Synthesis of Naphthoquinone-Fused Cyclobutadiene **Ruthenium Complexes**

Yoshihiko Yamamoto,* Takayasu Arakawa, and Kenji Itoh

Department of Applied Chemistry, Graduate School of Engineering, Nagoya University, Nagoya 464-8603, Japan

Received April 12, 2004

A coordinatively unsaturated ruthenacycle, which was formed from Cp*RuCl(cod) and 1,2bis(phenylpropiolyl)benzene, was isomerized to a new sandwich complex consisting of a Cp* and a naphthoquinone-fused cyclobutadiene ligand at ambient temperature. On the other hand, the treatment of the same ruthenacycle with excess $AgBF_4$ at room temperature produced a tetramethylfulvene cyclobutadiene complex. In contrast, a cationic cyclobutadiene complex was formed from the isolated Cp*RuCl(cyclobutadiene) with excess AgBF₄.

Transition-metal-catalyzed cyclotrimerizations of alkynes have received continuous attention as a facile method to obtain aromatic molecules,¹ since the first report of Reppe and co-workers.² Especially, their intramolecular versions are synthetically useful, because they give polycyclic products chemoselectively.³ In this context, we have recently developed the ruthenium(II)catalyzed cycloaddition of 1,6-diynes with monoalkynes, affording bicyclic benzenes chemo- and regioselectively under mild conditions.⁴ We have also reported that the Ru(II)-catalyzed cycloaddition of 1,2-bis(propiolyl)benzenes furnished anthraquinone derivatives in moderate to high yields.⁵ During these studies, it was found that a ruthenium(II) precatalyst, Cp*RuCl(cod) 1 (Cp* = η^{5} -C₅Me₅), was treated with divne **2** or **5** bearing a terminal phenyl substituent to give rise to ruthenacycle complex **3** or **6**, respectively (Schemes 1 and 2).^{4b,5} The Ru(II)-catalyzed cycloaddition of the 1,6-diynes is considered to proceed via a ruthenacycle intermediate very similar to $\mathbf{3}^{4b,6}$ In fact, $\mathbf{3}$ reacted with acetylene at 40 °C to afford the expected terphenyl product 4 (Scheme 1).^{4b} In contrast, the naphthoquinone-fused analogue 6 behaved in a totally different manner under the same reaction conditions to result in the formation of a new complex. Herein, we report the formation of naphthoquinone-fused cyclobutadiene complexes from 6.

As previously reported,⁵ the treatment of $\mathbf{1}$ with 1.2 equiv of 5 in 1,2-dichloromethane (DCE) at room temperature for 0.5 h gave 6 in 79% yield as dark red crystals after recrystallization (Scheme 2). The X-ray crystallographic analysis disclosed that 6 has a naph-

⁴ Corresponding author. E-mail: yamamoto@apchem.nagoya-u.ac.jp. (1) (a) Shore, N. E. In Comprehensive Organic Synthesis, Trost, B. (1) (a) Snore, N. E. In Comprehensive Organic Synthesis, frost, B.
M., Fleming, I., Eds.; Pergamon: Oxford, 1991; Vol. 5, pp 1129-1162.
(b) Grotjahn, D. B. In Comprehensive Organometallic Chemistry II; Hegedus, L. S., Abel, E. W., Stone, F. G. A., Wilkinson, G., Eds.; Pergamon: Oxford, 1995; Vol. 12, pp 741-770.
(2) Reppe, W.; Schweckendiek, W. J. Justus Liebigs Ann. Chem. **1948**, 560, 104-116.

Scheme 1 CDCl₃ r.t., 4 days 2 1.2 equiv Ph acetylene (1 atm) Cr Rú CI CDCl₃ 40 °C, 5 days Ρh Ph 3 4 Scheme 2 Ph Ph ő DCE rt, 0.5 h CDCl₃ rt, 3 d 5 1.2 equiv 79% 83% Cn O Ru-Cl ,Cp* Ph rt Βú CI Ph Ρh Ö Ö 6 79% 7

thoquinone-fused ruthenacycle framework. The Ru-C1 and Ru-C4 bond lengths are 1.990(2) and 2.009(2) Å, which are intermediate between those of the known ruthenacyclopentatriene-type complexes I and II (1.942-(6) and 1.969(4) Å, respectively) and the ruthenacyclopentadiene phosphine complex III (2.059(5) and 2.092(4) Å) (Figure 1).⁷⁻⁹ In striking contrast to the known ruthenacyclopentatrienes, the C1-C2 and C3-C4 bonds

⁽³⁾ Saito, S.; Yamamoto, Y. Chem. Rev. 2000, 100, 2901-2915.

