignments being correct and with Hush theory applying to these systems despite the anomalous band shape for $\mathbf{B}^{\bullet+}$.

Estimation of Rate Constants for ET from the Optical Data. Table VI contains ET parameters and rate constants estimated from the optical data for hydrazines $\mathbf{s 3 ^ { + + }}, \mathbf{a} 3^{++}$, and $\mathbf{a 8} 8^{++}$and hydrazyls $\mathbf{s} \mathbf{2}^{++}, \mathbf{a} 2^{++}$, and $\mathbf{a} 7^{\bullet^{+}}$. We have employed eq 12 , which

$$
\begin{equation*}
k_{\mathrm{et}}=\kappa_{\mathrm{el}} \nu_{\mathrm{in}}\left(\lambda_{\mathrm{in}} / \lambda\right)^{1 / 2} \Gamma_{\mathrm{n}} \exp (-\lambda / 4 R T) \tag{12}
\end{equation*}
$$

includes the effects of nuclear tunneling, to estimate $k_{\mathrm{et}}$, the rate constant for intramolecular electron exchange. The $J$ values estimated from eq 11 are large enough to make the electron transmission coefficient $\kappa_{\mathrm{el}}$ of eq 12 be 1.0 for all entries of Table VI; ${ }^{29}$ the ET is adiabatic. Equation 12 uses Holstein's nuclear tunneling transmission coefficient $\Gamma_{\mathrm{n}}$, evaluated in eq 13 (which is eq 69 of ref 1a), and for brevity has been written employing

[^9] $\mathrm{kel}_{\mathrm{el}}>0.94$ for entries in Table VIII.
\[

$$
\begin{gather*}
\mathrm{F}=h \nu_{\mathrm{in}} / 4 k_{\mathrm{b}} T .^{30} \text { The nuclear transition-state crossing (coupling) } \\
\Gamma_{\mathrm{n}}=\exp \left\{\left(-\lambda_{\mathrm{in}} / h \nu_{\mathrm{in}}\right)(\tanh (F)-F)^{1 / 2}\right\} \tag{13}
\end{gather*}
$$
\]

frequency, $h \nu_{\text {in }}$ (also called $\hbar \omega$ and $h \nu_{\mathrm{q}}$ in various treatments ${ }^{1.5}$ ) has as usual been included by employing one effective value of $h \nu_{\text {in }}$ for a given system. Although the metal-centered systems of mixed-valence complexes have low $h \nu_{\text {in }}$ values (according to Hush, they probably do not much exceed $300 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$ for systems involving linked metal ions), ${ }^{\text {sc.d }}$ organic compounds have much higher effective $h \nu_{\text {in }}$ values, which makes tunneling effects significant. For example, Grampp and Jaenicke ${ }^{31}$ employ $h \nu_{\text {in }}$ of $1667 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$ for $p$-phenylenediamine self-ET, Closs, Miller, and co-workers ${ }^{32}$ use $1500 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$ for mixed ET between aromatic radical anions and neutral aromatics in steroid-bridged systems, and Weaver, Nelsen, and co-workers ${ }^{33}$ discussed possible values of 1500 and $1000 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$ for sesquibicyclic hydrazine self-ET. We include a range of $h \nu_{\text {in }}$ values in Table VI because the appropriate value to use is not clear. Larger $h \nu_{\text {in }}$ values are considered for $\mathbf{B}^{\bullet+}$ than for $\mathbf{A}^{\bullet+}$ because they should be larger for $\mathrm{B}^{\bullet+}$; $\mathrm{N}=\mathrm{N}$ stretches are significantly higher in frequency than $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{N}$ stretches, and the stretching frequency contribution to $\mathbf{B}^{++}$includes averages of $(\mathrm{N}=\mathrm{N})^{+}$and $(\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{N})^{+}$, while that for $\mathrm{A}^{++}$includes averages of $(\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{N})^{+}$and $(\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{N})$.

As shown in Table VI, $\mathbf{B}^{\bullet+}$ examples are predicted from their optical spectra to show fast ET on the ESR time scale, as observed. For $\mathrm{A}^{++}$, despite the very large $\lambda$ value, the tunneling corrections are also large, and ET which is slow on the ESR time scale is predicted for rather small $h \nu_{\text {in }}$ values of $\leq 1200 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$. AM1 calculations on sesquibicyclic hydrazines predict many lowfrequency vibrations, and we obtained a prediction of $h \nu_{\text {in }}$ on the order of $1000 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$ for such compounds (using a summation weighted upon the change in pyramidality at nitrogen caused by the vibrations), ${ }^{33}$ so we do not believe that such low $h \nu_{\text {in }}$ values are out of the question for $\mathbf{A}^{++}$. The substantial agreement of the $k_{\mathrm{el}}$ values of Table VI with the limited information available from the ESR spectra of $\mathbf{A}^{++}$and $\mathbf{B}^{++}$suggests to us that our band assignments are correct and that Hush theory fits the optical spectra of these compounds rather well.

