The Chloride Effect: Structural Dependence of Ruthenium Silyl Complexes on Phosphorus and Silicon Substituents

Samuel T. N. Freeman,[†] Jeffrey L. Petersen,[‡] and Fredrick R. Lemke^{*,†}

Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry, Ohio University, Athens, Ohio 45701, and Department of Chemistry, West Virginia University, Morgantown, West Virginia 26506

Received October 9, 2003

Summary: The structures for a series of $Cp(PR_3)_2RuSiX_3$ { $PR_3 = PMe_3$, $SiX_3 = SiCl_3$, $SiMeCl_2$, $SiPhCl_2$; $PR_3 = PMe_2Ph$, $SiX_3 = SiCl_3$ } complexes were determined and compared. The Ru-Si and Si-Cl distances in these complexes increased when Cl was replaced with Me or Ph groups and correlated with the observed spectroscopic properties of these complexes. The structural variations were explained by $d(Ru)-\sigma^*(Si-Cl) \pi$ -back-bonding interactions.

Introduction

Metal-silicon compounds have generated much interest in the past decade¹⁻⁴ owing to their intermediacy in reactions such as hydrosilylation^{5,6} and dehydrogenative silvlation.^{7–9} Consequently, special attention has been given to the influence of transition metal fragments on the bonding and reactivity of silicon atoms. Previously, we had reported the effect of different silicon and phosphorus substituents on the spectroscopic properties for a series of ruthenium silyl compounds of the type Cp(PR₃)₂RuSiX₃.^{10,11} Our studies indicated that the Ru-Si bond strengthened as the substituents on silicon became more electron-withdrawing (as evidenced by an increase in ${}^{2}J_{SiP}$, Figure 1 top) but was unaffected by changes in the phosphine ligand. Also, we observed that the ruthenium silvl groups were differentiated into three classes (a dichlorosilyl, a monochlorosilyl, and a non-chlorosilyl class; Figure 1 bottom); these classes

(5) Speier, J. L. Adv. Organomet. Chem. 1979, 17, 407-447.



Figure 1. Top: ${}^{2}J_{SiP}$ (Hz) vs $\Sigma \chi_{l}(SiX_{3})$ for ruthenium silyl complexes of the type Cp(PR₃)₂RuSiX₃ {PR₃ = PMe₃ (\bigcirc), PMe₂Ph (\Box), PMePh₂ (\diamond)}. Bottom: 29 Si NMR chemical shift of the silyl groups vs $\Sigma \chi_{l}(SiX_{3})$ for ruthenium silyl complexes of the type Cp(PR₃)₂RuSiX₃ {PR₃ = PMe₃ (\bigcirc), PMe₂Ph (\Box), PMePh₂ (\diamond)} showing the three silyl classes: dichlorosilyl (solid line), monochlorosilyl (dashed line), and non-chlorosilyl (dotted line).

were attributed to varying degrees of d(Ru)– $\sigma^*(Si-Cl)$ π -back-bonding.

[†] Ohio University.

[‡]West Virginia University, crystal structure determinations.

Tilley, T. D. In *The Silicon-Heteroatom Bond*; Patai, S., Rappoport, Z., Eds.; John Wiley & Sons: New York, 1991; pp 245-307.
 Tilley, T. D. In *The Silicon-Heteroatom Bond*; Patai, S., Rap-

 ⁽³⁾ Sharma, H. K.; Pannell, K. H. Chem. Rev. 1995, 95, 1351–1374.

⁽⁴⁾ Corey, J. Y.; Braddock-Wilking, J. *Chem. Rev.* **1999**, *99*, 175–292.

⁽⁶⁾ Ojima, I.; Li, Z.; Zhu, J. In *The Chemistry of Organic Silicon Compounds*, Rappoport, Z., Apeloig, Y., Eds.; John Wiley & Sons: New York, 1998; Vol. 2, pp 1687–1792.

