

**Ruthenium Carbonyl 1,4-Diaza-1,3-butadiene (R-DAB)
Complexes.¹ Reactivity of Ru₃(CO)₉(R-DAB) toward
Diazomethane. Addition of a Methylene Fragment to a
Trinuclear Species with Concomitant Rupture of a Single Ru-Ru
Bond. Molecular Structure of
Octacarbonyl(1,4-dineopentyl-1,4-diaza-1,3-butadiene)-
(μ -methylene)triruthenium: (μ -CH₂)Ru₃(CO)₈(neo-Pen-DAB)**

Jan Keijsper, Louis H. Polm, Gerard van Koten, and Kees Vrieze*

*Anorganisch Chemisch Laboratorium, J.H. van't Hoff Instituut, University of Amsterdam, Nieuwe Achtergracht
166, 1018 WV Amsterdam, The Netherlands*

Kees Goubitz and Casper H. Stam

*Laboratorium voor Kristallografie, J.H. van't Hoff Instituut, Universiteit van Amsterdam, Nieuwe Achtergracht
166, 1018 WV Amsterdam, The Netherlands*

Received December 27, 1984

Ru₃(CO)₉(R-DAB) (R = neo-Pen, i-Bu; R-DAB = 1,4-disubstituted 1,4-diaza-1,3-butadiene; RN=CHCH=NR)² reacts with ethereal diazomethane at room temperature to yield the novel addition product (μ -CH₂)Ru₃(CO)₈(R-DAB). During the reaction one single Ru-Ru bond is broken while the eight-electron-coordination mode of the diimine ligand is unaffected. This is shown by an X-ray crystal structure determination for the R = neo-Pen derivative. Crystals of (μ -CH₂)Ru₃(CO)₈(neo-Pen-DAB) are monoclinic of space group P2₁/n with cell constants $a = 13.819$ (2) Å, $b = 21.339$ (2) Å, $c = 9.485$ (1) Å, $\beta = 108.22$ (1)°, and $Z = 4$. A total of 3159 reflections have been used in the refinement resulting in a final R value of 0.026 ($R_w = 0.040$). Electronically, this species can be considered as a 50-electron trinuclear complex accordingly having only two Ru-Ru bonds: Ru(1)-Ru(2) = 2.8690 (6) and Ru(1)-Ru(3) = 2.9079 (6) Å. The third Ru(2)···Ru(3) distance of 3.1021 (6) Å is considered as a nonbonding distance and is asymmetrically bridged by the methylene moiety: Ru(2)-C(17) = 2.048 (5) and Ru(3)-C(17) = 2.204 (6) Å, which is a rather unique feature. The Ru(2)-Ru(1)-Ru(3)-CC(17) moiety has a butterfly geometry with a dihedral angle of 143.1°. All carbonyls are terminally bonded: two to Ru(1) and Ru(2) each and four to Ru(3). The neo-Pen-DAB ligand is σ -N, σ -N' bonded to Ru(2) with equal Ru(2)-N bond lengths of 2.16 (1) Å. Besides, both imine bonds are η^2 -coordinated to Ru(1) as evidenced by the observation that all four atoms of the N(1)=C(1)-C(2)=N(2) part are located at about equal distance (2.21 (2) Å) from Ru(1). Likewise, the three equal bond lengths within the diimine part (1.38 (1) Å) are consistent with an eight-electron σ -N, σ -N', η^2 -C=N, η^2 -C'=N' bonding mode. The complexes have been further characterized by IR, FD-mass, ¹H NMR, and ¹³C NMR spectroscopy. The carbene's chemical shifts are 3.7 (¹H NMR) and 32.5 ppm (¹³C NMR), which is in line with the absence of a direct Ru(2)-Ru(3) interaction. The two halves of the R-DAB ligand are magnetically equivalent, indicating that in solution the "flying" motion of the Ru(2)-Ru(1)-Ru(3)-C(17) butterfly is fast on the NMR time scale.

Introduction

Multisite bonded R-DAB ligands² (R-DAB = RN=CHCH=NR = 1,4-disubstituted 1,4-diaza-1,3-butadiene) can exhibit strong activation, resulting in C-C,³ C-H,⁴ N-C,⁵ or N-H⁶ bond formation. The synthesis of polynuclear R-DAB complexes, in which such multisite bonding

may occur because of possible involvement of the π -electrons in the coordination,⁷ therefore is of great interest. One of the possibilities to obtain polynuclear R-DAB species is the reaction of polynuclear metal carbonyls with R-DAB. During the last 5 years we have gained much insight in the Ru₃(CO)₁₂/R-DAB reaction sequence and several reactive intermediates have been isolated. Attention is now especially focused on the study of the reactivity of these intermediates. It has been found that, e.g., Ru₂(CO)_{*n*}(R-DAB) ($n = 5, 6$) reacts with several ligands L (L = R-DAB, sulfine, carbodiimide, acetylene, and ketene) to yield R-DAB-L coupled products.³ Another promising intermediate, i.e., Ru₃(CO)₈(R-DAB), reacts quickly and reversibly with CO to yield the 50-electron trinuclear compound Ru₃(CO)₉(R-DAB) (see Figure 1).^{8a}

(1) Part 8: for earlier parts see ref 3a-c and 8.

(2) For a recent review on R-DAB chemistry: van Koten, G.; Vrieze, K. *Adv. Organomet. Chem.* **1982**, *21*, 151. In this review the nomenclature for the ligands is also explained.

