No reaction could be observed between the analogous diorganyl diselenides and sulfur, selenium, or tellurium. when mechanical stirring was applied instead of ultrasound. Also, no reactions occurred in all investigated systems $2a = 1a + PhTeSeSeTePh$ (4)

The solution behavior of **2a, 3a** and **2b, 3b** is entirely different. **2a, 3a** establish equilibria as given in eq **4,** whereas **2b, 3b** are kinetically stable, most likely for steric reasons. By addition of **la** to the mixture both equilibria

$$
2a = 1a + PhTeSeSeTePh
$$
 (4)

$$
3a \rightleftharpoons 1a + PhTeSSTePh
$$

are shifted almost entirely to the left. The 12STe NMR data for the species involved are given in Table I.

Low-Valent Titanium Porphyrin Complexes: Synthesis and Structural Characterization of the First Titanium(I I) Porphyrin Complex, (q*-Dlphenylacetyiene)titanIum Octaethyiporphyrin

L. **Keith Woo,**' J. Alan Hays, Robert A. Jacobson,* and Catherine** L. **Day**

Ames Laboratcny and the Department of Chemistfy, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa 5001 1

Received March 26. 199 1

Summary: **The anaerobic reduction of the dlchlorotitanium(IV) porphyrins (OEP)TiCI, and (TTP)TiCI, (OEP** = **octaethylporphyrlnato, TTP** = *meso* **-tetra-p -tolylporphyrinato) with LiAIH, in the presence of diphenyl**acetylene in toluene produces the π -alkyne Ti(II) adducts $(OEP)Ti(\eta^2-PhC=CPh)$ (1) and $(TTP)Ti(\eta^2-PhC=CPh)$ (2). **The structure of 1 has been determined by single-crystal X-ray diffraction analysis. Complex 1 crystallizes in the centrosymmetric space group** $C2/c$ **with** $a = 49.369(7)$ \hat{A} , $b = 13.734$ (9) \hat{A} , $c = 36.042$ (5) \hat{A} , $\beta = 136.62$ (1)^o, $V = 16784$ (9) \AA^3 , $Z = 16$, $R = 0.061$, and $R_w = 0.063$. The **asymmetric unit of 1 contains** two **molecules. Alkyne C-C distances and Ti-alkyne distances are 1.30 (1) (C27-C28), 2.016 (5) (TIl-C27), 2.015 (5) (Ti,-C 1.30 (1) C**–**C** distances and Ti–alkyne distances are 1.30 (1)
 (C₂₇–C₂₈), 2.016 (5) (Ti₁–C₂₇), 2.015 (5) (Ti₁–C₂₈), 1.30 (1)
 (C₆₁–C₆₂), 2.007 (7) (Ti₂–C₆₁), and 2.028 (7) Å (Ti₂–C₆₂).

Despite the great interest in metalloporphyrins, the chemistry of early-transition-metal porphyrin complexes remains in an undeveloped state. A primary reason for this stems from the fact that syntheses of these complexes thermodynamically lead to the formation of high-valent oxo complexes.² The $M=O$ groups in these metalloporphyrins are typically d^0-d^2 and are often extremely difficult to cleave.³ We have recently examined the We have recently examined the metal-centered redox chemistry of titanium oxo and titanium halide porphyrin complexes. 4 As an extension of our work on titanium porphyrins, we have begun to investigate the chemistry of low-valent Ti porphyrin complexes. To date, Ti(II1) is the lowest valent state known to exist in a titanium porphyrin complex? We report here the synthesis and structural characterization of the first Ti(I1) porphyrin complexes.