^{(4) (}a) Yamamoto, Y.; Ogawa, R.; Itoh, K. Chem. Commun. 2000. 549-550. (b) Yamamoto, Y.; Arakawa, T.; Itoh, K. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2003, 125, 12143-12160.

⁽⁵⁾ Yamamoto, Y.; Hata, K.; Arakawa, T.; Itoh, K. Chem. Commun. 2003. 1290-1291.

⁽⁶⁾ Kirchner, K.; Calhorda, M. J.; Schmid, R.; Veiros, L. F. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2003, 125, 11721-11729.

⁽⁷⁾ Albers, M. O.: de Waal, D. J. A.: Liles, D. C.: Robinson, D. J.: Singleton, E.; Wiege, M. B. J. Chem. Soc., Chem. Commun. 1986, 1680–1682.

⁽⁸⁾ Ernst, C.; Walter, O.; Dinjus, E. J. Prakt. Chem. 1999, 341, 801-804.

⁽⁹⁾ Yi, C. S.; Torres-Lubian, J. R.; Liu, N. Organometallics 1998, 17, 1257-1259.



Figure 1. Precedent ruthenacycle complexes bearing a Cptype ligand.



Figure 2. ORTEP diagram for 7, showing one of two crystallographically unique molecules in the unit cell. Ellipsoids are shown at the 50% probability level. All hydrogen atoms were omitted for clarity.

(1.395(3) and 1.400(3) Å, respectively) are shorter than the C2-C3 bond (1.430(3) Å). Although 6 can be considered to be a coordinatively unsaturated metallacyclopentadiene in terms of these features, the ¹³C NMR spectroscopy showed the characteristic carbene resonance of the C1 and C4 carbons at δ 263.89, as commonly observed for the previously reported ruthenacyclopentatrienes.7,8

The treatment of 6 with acetylene (1 atm) in DCE at ambient temperature gave no cycloadduct, but instead a small amount of a new product 7 was formed. In the absence of acetylene, the reaction of 1 with 5 in CDCl₃ was monitored by ¹H NMR spectroscopy. The initially formed ruthenacycle complex 6 decreased gradually and completely converted to 7 after stirring for 3 days. This behavior is in striking contrast to the rhodium analogue of 6, which reacted with monoalkynes to give anthraquinones in refluxing xylene.¹⁰ After recrystallization, 7 was isolated in 83% yield as black crystals. In its ¹H NMR spectrum, the Cp* ligand was observed as a singlet peak at δ 1.30. The absence of carbene carbons was confirmed by ¹³C NMR spectroscopy. Finally, X-ray crystallography unambiguously disclosed that 7 is a ruthenium(II) sandwich complex consisting of the Cp* and naphthoquinone-fused cyclobutadiene ligands as shown in Figure 2. The unit cell contains the two crystallographically unique molecules 7(A) and 7(B). As summarized in Table 2, no remarkable difference was found in the C–C bond lengths (1.403(11)–1.485(9) Å) of the cyclobutadiene ligand, and the Ru-C2 and Ru-C3 distances are slightly shorter than those of Ru–C1 and Ru–C4. As a result, the [Cp*RuCl] fragment is tilted toward the naphthoguinone ring. The cyclobutadiene carbons resonated at δ 94.49 and 71.52 in the ¹³C NMR spectrum.