(3) (a) Staal, L. H.; Polm, L. H.; Balk, R. W.; van Koten, G.; Vrieze, K.; Brouwers, A. M. F. *Inorg. Chem.* **1980**, *19*, 3343. (b) Staal, L. H.; van Koten, G.; Vrieze, K.; van Santen, B.; Stam, C. H. *Inorg. Chem.* **1981**, *20*, 3598. (c) Keijsper, J.; Polm, L. H.; van Koten, G.; Vrieze, K.; Abbel, G.; Stam, C. H. *Inorg. Chem.* **1984**, *23*, 2142. (d) Keijsper, J.; Polm, L. H.; van Koten, G.; Vrieze, K.; Stam, C. H.; Schagen, J. D. *Inorg. Chim. Acta*, submitted for publication.

(4) Keijsper, J.; Grimberg, P.; van Koten, G.; Vrieze, K.; Christopherson, M.; Stam, C. H. *Inorg. Chim. Acta* **1985**, *102*, 29.

(5) Polm, L. H.; van Koten, G.; Vrieze, K.; Stam, C. H.; van Tunen, W. C. J. *J. Chem. Soc. Chem. Commun.* **1983**, 1177.

(6) Keijsper, J.; Mul, J.; van Koten, G.; Vrieze, K.; Ubbels, H. C.; Stam, C. H. *Organometallics* **1984**, *3*, 1732.

(7) See, e.g., ref 2, 3a, and 6.

(8) (a) Keijsper, J.; Polm, L. H.; van Koten, G.; Vrieze, K.; Seignette, F. F. A. B.; Stam, C. H. *Inorg. Chem.* **1985**, *24*, 518. (b) Staal, L. H.; van Koten, G.; Vrieze, K.; Ploeger, F.; Stam, C. H. *Inorg. Chem.* **1981**, *20*, 1830. (c) Staal, L. H.; Polm, L. H.; van Koten, G.; Vrieze, K.; Ploeger, F.; Stam, C. H. *Inorg. Chem.* **1981**, *20*, 3590.




Figure 1. The reversible reaction of CO with $\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_8(\text{R-DAB})$ showing the schematic structures of the Ru_3 species and the empty coordination site on Ru(2).

This reaction is accompanied with a green to red color change and may occur because of the gap in the coordination sphere of Ru(2), trans to the Ru(3)(CO)₄ unit (see Figure 1). Surprisingly, no metal-metal nor a metal-ligand bond is broken during the CO addition but instead the Ru(2)-Ru(*n*) (*n* = 1, 3) and Ru(2)-C(O) bonds are weakened.^{8a} It has been argued that this may happen because the extra electron density is moved to an antibonding orbital, mainly localized on Ru(2). The availability of the empty coordination site on Ru(2) to which other ligands L can be bonded, in combination with the proximity of the multisite bonded R-DAB ligand may lead to novel types of interaction between R-DAB and L. We therefore are extensively studying the chemistry of $\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_8(\text{R-DAB})$, and it is already been found that $\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_8(\text{R-DAB})$ reacts with acetylenes, allenes, phosphines, and molecular hydrogen.⁹

Recently, the formal two-electron-donating carbene ligand has drawn much attention because it may play an important intermediate role in FT synthesis and alkyne polymerization.¹⁰ Analogous C-C coupling to that occurring during FT synthesis¹¹ as well as C-C coupling between a CH₂ fragment and CO or alkyne¹² has been observed. Recently, Herrmann has extensively reviewed the novel structural and chemical features of methylene-bridged complexes.¹³

We were interested to find out (i) if a methylene unit could add to $\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_8(\text{R-DAB})$ and (ii) if so, whether it may react further with the activated R-DAB ligand. Therefore, we have carried out the reaction of $\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_8(\text{R-DAB})$ with diazomethane, which method is generally the most direct way to obtain a methylene complex,¹³ and the results of this reaction are described in this paper.

Experimental Section

Materials and Apparatus. NMR spectra were obtained on a Bruker WM250 (¹H) and a Bruker WP80 (¹³C) apparatus. IR spectra were recorded with a Perkin Elmer 283 spectrophotometer. mass spectra were obtained with a Varian MAT 711 mass spectrometer, applying field desorption technique. Elemental analyses were obtained from the elemental analysis section of the Institute for Applied Chemistry, TNO, Utrecht, The Netherlands. All




Figure 2. The molecular geometry of $(\mu\text{-CH}_2)\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_8(\text{neo-Pen-DAB})$.

preparations were carried out in an atmosphere of purified nitrogen, using carefully dried solvents. Silica gel for column chromatography (60 mesh) was dried and activated before use. $\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_8(\text{R-DAB})$ ^{3c} and an diethyl ether solution of diazomethane¹⁴ (from KOH and *N*-methyl-*N*-nitrosourea) have been prepared according to literature procedures.

Synthesis of $(\mu\text{-CH}_2)\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_8(\text{R-DAB})$ (R = *i*-Bu, neo-Pen). $\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_8(\text{R-DAB})$ (0.33 mmol; prepared *in situ*^{3c}) was stirred in 30 mL of toluene at room temperature. Diazomethane (dissolved in diethyl ether) was slowly added until all the $\nu(\text{CO})$ IR peaks due to the starting complex had been replaced by those of the product. During the reaction, the color of the solution changed from green to yellow/green. After additional stirring for 0.5 h, the solvent was evaporated *in vacuo* at 60 °C and the residue purified by column chromatography (silica, eluent hexane). A yellow fraction was obtained which at -80 °C yielded 80% of yellow crystals. These were identified as $(\mu\text{-CH}_2)\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_8(\text{R-DAB})$ by elemental analysis, by IR, FD-mass, ¹H NMR, and ¹³C NMR spectroscopy (Table III), and by an X-ray crystal structure determination for the R = neo-Pen derivative.