It will be noted from Table IV that lowering the temperature from $+25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ to $-25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ increases $E_{\text {op }} 0.2-0.5 \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}$ for $\mathrm{s} 2^{-}+$
(30) We note that Hush ${ }^{5 c}$ employs a slightly larger nuclear tunneling transmission coefficient, $\Gamma_{\mathrm{n}}^{\prime}$ of eq $\mathrm{A}: \Gamma_{\mathrm{n}}^{\prime} / \Gamma_{\mathrm{n}}$ is 1.04 at $h \nu_{\mathrm{in}}=300 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$ and increases to 2.98 at $h \nu_{\text {in }}=1800 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$.

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Gamma_{\mathrm{n}}^{\prime}=[U \cosh (U)]^{-1 / 2} \Gamma_{\mathrm{n}}, \quad \text { where } U=h \nu_{\mathrm{in}} / 2 k_{\mathrm{b}} T \tag{A}
\end{equation*}
$$

As discussed in the Bandwidth and Band Shape section, the bandwidths we observe do not support the use of the larger tunneling correction. Use of Hush's eq A would make the dotted $\Delta G^{*}(\omega)$ curves of Figure 9, $\mathbf{s 2 *}$ closer to the solid $\Delta G-J$ curve.
(31) (a) Grampp, G.; Jaenicke, W. Ber. Bunsenges. Phys. Chem. 1991, 95 , 904. (b) $\gamma\left(-25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right) / \gamma\left(25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)$ is 0.94 for propylene carbonate, 0.97 for acetonitrile, 0.98 for DMF, and 1.01 for methylene chloride. ${ }^{29 n}$
(32) For a review, see: Closs, G. L.; Miller, J. R. Science 1988, 240, 440.
(33) Phelps, D. K.; Ramm, M. T.; Yang, Y.; Neisen, S. F.; Weaver, M. J. J. Phys. Chem. 1993, 97, 181.

Table VII. Values of Hush's $g(\omega, T)$ (see eq 18)

| $h \omega, \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$ | $g\left(-25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)$ | $g\left(+25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)$ | $g\left(-25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right) /$ <br> $g\left(+25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 300 | 1.114 | 1.081 | 1.031 |
| 600 | 1.360 | 1.272 | 1.069 |
| 900 | 1.624 | 1.493 | 1.088 |
| 1200 | 1.867 | 1.707 | 1.094 |
| 1500 | 2.086 | 1.904 | 1.096 |
| 1800 | 2.284 | 2.084 | 1.096 |

and $1.1-1.4 \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}$ for $\mathbf{a 7}^{++}$in three solvents each. Using $\Delta G^{*}$ $=E_{\text {op }} / 4$, these changes correspond to small positive $\Delta S^{*}$ values ( $+0.9-2.6$ and $+5.4-7.2 \mathrm{cal} / \mathrm{deg} \cdot \mathrm{mol}$, respectively). These results clear up what has been a semantic problem for us. Sutin ${ }^{1 a}$ and Grampp and Jaenicke ${ }^{31}$ discuss tunneling effects in terms of a temperature-dependent inner-sphere barrier ( $\lambda_{\text {in }}(T)$ ), and Grampp and Jaenicke use eqs 14 and 15 in their analyses of $k_{\text {ex }}$

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lambda_{\mathrm{in}}(T)=Y \lambda_{\mathrm{in}}^{\infty} \tag{14}
\end{equation*}
$$

$$
\begin{equation*}
\text { where } Y=F^{-1} \tanh (F), \quad F=h \nu_{\text {in }} / 4 k T \tag{15}
\end{equation*}
$$

measurements for ( $p$-phenylenediamine) ${ }^{0 / \bullet+}$ intermolecular selfET. However, if $E_{\text {op }}=\lambda$ decreased with temperature as $\lambda_{\text {in }}$ does in eq 14 , there would be large red shifts in $h \nu_{\text {max }}$ as the temperature was lowered. For example, if $\mathbf{B}^{++}$had $\lambda_{\text {in }}\left(25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)$ of $17.0 \mathrm{kcal} /$ $\mathrm{mol}, \lambda_{\text {in }}\left(-25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)$ would decrease to $15.35-14.40$ for $\hbar \omega$ of $900-$ $1800 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$, which corresponds to red shifts in $h \nu_{\text {max }}$ of $69-113 \mathrm{~nm}$. $\lambda_{\text {out }}$ is predicted to be proportional to $\gamma$, which also changes with temperature, but using Grampp and Jaenicke's compilation of $\gamma$ values as a function of temperature, ${ }^{31 \mathrm{~b}}$ small to medium red shifts are predicted for three of the four solvents studied. The much smaller blue shift observed makes it clear that $E_{\text {op }}$ measures $\lambda_{t}$ $=\lambda_{\text {out }}+\lambda_{\text {in }}^{\infty}$, and not $\lambda_{\text {in }}(T)$. It seems misleading to state that $\lambda_{\text {in }}$ decreases with temperature according to eq 14 ; it is not the energy separation for vertical electron transfer but the tunneling correction to the ET rate constant which eq 14 describes.