Organometallics, Vol. 23, No. 15, 2004 3611

Table 1. Selected Bond Distances (Å) and Angles (deg) of 6 and 8

	6	8
Ru-Cl	2.3279(6)	2.365
Ru-C1	1.990(2)	1.990
Ru-C4	2.009(2)	1.990
C1-C2	1.395(3)	1.402
C2-C3	1.430(3)	1.423
C3-C4	1.400(3)	1.403
C1–Ru–C4	78.43(8)	79.960
Ru-C1-C2	118.08(15)	115.861
C1-C2-C3	113.11(19)	113.955

Table 2. Selected Bond Distances (Å) for **Cyclobutadiene Complexes 7, 9, and 13**

•		-			
	7 (A)	7 (B)	9	13 (A)	13 (B)
Ru–C1	2.289(8)	2.283(7)	2.492	2.208(7)	2.206(7)
Ru–C2	2.107(7)	2.125(8)	2.143	2.145(8)	2.114(9)
Ru–C3	2.128(7)	2.104(6)	2.095	2.141(7)	2.162(8)
Ru–C4	2.271(7)	2.230(7)	2.340	2.285(7)	2.230(7)
Ru–X	2.3840(19)	2.3839(19)	2.445	2.075(8)	2.040(8)
(Cl or N)					
C1–C2	1.485(9)	1.479(10)	1.495	1.542(10)	1.448(10)
C2-C3	1.454(9)	1.422(11)	1.456	1.371(11)	1.487(10)
C3-C4	1.469(10)	1.474(8)	1.484	1.524(10)	1.433(10)
C4-C1	1.472(10)	1.403(11)	1.437	1.495(11)	1.400(10)

The ruthenium cyclobutadiene complexes bearing a Cp or a Cp* ligand have been obtained directly from appropriate ruthenium complexes and monoalkynes.¹¹ While the intermediacy of metallacyclopentadienes in the formation of cyclobutadiene complexes from alkynes has been well documented,¹² the isomerization of the isolated ruthenacyclopentatrienes to the corresponding cyclobutadiene complexes has not been observed previously.^{4b,7,8} In contrast, the relevant naphthoquinonefused analogue 6 was slowly converted to 7 at ambient temperature. This unprecedented behavior might be attributed to its metallacycle moiety being close to a coordinatively unsaturated metallacyclopentadiene rather than a metallacyclopentatriene (see ${\bf I}$ and ${\bf II}$ in Figure 1).

On the basis of the exclusive conversion of 6 to 7, the latter was expected to be more stable than the former. To know the thermodynamic properties of these compounds, we carried out density functional studies of model complexes 8 and 9. First, their geometries were optimized at the B3LYP/LACVP* level (Figure 3). The obtained geometries were in good agreement with those of 6 and 7, respectively (Tables 1 and 2). Then, their energies were evaluated by single-point energy calculations for the obtained geometries at the B3LYP level using larger basis sets (see Experimental Section). Contrary to our expectation, it was found that the cyclobutadiene complex 9 is thermodynamically less stable than the ruthenacycle 8 by 1.63 kcal/mol. The detail of the present isomerization is not clear at this stage, but the simple reductive elimination mechanism seems unlikely. The direct transformation of a related

^{(11) (}a) Crocker, M.; Green, M.; Orpen, A. G.; Thomas, D. M. J. Chem. Soc., Chem. Commun. **1984**, 1141-1144. (b) Campion, B. K.; Heyn, R. H.; Tilley, T. D. Organometallics **1990**, *9*, 1106–1112. (c) Braun, T.; Steinert, P.; Werner, H. J. Organomet. Chem. **1995**, *488*, 169–176. (d) Gemel, C.; LaPensée, A.; Mauthner, K.; Mereiter, K.; Schmid, R.; Kirchner, K. Monatsh. Chem. 1997, 128, 1189-1199. (d) Rüba, E.; Mereiter, K.; Schmid, R.; Sapunov, V. N.; Kirchner, K.; Schottenberger, H.; Calhorda, M. J.; Veiros, L. F. *Chem. Eur. J.* **2002**, 8, 3948-3961.

⁽¹⁰⁾ Müller, E. Synthesis 1974, 761-774.

⁽¹²⁾ Efraty, A. Chem. Rev. 1977, 77, 691-744.