Crystal Structure Determination of $(\mu\text{-CH}_2)\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_8(\text{neo-Pen-DAB})$ [$\text{C}_{21}\text{H}_{26}\text{N}_2\text{O}_8\text{Ru}_3$; Octaonyl(1,4-dineopentyl-1,4-diaza-1,3-butadiene)(μ -methylene)triruthenium]. Crystals of the title compound are monoclinic of space group $P2_1/n$. The unit cell has the following dimensions: $a = 13.819$ (2) Å, $b = 21.339$ (2) Å, $c = 9.485$ (1) Å, $\beta = 108.22$ (1)°; $Z = 4$, $V = 2656$ (3) Å³, d_{calc} = 1.84 g cm⁻³. A total of 4502 reflections ($2.5 \leq \theta \leq 65^\circ$; $-16 \leq h \leq 15$, $0 \leq k \leq 24$, $0 \leq l \leq 10$) were measured on a NONIUS CAD 4 diffractometer using graphite-monochromated Cu K α radiation. a total of 1343 reflections of the 4502 reflections were below the $2.5\sigma(I)$ level and treated as unobserved. Crystal dimensions: $0.08 \times 0.08 \times 0.16$ mm; $\mu = 143.8$ cm⁻¹. The Ru positions were found from an E Fourier obtained by means of the symbolic addition program set SIMPEL.^{15a} The remaining non-hydrogen atoms were derived from subsequent ΔF syntheses. After isotropic block-diagonal least-squares refinement ($R = 0.083$) the empirical absorption correction DIFABS^{15b} was applied. Subsequent anisotropic refinement converged to $R = 0.026$ ($R_w = 0.040$) for the 3159 reflections observed. During the final cycles the H atoms, which were located in a ΔF synthesis, were included in the refinement with isotropic temperature parameters. A weighting scheme of $w = 1/(2.7 + F_o + 0.026F_o^2)$ was employed, and an extinction correction was applied. The anomalous scat-

(9) Keijsper, J.; Polm, L. H.; Zoet, R.; van Koten, G.; Vrieze, K., *in press*.

(10) (a) Muetterties, E. L.; Stein, J. *Chem. Rev.* **1979**, *79*, 479. (b) Brady, R. C.; Pettit, R. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1980**, *102*, 6181; **1981**, *103*, 1287. (c) Dyke, A. F.; Knox, S. A. R.; Naish, P. J.; Taylor, G. E. *J. Chem. Soc., Chem. Commun.* **1980**, 803 and references therein.

(11) Laws, J. W.; Puddephat, R. *J. J. Chem. Soc., Chem. Commun.* **1984**, 116.

(12) (a) Morrison, E. D.; Steinmetz, G. R.; Geoffroy, G. L.; Fultz, W. C.; Reingold, A. L. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1983**, *105*, 4104. (b) Colborn, R. E.; Dyke, A. F.; Knox, S. A. R.; Macpherson, K. A.; Orpen, A. G. *J. Organomet. Chem.* **1982**, *239*, C15. (c) Nucciarone, D.; Taylor, N. J.; Carty, A. J. *Organometallics* **1984**, *3*, 177.

(13) Herrmann, W. A. *Adv. Organomet. Chem.* **1982**, *20*, 159.

(14) Arndt, F. "Organic Syntheses"; Wiley: New York, 1943; Coll. Vol. 2, p 165.

(15) (a) Overbeek, A. R.; Schenk, H. In "Computing in Crystallography" Schenk, H., Olthof, R., van Koningsveld, H., Bassi, G. C., Eds., Delft University Press: Delft, 1978. (b) Walker N.; Stuart, D. *Acta Crystallogr., Sect. A* **1983**, *A39*, 158. (c) Stewart, J.M.; The X-RAY system, Tech. Rep. TR 446 Computer Science Center; University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland. (d) "International Tables for Crystallography"; Kynock Press: Brimingham, 1974; Vol. IV. (e) Motherwell, S.; Clegg, B. "Pluto, Program for Plotting Molecular and Crystal Structures"; University of Cambridge: England, 1978.

Table I. The Final Atomic Coordinates (Esd) of $(\mu\text{-CH}_2)\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_8(\text{neo-Pen-DAB})$


