a double doping of DNA by ET^+ and MV^{2+} (Figure 1).

Electron Transfer. The interaction of ET⁺ and MV²⁺ in water is indicated by the quenching of fluorescence of ET⁺ by an increasing concentration c_{MV}^{w} (Figure 2). After correcting the data for ion-ion interaction (Debye-Hückel), we obtain for the relative intensity I/I_0 a Stern-Volmer relation $I_0/I - 1 = K_Q^w c_{MV}^w$ with Intensity $1/1_0$ a Stein-volmer relation $1_0/1 = 1 - K_Q c_{MV}$ with $K_Q^w = 1.5 M^{-1}$ (Figure 2). Quenching is enhanced by NaCl (Figure 2). For infinite concentration of salt we extrapolate $K_Q^s = 27.5 M^{-1}$. We assign the quenching to electron transfer considering the redox potentials¹⁵ $E'_0(ET^{+*}/ET^{2+}) = -0.52 V_{\text{NHE}}$ (from $E'_0(ET^+/ET^{2+}) = 1.68 V_{\text{NHE}}$) and $E'_0(MV^+/MV^{2+}) = -0.44 V_{\text{NHE}}$. In fact, after flash excitation of ET⁺ we observe reduced MV⁺. The maximal rate constant with salt is $k_{el}^s = 1.6 V_{el}^{-1} M^{-1} e^{-1}$ considering $K_e^{-s} = k_e^{-s} e^{-s}$ with a lifetime $\pi_{el}^{-s} = 0.42 V_{el}^{-1}$. × 10¹⁰ M⁻¹ s⁻¹, considering $K_Q^s = k_{el}^s \tau_{ET}^s$ with a lifetime $\tau_{ET}^s =$ 1.7 ns.

With ET⁺ bound to DNA ($\nu_{ET} = 0.02/bp$), its fluorescence is quenched by MV²⁺ most efficiently (Figure 2). At low concentration we obtain a Stern-Volmer relation with $K_Q^{\text{DNA}} = 7.6 \times$ 10⁵ M⁻¹. The DNA matrix enhances the yield of electron transfer by a factor $K_Q^{\text{DNA}}/K_Q^{\text{w}} = 507\,000$. Saturation is observed around $I_0/I = 10$ above $c_{\text{MV}}^{\text{w}} = 10^{-5}$ M.

Five contributions may be responsible for the dramatic effect: (i) enhanced lifetime of ET^{+*} , (ii) reduced repulsion of approaching reactands, (iii) enhanced interfacial concentration c_{MV} , (iv) restriction of diffusion, and (v) modulation of electron transfer. With $\tau_{\text{ET}}^{\text{DNA}} = 20$ ns the first effect contributes a factor of $\tau_{\text{ET}}^{\text{DNA}}/\tau_{\text{ET}}^{s} = 12$. The factor of vanishing repulsion is indicated by the salt effect $K_Q^s/K_Q^w = 18$. Accumulation is estimated as $c_{MV}{}^i/c_{MV}^w = 2.2 \times 10^5$. (From $c_{MV}{}^i = \nu_{MV}/V_i$ with an interfacial volume $V_i = \pi (2r_Hw_i + w_i^2)h_{pp} = 1.34 \text{ nm}^3/\text{bp}$, with helix radius $r_{\rm H} = 1$ nm, width of interfacial shell $w_{\rm i} = 0.5$ nm, and height of base pair $h_{\rm bp} = 0.34 \text{ nm/bp}$, considering $\nu_{\rm MV} = \bar{\nu}_{\rm MV} K_{\rm MV} c_{\rm MV}^{\rm w}$ at low concentration). Thus the cumulative effect of the contributions i-iii could be 100 times larger than the enhancement actually observed. The discrepancy may indicate a slowing down of electron transfer itself (diffusion or reaction).