Figure 3. DFT-optimized structures of model complexes **8** and **9**.

cobaltacyclopentadiene, CpCo(C₄H₄), into the corresponding cyclobutadiene complex was reported to be a symmetrically forbidden process due to the HOMO– LUMO crossing.¹³ Vollhardt and co-workers, therefore, proposed the cyclopropenylcarbene complex **10** as an intermediate for the interconversion between the cyclobutadiene complexes and the cobaltacyclopentadienes.^{14,15} The mechanism involving such an elusive intermediate could reasonably explain the formation of cyclobutadiene complexes from monoalkynes. However, a highly strained bicyclic species such as **11** is not conceivable for the cases involving diynes.¹⁶



The lack of the reactivity of **6** toward the cycloaddition with acetylene might be attributed to the steric crowding around the ruthenium center. To open the coordination site, we attempted chlorine ligand abstraction with a silver salt (Scheme 3). In the presence of excess 1-hexyne, **6** was treated with 4 equiv of AgBF₄ in THF at room temperature to give rise to a new product. In



Figure 4. ORTEP diagram for **13**, showing one of two crystallographically unique molecules in the unit cell. Ellipsoids are shown at the 50% probability level. All hydrogen atoms and BF_4^- were omitted for clarity.



its ¹H NMR spectrum, the singlet signal of the Cp* ligand of **6** disappeared, but instead, three singlet signals were observed at δ 3.65, 1.08, and 1.00 with the integral ratio of 1:2:2. These observations suggest that the Cp* ligand was converted to a tetramethylfulvene ligand. Its methyl and methylene carbons are assigned to signals at δ 71.8, and 7.87 and 6.79, respectively, by the ¹³C DEPT study. In addition, the sp² carbons of the cyclobutadiene and the fulvene ligands appeared at δ 105.35, 104.56, 95.90, 86.47, and 73.35 in the ¹³C NMR spectrum. Whereas a single crystal suitable for X-ray study was not obtained, these spectral data allowed us to assign **12** to a tetramethylfulvene cyclobutadiene complex. The elemental and the FAB mass analyses also supported this structural assignment.

In the absence of 1-hexyne, the yield of **12** was decreased to 19%. The role of the alkyne additive for this transformation is unclear. The formation of the fulvene ligand probably occurs prior to the formation of the cyclobutadiene, because the treatment of **7** with excess AgBF₄ gave rise to a cationic cyclobutadiene complex instead of **12** (Scheme 3). After recrystallization from CH₃CN-Et₂O, **13** bearing a coordinated acetonitrile was isolated in 37% yield. The remaining Cp* ligand was observed in its ¹H NMR spectrum as a singlet at δ 1.44. The structure of **13** was unambiguously confirmed by X-ray crystallography as shown in Figure 4.

⁽¹³⁾ Hardesty, J. H.; Koerner, J. B.; Albright, T. A.; Lee, G.-Y. J. Am. Chem. Soc. **1999**, 121, 6055–6067.

⁽¹⁴⁾ Ville, G. A.; Vollhardt, K. P. C.; Winter, M. J. Organometallics 1984, 3, 1177-1187.

⁽¹⁵⁾ For interconversion between cyclobutadiene and acetylene via cyclopropenylcarbene, see: Kollmar, H.; Carrion, F.; Dewar, M. J. S.; Bingham, R. C. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1981**, *103*, 5292–5303.

⁽¹⁶⁾ For cyclobutadiene complexes derived from cyclic diynes, see: (a) King, R. B.; Efraty, A. J. Am. Chem. Soc. **1970**, *92*, 6071–6073. (b) King, R. B.; Efraty, A. J. Am. Chem. Soc. **1972**, *94*, 3021–3025. (c) Gleiter, R.; Merger, R.; Nuber, B. J. Am. Chem. Soc. **1992**, *114*, 8921– 8927. (d) Gleiter, R.; Merger, R.; Irngartinger, H.; Nuber, B. J. Org. Chem. **1993**, *58*, 2025–2028. (e) Gleiter, R.; Merger, R.; Treptow, B.; Witter, W.; Pflästerer, G. Synthesis **1993**, 558–560.

In conclusion, we found that the coordinatively unsaturated ruthenacycle **6**, which was formed from Cp*RuCl(cod) and the diketodiyne **5**, was isomerized to the naphthoquinone-fused cyclobutadiene complex **7** at ambient temperature. On the other hand, the treatment of **6** with excess $AgBF_4$ at room temperature produced the tetramethylfulvene cyclobutadiene complex **12**. In contrast, the cationic cyclobutadiene complex **13** was formed from **7** upon treatment with $AgBF_4$ at room temperature.