atoms	x	y	z	atoms	x	y	z
Ru(1)	0.27583 (3)	0.15987 (2)	0.23603 (5)	C(18)	0.1719 (5)	0.1375 (3)	-0.1254 (6)
Ru(2)	0.10654 (3)	0.12365 (2)	0.33202 (4)	C(19)	0.1128 (4)	0.0540 (2)	-0.0461 (6)
Ru(3)	0.08474 (3)	0.14212 (2)	-0.00088 (4)	C(20)	-0.0470 (5)	0.1277 (2)	-0.1450 (6)
O(13)	0.3230 (4)	0.2663 (2)	0.0617 (6)	C(21)	0.0766 (4)	0.2323 (3)	-0.0250 (7)
O(14)	0.4031 (4)	0.0772 (2)	0.1051 (6)	H(11)	0.398 (4)	0.129 (2)	0.516 (6)
O(15)	-0.0079 (3)	0.0017 (2)	0.2783 (5)	H(21)	0.336 (4)	0.234 (2)	0.485 (6)
O(16)	-0.0003 (4)	0.1384 (2)	0.5567 (6)	H(31)	0.255 (4)	0.005 (3)	0.352 (6)
O(18)	0.2225 (4)	0.1365 (2)	-0.2009 (5)	H(32)	0.370 (4)	0.032 (3)	0.400 (6)
O(19)	0.1327 (3)	0.0026 (2)	0.0597 (5)	H(51)	0.312 (4)	-0.094 (3)	0.478 (6)
O(20)	-0.1258 (3)	0.1192 (-)	-0.2260 (5)	H(52)	0.417 (4)	-0.065 (3)	0.515 (6)
O(21)	0.0679 (4)	0.2852 (2)	-0.0416 (6)	H(53)	0.374 (4)	-0.095 (3)	0.638 (6)
N(1)	0.2638 (3)	0.0938 (2)	0.4144 (5)	H(61)	0.464 (4)	0.029 (3)	0.684 (6)
N(2)	0.1970 (3)	0.2083 (2)	0.3750 (5)	H(62)	0.366 (4)	0.069 (2)	0.707 (6)
C(1)	0.3346 (4)	0.1399 (2)	0.4734 (6)	H(63)	0.404 (4)	0.005 (3)	0.805 (6)
C(2)	0.2989 (4)	0.2004 (2)	0.4570 (6)	H(71)	0.222 (4)	-0.036 (3)	0.710 (6)
C(3)	0.3044 (4)	0.0289 (2)	0.4252 (6)	H(72)	0.188 (4)	0.031 (3)	0.618 (6)
C(4)	0.3170 (4)	-0.0070 (3)	0.5684 (7)	H(73)	0.174 (4)	-0.036 (3)	0.517 (6)
C(5)	0.3595 (6)	-0.0711 (3)	0.5484 (8)	H(81)	0.114 (4)	0.277 (3)	0.246 (6)
C(6)	0.3931 (5)	0.0260 (3)	0.7017 (7)	H(82)	0.234 (4)	0.300 (3)	0.352 (6)
C(7)	0.2165 (5)	-0.0149 (3)	0.5994 (8)	H(101)	0.101 (4)	0.388 (3)	0.339 (6)
C(8)	0.1672 (4)	0.2754 (2)	0.3467 (7)	H(102)	0.216 (4)	0.391 (3)	0.464 (6)
C(9)	0.1302 (5)	0.3099 (3)	0.4629 (8)	H(103)	0.122 (4)	0.403 (3)	0.508 (6)
C(10)	0.1423 (7)	0.3795 (3)	0.4392 (11)	H(111)	-0.034 (4)	0.316 (3)	0.340 (6)
C(11)	0.0207 (7)	0.299 (4)	0.4417 (13)	H(112)	-0.001 (4)	0.251 (3)	0.457 (6)
C(12)	0.1955 (7)	0.2947 (4)	0.6183 (9)	H(113)	-0.007 (4)	0.319 (3)	0.505 (6)
C(13)	0.3026 (4)	0.2268 (3)	0.1266 (7)	H(121)	0.148 (4)	0.304 (3)	0.676 (6)
C(14)	0.3546 (4)	0.1090 (3)	0.1550 (6)	H(122)	0.264 (4)	0.310 (3)	0.675 (6)
C(15)	0.0385 (4)	0.0476 (2)	0.2965 (6)	H(123)	0.198 (4)	0.245 (3)	0.624 (6)
C(16)	0.0426 (4)	0.1334 (3)	0.4711 (6)	H(171)	-0.054 (4)	0.140 (3)	0.114 (6)
C(17)	-0.0044 (4)	0.1588 (2)	0.1519 (6)	H(172)	-0.022 (4)	0.198 (3)	0.155 (6)

tering of Ru was taken into account. The programs were taken from the XRAY 76 system,¹⁵ unless otherwise stated. The scattering factors, dispersion correction, absorption coefficients^{15d} and the program for plotting^{15e} were taken from the literature.

The molecular geometry of $(\mu\text{-CH}_2)\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_8(\text{neo-Pen-DAB})$ with the numbering of the atoms is shown in Figure 2, which is a PLUTO^{15e} drawing of the molecule. Atomic parameters, bond lengths, and selected bond angles are given in Tables I and II. All bond angles, anisotropic thermal parameters, and a list of observed and calculated structure factors are included with the supplementary material.

Results

Formation of $(\mu\text{-CH}_2)\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_8(\text{R-DAB})$. $\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_8(\text{R-DAB})$ (R = neo-Pe, i-Bu) reacts with diazomethane according to eq 1. The addition of the methylene



unit occurs smoothly and produces the methylenetri-ruthenium complex in high yield at room temperature, i.e., without any noticeable decomposition of the trinuclear metal carbonyl. Reaction of $\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_8(\text{R-DAB})$ with the much less reactive diphenyldiazomethane¹⁶ did not lead to a carbene complex, and instead only slow decomposition was observed.

The methylene complex is soluble in hexane and relatively stable as compared to the starting complex.

Molecular Geometry of $(\mu\text{-CH}_2)\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_8(\text{neo-Pen-DAB})$. The molecular geometry of $(\mu\text{-CH}_2)\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_8(\text{neo-Pen-DAB})$ is depicted in Figure 2. In Tables I and II the atomic coordinates and selected bond distances and angles are given.