We restrict a mechanistic interpretation to a sketch of two limiting aspects, diffusion control at low occupation and reaction control near saturation. Diffusion control: In the limit of low occupation we describe fluorescence quenching by diffusion control in 1D as $I_0/I - 1 = 1.8(4D_{\rm MV}\tau_{\rm ET}{}^{\rm DNA}/\pi h_{\rm bp}{}^2)^{1/2}\nu_{\rm MV}$. (The nons-tationary term of diffusion¹⁶ dominates in 1D.) Comparison with the data by using $\nu_{MV} = \bar{\nu}_{MV} K_{MV} c_{MV}^{w}$ yields a diffusion coefficient $D_{MV} = 2.5 \times 10^{-7} \text{ cm}^2/\text{s}$. The mobility of MV^{2+} along the double helix appears to be restricted. Reaction control: In the limit of saturation we consider electron transfer between localized reactands in the nonadiabatic limit with $k_{el} = k_{el}^0 \exp(-E^*/kT)$ with $k_{\rm el}^{0} = V_{\rm el}^{2} (h^2 \lambda k T / 4\pi^3)^{-1/2}$ and $E^* = (1 + \Delta / \lambda)^2 (\lambda / 4)$ (interaction energy $V_{\rm el}$, Planck's constant h, drop of redox potential Δ , reorganization energy λ).¹⁷ The rate constant is obtained from $I_0/I - 1 = k_{el} \tau_{ET}^{DNA}$. From an Arrhenius plot between 5 and 40 °C we determine $k_{el}^{0} = 1.1 \times 10^{12} \text{ s}^{-1}$ with $E^* = 0.180 \text{ eV}$. With $\Delta = 0.1$ eV, the reorganization energy is $\lambda = 0.95$ eV and the interaction energy $V_{el} = 8$ meV. This large value indicates an intimate contact of donor and acceptor. Without further knowledge of the precise location of MV^{2+} and of the redox potentials in DNA, we avoid a more detailed analysis.¹

Summary. We use the double helix as a medium for an organized reaction. The well-defined matrix allows a detailed evaluation of photoinduced electron transfer between intercalated ethidium and condensed methylviologen. In preliminary timeresolved studies we have observed that the nonexponential decay of ET^{+*} occurs within 1 ns on one hand and that the lifetime of hole and electron as ET^{2+} and MV^+ is beyond 1 ms on the other hand. We proceed in the assembly of a photosynthetic reaction chain in defined sequences of DNA.

Acknowledgment. We thank Carola Kemper and Uwe Theilen for their excellent technical assistance and the Deutsche Forschungemeinschaft (Grant Fr 349/3) and the Fond der Chemischen Industrie for their generous support.

Photolysis of N-(2-Methyl-2-propenyl)phthalimide in Methanol. Evidence Supporting Radical-Radical Coupling of a Photochemically Generated Radical Ion Pair

Paul H. Mazzocchi* and Gregory Fritz

Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland 20742 Received March 3, 1986

The nature of radical cation-radical anion interactions is a topic of current interest. For photochemically generated radical ion pairs in the absence of nucleophiles the major process is usually back electron transfer or proton transfer to give a radical pair¹ (path a) although radical-radical coupling of the radical ion pair

$$\dot{A}BH + C = C\dot{C} \stackrel{\bullet}{\longrightarrow} \dot{A}B + \dot{C}CCH \stackrel{b}{\longrightarrow} \ddot{A}BCCCH$$

(path b) to a zwitterion has been suggested in several cases.² In nucleophilic solvents, such as alcohols, it is well established that the alcohol adds to the radical cation in an anti-Markovnikov manner³ to give the most stable radical which can then undergo subsequent reactions. To date there is no convincing data available to support radical-radical coupling of the radical ion pair (path b) and the conclusive demonstration that this process occurs would establish a new reaction of photochemically generated radical ion pairs.

It appeared to us that the most convincing evidence for radical-radical coupling of a photochemically generated radical ion pair would be to trap the resultant zwitterionic intermediate, most conveniently by addition to a nucleophile. To accomplish this, conditions would have to be set up to favor radical coupling over nucleophilic addition to the radical cation and an unexpected product, that which would have been formed from "Markovnikov" addition of the nucleophile to the radical cation, would have to result.



^{(1) (}a) Mattes, S. L.; Farid, S. In Organic Photochemistry; Padwa, A., Ed.; Marcel Dekker: New York, 1983; Vol. 6, pp 233-326. (b) Hub, W.; Schneider, S.; Dorr, F.; Oxman, J. D.; Lewis, F. D. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1984, 106, 708.

⁽¹⁵⁾ Clark, W. M. Oxidation Reduction Potentials of Organic Systems; Robert E. Krieger: Huntington, NY, 1972. Kittler, L.; Löber, G.; Gollmich, F. A.; Berg, H. J. Electroanal. Chem. 1980, 116, 503.