Experimental Section

General Considerations. ¹H and ¹³C NMR spectra were obtained for samples in CDCl₃ solution. Flash chromatography was performed with a silica gel column (Merck Silica gel 60) eluted with mixed solvents (hexane/AcOEt). Elemental analyses were performed by the Microanalytical Center of Kyoto University. Melting points were obtained in sealed capillary tubes and are uncorrected. 1,2-Dichloroethane was distilled from CaH₂ and degassed. RuCl₃·*x*H₂O was purchased from N. E. Chemcat Corporation. Cp*RuCl(cod) was obtained according to the literature procedures.¹⁶ 1,2-Bis(phenylpropiolyl)benzene **5** was reported in the literature.¹⁷

Synthesis of Ruthenacycle 6. To a solution of Cp*RuCl-(cod) (130.2 mg, 0.343 mmol) in degassed 1,2-dichloroethane (1 mL) was added a solution of a diketodiyne 5 (140.2 mg, 0.419 mmol) in degassed 1,2-dichloroethane (3 mL) at 0 °C. The solution was further stirred at room temperature for 30 min. The solution was concentrated in vacuo, and the residue was recrystallized from CHCl₃/ether to afford 6·CHCl₃ (196.3 mg, 78.9%) as dark red crystals: mp 178.5-178.9 °C; IR (CHCl₃) 1656 cm⁻¹; ¹H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 1.03 (s, 15 H), 7.01 (d, J = 7.2 Hz, 4 H), 7.20 (t, J = 7.2 Hz, 4 H), 7.46 (tt, J = 7.5, 1.5 Hz, 2 H), 7.64 (dd, J = 6.0, 3.3 Hz, 2 H), 8.05 (dd, J = 6.0, 3.3 Hz, 2 H); 13 C NMR (75 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 10.20, 108.45, 125.63, 127.04, 127.07, 127.62, 133.19, 133.71, 148.59, 155.67, 178.28, 263.89; MS (FAB) m/z (%): 606 (39) [M⁺], 571 (100) [M⁺ - Cl]. Anal. Calcd (%) for C₃₅H₃₀Cl₄O₂Ru (725.49): C, 57.94; H, 4.17. Found: C, 58.07; H, 4.15.

Synthesis of Cyclobutadiene Complex 7. To a solution of Cp*RuCl(cod) (376.9 mg, 0.993 mmol) in degassed CDCl₃ (1 mL) was added a solution of diketodiyne **5** (410.0 mg, 1.23 mmol) in degassed CDCl₃ (4 mL) at 0 °C. The solution was further stirred at room temperature for 3 days. The solution was concentrated in vacuo, and the residue was recrystallized from CHCl₃/ether to afford **7**·CHCl₃ (601.8 mg, 83.5%) as black crystals: mp 221.3–222.2 °C; IR (CHCl₃) 1654 cm⁻¹; ¹H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 1.30 (s, 15 H), 7.30–7.40 (m, 6 H), 7.61 (dd, J = 6.0, 3.6 Hz, 2 H), 7.81 (dd, J = 8.1, 1.8 Hz, 4 H), 8.04 (dd, J = 6.0, 3.6 Hz, 2 H); ¹³C NMR (75 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 8.91, 71.52, 94.49, 101.77, 126.15, 127.85, 128.83, 129.96, 130.45, 132.81, 134.87, 183.81; MS (FAB) *m*/*z* (%) 606 (84) [M⁺], 571 (100) [M⁺ - Cl]. Anal. Calcd (%) for C₃₅H₃₀Cl₄O₂Ru (725.49): C, 57.94; H, 4.17. Found: C, 57.93; H, 4.18.

Synthesis of Tetramethylfulvene Complex 12. To a solution of AgBF₄ (67.5 mg, 0.347 mmol) and 1-hexyne (79.9 mg, 0.973 mmol) in degassed THF (5 mL) was added a solution of **6**·CHCl₃ (66.5 mg, 0.0917 mmol) in degassed THF (35 mL) at room temperature. The solution was further stirred at room temperature overnight. The solution was concentrated in vacuo, and the residue was purified by silica gel flash column chromatography (hexane/AcOEt, 7:1) to give **12** (17.8 mg, 34.1%) as red solids: mp 190.8–191.3 °C; IR (CHCl₃) 1638 cm⁻¹; ¹H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 1.00 (s, 6 H), 1.08 (s, 6 H), 3.65 (s, 2 H), 7.17–7.22 (m, 2 H), 7.33 (t, J = 7.2 Hz, 4 H), 7.48 (dd, J = 5.7, 3.3 Hz, 2 H), 7.70 (d, J = 7.2 Hz, 4 H), 7.96