Bandwidth and Band Shape. We shall now consider the width of the CT bands observed here in somewhat more detail. Metalcentered mixed-valence complex CT bands have usually been identified ${ }^{4}$ using Hush's criterion that the observed bandwidth (full width at half-height of the maximum absorption) is slightly greater than the high-temperature limit, $\nu_{1 / 2}$ (HTL), shown in eq 16 , where $h \nu_{\text {max }}$ is the CT band absorption maximum in $\mathrm{cm}^{-1}$ and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\nu_{1 / 2}(\mathrm{HTL}), \mathrm{cm}^{-1}=\left[\left(16 \ln (2) k_{\mathrm{b}} T\right) h \nu_{\max }\right]^{1 / 2} \tag{16}
\end{equation*}
$$

$\left[16 \ln (2) k_{\mathrm{h}} T\right]^{1 / 2}$ is $47.74 \mathrm{~cm}^{1 / 2}$ at $-25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and 47.94 at $+25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The high-temperature limit is only reached when $2 k_{\mathrm{b}} T\left(414 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}\right.$ at $25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ) is much larger than $\hbar \omega$. The compounds studied here are clearly not at the high-temperature limit. In his 1985 review, ${ }^{\text {sc }}$ Hush employs a larger expectation value of the bandwidth for systems having an appreciable $\hbar \omega$ value, recommending use of eqs 17 and 18 to estimate $\nu_{1 / 2}$ :

$$
\begin{equation*}
\nu_{1 / 2}=g(\omega, T) \nu_{1 / 2}(\mathrm{HTL}) \tag{17}
\end{equation*}
$$

$$
\begin{equation*}
g(\omega, T)=[U \operatorname{coth}(U)]^{1 / 2}, \text { where } U=h \nu_{\mathrm{in}} / 2 k_{\mathrm{b}} T \tag{18}
\end{equation*}
$$

Values of $g(\omega, T)$ of interest here appear in Table VII. It will be noted that the ratios of observed bandwidth for the CT bands to $\nu_{1 / 2}(\mathrm{HTL})$ are all greater than 1 , but that they are less than $g(\omega, T) \nu_{1 / 2}(\mathrm{HTL})$ using reasonable values for $h \nu_{\mathrm{in}}$. It appears from our data that eq 17 overestimates $\nu_{1 / 2}$ at high $\mathrm{h} \nu_{\text {in }}$ values for our compounds. ${ }^{30}$ Another eq 17 prediction not confirmed by our experimental data for $\mathbf{s 2}^{++}$or $\mathbf{a} 7^{\circ+}$ is the $9 \%$ increase in $\nu_{1 / 2}$ predicted for $h \nu_{\text {in }}>900 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$ when the temperature is lowered from $+25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ to $-25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The $\mathrm{B}^{\bullet+}$ examples have slightly larger $W_{1 / 2} / \nu_{1 / 2}(\mathrm{HTL})$ ratios than do $\mathrm{A}^{\bullet+}$ examples and obviously exhibit

Table VIII. Comparison of ET Parameters ${ }^{a}$ for Mixed-Valence Organic Radical Cations with Organometallics

| quantity | s3 ${ }^{+}$ | s2 ${ }^{\text {+ }}$ | 17 | 18 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $E_{\text {op }}=\lambda$ | 19.5/55.8 | 9.4/26.9 | 7.7/22.0 | 7.5/21.4 |
| $\lambda_{\text {in }}$ | $16.0 / 45.8^{\text {b }}$ | 5.9/16.9 ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | 1.6/4.7 ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | 0.7/2.0 ${ }^{\text {d }}$ |
| $\lambda_{\text {out }}\left(\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}\right)$ | $3.5 / 10.0^{\text {b }}$ | $3.5 / 10.0^{\text {b }}$ | 4.8/13.7 | 6.3/18.1 ${ }^{\prime}$ |
| $J g$ | 1.4/4.0 | 1.2/3.4 | $\begin{gathered} 0.38-0.43^{h} / \\ 1.1-1.2 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 030-0.38 \mathrm{~J} \\ 0.9-1.1 \end{gathered}$ |
| $h \nu_{1 / 2}, \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$ | est. 1000 | est. 1500 | $\leq 300^{k}$ | $\leq 300^{k}$ |
| $\begin{array}{r} \Delta G^{*}-J / \\ \Delta G^{*} m \end{array}$ | 0.7 | 0.5 | $0.8{ }^{n}$ | 0.8 |
| $S=\lambda_{\text {in }} / h \nu_{\text {in }}$ | $\sim 16.5$ | $\sim 3.9$ | >5.3 | >2.3 |