⁽¹⁶⁾ Yguerabide, J.; Dillon, M. A.; Burton, M. J. Chem. Phys. 1964, 40, 3040

⁽¹⁷⁾ Ulstrup, J.; Jortner, J. J. Chem. Phys. 1975, 63, 4358.
(18) Miller, J. R.; Peeples, J. A.; Schmitt, M. J.; Closs, G. L. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1982, 104, 6488. Guarr, T.; McGuire, M.; Strauch, S.; McLendon, G. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1983, 105, 616. Milosavljevic, B. H.; Thomas, J. K. J. Phys. Chem. 209, 820, 125. Phys. Chem. 1985, 89, 1830.

^{(2) (}a) Arnold, D. B.; Wong, P. C.; Maroulis, A. J.; Cameron, T. S. Pure Appl. Chem. 1980, 52, 2609. (b) Borg, R. M.; Arnold, D. B.; Cameron, T. S. Can. J. Chem. 1984, 62, 1785. (c) Mazzocchi, P. H.; Klingler, L. J. Am.

<sup>Chem. Soc. 1984, 106, 7567.
(3) (a) Urry, W. H.; Stacey, F. W.; Huyser, E. S.; Juveland, O. O. J Am.</sup> Chem. Soc. 1954, 76, 450.
(b) Maruyama, K.; Kubo, Y.; Machida, M.; Oda, K.; Kanaoka, Y.; Fukuyama, K.; J Org. Chem 1978, 43, 2303.
(c) Machida, M.; Oda, K.; Maruyama, K.; Kubo, Y.; Kanaoka, Y. Heterocycles 1980, 14, 720. 779

We chose N-(2-methyl-2-propenyl)phthalimide (1) as our substrate. Intramolecular electron transfer in this system should be reasonably efficient⁴ on the basis of the fact that it is known to occur in the analogous intermolecular system and the expectation that the proximity of the two radical ions should favor the desired radical coupling process through a five-membered transition state. The resultant stable tertiary cation 3 could be trapped by methanol to yield 4 which could undergo acid-catalyzed loss of water and methanol to 5.





The typical reaction of the radical cation with methanol would afford biradical 6 which would close to 7 and subsequently reopen to 8, a process which has numerous precedents.⁴

We were quite gratified when, on irradiation of 1 in methanol, we obtained 4, 5, and 8 since the formation of these products appeared to support paths c and d. We were perplexed, however, when we observed that compounds 9 and 10 were also formed along with 11.6 Although 11 arises from simple methanolysis of 1, compounds 9 and 10 correspond to the excision of a CH_2 unit from 1 and might represent a further and unwanted complication in its photochemistry.



Careful examination of the photolysis reaction by HPLC showed that 4 and 8 were the only primary photoproducts, ap-

(4) Mazzocchi, P. H.; Minamikawa, S.; Wilson, P. J. Org. Chem. 1985, 50, 2681.

(5) (a) Kanaoka, Y.; Migita, Y.; Koyama, K.; Sato, Y.; Nakai, H.; Mi-zoguchi, T. *Tetrahedron Lett.* **1973**, 1193. (b) Mazzocchi, P. H.; Minami-kawa, S.; Bowen, M. J. J. Org. Chem. **1978**, 43, 3079. (c) Mazzocchi, P. H.; Minamikawa, S.; Wilson, P. *Tetrahedron Lett.* **1978**, 4361.

Minamikawa, S.; Wilson, P. Tetrahedron Lett. 1978, 4361. (6) (a) Products were isolated by column chromatography (silica gel, ethyl acetate-hexane) followed by preparative TLC. Isolated products: 4 (5%); 8 (11%); 11 (3%); 9 (3%); 10 (2%). (b) Selected physical data. 4: IK (CHCl₃) 3460 (br), 1700 cm⁻¹; ¹H NMR (CDCl₃/Me,Si) δ 7.75 (1 H, m), 7.58 (2 H, m), 7.49 (1 H, m), 4.95 (1 H, brs), 3.82 (1 H, dd, J = 0.6, 12.6 Hz), 3.52 (1 H, d, J = 12.6 Hz), 3.42 (3 H, s), 2.57 (1 H, d, J = 13.4 Hz), 1.65 (1 H, dd, J = 0.6, 13.4), 1.43 (3 H, s). 5: mp 79–81 °C; mass spectrum $C_{12}H_9NO$, m/z found M⁺ 183; IR (CHCl₃) 3020, 1740 cm⁻¹; ¹H NMR (CDCl₃/Me₄Si) δ 7.60 (1 H, m), 7.40 (1 H, m), 7.11–7.26 (2 H, m), 6.75 (1 H, brs), 6.05 (1 H, s), 2.03 (3 H, brs). 10: IR (CHCl₃) 3440, 1750, 1665 cm⁻¹; ¹H NMR (CDCl₃/Me₄Si) δ 7.92 (1 H, m), 7.60–7.73 (3 H, m), 7.13 (1 H, brt, J = 6.5 Hz), 3.85 (1 H, dd, J = 6.5, 16.9 Hz), 3.74 (3 H, s), 3.48 (1 H, dd, J = 6.5, 16.9 Hz), 1.57 (3 H, s). 11: ¹H NMR (CDCl₃/Me₄Si) δ 7.40–7.93 (5 H, m), 4.95 (2 H, m), 4.03 (2 H, m), 300 (3 H, s), 1.85 (3 H, brs). (c) Compound 4 was unstable and readily converted to 5. (d) H, brs). (c) Compound 4 was unstable and readily converted to 5. (d) Compound 8 was characterized by alkylation (NaH, MeI, DMF) and com-parison of its N-methyl derivative with an authentic sample prepared by photochemical addition of 2-(methoxymethyl)propene to N-methylphthal-imide.⁷ (e) Compound 9 was compared to an authentic sample.⁸ (f) Compound 11 was unstable, readily closing to 1.
 (7) Mazzocchi, P. H.; Wilson, P.; Khachik, F.; Klingler, L.; Minamikawa, S. J. Org. Chem. 1983, 48, 2981.