⁽⁷⁾ Ezbiansky, K.; Djurovich, P. I.; LaForest, M.; Sinning, D. J.;
Zayes, R.; Berry, D. H. *Organometallics* 1998, *17*, 1455–1457.
(8) Christ, M. L.; Sabo-Etienne, S.; Chaudret, B. *Organometallics*

⁽⁶⁾ Christ, M. L., Sabo-Etlenne, S., Chaudret, B. Organometanics 1995, 14, 1082–1084.

 ⁽⁹⁾ Delpech, F.; Mansas, J.; Leuser, H.; Sabo-Etienne, S.; Chaudret,
 B. Organometallics 2000, 19, 5750-5757.

⁽¹⁰⁾ Lemke, F. R.; Galat, K. J.; Youngs, W. J. Organometallics **1999**, *18*, 1419–1429.

⁽¹¹⁾ Freeman, S. T. N.; Lofton, L. L.; Lemke, F. R. Organometallics **2002**, *21*, 4776–4784.

Table 1. Selected Interatomic Distances (Å) and Angles (deg) for Cp(PR₃)₂RuSiX₃

0	· 0/			
	2	1 ^a	3	4
PR ₃	PMe ₂ Ph	PMe ₃	PMe ₃	PMe ₃
SiX ₃	SiCl ₃	SiCl ₃	SiMeCl ₂	SiPhCl ₂
Ru-Si	2.2811(11)	2.265(2)	2.294(2)	2.31019(9)
Ru-P(1)	2.2912(10)	2.273(2)	2.276(2)	2.2712(9)
Ru-P(2)	2.2797(10)	2.280(2)	2.261(2)	2.2754(8)
$Ru-Cnt^b$	1.903	1.887	1.917	1.910
Si-Cl(1)	2.124(2)	2.122(3)	2.145(3)	2.1545(12)
Si-Cl(2)	2.119(2)	2.114(3)	2.153(3)	2.1335(11)
$Si-Z^{c}$	2.1130(14)	2.121(3)	1.905(7)	1.904(3)
P(1)-Ru-Si	91.09(4)	92.60(7)	93.22(7)	91.02(4)
P(2)-Ru-Si	92.67(4)	93.00(7)	94.42(8)	93.72(3)
Cnt-Ru-Si ^b	120.0	121.2	119.1	122.3
P(1)-Ru-P(2)	97.64(4)	95.80(7)	95.42(8)	95.27(3)
Cnt-Ru-P (av) ^{b}	123.6	123.2	123.6	123.1
Ru-Si-Cl(1)	117.53(5)	116.8(1)	114.92(10)	112.87(4)
Ru-Si-Cl(2)	114.89(6)	115.0(1)	122.22(10)	121.84(4)
Ru–Si–Z ^c	125.20(6)	125.6(1)	119.2(3)	120.35(9)
Cl(1)-Si-Cl(2)	98.93(6)	99.0(1)	97.96(13)	97.39(5)
$Cl(2)-Si-Z^{c}$	98.21(7)	98.8(1)	99.0(3)	99.74(9)
$Cl(1)-Si-Z^{c}$	97.30(6)	96.9(1)	99.1(3)	100.29(9)

 a Data taken from ref 10. b Cnt = the centroid of the cyclopentadienyl ring. c Z represents either chlorine or a carbon bonded to silicon.

Our spectroscopic studies indicated that the ruthenium silicon interaction was more dependent on the substituents on silicon than on the substituents on phosphorus. A major question concerning these $Cp(PR_3)_2$ -RuSiX₃ complexes still remained. How were the spectroscopically observed substituent effects manifested in the structures of $Cp(PR_3)_2RuSiX_3$? To address this question, we have determined the structures of several $Cp(PR_3)_2RuSiX_3$ {SiX₃ = SiCl₃, PR₃ = PMe₃ (1), PMe₂Ph (2); PR₃ = PMe₃, SiX₃ = SiMeCl₂ (3), SiPhCl₂ (4)} complexes. A comparison between the structural and spectroscopic trends of 1-4 is reported herein. Prior to this study, only the structure of $Cp(PMe_3)_2RuSiCl_3$ (1) had been reported;¹⁰ selected interatomic distances and angles for 1 are listed in Table 1.