${ }^{a}$ Units: $\times 10^{3} \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}$. ${ }^{b}$ Obtainded using $E_{\text {op }}=\lambda_{\text {in }}+\lambda_{\text {out }}$, using $\lambda_{\text {out }}=10.0 \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}$ (instead of the $7.5 \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}$ used in Table VIII). ${ }^{c}$ From ref 24 . $^{c}$ Obtained using $E_{\text {op }}=\lambda_{\text {in }}+\lambda_{\text {out }}+\lambda_{\text {so }}$, using $\lambda_{\text {so }}$ $=3.6 \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol} .{ }^{24 f}$ Obtained using $E_{\mathrm{op}}=\lambda_{\text {in }}+\lambda_{\text {out }}+\lambda_{50}$, using $\lambda_{80}=$ $1.3 \mathrm{kcal} /$ mol..$^{24} \mathrm{~g}$ Obtained using eq $11 .{ }^{h} \nu_{1 / 2}$ not reported; ${ }^{22}$ these numbers use the $1.1-1.4$ reported range of $\nu_{1 / 2}$ (obs) $/ \nu_{1 / 2}(\mathrm{HTL}) .{ }^{j} \epsilon\left(\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}\right)$ not reported; ${ }^{23 a-c}$ we used an estimate of $300-500$, from $\epsilon$ values in methylene chloride and nitrobenzene. ${ }^{23 \mathrm{a}}$ The infinite dilution $E_{\text {op }}$ and $\nu_{1 / 2}$ of 7.35 and $4.00 \times 10^{3} \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$, respectively, ${ }^{21 \mathrm{c}}$ produce a $J$ of $1.0 \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}$ using $\epsilon$ of $500 .{ }^{k}$ From ref $5 \mathrm{c} .{ }^{m}$ Using $\Delta G^{*}=E_{\mathrm{op}} / 4 .{ }^{n}$ Use of $\Delta G^{*}=\left(E_{\mathrm{op}}-\right.$ $\lambda_{\mathrm{so}}$ )/4 (see e) produces $0.7_{5}$.
more complex band shapes; more than one band is starting to be resolved. We suggest that this beginning of resolution of structure occurs because of the high $h \nu_{\text {in }}$ values and low $E_{\text {op }}$ values for $\mathrm{B}^{\bullet+}$.

## Conclusion

Use of Hush theory on the four- $\sigma$-bond-linked examples of $\mathbf{A}^{\bullet+}$ and $\mathbf{B}^{++}$gives a set of $E_{\text {op }}$ and $J$ values which both appear reasonable on the basis of estimates from related compounds and which predict the qualitative ESR spectral result observed, that intramolecular ET is fast on the ESR time scale for $\mathbf{B}^{++}$but slow for $\mathbf{A}^{\bullet+}$. We believe it is useful to compare the ET parameters derived for examples of $\mathbf{A}^{\bullet+}$ and $\mathbf{B}^{\bullet+}$ with literature data for the representative mixed-valence compounds, bis(ruthenium) bis(bipyridine) chloride 17 and bis(ferrocene) 18; Table VIII makes this comparison at $25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ in acetonitrile. The $J$ values of for 17 and 18 were estimated using published data for metal-metal distance and optical spectra in acetonitrile, ${ }^{22.23}$ employing eq 11 . Figure 9 shows Marcus-Hush diagrams drawn to the same scale of the ET barrier regions of $\mathbf{s} 3^{++}, 52^{{ }^{+}}$, and 17 ( 18 would look very similar) using data from Table VIII. The parabola crossover point is taken as $\Delta G^{*}=E_{\mathrm{op}} / 4$. The solid line representing the thermal barrier employs the relationship $\Delta G_{\mathrm{th}}^{*}=\Delta G^{*}-J$. This classical relationship is made more complicated by nuclear tunneling effects. We have tried to represent tunneling effects by including curves for $\Delta G^{*}(\omega)^{34}$ for $\mathbf{s} 3^{\mathbf{o}^{+}}$and $\mathbf{s} 2^{++}$, obtained using eq 19 , which employs eqs 14 and 15 . These $\Delta G^{*}(\omega)$ curves

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Delta G^{*}(\omega)=\left(\lambda_{\text {out }}+Y \lambda_{\text {in }}^{\infty}\right) / 4 \tag{19}
\end{equation*}
$$

are shown as dotted lines for $h \nu_{\mathrm{in}}=900$ and $1200 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$ for $\mathbf{s 3}^{\circ+}$ (which lie slightly above and below the solid line shown for the $\Delta G_{\mathrm{th}}^{*}$ curve). The ET barrier for $\mathbf{s} 2^{++}$is significantly broader, and the dotted $h \nu_{\text {in }}=1500$ and $1800 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$ curves shown both lie well above the $\Delta G_{\mathrm{th}}^{*}$ curve. No $\Delta G^{*}(\omega)$ curve is shown for 17 because with its small estimated $h \nu_{\mathrm{in}}$, its curve falls very close to the parabola crossover point; as often stated, 1.5 tunneling is not very important for metal-centered mixed-valence complexes. Table VIII and Figure 9 emphasize the special features of intramolecular ET in the organic compounds studied here. $\lambda_{\text {in }}$ is larger for both organic compounds and is exceptionally large for $\mathbf{s 3 ^ { \circ + }}$. These compounds have substantial $J$ values relative to $\lambda / 4$. The narrow barrier for $3^{\circ+}$ causes large tunneling effects which would decrease the effective $\Delta G_{t h}^{*}$ even further if the effective $\hbar \omega$ were large enough. Experimentally, ET is slow in the ESR time scale,

[^10]