(8) Bowen, M. Ph.D. Thesis, University of Maryland, 1977.

pearing in the early stages of the reaction along with 11 which was subsequently shown to be a thermal product in equilibrium with 1 under the reaction conditions. Compound 5 was shown to arise from 4 presumably via acid-catalyzed dehydration and demethanolysis, thus ruling out the sequence outlined below.



Since 9 and 10 are not photoproducts of 1 they must be photoproducts of 11. We suggest that the first step in this reaction is a [2+2] intramolecular photoaddition of the alkene to the ester carbonyl⁹ to give the unobserved oxetane 12 which can then lose formaldehyde to give the enol ether 10. Subsequent hydrolysis of 10 during the isolation process would give the ketone 9. It is quite possible that 8 also arises via acid-assisted methanolysis of the oxetane¹⁰ in addition to formation via path d, and we are presently conducting experiments to decide this question.



Scheme I

 $2 \xrightarrow{k_3} 3$ 2 + MeOH $\xrightarrow{k_6} 6$ $6 \xrightarrow{k_8} 8$ $3 + \text{MeOH} \xrightarrow{k_4} 4$ $\Phi_8/\Phi_4 = \frac{k_6[\text{MeOH}]}{\nu}$

Our conclusion is that 4 and 8 are the only primary photoproducts of the reaction and are generated via the mechanism outlined in Scheme I. Consistent with expectations for Scheme I a linear relationship between the Φ_8/Φ_4 ratio and methanol concentration¹¹ was observed, and the slope of the line indicates that the rate of radical-radical coupling (k_3) is an order ot magnitude greater than the rate of methanol addition to the radical cation (k_6) . Strong supporting evidence for the intermediacy of 2 was provided by a solvent effect study. If the polar intramolecular radical anion-radical cation is a true intermediate, the formation of 4 and 8 should be favored in polar solvents. In fact, when 1 was irradiated in 4 M solutions of methanol in methylene chloride, methyl acetate, and acetonitrile the relative quantum yield for the formation of 4 (and 8) increased from 1 to 1.29 to 2.18. These data, along with the formation of 8, support our

(9) (a) Neunteufel, R. A.; Arnold, D. R. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1973, 95, (a) Neutreulei, R. A., Arhold, D. R. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1973, 93, 4080.
 (b) Shigemitsu, Y.; Katsuhara, Y.; Odaira, Y. Tetrahedron Lett. 1971, 2887.
 (c) Sakuragi, H.; Tokumaru, K. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1982, 104, 6796.
 (10) (a) Shimizu, M.; Ando, R.; Kuwajima, I. J. Org. Chem. 1984, 49, 1230.
 (b) Ruotsalinen, H.; Kaakkurivaara, J.; Virtanen, P.; Olavi, I. Chem.

Abstr. 1972, 76, 71849p. (c) Petrash, S. A.; Bogatskii, A. V.; Samitov, Y. Y. Chem. Abstr. 1973, 79, 31344a. (11) Irradiations of 1 were conducted in parallel in pure methanol (24.7

M) and 18.5, 12.3, and 6.2 M methanol in acetonitrile.

contention that the excited state of 1 undergoes intramolecular electron transfer and conclusively demonstrates that the intramolecular radical ion pair must be a key intermediate to 4 and 8. These results show that radical-radical coupling of the radical ion pair (path b) occurs, establishes that this process can occur in competition with back electron transfer and proton transfer, and requires that it be considered as a possible route in other systems. We are presently searching for other examples of this process.