Table 3.	Crystal Data and Structure Refinement
	for 7·CHCl ₃ and 13·CH ₃ CN

	$7 \cdot CHCl_3$	13 •CH ₃ CN
empirical formula	C70H60Cl8O4Ru2	C ₇₆ H ₇₀ B ₂ F ₈ N ₄ O ₄ Ru ₂
fw	1450.92	1479.12
cryst syst	triclinic	triclinic
space group	<i>P</i> 1	<i>P</i> 1
unit cell dimens		
<i>a</i> (Å)	9.63035(5)	9.8491(9)
b (Å)	10.0871(5)	12.1189(11)
c (Å)	17.2611(9)	14.7018(14)
α (deg)	104.3550(10)	99.005(2)
β (deg)	93.7220(10)	100.104(2)
γ (deg)	106.2240(10)	102.127(2)
volume (Å ³)	1539.12(14)	1654.6(3)
Z	1	1
density(calcd)	25.046	22.266
(Mg/m^3)		
absorp coeff (mm ⁻¹)	14.217	8.006
F(000)	11776	11340
cryst size (mm)	$0.1\times0.4\times0.8$	0.1 imes 0.5 imes 0.6
index ranges	$-6 \le h \le 13$,	$-13 \le h \le 13$,
C	$-13 \leq k \leq 13$,	$-16 \leq k \leq 13$,
	$-23 \le l \le 23$	$-20 \leq l \leq 14$
no. of reflns collected	12 208	12 987
no. of indep reflns	9790 [0.0199]	10 443 [0.0244]
[R(int)]		
no. of data/restraints/	9790/3/767	10 443/3/879
params		
goodness-of-fit on F ²	1.094	1.070
final <i>R</i> indices	$R_1 = 0.0302$	$R_1 = 0.0367$
$[I > 2\sigma(I)]^a$	$wR_2 = 0.0818$	$wR_2 = 0.0979$
R indices (all data) ^a	$R_1 = 0.0323.$	$R_1 = 0.0392$
	$wR_2 = 0.0879$	$wR_2 = 0.1005$
largest diff peak and	0.809 and -0.996	1.361 and -0.637
hole ($e \cdot A^{-3}$)		

^a $R_1 = \sum |(F_0 - F_c)| / \sum (F_0)$. $wR = \sum [(w(F_0 - F_c)^2)] / \sum (wF_0^2)^{1/2}$.

(dd, J = 5.7, 3.3 Hz, 2 H); ¹³C NMR (75 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 6.79 (CH₃), 7.87 (CH₃), 71.82 (CH₂), 73.35, 86.47, 95.90, 104.56, 105.35, 125.30, 126.66, 127.21, 128.10, 131.59, 134.20, 134.87, 180.60; MS (FAB) *m*/*z* (%) 570 (100) [MH⁺]. Anal. Calcd (%) for C₃₄H₂₈Cl₄O₂Ru (569.65): C, 71.69; H, 4.95. Found: C, 71.66; H, 4.98.

Synthesis of Cationic Cyclobutadiene Complex 13. To a solution of AgBF₄ (180.7 mg, 0.928 mmol) in degassed THF (5 mL) was added a solution of 7·CHCl₃ (142.2 mg, 0.196 mmol) in degassed THF (35 mL) at room temperature. The solution was further stirred at room temperature overnight. The solution was concentrated in vacuo, and the residue was recrystallized from CH₃CN/ether to afford 13·CH₃CN (53.9 mg, 37.2%) as black crystals: mp 201.9-202.5 °C; IR (CHCl₃) 2349, 2273, 1663 cm⁻¹; ¹H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 1.44 (s, 15 H), 2.07 (s, 3 H), 2.16 (s, 3 H), 7.45-7.48 (m, 6 H), 7.70-7.76 (m, 6 H), 8.07 (dd, J = 5.7, 3.3 Hz, 2 H); ¹³C NMR (75 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 2.10, 4.25, 8.62, 73.39, 96.52, 104.15, 126.59, 127.76, 128.89, 129.94, 130.34, 132.17, 133.59, 134.08, 181.92; MS (FAB) m/z (%) 612 (19) [M⁺], 571 (100) [M⁺ - CH₃CN]. Anal. Calcd (%) for C₃₈H₃₅BF₄N₂O₂Ru (739.57): C, 61.71; H, 4.77; N, 3.79. Found: C, 61.96; H, 4.89; N, 3.42.