Figure 9. -Hush plots of the crossover region for examples of $\mathbf{A}^{++}\left(\mathbf{2}^{++}\right)$, $\mathrm{B}^{\cdot+}\left(3^{++}\right)$, and a representative transition-metal mixed-valence compound (17) from data in Table VIII.
requiring that the effective $h \omega$ of $\mathrm{A}^{\bullet+}$ is rather low for an organic compound (if the oversimplified tunneling equation we used is indeed accurate, which can certainly be questioned). $\mathbf{5 2 ^ { + + }}$ has a $\Delta G^{*}$ more comparable to those of the transition-metal mixedvalence complexes, and although $J$ is no larger than for that $\mathbf{s 3}{ }^{\cdot+}$, it is so large relative to $\Delta G^{*}$ that use of eq 12 to calculate the rate constant appears to underestimate the rate constant compared to use of the classical approach of using $\Delta G_{\mathrm{th}}^{*}=\Delta G^{*}-J .{ }^{30}$

## Experimental Section

2,3,7,8-Tetrakis (ethoxycarbonyl) -2,3,7,8-tetraazahexacyclo[7.4.1.0 $\left.{ }^{4,11} .0^{5,14} .0^{6,11} .0^{10.13}\right]$ tetradecane (5). A saturated solution of 2.0 $\mathrm{g}(4.2 \mathrm{mmol})$ of the diene 41 in 1.3 L of dry acetone was placed in a $1.5-\mathrm{L}$ photowell, deaerated with $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ for 1 h , and photolyzed for 5 h with a 450-W Hanovia mercury lamp fitted with a Vycor filter. Solvent was removed by evaporation. A second batch of $1.2 \mathrm{~g}(2.5 \mathrm{mmol})$ of the diene was treated similarly. The combined photolysis products were vacuum distilled ( $80^{\circ} \mathrm{C} ; 0.1 \mathrm{mmHg}$ ) to remove the low-boiling, acetone-derived
side products. The remaining mixture crystallized to form a yellow solid, which was in turn recrystallized from hot methanol. The remaining yellow oil was purified by flash chromatography on $40-60 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ of silica gel, using 50:50 ethyl acetate:methylene chloride, and the resulting yellow oil was recrystallized from ether at $-20^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, giving $5\left(2.79 \mathrm{~g}, 5.8 \mathrm{mmol}, 87 \%\right.$, lit. ${ }^{9}$ $90 \%$ ), mp $153-154^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ (lit. ${ }^{9} \mathrm{mp} 155-156{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ): ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( 200 MHz , $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 4.23(12 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.20-2.90(6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.28(12 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m})$.

2,3,7,8-Tetraazahexacyclo[7.4.1.0 $0^{412} .0^{5,14}, 0^{6,11} .0^{10,13}$ ]tetradeca-2,7-diene (6). In a $50-\mathrm{mL} 3$-necked round-bottomed flask fitted with a condenser and a gas inlet adapter, a mixture of $640 \mathrm{mg}(1.34 \mathrm{mmol})$ of the tetraester $5,2.0 \mathrm{~g}(30.30 \mathrm{mmol})$ of powdered $85 \% \mathrm{KOH}$ pellets, and 25 mL of dry, degassed methanol was refluxed under nitrogen for 1.5 h . After cooling, this mixture was poured into a beaker containing 4 mL of concentrated $\mathrm{HCl}, 40 \mathrm{~g}$ of ice, and 40 g of distilled water with stirring. This solution was warmed to $40^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, removed from heat, and neutralized to pH 7 with $5 \mathrm{~N} \mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{OH}$ solution. A $1.4-\mathrm{mL}$ portion of $2 \mathrm{~N} \mathrm{CuCl}_{2}$ solution was added dropwise with occasional stirring. The red-brown precipitate was collected on a Buchner funnel; neutralization and precipitation were repeated twice. The copper salt was washed with $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}, 95 \%$ ethanol, and cold distilled water and then air-dried for 3 h , giving 600 mg of the copper complex of 6 . To a vigorously stirred slurry of 600 mg of the copper complex in 10 mL of distilled water was added dropwise an icecooled solution of $400 \mathrm{mg}(10.0 \mathrm{mmol})$ of NaOH in 10 mL of distilled water. The resulting yellow-green mixture was extracted 4 times with $15-\mathrm{mL}$ portions of methylene chloride. The grass-green aqueous layer was stirred overnight with 50 mL of methylene chloride. The combined organic layers were dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered, and evaporated. The crude product was purified by sublimation ( 0.16 mmHg ) using an oil bath at $120^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ to give $6,(89.8 \mathrm{mg}, 0.482 \mathrm{~mm}, 36 \%), \mathrm{mp}>280^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ (lit..$^{9}$ $\mathrm{mp} 320^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, sealed tube): ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $200 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 5.63$ ( $\mathrm{s}, 4 \mathrm{H}$ ), $2.44(\mathrm{~s}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 1.73(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H})$.