Results and Discussion

Synthesis of Ruthenium Silyl Complexes. The complexes Cp(PMe₂Ph)₂RuSiCl₃ (**2**)¹¹ and Cp(PMe₃)₂-RuSiMeCl₂ (**3**)^{10,12} were prepared by published methods. Cp(PMe₃)₂RuSiPhCl₂ (**4**) was prepared by the direct reaction of Cp(PMe₃)₂RuH with PhSiCl₃ in CH₂Cl₂ (eq 1); the cationic dihydride [Cp(PMe₃)₂RuH₂]Cl was a byproduct of this reaction. Complex **4** was obtained in good yields as a yellow solid and exhibited NMR resonances (¹H, ²⁹Si, and ³¹P) characteristic of silyl complexes containing the Cp(PR₃)₂Ru half-sandwich moiety.^{10,11}





Figure 2. Perspective view of the molecular structure of $Cp(PMe_2Ph)_2RuSiCl_3$ (2) with atom labels provided for all unique non-hydrogen atoms.



Figure 3. Perspective view of the molecular structure of Cp(PMe₃)₂RuSiMeCl₂ (**3**) with atom labels provided for all unique non-hydrogen atoms.

Structures of Cp(PR₃)₂RuSiX₃. The crystal structures of **2**–**4** were determined by X-ray diffraction at 295 K, and selected interatomic distances and angles are listed in Table 1. The molecular structures of **2**–**4** (Figures 2–4, respectively) adopted a three-legged "piano-stool" geometry around ruthenium with "legs" composed of one silyl group and two phosphine groups.¹³ The Ru–Si distances of 2.28–2.31 Å were consistent with a single bond and fall on the low end of the range (2.27–2.51 Å) observed for related d⁶ ruthenium silyl complexes.^{1,2,10,14–16} The Si–Cl distances of 2.11–2.15 Å were considerably longer than the Si–Cl distance in

⁽¹²⁾ Lemke, F. R. J. Am. Chem. Soc. **1994**, *116*, 11183–11184. (13) A preliminary structural analysis of Cp(PMePh₂)₂RuSiCl₃ showed that this compound crystallizes in a C-centered monoclinic crystal lattice with dimensions a = 15.168(1) Å, b = 12.121(1) Å, c = 17.369(1) Å, and $\beta = 106.358(1)^\circ$. The X-ray diffraction data indicated either that the entire molecule was disordered about a crystallographic 2-fold axis or that the lattice dimensions were extended along one direction. Efforts to refine the molecular structure in the centrosymmetric space group C2/c with four pairs of half-molecules with each pair symmetrically disposed about a different crystallographic 2-fold axis were sufficient to verify the atom connectivity. A perspective view of the molecular structure of Cp(PMePh₂)₂RuSiCl₃ showed that the Me substituent of each diphenylmethylphosphine ligand was directed away from the cyclopentadienyl ligand. The overall structure was consistent with that expected for a three-legged piano stool, with the three legs consisting of two PMePh₂ groups and one SiCl₃ group.



Figure 4. Perspective view of the molecular structure of $Cp(PMe_3)_2RuSiPhCl_2$ (4) with atom labels provided for all unique non-hydrogen atoms.

free polychlorosilanes $(2.02 \text{ Å})^{17}$ and other group 8 trichlorosilyl complexes (2.03-2.09 Å).¹⁸⁻²⁵