Crystallographic Structural Determination of 7· **CHCl₃ and 13·CH₃CN.** Single crystals of 7·CHCl₃ and **13·**CH₃CN suitable for X-ray analysis were obtained by recrystallization from CHCl₃/ether and CH₃CN/ether, respectively. Single crystals were mounted on a quartz fiber, and diffraction data were collected in the *θ* range of 1.23–29.15° for 7·CHCl₃ and 1.44–29.19° for **13·**CH₃CN at 173 K on a Brucker SMART APEX CCD diffractometer with graphitemonochromated Mo Kα radiation ($\lambda = 0.71073$ Å). An absorption correction was made using SADABS. The structure was solved by direct methods and refined by full-matrix least squares on *F*² by using SHELXTL. All non-hydrogen atoms were refined with anisotropic displacement parameters. All

⁽¹⁷⁾ Oshima, N.; Suzuki, H.; Moro-oka, Y. Chem. Lett. 1984, 1161–1164.

hydrogen atoms were placed in calculated positions. Final refinement details are compiled in Table 3.

Computational Methods. The Q-chem 2.0 program¹⁹ in the Spartan '02 software package²⁰ was used for geometry optimizations, and the single-point energy calculations for the obtained geometries were performed with the Gaussian 98 program package.²¹ All geometries of intermediates and transition states were fully optimized at the B3LYP²²/LACVP* level of theory. The LACVP* basis set uses a double- ζ basis set with the relativistic effective core potential of Hay and

Cuengbo, G.; Sauerbier, M.; Segnitz, A.; Stretchuss, D.; Hiomas, R. Liebigs Am. Chem. 1971, 754, 64–89.
(19) Kong, J.; White, C. A.; Krylov, A. I.; Sherrill, D.; Adamson, R. D.; Furlani, T. R.; Lee, M. S.; Lee, A. M.; Gwaltney, S. R.; Adams, T. R.; Ochsenfeld, C.; Gilbert, A. T. B.; Kedziora, G. S.; Rassolov, V. A.; Maurice, D. R.; Nair, N.; Shao, Y.; Besley, N. A.; Maslen, P. E.; Dombroski, J. P.; Daschel, H.; Zhang, W.; Korambath, P. P.; Baker, J.; Byrd, E. F. C.; Voorhis, T. V.; Oumi, M.; Hirata, S.; Hsu, C.-P.; Ishikawa, N.; Florian, J.; Warshel, A.; Johnson, B. G.; Gill, P. M. W.; Head-Gordon, M.; Pople, J. A. J. Comput. Chem. 2000, 21, 1532–1548.

Head-Gordon, M., Fopie, S. A. J. Computer Cham. Lett., Invine, CA, 2002.
(20) Spartan '02, version 1.0.2; Wavefunction, Inc.: Irvine, CA, 2002.
(21) Frisch, M. J.; Trucks, G. W.; Schlegel, H. B.; Scuseria, G. E.;
Robb, M. A.; Cheeseman, J. R.; Zakrzewski, V. G.; Montgomery, J. A.,
Jr.; Stratmann, R. E.; Burant, J. C.; Dapprich, S.; Millam, J. M.;
Daniels, A. D.; Kudin, K. N.; Strain, M. C.; Farkas, O.; Tomasi, J.;
Barone, V.; Cossi, M.; Cammi, R.; Mennucci, B.; Pomelli, C.; Adamo,
C.; Clifford, S.; Ochterski, J.; Petersson, G. A.; Ayala, P. Y.; Cui, Q.;
Morokuma, K.; Salvador, P.; Dannenberg, J. J.; Malick, D. K.; Rabuck,
A. D.; Raghavachari, K.; Foresman, J. B.; Cioslowski, J.; Ortiz, J. V.;
Baboul, A. G.; Stefanov, B. B.; Liu, G.; Liashenko, A.: Piskorz, P.;
Komaromi, I.; Gomperts, R.; Martin, R. L.; Fox, D. J.; Keith, T.; Al-Laham, M. A.; Peng, C. Y.; Nanayakkara, A.; Challacombe, M.; Gill,
P. M. W.; Johnson, B.; Chen, W.; Wong, M. W.; Andres, J. L.; Gonzalez,
C.; Head-Gordon, M.; Replogle, E. S.; Pople, J. A. Gaussian 98, revision
A. 11; Gaussian, Inc.: Pittsburgh, PA, 2001.
(22) (a) Kohn, W.; Becke, A. D.; Parr, R. G. J. Phys. Chem. 1996.