2,8-Bis(dimethylethyl)-2,8-diazonia-3,7-diazahexacyclo[7.4.1.0 ${ }^{\left.4,12.0^{5}, 14.0^{6,11} .0^{10,13}\right] \text { tetradeca-2,7-diene Bis(tetrafluoroborate) }}$ (s7 ${ }^{\mathbf{2}}{ }^{+}\left(\mathrm{BF}_{4}\right)_{2}$ and 2,7-Bis(dimethylethyl)-2,7-diazonia-3,8-diazahexacyclo[7.4.1.04,12.0 ${ }^{5,14} .0^{6,11} .0^{10,13}$ ]tetradeca-2,7-diene Bis(tetrafluoroborate) ( $\mathbf{a}^{\mathbf{2 +}}\left(\mathrm{BF}_{4}\right)_{\mathbf{2}}$. In an oven-dried $25-\mathrm{mL}$ round-bottomed flask with a stirbar and a rubber septum, a mixture of $100 \mathrm{mg}(0.537 \mathrm{mmol})$ of bis(azo) compound 6 and 10 mL of tert-butyl alcohol was degassed with a nitrogen stream, and 0.18 mL ( 2 equiv, 1.07 mmol ) of $\mathrm{HBF}_{4} \cdot \mathrm{OEt}_{2}$ was added. The mixture was refluxed 20 h , cooled, and stirred with 20 mL of ether. The solvents were decanted and the solid collected, and evaporation of the solvent gave a total of 230 mg of yellow solid. Two recrystallizations from $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN} /$ ether at $-20^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ gave $76 \mathrm{mg}(0.16 \mathrm{mmol}, 30 \%)$ of large, white, squarish crystals shown by ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR showed to be exclusively the anti isomer, mp $199-202^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ dec. $\mathrm{a}^{2+}{ }^{2+}{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $200 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{CN}$ ) $\delta 6.45$ (br s, 2 H ), 6.19 (br s, 2H), 3.03 (br s, 4 H ), 2.61 (br s, 2H), 1.71 $(2,18 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $67.5 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{CN}$ ) $\delta 83.08(\mathrm{C}), 70.93(\mathrm{CH})$, $65.68(\mathrm{CH}), 44.60(\mathrm{CH}), 42.42(\mathrm{CH}), 41.44(\mathrm{CH}), 26.47\left(\mathrm{CH}_{3}\right)$. Anal. Calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{18} \mathrm{H}_{28} \mathrm{~B}_{2} \mathrm{~F}_{8} \mathrm{~N}_{4}$ : $\mathrm{C}, 45.59 ; \mathrm{H}, 5.96 ; \mathrm{N}, 11.82$. Found: $\mathrm{C}, 45.45$; $\mathrm{H}, 5.83 ; \mathrm{N}, 11.73$.
The mother liquors were concentrated and dissolved in hot methanol. Cooling to $-20^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ resulted in slightly orange spherical clusters of needlelike crystals ( $80 \mathrm{mg}, \mathrm{mmol}, 31 \%$ ), mp $190-200^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. A second recrystallization from $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN} / \mathrm{MeOH}$ resulted in 30 mg of white crystals but did not improve the ratio of isomers, shown by NMR to be $\sim 15 \%$ ani , $85 \%$ syn. s $^{72+}$ : ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(200 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{CN}\right) \delta 6.50(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 6.16$ (m, $2 \mathrm{H}), 3.02(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 2.59(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.70(\mathrm{~s}, 18 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( 125 MHz , $\left.\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{CN}\right) \delta 82.93(\mathrm{C}), 71.29(\mathrm{CH}), 65.07(\mathrm{CH}), 44.95(\mathrm{CH}), 44.03(\mathrm{CH})$, $41.84(\mathrm{CH}), 41.77(\mathrm{CH}), 26.38\left(\mathrm{CH}_{3}\right)$.

2,7-BIs(dimethylethyl)-3,8-dimethyl-2,3,7,8-tetraazahexacyclo[7.4.1.0 ${ }^{\text {, } 12} .0^{5.14 .} 0^{6,11} .0^{10,13}$ ]tetradecane (a8). In an oven-dried $25-\mathrm{mL}$ round-bottomed flask with a stirbar and a rubber septum, a mixture of $76 \mathrm{mg}(0.16 \mathrm{mmol})$ of $\mathrm{a} 7^{2+}$ and 2 mL of THF was degassed with a stream of nitrogen. A $0.69-\mathrm{mL}$ ( 6 equiv, 0.97 mmol ) portion of 1.4 M MeLi solution was added slowly by syringe. The mixture cleared in 5 min to give a colorless solution. The reaction was stirred for 1.5 h and then quenched with 2 mL of saturated $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$ solution. Extraction with ether ( $3 \times 30 \mathrm{~mL}$ ), followed by drying over $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$ and evaporation, gave a white solid. The product 28 was crystallized twice from acetone/hexane at $-20^{\circ} \mathrm{C},(93.7 \%) \mathrm{mp} 107-100^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ : MS calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{20} \mathrm{H}_{34} \mathrm{~N}_{4}, 330.2776$, found $330.2802 ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{CN}$ ) $\delta 2.95-3.03$ (complex, 4 H ), 2.67-2.86 (complex, 6H), $\{2.57$ (A + C), 2.38 (B), 2.39 (C), 3 s , $\left.6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{NCH}_{3}\right\},\left\{1.078\right.$ (A), 1.16 (B), 1.09 (C), 1.081 (C), $\left.4 \mathrm{~s}, 18 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CCH}_{3}\right\} ;$ mole fractions from intetration of the $\mathrm{NCH}_{3}$ region, $\mathbf{A}, 0.56_{8}, \mathbf{B}, 0.28_{8}$, $\mathrm{C}, 0.14_{4}$, and of the $\mathrm{CCH}_{3}$ region, $\mathrm{A}, 0.56_{3}, \mathrm{~B}, 0.28_{8}, \mathrm{C}, 0.14_{8} ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $\left(125 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta, \mathrm{A}, 28.32\left(\mathrm{CH}_{3}\right), 33.06(\mathrm{CH}), 33.17(\mathrm{CH}), 37.38$
$(\mathrm{CH}), 49.65\left(\mathrm{CH}_{3}\right), 50.42(\mathrm{CH}), 58.24(\mathrm{CH}), 58.25\left(\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{q}}\right), \mathrm{B}, 28.28\left(\mathrm{CH}_{3}\right)$, $29.70(\mathrm{CH}), 34.31(\mathrm{CH}), 37.57(\mathrm{CH}), 48.02\left(\mathrm{CH}_{3}\right), 52.24(\mathrm{CH}), 57.76$ $(\mathrm{CH}), 58.36\left(\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{q}}\right), \mathrm{C}, 28.55,28.60$, (the smaller intensity minor conformation peaks have not been reliably located).