Complexes 1–4 adopted a staggered conformation about the Ru-Si bond with the cyclopentadienyl and a chloride in an anti relationship (average cyclopentadienvl centroid–Ru–Si–Cl dihedral angle = $166.1 \pm 9.1^{\circ}$). The silyl groups had a distorted tetrahedral geometry with an average Cl–Si–Z (Z = Cl, C) angle of 98.6 \pm 0.6° and an average Ru–Si–Z angle of $118.9 \pm 2.4^{\circ}$. The Ru–Si–Cl angles (123.7 \pm 1.4° average) anti to the Cp group were significantly larger than the non-anti Ru–Si–Z angles (116.5 \pm 1.7° average). In related three-legged piano-stool ruthenium silyl complexes, the Ru-Si-Z angle for substituents anti to a Cp or benzene group have also been observed to be larger (generally \geq 10°) than the Ru–Si–Z angles of the other substituents on silicon: Cp(PMe₃)₂RuSiCl₂Cp* [Ru-Si-Cl-(anti) 119.9° vs Ru–Si–Cl 109.2°],¹⁴ Cp*(PMe₃)₂-RuSiPh₂H [Ru-Si-H(anti) 112.9° vs Ru-Si-Ph 98.8° (av)],²⁶ Cp*(PMe₃)₂RuSiPh₂OTf [Ru-Si-OTf(anti) 118.2° vs Ru-Si-Ph 96.9° (av)],¹⁶ (C₆H₆)(PPh₃)Ru(SiX₃)₂ (SiX₃ = SiCl₃, SiMeCl₂, SiMe₃) [Ru-Si-X(anti, X = Cl, C) 125.2° (av) vs Ru-Si-X 113.4° (av)].²⁷

(14) Lemke, F. R.; Simons, R. S.; Youngs, W. J. Organometallics 1996, 15, 216-221.

- (15) Straus, D. A.; Tilley, T. D.; Rheingold, A. J.; Geib, S. J. J. Am. Chem. Soc. **1987**, 109, 5872–5873.
- (16) Grumbine, S. K.; Straus, D. A.; Tilley, T. D. Polyhedron 1995, 14, 127–148.
- (17) Kaftory, M.; Kapon, M.; Botoshansky, M. In *The Chemistry of Organic Silicon Compounds*; Rappoport, Z., Apeloig, Y., Eds.; John Wiley & Sons: New York, 1998; Vol. 2, pp 181–265.
- (18) Einstein, F. W. B.; Jones, T. Inorg. Chem. 1982, 21, 987–990.
 (19) Schubert, U.; Kraft, G.; Walther, E. Z. Anorg. Allg. Chem. 1984,
- 519, 96–106.
 (20) Asirvatham, V. S.; Yao, Z.; Klabunde, K. J. J. Am. Chem. Soc.
 1994, 116, 5493–5494.
- (21) Yao, Z.; Klabunde, K. J.; Asirvatham, A. S. *Inorg. Chem.* **1995**, *34*, 5289–5294.
- (22) Connolly, J. W.; Cowley, A. H.; Nunn, C. M. Polyhedron 1990, 9, 1337-1340.
- (23) Manojlovic-Muir, L.; Muir, K. W.; Ibers, J. A. *Inorg. Chem.* **1970**, *9*, 447–452.
- (24) Vancea, L.; Benneett, M. J.; Jones, C. E.; Smith, R. A.; Graham,
 W. A. G. *Inorg. Chem.* **1977**, *16*, 897–902.
 (25) Hübler, K.; Hunt, P. A.; Maddock, S. M.; Rickard, C. E. F.;
- (25) Hübler, K.; Hunt, P. A.; Maddock, S. M.; Rickard, C. E. F.; Roper, W. R.; Salter, D. M.; Schwerdtfeger, P.; Wright, L. J. Organometallics **1997**, *16*, 5076–5083.
- (26) Straus, D. A.; Zhang, C.; Quimbita, G. E.; Grumbine, S. D.; Heyn, R. H.; Tilley, T. D.; Rheingold, A. L.; Geib, S. J. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1990**, *112*, 2673–2681.

Organometallics, Vol. 23, No. 5, 2004 1155



Figure 5. Interaction of the Cp(PMe₃)₂Ru fragment HOMO and HOMO-1 with linear combinations of Si–X σ^* orbitals.

Changing the phosphine from PMe₃ to PMe₂Ph had structurally very little effect. The bond distances and angles around ruthenium and silicon in **1** and **2** were essentially the same; the only exception was a slight lengthening of the Ru–Si distance from 2.27 Å in **1** to 2.28 Å in **2**. This similarity in structural parameters for **1** and **2** was consistent with the little to no phosphine dependence observed in the spectroscopic properties of these complexes (Figure 1).