The addition of the two-electron-donating methylene group to the 48-electron $\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_8(\text{neo-Pen-DAB})$ complex results in a rupture of one single Ru-Ru bond: Ru(2)---Ru(3) amounts to 3.1012 (6) Å, which can be considered as a nonbonding distance. In the starting complex⁹ the analogous Ru-Ru bond distance is 2.768 (1) Å while in Ru complexes in which the methylene bridge is supported by a Ru-Ru bond, this bonding distance is ca. 2.67 Å.¹³ We know of only one other Ru complex that contains a methylene group bridging a nonbonding Ru---Ru distance; in fact, in $[(\eta^5\text{-C}_5\text{H}_5)\text{Ru}(\text{CO})_2]_2(\mu\text{-CH}_2)$, having a Ru---Ru separation of 3.8 Å, it is the CH_2 group that holds together the two Ru centers.¹⁷ The other two Ru-Ru bond lengths in $(\mu\text{-CH}_2)\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_8(\text{neo-Pen-DAB})$ can be envisaged as normal single bond lengths (Ru(1)-Ru(2) = 2.8690 (6) Å, Ru(1)-Ru(3) = 2.9079 (6) Å) which are comparable with the single bond lengths found in $\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_{12}$ (2.854 (3) Å (mean)).¹⁸ With the exception of a few examples,^{8a} such a rupture of a bond (in the present case a metal-metal bond) can be expected when a two-electron donor is added to a 48-electron trinuclear species.¹⁹

All eight carbonyls in $(\mu\text{-CH}_2)\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_8(\text{neo-Pen-DAB})$ are terminally bonded: two to Ru(1) and Ru(2) each and four to Ru(3), all with normal Ru-C and C-O bond lengths and Ru-C-O bond angles. Ru(3) is approximately octahedrally surrounded by C(17), C(18), C(19), C(20), C(21), and Ru(2) (see Table II).

The Ru(1)-Ru(2) bond is bridged by the neo-Pen-DAB ligand, which is bonded to Ru(2) via N(1) and N(2) with equal bond lengths of 2.162 (4) Å (mean). The four central

(17) Lin, Y. C.; Calabrese, J. C.; Wreford, S. S. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 1983, 105, 1679.

(18) Churchill, M. R.; Hollander, F. J.; Hutchinson, J. P. *Inorg. Chem.* 1977, 16, 2655.

(19) See, e.g.: Chisholm, M. H.; Rothwell, I. P. *Prog. Inorg. Chem.* 1982, 29, 1. See also ref 13, p 179.

(16) See, e.g., ref 13, p 180.

Table II. Selected Geometric Parameters (Esd) of $(\mu\text{-CH}_2)\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_8(\text{neo-Pen-DAB})$

Bond Lengths (Å)			
Metal Carbonyl Part			
Ru(1)–Ru(2)	2.8690 (6)	Ru(3)–C(21)	1.937 (6)
Ru(2)–Ru(3) ^a	3.1021 (6)	C(13)–O(13)	1.133 (8)
Ru(1)–Bu(3)	2.9079 (6)	C(14)–O(14)	1.156 (9)
Ru(1)–C(13)	1.868 (6)	C(15)–O(15)	1.154 (7)
Ru(1)–C(14)	1.864 (6)	C(16)–O(16)	1.149 (9)
Ru(2)–C(15)	1.853 (5)	C(18)–O(18)	1.147 (9)
Ru(2)–C(16)	1.814 (7)	C(19)–O(19)	1.128 (6)
Ru(3)–C(18)	1.936 (7)	C(20)–O(20)	1.134 (7)
Ru(3)–C(19)	1.944 (5)	C(21)–O(21)	1.140 (7)
Ru(3)–C(20)	1.929 (5)		
Metal-neo-Pen-DAB Part			
Ru(1)–N(1)	2.249 (4)	N(2)–C(8)	1.492 (6)
Ru(1)–N(2)	2.215 (5)	C(3)–C(4)	1.520 (8)
Ru(1)–C(1)	2.183 (5)	C(4)–C(5)	1.526 (9)
Ru(1)–C(2)	2.197 (6)	C(4)–C(6)	1.539 (8)
Ru(2)–N(1)	2.163 (4)	C(4)–C(7)	1.517 (10)
Ru(2)–N(2)	2.161 (4)	C(8)–C(9)	1.540 (10)
N(1)–C(1)	1.377 (6)	C(9)–C(10)	1.521 (9)
C(1)–C(2)	1.373 (7)	C(9)–C(11)	1.496 (12)
N(2)–C(2)	1.391 (6)	C(9)–C(12)	1.504 (10)
N(1)–C(3)	1.486 (7)		
Metal Carbene Part			
Ru(2)–C(17)	2.048 (5)	Ru(3)–C(17)	2.204 (6)
Bond Angles (deg)			
Metal Carbonyl Part			
Ru(2)–Ru(1)–Ru(3)	64.95 (2)	Ru–C–O(mean) ^b	177.0 (20)
Metal Carbene Part			
Ru(i)–C(17)–Ru(3)	93.6 (2)	H(171)–C(17)–H(172)	109.3 (55)
Around Ru(1)			
Ru(2)–Ru(1)–N(1)	48.1 (1)	N(1)–Ru(1)–C(2)	63.4 (2)
Ru(2)–Ru(1)–N(2)	48.2 (1)	N(1)–Ru(1)–C(13)	166.2 (2)
Ru(2)–Ru(1)–C(1)	72.4 (1)	N(1)–Ru(1)–C(14)	97.8 (2)
Ru(2)–Ru(1)–C(2)	72.1 (1)	N(2)–Ru(1)–C(1)	64.5 (2)
Ru(2)–Ru(1)–C(13)	134.8 (2)	N(2)–Ru(1)–C(2)	36.8 (2)
Ru(2)–Ru(1)–C(14)	127.8 (2)	N(2)–Ru(1)–C(13)	101.2 (2)
Ru(3)–Ru(1)–N(1)	103.7 (1)	N(2)–Ru(1)–C(14)	167.8 (2)
Ru(3)–Ru(1)–N(2)	91.4 (1)	C(1)–Ru(1)–C(2)	36.5 (2)
Ru(3)–Ru(1)–C(1)	136.6 (1)	C(1)–Ru(1)–C(13)	130.4 (2)
Ru(3)–Ru(1)–C(2)	127.9 (1)	C(1)–Ru(1)–C(14)	103.6 (2)
Ru(3)–Ru(1)–C(13)	87.7 (2)	C(2)–Ru(1)–C(13)	103.5 (2)
Ru(3)–Ru(1)–C(14)	96.4 (1)	C(2)–Ru(1)–C(14)	133.9 (2)
N(1)–Ru(1)–N(2)	71.2 (2)	C(13)–Ru(1)–C(14)	88.5 (3)
N(1)–Ru(1)–C(1)	36.2 (2)		
Around Ru(2)			
Ru(1)–Ru(2)–N(1)	50.8 (1)	N(1)–Ru(2)–C(17)	144.6 (2)
Ru(1)–Ru(2)–N(2)	49.8 (1)	N(2)–Ru(2)–C(15)	175.4 (2)
Ru(1)–Ru(2)–C(15)	126.6 (2)	N(2)–Ru(2)–C(16)	98.7 (2)
Ru(1)–Ru(2)–C(16)	146.1 (2)	N(2)–Ru(2)–C(17)	195.1 (2)
Ru(1)–Ru(2)–C(17)	96.2 (2)	C(15)–Ru(2)–C(16)	84.2 (3)
N(1)–Ru(2)–N(2)	73.8 (1)	C(15)–Ru(2)–C(17)	87.9 (2)
N(1)–Ru(2)–C(15)	101.7 (2)	C(16)–Ru(2)–C(17)	99.0 (2)
N(1)–Ru(2)–C(16)	115.7 (2)		
Around Ru(3)			
Ru(1)–Ru(3)–C(17)	91.7 (1)	C(17)–Ru(3)–C(21)	83.9 (2)
Ru(1)–Ru(3)–C(18)	83.7 (2)	C(18)–Ru(3)–C(19)	88.5 (3)
Ru(1)–Ru(3)–C(19)	83.2 (1)	C(18)–Ru(3)–C(20)	100.9 (3)
Ru(1)–Ru(3)–C(20)	175.0 (2)	C(18)–Ru(3)–C(21)	90.1 (3)
Ru(1)–Ru(3)–C(21)	88.1 (1)	C(19)–Ru(3)–C(20)	94.9 (2)
C(17)–Ru(3)–C(18)	172.6 (2)	C(19)–Ru(3)–C(21)	171.3 (2)
C(17)–Ru(3)–C(19)	96.8 (2)	C(20)–Ru(3)–C(21)	93.9 (2)
C(17)–Ru(3)–C(20)	83.9 (2)		
Metal-neo-Pen-DAB Part			
Ru(1)–N(1)–Ru(2)	81.1 (1)	Ru(2)–N(2)–C(2)	115.5 (3)
Ru(1)–N(2)–Ru(2)	82.0 (1)	Ru(2)–N(1)–C(3)	128.0 (3)
Ru(2)–N(1)–C(1)	116.2 (3)	Ru(2)–N(2)–C(8)	131.1 (3)
The neo-Pen-DAB Part			
N(1)–C(1)–C(2)	116.3 (4)	C(2)–N(2)–C(8)	113.0 (4)
N(2)–C(2)–C(1)	116.2 (4)	N(1)–C(3)–C(4)	117.8 (5)
C(1)–N(1)–C(3)	115.7 (4)	N(2)–C(8)–C(9)	117.7 (5)
C–C–C(<i>t</i> -Bu)	109.5 (20)		
(mean) ^b			