Bis(adduct) of MTAD with 1,6-Methano[10]annulene (10). ${ }^{35}$ A solution of 158 mg ( 1.40 mmol ) of 4-methyl-1,2,4-triazoline-3,5-dione (MTAD) in 10 mL of methylene chloride was added to a solution of 101 mg ( 0.70 mmol ) of $1,6-$ methano[10]annulene ( 9$)^{12}$ in 10 mL of methylene chloride and allowed to stand for 2.5 h at room temperature, and a few drops of annulene solution was added to decolorize the residual MTAD. Evaporation of solvent followed by drying in vacuo gave $260 \mathrm{mg}(0.706$ mmol ) of $10, \mathrm{mp} 136-142^{\circ} \mathrm{C} \mathrm{dec}\left(\mathrm{lit} .5^{35} \mathrm{mp} 253-254^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right.$ ): ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR (200 $\left.\mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 6.17(4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{t}, J=3.6 \mathrm{~Hz}), 5.38(4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{t}, J=3.6 \mathrm{~Hz}), 2.97$ ( $6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$ ), $0.97(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s})$.

Hydrogenation of 10 to $11 .{ }^{13}$ A solution of $2.40 \mathrm{~g}(6.51 \mathrm{mmol})$ of bis(adduct) 10 in 70 m of hot glacial acetic acid (distilled) in a glass autoclave liner was treated with 1 g of $10 \% \mathrm{Pd} / \mathrm{C}$ catalyst (Aldrich), and with the aid of a booster pump, hydrogen pressure was taken to 4800 psi, the temperature was raised to $80^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, and both were maintained for 50 h with shaking of the reaction chamber. After the autoclave was cooled and dismantled, the reaction mixture was filtered over Celite and washed with hot glacial acetic acid. The solvent was removed by evaporation to give a reddish-brown solid which was chromatographed on silica gel ( $10 \% \mathrm{MeOH}, \mathrm{CHCl}_{3}$ ). The 2.0 g of product was determined to contain $60 \%(1.20 \mathrm{~g})$ of 11 and $40 \%(0.80 \mathrm{~g})$ of starting material 10 : yield $49 \%$ (lit. ${ }^{13}$ yield $77 \%$ ); $\mathrm{mp}>280^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ (lit. ${ }^{13} \mathrm{mp}>340^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ); ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(200 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3} /\right.$ methanol- $\left.d_{4}\right) \delta 4.46(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.29(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.99$ (s, 6H), 2.45-1.75 (m, 9H), 1.38 (s, 3H).

2-Methyl-11,12,13,14-tetraazatetracyclo[6.2.2.2 3,6.02,7]tetradeca-11,-13-diene (12). A mixture of $2.00 \mathrm{~g}(4.35 \mathrm{mmol})$ of $10,180 \mathrm{~mL}$ of 2-propanol, and 2.6 g ( 39.4 mmol ) of KOH pellets ( $85 \%$ ) was refluxed under nitrogen for 40 h . The reaction was cooled to room temperature, acidified to pH 2 with 2 N HCl , and treated with $25 \mathrm{~g}(0.18 \mathrm{~mol})$ of $\mathrm{CuCl}_{2}$ in 600 mL of distilled water. After the mixture was stirred at room temperature for 2 h , a $30-\mathrm{mL}$ portion of concentrated $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{OH}$ was added to give a blue solution which was extracted with methylene chloride ( 4 $\times 100 \mathrm{~mL}$ ). The combined organic layers were washed with distilled water ( $2 \times 10 \mathrm{~mL}$ ), dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered, and evaporated. The product was purified by column chromatography on silica gel ( $5 \% \mathrm{MeOH}$ / $\mathrm{CHCl}_{3}$ ), followed by slow crystallization from $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$. A total of 627 $\mathrm{mg}\left(71 \%\right.$, lit. ${ }^{11} 80 \%$ ) of 12 was collected as light yellow crystals, mp $220-222^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ (lit. $.^{11} \mathrm{mp} 231^{\circ} \mathrm{C}:{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $200 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 5.11$ (d, $4.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.81(\mathrm{t}, 2.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.00-1.80(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.60-1.40(\mathrm{~m}$, $3 \mathrm{H}), 1.40-1.20(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.19(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.85(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H})$.