Acknowledgment. We thank the National Science Foundation for funds to purchase a 400-MHz NMR spectrometer under Grant DMB-84-20175.

One- and Two-Electron Photooxidation of a Molybdenum(III) Thiocyanate Complex

Qin Yao and Andrew W. Maverick*

Department of Chemistry, Washington University St. Louis, Missouri 63130 Received April 1, 1986

There has been continuing interest in the properties of excited states of transition-metal complexes and in their use as catalysts for redox reactions. However, photoredox processes have generally been confined to one-electron transfers, while many desirable redox reactions require the transfer of two or more electrons in a single substrate molecule. One-electron photoredox reactions, such as those of polypyridine complexes of chromium(III)¹ and ruthenium(II),² and multielectron redox activity in ruthenium- and osmium-based systems,³ have been investigated separately. Our goal has been to generate multielectron oxidants photochemically by beginning with d³ complexes of the early transition metals: initial excited-state electron transfer is to be followed by a second thermal electron transfer, thus producing a net two-electron transformation. In addition to our recent work with vanadium(II),4 we have been interested in the heavier d³ ions, whose photoredox properties have not been studied before. We now report facile ground- and excited-state oxidation of the hexakis(thiocyanato-N)molybdate(3-) ion, $Mo(NCS)_6^{3-}$, and the disproportionation of the initial electron-transfer product $Mo(NCS)_6^{2-}$ to generate the molybdenum(V) dimer $(SCN)_3MoO(\mu-O)_2MoO(NCS)_3^{4-}$. These observations constitute the first photoredox reactions ever recorded in a molybdenum(III) complex. They indicate not only that a broad new class of transition-metal complexes can be used as redox sensitizers but that many such systems are likely to be useful in photoinitiated net two-electron-transfer processes.

Octahedral d³ complexes have the ${}^{4}A_{2g}$ ground state and the low-lying d-d excited states ${}^{4}T_{2g}$, ${}^{2}E_{g}$, ${}^{2}T_{1g}$, and ${}^{2}T_{2g}$.¹ The phosphorescent ${}^{2}E_{g}$ excited state is long-lived if it is lower in energy than ${}^{4}T_{2g}$; for chromium(III) this occurs only with strong-field ligands such as CN⁻ and 1,10-phenanthroline. In second- and third-row metal complexes, on the other hand, all three doublets lie below ${}^{4}T_{2g}$; this has been shown recently for $MoCl_{6}^{3-}$ in the elegant absorption and emission spectroscopic study of Flint and Paulusz.⁵ A variety of molybdenum(III) complexes, then, should have excited states sufficiently long lived for photoredox reactions. We chose $Mo(NCS)_6^{3-}$ for our initial experiments because its

2.0 1.8 1.6 Mo(NCS) 1.4 Absorbance ····· Mo(NCS) 1.2 1.0 0.8 0.8 ×10⁴ 0.4 0.2 0.0 300 400 500 600 700 800 900 1000 1100 1200 1300 Wavelength/nm

Figure 1. Room-temperature electronic absorption spectra: (-) K₃- $Mo(NCS)_6$ in water (2 × 10⁻⁵ M, 200-420 nm; 0.2 M, 740-1400 nm); (---) $Mo(NCS)_6^{2-}$ in CH₃CN (2 × 10⁻⁵ M).

Table I. Half-Wave Potentials from Cyclic Voltammetry

| couple | $E_{1/2}/V^a$ | |
|---------------------------------------|---------------|--|
| Mo(NCS) ₆ ^{2-/3-} | 0.05 | |
| TCNE ^{0/-b} | -0.16 | |
| $1,4-C_6H_4(NO_2)_2^{0/-1}$ | -1.08 | |
| $1,3-C_6H_4(NO_2)_2^{0/-}$ | -1.27 | |

^a Reversible one-electron couples in CH₃CN (0.1 M $(C_4H_9)(O_3SCF_3))$, vs. Fc/Fc⁺ (Fc = ferrocene). ^bTCNE = ethenetetracarbonitrile.

spectral and redox properties had been studied before.