As illustrated in eq **1,** lithium aluminum hydride reduction of toluene solutions of dichlorotitanium(1V) porphyrins in the presence of diphenylacetylene produces η^2 -alkyne complexes of Ti(II). In a typical reaction, 131

Jacobson,* and Catherine L. Day
 Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa 50011

26, 1991
 m^2 -alkyne complexes of Ti(II). In a typical reaction, 131

(POR)TiCl₂ + PhC=CPh $\frac{\text{LiAlH}_4}{(POR) \text{Ti}(\eta^2-\text{PhC}=\text{CPh})}$

(POR)Ti(

$$
POR/T1(\eta^2 - PhC = CP)
$$

1, POR = OEP
2, POR = TTP

mg of (OEP)TiCl₂⁶ (0.201 mmol), 141 mg of LiAlH₄ (3.67 mmol), and **41** mg of PhC*Ph **(0.23** mmol) were stirred in toluene (40 mL) under N_2 at 22 °C. Over 12 h, the brown solution turned into the ruby red color of the alkyne adduct **1.** Filtering the reaction mixture, concentrating the filtrate to ca. 2 mL , and cooling to -20 °C for 3 days produced **78** mg of purple microcrystals **(51%** yield) after washing with cold pentanes7 The TTP6 analogue **2** can be prepared in a similar manner.⁷

The alkyne adducts **1** and **2** are diamagnetic complexes that exhibit sharp ¹H NMR signals. For example, in C_6D_6 the diphenylacetylene protons of **1** appear as two multiplets at **6.29 (6** H, *m,* p protons) and **4.37** ppm **(4** H, o protons). The significant upfield shifta of these resonances are consistent with a structure in which the $C=$ triple bond of the alkyne binds to titanium, holding the phenyl substituents above the porphyrin ring current. The porphyrin meso protons resonate as a singlet at **10.33 (4** H) about the axis along the Ti-triple-bond centroid is rapid on the NMR time scale.

Crystals of the **OEP** complex **1** suitable for singlecrystal X-ray diffraction were **grown** by cooling a toluene solution to **-20** "C. Complex **1** crystallizes in the Centrosymmetric space group **C2/c** with two molecules in the asymmetric unit and 16 molecules per unit cell.⁸ The large number of non-hydrogen atoms **(110)** in the asymmetric unit significantly increased the difficulty and complexity of the

⁽¹⁾ Presidential Young Invwtigator, 1990-1996. (2) (a) Fuhrop, J.-H.; Smith, K. M. In *Porphyrins* **and** *Metalloporphyrins;* **Smith, K. M., Ed.; Ebevier:** Amsterdam, **1975; pp 796-799. (b) BOchler, J. W. In** *The Porphyriru;* **Dolphin, D., Ed.; Academic Pm: New York, 1978; Vol. 1, Chapter 10. (3) Nugent, W. A,; Mnyer, J. M.** *Metal-Ligand Multiple Bonds;* **Wdey**

New York, 1988.

⁽⁴⁾ Woo, L. K.; Hap, J. A.; Goll, J. *G. Inorg. Chem.* **1990,29,3916.** (5) (a) Boreham, C. J.; Buisson, G.; Duee, E.; Jordanov, J.; Latour, J.-M.; Marchon, J.-C. *Inorg. Chim. Acta* 1983, 70, 77. (b) Marchon, J.-C.; Latour, J.-M.; Boreham, C. J. *J. Mol. Catal.* 1980, 7, 227.

⁽⁶⁾ Abbreviations: OEP is the octaethylporphyrinato dianion and

TTP is the meso-tetra-p-tolylporphyrinato dianion.