^a Nonbonding distance. ^b The standard deviation of the mean value is calculated by $\sigma = \{\sum_i(x_i - \bar{x})^2 / (N - 1)\}^{1/2}$.




Figure 3. A view on the molecule showing its butterfly-like geometry and the two inequivalent halves of the α -diimine ligand.

atoms of the α -diimine ligand are located at about equal distance (2.21 (2) Å (mean)) from Ru(1). These geometries indicate that the neo-Pen-DAB ligand is σ -N, σ -N' coordinated to Ru(2) and η^2 -C=N, η^2 -C'=N' coordinated to Ru(1), thus donating its maximum of eight electrons to the metal carbonyl core,^{3c,8} just as in the starting complex.^{3c,9} The equal intraligand N(1)–C(1), N(2)–C(2), and C(1)–C(2) bond lengths of 1.38 (1) Å (mean) also point to an eight-electron-coordination. In free *c*-Hex-DAB the corresponding imine and central C–C bond lengths are 1.258 (3) and 1.457 (3) Å, respectively.²⁰ Obviously, π -backbonding from the metal carbonyl into the LUMO of the α -diimine extensively weakens the imine bonds in the present compound. The central C(1)–C(2) bond is strengthened because the LUMO has bonding character between these atoms.²⁰

The dihedral angle between the flat N(1)C(1)C(2)N(2) skeleton (maximum deviation from the least-squares plane being 0.017 Å) and N(1)Ru(2)N(2) is 12.0°, which is a normal value for an eight-electron-bonded R-DAB complex.^{3c,8} The α -diimine plane, which in the starting compound $\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_8(\text{neo-Pen-DAB})$ is about perpendicular to the Ru_3 plane, makes in the present compound an angle of 82.0° with the Ru triangle obviously because of the presence of the $\mu\text{-CH}_2$ unit (vide infra; see also Figure 3). The central C(1)–C(2) bond remains perpendicular (89.6°) to the Ru(1)–Ru(2) vector.