On the other hand, changes in the substituents on silicon had more of an effect on the bond distances and angles around ruthenium and silicon. A lengthening of the Ru–Si distance was observed when an electrone-gative Cl (Ru–Si 2.265 Å in 1) was replaced with less electronegative Me (Ru–Si 2.294 Å in 3) and Ph (Ru–Si 2.310 Å in 4) groups. This lengthening of the Ru–Si distances correlated with a decrease in ${}^2J_{SiP}$ for 1, 3, and 4 (Figure 1, top). The Ru–Si distance in 4 was longer than expected probably due to the larger steric demand of SiPhCl₂ compared to SiMeCl₂.

The long Si–Cl distances in **1**–**4** (range 2.11–2.15 Å) were attributable to $d(Ru) - \sigma^*(Si - X) \pi$ -back-bonding between the Cp(PMe₃)₂Ru and SiX₃ groups. Linear combinations of the Si–X (X = Cl, Ph, Me) σ^* orbitals of the silvl group gave rise to an a_1 and e set, assuming localized C_{3v} symmetry at silicon. The HOMO and HOMO-1 of the Cp(PMe₃)₂Ru moiety²⁸⁻³⁰ had the correct symmetry to interact with the doubly degenerate e set of Si–X σ^* orbitals,^{31,32} as shown in Figure 5. The magnitude of the d(Ru)- $\sigma^*(Si-X) \pi$ -back-bonding interaction depended on the silicon substituents and followed the order $Cl \gg Ph \approx Me.^{25}$ A ramification of this d(Ru)- σ^* (Si-Cl) π -back-bonding interaction was a substantial lengthening of the Si-Cl distances compared to other group 8 trichlorosilyl complexes (range 2.04-2.09 Å).¹⁸⁻²⁵

The Si–Cl distances also exhibited a significant dependence with respect to the other substituents on silicon. The average Si–Cl distance in **1** and **2** (2.119 \pm 0.004 Å) was shorter than the average Si–Cl distance in **3** and **4** (2.147 \pm 0.009 Å). This difference in Si–Cl distances can be attributed to more electron density in the $\sigma^*(\text{Si-Cl})$ orbitals of **3** and **4** compared to the amount of electron density in the $\sigma^*(\text{Si-Cl})$ orbitals of **1** and **2**. If the amount of electron density transferred from ruthenium to silicon by the d(Ru)– $\sigma^*(\text{Si-X})$ π -backbonding interaction was constant in **1–4**, then the

(30) Arnold, F. P., Jr. Organometallics 1999, 18, 4800-4809.

(32) Orpen, A. G.; Connelly, N. G. Organometallics 1990, 9, 1206–1210.

⁽²⁷⁾ Burgio, J.; Yardy, N. M.; Petersen, J. L.; Lemke, F. R. Organometallics **2003**, *22*, 4928–4932.

⁽²⁸⁾ Kostíc, N. M.; Fenske, R. F. Organometallics 1982, 1, 974–982.
(29) Grumbine, S. K.; Tilley, T. D.; Arnold, F. P.; Rheingold, A. L. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1994, 116, 5495–5496.

⁽³¹⁾ Orpen, A. G.; Connelly, N. G. J. Chem. Soc., Chem. Commun. 1985, 1310–1311.

Si-Cl distances will depend on the number of chlorines on the silicon. Thus, **1** and **2**, with three chlorines on silicon, will have on average less electron density in $\sigma^*(Si-Cl)$ orbitals and subsequently shorter Si-Cl bonds than **3** and **4**, with only two chlorines on silicon.