(7) Analytical data for (TTP)Ti(PhC=CPh): ¹H NMR (C_eD_e, 300 MHz) 9.06 (s, 8 H, β -H), 7.97 (d, 7.52 Hz, 8 H, -C_eH₄Me), 7.28 (m, 8 H, -C_eH₄Me), 6.45 (m, 6 **CJ~,~H&;** *UV-* **(toluene) 426 (%ret), W, ⁵⁸²nm; IR (mull) 1688** cm-1 (5.23); N, 6.26 (6.04). Analytical data for (OEP)Ti(PhC=CPh): ¹H NMR
(C₆D₆, 300 MHz) 10.33 (s, 4 H, meso H), 6.29 (m, 6 H, m, p H), 4.37 (m, 4 H, o H), 3.92 (q, 7.8 Hz, 16 H, CH₂CH₃), 1.84 ppm (t, 7.5 Hz, 24 H, ($\nu_{\text{C}\rightarrow\text{C}}$). **Anal. Calcd (found) for C₅₀H₅₄N₄Ti: C, 79.14 (78.59); H, 7.17** *(6.77)***; N, 7.38 (7.09).** *(u-).* **Anal. Calcd (found)** for **CaHMNITI: C, 83.21 (82.66); H, 5.18**

Figure 1. ORTEP drawings with 50% probability thermal ellipsoids and atom-labeling schemes for the molecules of the asymmetric unit of Ti(OEP)(PhC=CPh). Main distances (A) : Ti₁-N₁, 2.094 **unit of Ti(OEP)(PhC=CPh). Main distances (A): Ti₁-N₁, 2.094** (7) ; Ti_1-N_2 , 2.098 (8); Ti_1-N_3 , 2.099 (7); Ti_1-N_4 , 2.083 (8); Ti_1-C_{27} , 2.016 (5); **Ti₁-C₂₈, 2.015 (5); C₂₇-C₂₈, 1.30 (1); C₂₇-C₂₈, 1.46 (1); (6); Ti_z-N₈, 2.095 (7); Ti**_z-C₆₁, 2.007 (7); **Ti_z-C₆₂, 2.028 (7); C₆₀-C₆₁, 1.47 (1); C₆₁-C₆₂, 1.30 (1); C₆₂-C₆₃, 1.448 (9). Main angles (deg):
N₁-Ti₁-N₄, 85.3 (3); N₁-Ti₁-N₂, 87.7 (3); N₂-Ti₁-N₄, 150.8 (2);** N_2 -Ti₁-N₃, 84.4 (3); N_3 -Ti₁-N₄, 87.9 (3); C_{27} - C_{28} - C_{29} , 142.9 (6); $C_{28}-C_{27}-C_{28}$, 142.7 (5); $N_5-Ti_2-N_6$, 88.4 (2); $N_5-Ti_2-N_7$, 150.7 (2); N_5 –Ti₂–N₈, 85.3 (3); N_6 –Ti₂–N₇, 84.1 (2); N_7 –Ti₂–N₈, 88.0 (2); **1.474 (9); Ti₂-N_b, 2.086 (8); Ti₂-N₆, 2.093 (5); Ti**₂-N₇, 2.104 C_{61} ⁻ C_{62} ⁻ C_{63} , 143.4 **(6)**; C_{60} ⁻ C_{61} ⁻ C_{62} , 140.7 **(6)**.

structure determination. Direct methods were attempted but were unsuccessful. **A** new method was therefore tried and proved capable of readily determining the structure. A sharpened Patterson map was calculated, and a Patterson superposition procedure was carried out using a vector identified as a probable Ti-Ti vector.⁹ From the resulting map, the positions of all the titanium atoms in the cell plus likely positions for the coordinated nitrogens could be readily determined. Due to the size of this structure, those positions alone were ineffective at phasing the observed data. Therefore, with the titanium and nitrogen positions **as** departure points, the main porphyrin rings were modeled by using the **PCMODEL** molecular mechanics program and the resulting positions were input into the crystallographic least-squares refinement procedure. Refinement proceeded smoothly, and the remaining carbon

Figure 2. Crystal-packing diagram for $Ti(OEP)(n^2-PhC=CPh)$.

atom positions were revealed with use of difference Fourier calculations. Further details concerning this method of structure determination will be published elsewhere.¹⁰