(22) (a) Kohn, W.; Becke, A. D.; Parr, R. G. J. Phys. Chem. 1996, 100, 12974–12980. (b) Stephen, P. J.; Devlin, F. J.; Chabalowski, C. F.; Frisch, M. J. Phys. Chem. Lett. 1994, 98, 11623–11627. (c) Becke, A. D. J. Chem. Phys. 1993, 98, 5648–5652. (d) Becke, A. D. Phys. Rev. A 1988, 38, 3098–3100. (e) Lee, C.; Yang, W.; Parr, R. G. Phys. Rev. B 1988, 37, 785–789.

Wadt (LanL2 ECP)²³ for Ru and the 6-31G(d) basis sets²⁴ for other elements. The vibrational frequencies and zero-point energy (ZPE) were calculated at the same level of theory. The obtained structures were characterized by the number of imaginary frequencies (one or zero for transition or ground states, respectively). Visual inspection of imaginary vibrational modes was also performed with the Spartan '02 software package. The energy calculations were performed at the B3LYP level using the basis sets consisting of a [6s5p3d2f1g] contracted valence basis set with the Stuttgart–Dresden– Bonn energy-consistent pseudopotential²⁵ for Ru and the 6-311++G(d,p) basis sets²⁶ for other elements.

The supplementary crystallographic data for this paper [CCDC 235937 (7·CHCl₃) and CCDC 235938 (**13**·CH₃CN)] can be obtained free of charge via www.ccdc.cam.ac.uk/conts/ retrieving.html (or from the Cambridge Crystallographic Data Centre, 12, Union Road, Cambridge CB2 1EZ, UK; fax: +44 1223 336033; or deposit@ccdc.cam.ac.uk).

Acknowledgment. We gratefully acknowledge financial support (14750677) from the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology, Japan.

Supporting Information Available: CIF files for **7**· CHCl₃ and **13**·CH₃CN. This material is available free of charge via the Internet at http://pubs.acs.org.

OM049732G

(23) Hay, P. J.; Wadt, W. R. J. Chem. Phys. 1985, 82, 299-310.
(24) (a) Hehre, W. J.; Ditchfield, R.; Pople, J. A. J. Chem. Phys. 1972, 56, 2257-2261. (b) Hariharan, P. C.; Pople, J. A. Ther. Chim. Acta 1973, 28, 213-222. (c) Francl M. M.; Pietro, W. J.; Hehre, W. J.; Binkley, J. S.; Gordon, M. S.; DeFrees, D. J.; Pople, J. A. J. Chem. Phys. 1982, 77, 3654-3665.

Phys. 1982, 77, 3654–3665.
(25) (a) Andrae, D.; Häussermann, U.; Dolg, M.; Stoll, H.; Preuss,
H. Theor. Chim. Acta 1990, 77, 123–141. (b) Martin, J. M. L.;
Sundermann, A. J. Chem. Phys. 2001, 114, 3408–3420.

(26) (a) Krishnan, R.; Binkley, J. S.; Seeger, R.; Pople, J. A. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1980**, *72*, 650–654. (b) Clark, T.; Chandrasekhar, J.; Schleyer, P. v. R. *J. Comput. Chem.* **1983**, *4*, 294–301.

⁽¹⁸⁾ Müller, E.; Beissner, C.; Jäkle, H.; Langer, E.; Muhn, H.; Odenigbo, G.; Sauerbier, M.; Segnitz, A.; Streichfuss, D.; Thomas, R. *Liebigs Ann. Chem.* **1971**, *754*, 64–89.