Experimental Section

General Considerations. All manipulations of the ruthenium-containing compounds were conducted under an inert atmosphere of argon. The compounds were stored in an M-Braun glovebox, and reactions were carried out using highvacuum techniques.³³ ¹H NMR (250 MHz), ¹³C{¹H} NMR (62.9 MHz), and ³¹P{¹H} NMR (101.3 MHz) spectra were obtained using a Bruker 250 MHz spectrometer. ²⁹Si DEPT NMR (79.5 MHz) spectra were obtained using a Varian VXR 400S spectrometer. All NMR data were obtained in CD₂Cl₂. ¹H NMR data were referenced to the residual proton signal of the solvent at 5.32 ppm. ³¹P NMR data were externally referenced (0.00 ppm) to a sealed capillary containing H₃PO₄ (85%) in a NMR tube containing CD₂Cl₂. ¹³C NMR data were referenced to the carbon signal of the CD₂Cl₂ solvent at 53.8 ppm. ²⁹Si NMR data were externally referenced to a CD₂Cl₂ solution of TMS at 0.00 ppm. Elemental analyses were performed by Desert Analytics (Tucson, AZ).

Materials. Cp(PMe₃)₂RuH,³⁴ Cp(PMe₂Ph)₂RuSiCl₃ (**2**),¹¹ Cp(PMePh₂)₂RuSiCl₃,¹¹ and Cp(PMe₃)₂RuSiMeCl₂ (**3**)¹⁰ were prepared according to the literature procedure. PhSiCl₃ (Gelest) was degassed and stored in the glovebox. Hexanes was distilled from K/benzophenone and stored over [Cp₂TiCl]₂ZnCl₂.³⁵ CH₂Cl₂ and CD₂Cl₂ (Cambridge Isotope Labs) were dried over

(35) Sekutowski, D. G.; Stucky, G. D. Inorg. Chem. 1975, 14, 2192–2199.

 $CaH_2.\ CH_2Cl_2,\ CD_2Cl_2,\ and\ hexanes\ were\ degassed\ and\ vacuum\ transferred\ prior\ to\ use.$

Crystals of **2** and **4** suitable for X-ray diffraction were grown by liquid diffusion of hexanes into a CH_2Cl_2 solution of the corresponding ruthenium silyl complex at -30 °C.

Preparation of Cp(PMe₃)₂RuSiPhCl₂ (4). Compound **4** was prepared by an adaptation of the literature method.¹⁰ In a typical reaction, PhSiCl₃ (0.75 equiv) was added via syringe to a solution of Cp(PMe₃)₂RuH (100 mg, 0.313 mmol) in CH₂Cl₂ (~15 mL). The reaction mixture was allowed to stir at ambient temperature for 1 h. The volume was reduced by one-half in vacuo. Hexanes were added to the flask to initiate precipitation of [Cp(PMe₃)₂RuH₂]Cl. The suspension was filtered, and the yellow filtrate was dried in vacuo to give **4** as a yellow residue (66 mg, 85%). ¹H NMR (250 MHz, CD₂Cl₂): δ 7.74 (m, 2H, SiPh), 7.33 (m, 3H, SiPh) 4.66 (s, 5H, Cp), 1.49 (fd, N = 8.7 Hz, 18H, PMe₃). ²⁹Si{¹H} NMR (79.5 MHz, CD₂Cl₂): δ 76.82 (t, $J_{PSi} = 35.8$ Hz). ³¹P{¹H} NMR (101 MHz, CD₂Cl₂): δ 10.20. Anal. Calcd for C₁₇H₂₈P₂Cl₂RuSi (**4**): C, 41.30; H, 5.71. Found: C, 41.48; H, 5.54.

Acknowledgment. F.R.L. would like to thank the Research Challenge and Condensed Matter and Surface Science programs at Ohio University, and Dow Corning Corporation for financial support. J.L.P. acknowledges the financial support provided by the Chemical Instrumentation Program of the National Science Foundation (CHE-9120098) to acquire a Siemens P4 X-ray diffractometer.

Supporting Information Available: Tables of crystal data, data collection and refinement parameters, interatomic distances, and interatomic angles for **2**, **3**, and **4**. Full crystal-lographic data in CIF format for **2**, **3**, and **4**. This material is available free of charge via the Internet at http://pubs.acs.org.

OM034226X

⁽³³⁾ Shriver, D. F.; Drezdzon, M. A. *The Manipulation of Air-Sensitive Compounds*, 2nd ed.; Wiley-Interscience: New York, 1986. (34) Lemke, F. R.; Brammer, L. *Organometallics* **1995**, *14*, 3980–3987.