2-Methyl-11,14-bis(dimethylethyl)-11,14-diazonia-12,13-diazatetracyclo[6.2.2.2 ${ }^{3,6} .0^{2,7}$ tetradeca-11,13-diene Bis(tetrafluoroborate) ( $\left.\mathbf{1 3}^{2+}\left(\mathrm{BF}_{4}\right)_{2}\right)$. A mixture of 82 mg ( 0.40 mmol ) of bis(azo) compound $12,20 \mathrm{mLof}$ $l-\mathrm{BuOH}$, and 0.133 mL ( 2 equiv, 0.80 mmol ) of $\mathrm{HBF}_{4} \cdot \mathrm{OE}_{2}$ was prepared under nitrogen in an oven-dried $50-\mathrm{mL}$ round-bottomed flask with a rubber septum and refluxed for 48 h . Filtration gave an orange solid which proved to be the monobutylated product. This material was subjected to an additional 0.100 mL of acid and 10 mL of $t-\mathrm{BuOH}$ and refluxed for 30 h more. Addition of acid and alcohol was repeated until the reaction was complete. Concentration of the solution and addition of acetone gave slightly orange crystals which were recrystallized from $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}$ and ether to give $13^{2+}\left(\mathrm{BF}_{4}^{-}\right)_{2}, \mathrm{mp} 196-200^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ dec, 152 mg ( $0.309 \mathrm{mmol}, 77 \%$ ). Only one diastereomer was seen by NMR, and the anil relation of the $l$-butyl groups was assigned on the basis of the asymmetry of the NMR spectra: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{CN}$ ) $\delta 6.11$ $(\mathrm{m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.00(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.93(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.78(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.05(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H})$, $2.65-2.75(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.55-2.63(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.25-2.35(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.76(\mathrm{~s}, 9 \mathrm{H})$, $1.70(\mathrm{~s}, 9 \mathrm{H}), 1.63(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.50-1.65(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.35-1.45(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.05-$
(35) Askenazi, P.; Ginsburg, D.; Vogel, E. Tetrahedron 1977, 33, 1169.
$1.15(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $125 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{CN}$ ) $\delta 85.15(\mathrm{C}), 84.27(\mathrm{C})$, $76.99(\mathrm{CH}), 73.21(\mathrm{CH}), 71.65(\mathrm{CH}), 68.15(\mathrm{CH}), 46.17(\mathrm{CH}), 42.09$ $(\mathrm{CH}), 26.58\left(\mathrm{CH}_{3}\right), 26.07\left(\mathrm{CH}_{3}\right), 25.25\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right), 25.22\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right), 24.55\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)$, $23.75\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right), 21.90\left(\mathrm{CH}_{3}\right)$. Anal. Calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{19} \mathrm{H}_{34} \mathrm{~B}_{2} \mathrm{~F}_{8}: \mathrm{C}, 46.36 ; \mathrm{H}$, 6.98 ; N, 11.385. Found: $\mathrm{C}, 46.27 ; \mathrm{H}, 6.91 ; \mathrm{N}, 11.33$.

Instrumentation. NMR spectra were taken on Bruker WP-200, WP270 , or AM-500 spectrometers. ESR spectra were taken on a Bruker ESP 300E spectrometer. UV/visible spectra were taken on a HewlettPackard 8452 A diode array spectrophotometer, using matched $1-\mathrm{cm}$ quartz cells. Near-IR spectra were taken on (a) a Nicolet 740 spectrophotometer, using a Pb -Se detector, with a 1 mm quartz-window cell, and a Specac apparatus for low-temperature work, or (b) a Cary 17-D spectrophotometer using matched $1-\mathrm{cm}$ quartz cells.

Electrochemistry. Cyclic voltammograms were run at 2 mM , using as supporting electrolyte 0.1 M tetrabutylammonium perchlorate (Kodak or Fluka, recrystalized from hot $1: 1$ ethanol:water and dried at $110^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ before use). An EG\&E PAR Model 273 instrument interfaced to an IBM PC-XT was employed. A Corning ceramic junction SCE was employed as reference electrode. Either a gold or a platinum disc working electrode was used, and the disc was polished at least between every two scans when hydrazines were studied. Coulometry used a modified CV cell, with a Pt foil working electrode fused to the bottom of the cell and a Pt wire counter electrode in a side arm separated from the main compartment by a glass frit. The solution was stirred with a stream of nitrogen introduced through a Teflon-brand (duPont) needle. Electrolysis was carried out by applying a constant potential 0.2 V past the oxidation/ reduction potential of the compound until the current dropped to the predetermined background level.

Calculations. AM1 calculations ${ }^{36}$ used the VAMP program (version $4.4)^{37}$ modified for use on a Stardent 3000 computer. Saunders's MM2 ${ }^{10 \mathrm{a}}$ structure search program VAXMOL5 ${ }^{38}$ was modified by Peter A. Petillo to allow use of a VAX 8650 to input structures generated from molecular orbital calculations, using program NEWSEL, written by P.A.P.
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