The two molecules in the asymmetric unit of **1** are shown in Figure 1, and both have some features similar to those of a molybdenum analogue (TTP)Mo(η^2 -PhC=CPh), characterized by Weiss.¹¹ The geometry about each Ti is square pyramidal, with the four pyrrole nitrogens forming the basal plane and the alkyne triple bond at the apical site. The titanium atom is displaced from the mean 24-atom porphyrin core toward the alkyne by 0.54 **A.** The Ti_1-C_{27} and Ti_1-C_{28} distances are 2.016 (5) and 2.015 (5)
Å, and the $C_{27}-C_{28}$ distance is 1.30 (1) Å. In the second molecule, Ti_2-C_{61} and Ti_2-C_{62} distances are 2.007 (7) and 2.028 (7) Å and the $C_{61}-C_{62}$ distance is 1.30 (1) Å.

Two structural aspects of **1** differ greatly from those of the Mo analogue. In the Mo complex, the porphyrin ligand is saddle-shaped. The Ti complex **1** possesses a nearly planar porphyrin core. The largest deviation from planarity is 0.064 (6) **A** at Cg. The planarity of the porphyrin core is very likely related to the formation of intermolecular $\pi-\pi$ interactions¹² between pairs of porphyrins in the lattice, as shown in Figure 2. The interplanar distance that separates the porphyrins in an associated pair is 3.36 A. The other structural difference between these two alkyne complexes involves the orientation of the $C=$ vector in the molecule. In the Mo case, this vector eclipses two trans pyrrole nitrogens. However, in the Ti complex, the $C=$ vector bisects cis pyrrole nitrogens. For example, the torsional angle between the $C_{27}-C_{28}$ and N_1-N_3 vectors is 47.1°. This orientational difference presumably arises from steric factors. In both cases, the alkyne aligns in a manner that minimizes nonbonded interactions between the alkyne phenyl rings and the porphyrin substituents.

The bonding in the titanium complexes discussed here can be regarded **as** involving a four-electron-donor alkyne ligand, as was proposed for the Mo analogue.13 A comparison of (OEP)Ti(η^2 -PhC=CPh) with Cp₂Ti(CO)(η^2 - $PhC = CPh$ ¹⁴ supports this classification. The 18-electron rule suggests that the acetylene ligand is formally a 2 electron donor in the cyclopentadienyl complex. The longer Ti-C_{alkyne} distances (2.107 (7) and 2.230 (7) **A**) are in accord with this formalism. Although the alkyne ${\rm C}$ distances are similar in the two structures (1.285 (10) **A** in $Cp_2Ti(\eta^2-PhC=CPh)CO$), the C=C stretching frequencies for the two complexes are consistent with a two-electron-donor acetylene $(v_{\text{C} = \text{C}} = 1780 \text{ cm}^{-1})$ in

-
- **(13) Tataumi, K.; Hoffmann, R.; Templeton, J. L. Inorg. Chem. 1982, 21, 466.**
- **(14) Fachinetti, G.; Floriani, C.; Marchetti, F.; Mellini, M.** *J.* **Chem.** *SOC.,* **Dalton Trans. 1978, 1398.**

tallizes in the centrosymmetric space group $C2/c$ with $a = 49.369$ (7) Å, $b = 13.734$ (9) Å, $c = 36.042$ (5) Å, $\beta = 136.62$ (1)°, $V = 16784$ (9) Å³, $Z = 16$, $R = 0.061$ and $R_w = 0.063$. The = 136.62 (1)°, $V = 16784$ (9) A°, $Z = 16$, $R = 0.061$ and $R_w = 0.063$. The calculated density ($C_{80}H_{84}N_{4}\Pi$, $M_{t} = 758.90$) per unit cell is 1.201 g/cm³.
Data were collected at -40 °C on a Rigaku AFC6R diffracto 50.1°. Unique reflections (6219) with $I > 3\sigma(I)$ were used after correction for absorption. All non-hydrogen atoms were refined anisotropically. (8) Ti $(OEP)(\eta^2\text{-PhC=CPh})$

for absorption. All non-hydrogen atoms were refined anisotropically.