Surprisingly the methylene moiety C(17)H₂ asymmetrically bridges the nonbonding Ru(2)–Ru(3) distance: Ru(2)–C(17) = 2.048 (5) Å; Ru(3)–C(17) = 2.204 (6) Å. Such a large difference in bond lengths has, to our knowledge, never been observed before in homonuclear methylene complexes. Ru–Ru bond-assisted methylene bridges exhibit Ru–C bond lengths between 1.98 and 2.10 Å¹³ while the Ru–C bond lengths in $[(\eta^5\text{-C}_5\text{H}_5)\text{Ru}(\text{CO})_2]_2(\mu\text{-CH}_2)$ are 2.18 Å.¹⁷

The methylene carbon atom C(17) is not in one plane with the three Ru atoms. The dihedral angle between Ru(2)C(17)Ru(3) and the Ru_3 plane is 143.1° (see Figure 3). The "internal" angle Ru(2)–C(17)–Ru(3) of 93.6 (2)° is outside the range of $81 \pm 7^\circ$ given by Herrmann for $\text{M-CH}_2\text{-M}$ systems, again pointing to the absence of a direct metal–metal bond. In other carbene complexes in which such a metal–metal bond is missing, M–C–M angles are found between 88.9 (4) and 123°. It has been noted that this angle corresponds with the M–M distance present.¹³ The "external" angle H(171)C(17)H(172) of

(20) Keijsper, J.; van der Poel, H.; Polm, L. H.; van Koten, G.; Vrieze, K.; Seignette, P. F. A. B.; Varenhorst, R.; Stam, C. H. *Polyhedron* 1983, 2, 1111.

Table III. Spectroscopic Data of $(\mu\text{-CH}_2)\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_8(\text{R-DAB})$

compd	IR $\nu(\text{CO})$ freq ^a	¹ H NMR δ^b	¹³ C NMR δ^b	FD-mass ^c
R =	2085 (s), 2025 (s), 2013 (vs), 1997 (s), 1998 (s), 1942 (s), 1930 (s)	6.26 (ns, 1 H, imine H), 3.66 (s, 1 H, $\mu\text{-CH}_2$), 2.67 (d, 1 H, NCH ₂)/1.70 (d, 1 H, NCH ₂), 0.97 (s, 9 H, CH ₃)	102.9 (imine C), 71.0 (NCH ₂), 47.9 (CMe ₃), 33.4 ($\mu\text{-CH}_2$), 28.7 (CH ₃)	739 (727.7)
R = <i>i</i> -Bu	2085 (s), 2025 (m), 2010 (vs), 1997 (sh), 1989 (s), 1945 (s), 1930 (s)	6.16 ns, 1 H, imine H), 3.73 ns, 1 H, $\mu\text{-CH}_2$), 2.70 (d, 1 H, NCH ₂)/1.66 (m, 1 H, NCH ₂), 1.87 (m, 1 H, CH), 0.90 (d, 3 H, CH ₃)/0.84 (d, 3 H, CH ₃)	101.8 (imine C), 67.5 (NCH ₂), 48.7 (CH), 31.7 ($\mu\text{-CH}_2$), 20.0 (CH ₃)/19.6 (CH ₃)	711 (709.6)

^a Measured in hexane solution; in cm^{-1} . ^b Measured in CDCl_3 solution. The chemical shifts are given in ppm, relative to Me_4Si (multiplicity, integral, assignment). Vertical bars separate diastereotopic pairs. s = singlet; d = doublet; m = multiplet. ^c Observed (calculated). The highest peak of the isotope pattern of the molecular ion is given; calculated M values are based on ¹⁰¹Ru. ^e $J = 12$ Hz. ^f $J = 6$ Hz.

109.3(55) in the present complex is within the range given by Herrmann.¹³

IR Spectroscopy. $\nu(\text{CO})$ Region. The new $(\mu\text{-CH}_2)\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_8(\text{R-DAB})$ complexes have a characteristic $\nu(\text{CO})$ absorption spectrum (see Table III). The spectra show seven intense peaks in the terminal region only, i.e., between 2085 and 1930 cm^{-1} .

FD-Mass Spectroscopy. The complexes have also been characterized by field-desorption (FD) mass spectroscopy (see Table III). The spectra show a typical Ru_3 isotopic pattern around the m/z value of the molecular ion. No peaks due to $[\text{M} - \text{CO}]^+$ species are observed.

¹H NMR Spectroscopy. The ¹H NMR data are listed in Table III and are similar over the whole temperature range studied (-20 to $+40$ °C). The asymmetry that is present in the solid-state structure (vide supra) is not apparent from these data. Both the R-DAB ligand and the methylene fragment give rise to one symmetrical pattern. Obviously, in solution a fast (on the NMR time scale) flying motion of the butterfly $\text{Ru}(2)\text{-C}(17)\text{-Ru}(3)\text{-Ru}(1)$ is present, thereby creating a virtual mirror plane through these four atoms. In the tetranuclear cluster $\text{Ru}_4(\text{CO})_8(\text{R-DAB})_2$, in which the four metal atoms likewise define a butterfly, an identical flying motion has been proposed to account for the symmetrical chemical shift patterns observed.^{3c,8c}

The two imine protons give rise to one singlet at about 6.2 ppm, indicating an eight-electron-coordination mode for the α -diimine ligand,^{3c,8} just as found in the solid-state structure.