The weak absorption bands between 740 and 1400 nm in $Mo(NCS)_{6^{3-}}$ (Figure 1) have been assigned to the three quartet \rightarrow doublet transitions,⁶ with ${}^{4}A_{2g} \rightarrow {}^{4}T_{2g}$ probably obscured by the intense ligand-to-metal charge-transfer absorption that begins

near 400 nm.⁷ The ion has not been reported to luminesce. Sykes and co-workers showed that $IrCl_6^{2-}$ oxidizes $Mo(NCS)_6^{3-}$ to the deep red-brown molybdenum(IV) complex $Mo(NCS)_6^{2-}$, which is stable in nonaqueous solvents but disproportionates in water to give $Mo(NCS)_6^{3-}$ and a molybdenum(V) species.⁸ Thus, $Mo(NCS)_{6}^{3-}$ is subject to one-electron oxidation, and the initial molybdenum(IV) product can readily undergo a second electron transfer. We have now accomplished these one- and two-electron oxidations of $Mo(NCS)_6^{3-}$ photochemically.

Conventional flash irradiation (350-450 nm) of solutions of K₃Mo(NCS)₆·4H₂O⁸ and 1,4-dinitrobenzene in CH₃CN⁹ leads to transient absorption signals characteristic of $Mo(NCS)_6^{2-}$ (410 and 560 nm; see Figure 1).¹⁰ These absorptions decay with second-order kinetics, as expected for reaction 2 (A = 1,4-di-

$$Mo(NCS)_6^{3-} + A \xrightarrow{h\nu} Mo(NCS)_6^{2-} + A^-$$
 (1)

$$Mo(NCS)_6^{2-} + A^- \xrightarrow{\kappa_b} Mo(NCS)_6^{3-} + A$$
 (2)

nitrobenzene). Based on kinetic data, and on absorption spectral data for $Mo(NCS)_6^{2-}$ ($\epsilon_{560} = 2.6 \times 10^4 \text{ M}^{-1} \text{ cm}^{-1} n^{-1}$), k_b is approximately $8 \times 10^8 \text{ M}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}$, a reasonable value for a diffusioncontrolled reaction between two anions. Comparable experiments in acetone solution give transient-absorption signals attributable to A⁻ ($\lambda > 750 \text{ nm}^{11}$) as well as those expected for Mo(NCS)₆²⁻.

Electrochemical data for of $Mo(NCS)_6^{3-}$ and several electron acceptors are shown in Table I. Mixtures of $Mo(NCS)_6^{3-}$ and TCNE undergo slight spontaneous electron transfer; absorption spectra of the mixtures yield an equilibrium constant for the reaction $Mo(NCS)_6^{3-} + TCNE \Rightarrow Mo(NCS)_6^{2-} + TCNE^-$ of 0.0004 in CH₃CN at room temperature. This is in agreement with the half-wave potentials for the two redox couples. With

⁽¹⁾ Jamieson, M. A.; Serpone, N.; Hoffman, M. Z. Coord. Chem. Rev. 1981, 39, 121-179

⁽²⁾ Caspar, J. V.; Meyer, T. J. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1983, 105, 5583-5590.
(3) (a) Dobson, J. C.; Seok, W. K.; Meyer, T. J. Inorg. Chem. 1986, 25, 1513-1514.
(b) Gilbert, J. A.; Eggleston, D. S.; Murphy, W. R., Jr.; Geselowitz, D. A.; Gersten, S. W.; Hodgson, D. J.; Meyer, T. J. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1985, 107, 3855-3864.

 ⁽⁴⁾ Shah, S. S.; Maverick, A. W. Inorg. Chem. 1986, 25, 1867–1871.
 (5) Flint, C. D.; Paulusz, A. G. Mol. Phys. 1981, 44, 925–938. Their treatment also included the effects of spin-orbit coupling.

⁽⁶⁾ Pruchnik, F.; Wajda, S. Rocz. Chem. 1969, 43, 1379-1386.
(7) Schmidtke, H.-H. Ber. Bunsenges. Phys. Chem. 1967, 71, 1138-1145.
(8) Soares, A. B.; Taylor, R. S.; Sykes, A. G. Inorg. Chem. 1978, 17, 496-498

⁽⁹⁾ Solutions of $Mo(NCS)_6^{3-}$ and the electron acceptors are stable in the dark. We also observe no spectroscopic evidence for ground-state complex formation in these experiments.

⁽¹⁰⁾ Mitchell, P. C. H.; Williams, R. J. P. J. Chem. Soc. 1962, 4570-4578. (11) Abe, T.; Ikegami, Y. Bull. Chem. Soc. Jpn. 1978, 51, 196-200.