(9) Patterson map calculations were carried out by using: Powell, D.

R.; Jacobsen, R. A. "FOUR: A Generated Crystallographic Fourier

Program" U.S. DOE 1980. Molecular mechanics calculations were performed by using PCMO-**DEL (Serena software, Box 3076, Bloomington,** IN, **1989). Least-equarea and difference Fourier calculations were carried out by using the TEX-SAN-TEXRAY etnrcture solution pnckage (Molecular Structure Gorp., 1985). Cryetal structure dingrams were prepared by using: Johnson, C. K. 'ORTEP 11", Report ORNL-5138; Oak Ridge National Laboratory: Oak Ridge, TN, 1976.**

____~ **(10) Day, C.; Jacobson, R. A. Acta Crystallogr., to be submitted for publication.**

⁽¹¹⁾ DeCian, A.; Colin, J.; Schappacher, M.; Ricard, L.; Weias, R. L. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 1981, *103, 1850.*
(12) Scheidt, W. R.; Lee, Y. J. *Struct. Bonding* 1987, 64, 1.

 $Cp_2Ti(CO)(\eta^2-PhC=CPh)$ and a four-electron-donor acetylene $(\nu_{C\rightarrow C} = 1701 \text{ cm}^{-1})$ in (OEP)Ti(η^2 -PhC==CPh). Finally, the ¹³C NMR spectrum for $(OEP)Ti(\eta^2-Ph)$ CPh) provides further support for **this** bonding interaction. The ¹³C chemical shift for the C=C carbon occurs at 219.4 ppm. Despite a significant upfield shift due to the porphyrin ring current,16 this signal falls well within the region expected for a four-electron-donor ligand.¹⁶ In this regard, the alkyne complexes **1** and **2** represent the first metallo-

(16) Templeton, J. L. *Adu. Organomet. Chem.* **1989, 29, 1.**

porphyrins that contain Ti(I1). Reactivity studies of these novel complexes are also consistent with a Ti(I1) formal i sm 17

Acknowledgment. Funding for this **work** was provided by the NSF and by the USDOE through the Ames Laboratory. We thank Dr. David C. Smith for helpful discussions.

Supplementary Material Available: Text detailing the **data** collection and **listings** of atomic coordinates, thermal parameters, bond distances and angles, and least-squares planes for **1** (41 pages); a listing of calculated and observed structure factors for **1 (43** pages). Ordering information is given on any current masthead page.

(17) Woo, **L. K.; Hays,** J. **A., to be submitted for publication.**

Art ic 1 es

Mechanism of the Photoreaction between $(\eta^5\text{-}C_5H_5)M(CO)_3X$ **(M** = **Mo, W) and Allylic Halides**

Ross H. Hill,^{*} Anna Becalska, and Nghia Chiem

DepaHment of Chemistty, Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, British Columbia, Canada V5A 7S6

Received November 7, 7990

Photolysis of $(\eta^5$ -C₅H₅)Mo(CO)₃Cl in the region of 100 K in allyl halide leads to CO loss and the generation of $(\eta^5$ -C₅H₅)Mo(CO)₂(η^2 -C₃H₅X)Cl (X = Cl, Br, I). This molecule reacts thermally to prod C_5H_5)Mo(CO)(η^3 -C₃H₅)ClX. The activation barrier to this reaction is 34 kJ/mol **(X = Cl).** This is contrasted with the results obtained upon photolysis of $(\eta^5$ -C₅H₅)M(CO)₃X with allyl halides (M = Mo, X = Br; M = W, X = Cl, Br, I). Although initial formation of $(\eta^5$ -C₅H₅)M(CO)₂(η^2 -C₃H₅CX)X is observed upon \tilde{C}_5H_5) $\tilde{M}(CO)_2(\eta^3-C_3H_5)X][X]$. For $M = W$, $\tilde{X} = Cl$ the activation barrier for the reaction is 69 kJ/mol.
When it is warmed further, $[(\eta^5-C_5H_5)W(CO)_2(\eta^3-C_3H_5)X][X]$ decomposes to produce $(\eta^5-C_5H_5)W(CO)_2X_3$ These results are discussed in terms of an electron transfer from the metal to the coordinated allyl halide.

Herein we report a study of the mechanism of the photoreaction between $(\eta^5$ -C₅H₅)M(CO)₃X (M = Mo, W) and allylic halides. This reaction was recently reported by Davidson and Vasapollo' to generate, in the case of $(\eta^5$ -C₅H₅)Mo(CO)₃Cl, good yields of the allylic product according to eq 1. The products obtained for the other

$$
(\eta^5-C_5H_5)Mo(CO)_3Cl + CRHCHCH_2Cl \xrightarrow{h\nu} (\eta^5-C_5H_5)Mo(CO)(\eta^3-CH_2CHCHR)Cl_2 + 2CO (1)
$$

$$
R = H, Me
$$

metals were not the allylic complexes but rather the complexes $(\eta^5$ -C₅H₅)W(CO)₂Cl₃ and [CrCl₂(η^5 -C₅H₅)]. It was postulated that the difference in reactivity arises from an initial CO loss product that undergoes oxidative addition with allyl halide to generate $(\eta^5$ -C₅H₅)M(CO)₂Cl₂(η^1 -CH2CHCHR) for each of the metals. The differing reactions of these species were suggested to account for the variation in reactivity.

We have recently studied the reaction of allyl halides with a variety of transition-metal centers. Complexes of

(1) Davidson, J. L.; **Vasapollo, G.** *J. Organomet. Chem.* **1985,291,43.**

the type $(\eta^5 - C_5H_5)M(CO)_n$ (M = Mn, n = 3; M = Co, Rh, $n = 2$) were found to lose CO upon photolysis to generate complexes in which the allyl was bound as an olefin, $(\eta^5$ -C₅H₅)M(CO)_{n-1}(η^2 -C₃H₅X). In each case we were able to show that, at an appropriate temperature, the η^2 -allylic olefin underwent an intramolecular electron-transfer reaction to yield the allylic products, $(\eta^5$ -C₅H₅)M(CO)_{n-1}- $(\eta^3$ -C₃H₅ $)$ ⁺.²

Since no reason for a difference in reactivity between the complexes we studied and the $(\eta^5$ -C₅H₅)M(CO)₃X series was obvious to us, we decided to investigate this reaction. It should be noted that several reports have established that the initial reaction of $(\eta^5\text{-}C_5\text{H}_5)\text{M(CO)}_3\text{Cl}$ $(M = Mo, W)$ upon photolysis is CO loss.³⁻⁵ Here we describe our efforts to determine the result of photolysis in the presence of allyl halides. Related studies include the investigation of the mechanism of the photoreaction of $(\eta^5$ -C₅H₅)W(CO)₃Cl with other halocarbons.⁵ The main points we will address in this study are the overall mech-

^{(15) &}lt;sup>13</sup>C resonances for ligands held above a porphyrin are typically shifted 20 ppm upfield relative to those for the non-porphyrin analogues.
See for example: (a) Wayland, B. B.; Woods, B. A.; Pierce, R. J. Am. Chem. S *Organometallics* **1985,** *4,* **1887.**

⁽²⁾ Hill, R. H. J. Chem. Soc., Chem. Commun. 1989, 293.
(3) Hooker, R. H.; Mahmoud, K. A.; Rest, A. J. J. Chem. Soc., Dalton
Trans. 1990, 1231.

⁽⁴⁾ Alway, D. G.; Barnett, K. W. *Inorg. Chem.* **1980,19, 1533.** *(5)* **Goldman, A. S.; Tyler, D. R.** *Organometallics* **1984, 3, 449.**