The methylene protons appear at 3.7 ppm, which agrees fairly well with the 1–3 ppm region, given by Herrmann for the ¹H NMR chemical shifts of $\mu\text{-C}(\text{H})\text{R}$ moieties that are unsupported by a metal–metal bond.^{13,21} In the latter type of compounds chemical shifts have recently been reported at 3.5 ppm for $[\text{Pt}_2\text{-}\mu\text{-}\{o\text{-C}_6\text{H}_4\text{P}(\text{Ph})\text{-CH}_2\text{CH}_2\text{PPh}_2\}_2(\mu\text{-CH}_2)]^{22}$ and at 3.77 ppm for $(\eta^5\text{-C}_5\text{Me}_5)_2\text{Mo}_2(\text{CO})_4(\mu\text{-CH}_2)(\text{CH}_2\text{N}_2)$.²³ When an additional metal–metal bond is present, the $\mu\text{-C}(\text{H})\text{R}$ proton appears in between 5 and 11 ppm.¹³

¹³C NMR Spectroscopy. The ¹³C NMR data are also listed in Table III. Again the two halves of the molecule are magnetically equivalent as a result of the “flying” motion of the $\text{Ru}(2)\text{-C}(17)\text{-Ru}(3)\text{-Ru}(1)$ butterfly. The imine carbon atoms give rise to one signal near 100 ppm while the two neo-Pen groupings give rise to one single neo-Pen pattern at the expected chemical shift positions. The methylene carbon is observed at ca. 32 ppm, which is at a slightly lower field than the 0–10 ppm region, given

by Herrmann for bridging carbene atoms in species in which no supporting metal–metal bond is present.¹³ However, this range may be too small because chemical shifts as low as 46 ppm ($[\text{Pt}_2\text{-}\mu\text{-}\{o\text{-C}_6\text{H}_4\text{P}(\text{Ph})\text{-CH}_2\text{CH}_2\text{PPh}_2\}_2(\mu\text{-CH}_2)]^{22}$ and 64 ppm ($(\eta^5\text{-C}_5\text{Me}_5)_2\text{Mo}_2(\text{CO})_4(\mu\text{-CH}_2)(\text{CH}_2\text{N}_2)$)²³ have recently been reported. It must be noted that in case a supporting metal–metal bond is present, the $\mu\text{-C}$ atom resonates between 100 and 210 ppm.¹³

The ¹³C NMR data of the present compounds are the first examples of such data for eight-electron-bonded R-DAB derivatives. Accordingly, it is now possible to derive the nature of the coordination mode present in new R-DAB complexes not only from the ¹H NMR chemical shifts of the imine protons^{2,3,8} but also from the ¹³C NMR pattern for the imine carbons. Thus these imine C atoms in free R-DAB resonate at ca. 160 ppm, and this position hardly changes when the ligand is four electron $\sigma\text{-N}$, $\sigma\text{-N}'$ coordinated.²⁴ When R-DAB is six-electron $\sigma\text{-N}$, $\mu\text{-N}'$, $\eta^2\text{-C}=\text{N}'$ bonded, the two imine halves are magnetically inequivalent and accordingly the two C atoms have different chemical shifts. The one of $\sigma\text{-N}$ -coordinated part resonates at ca. 170 ppm, while the one which is $\eta^2\text{-C}=\text{N}'$ -coordinated is drastically shifted upfield to about 70 ppm.²⁴ This upfield shift is the result of shielding caused by π -back-donation from the metal to the ligand. In symmetrically eight-electron $\sigma\text{-N}$, $\sigma\text{-N}'$, $\eta^2\text{-C}=\text{N}'$ bonded R-DAB complexes, two imine C atoms are equivalent again and give rise to only one peak at about 100 ppm.²⁵

Discussion

Formation of the Complexes. The present reaction can be viewed as an addition (or insertion) of a CH_2 moiety to (into) a single Ru–Ru bond. Carbene addition to multiple metal–metal bonds has been extensively studied by Herrmann et al.,¹³ but addition to single bonds is less well documented. In the latter case this is because in the resulting species a supporting metal–metal bond, which generally stabilizes the $\text{M}(\mu\text{-CH}_2)\text{M}'$ interaction, is absent. The best known examples of products in which a methylene fragment has inserted into a single metal–metal bond are the so-called A-frame Pt dimers.^{22,26} In these complexes the two Pt centers are held together by the bridging methylene group and by a bridging diphos ligand. Only one example is known in which the two metals are held together by the $\mu\text{-CH}_2$ bridge only: i.e., $[(\eta^5\text{-C}_5\text{H}_5)\text{Ru}$

(24) Staal, L. H.; Keijsper, J.; Polm, L. H.; Vrieze, K. *J. Organomet. Chem.* **1981**, *204*, 101.

(25) In $\text{Mn}_2(\text{CO})_6(t\text{-Bu-DAB})$, containing also an eight-electron-bonded α -diimine ligand, the ¹³C NMR chemical shift of the imine carbon atoms is 103.4 ppm. Keijsper, J.; van Koten, G.; Vrieze, K., *Organometallics*, accepted for publication.

(26) (a) Brown, M. P.; Fisher, J. R.; Puddephatt, R. J.; Seddon, K. R. *Inorg. Chem.* **1979**, *18*, 2808. (b) Muralidharan, S.; Espenson, J. H. *Ibid.* **1983**, *22*, 2786. (c) Azam, K. A.; Frew, A. A.; Lloyd, B. R.; Muir, L. M.; Muir, K. W.; Puddephatt, R. J. *J. Chem. Soc., Chem. Commun.* **1982**, 614.

(21) In $[(\eta^5\text{-C}_5\text{H}_5)\text{Ru}(\text{CO})_2]_2(\mu\text{-CH}_2)$ the methylene protons give chemical shifts at 2.3 ppm.¹⁷

(22) Arnold, D. P.; Bennett, M. A.; McLaughlin, G. M.; Robertson, G. B. *J. Chem. Soc., Chem. Commun.* **1983**, 34.

(23) Herrmann, W. A.; Bell, L. K. *J. Organomet. Chem.* **1982**, *239*, C4.

(CO)₂(μ-CH₂).¹⁷ Also in the present complex the Ru(2)(μ-CH₂)Ru(3) unit is stabilized by the presence of a bridging group, i.e., the Ru(1) center, while the whole cluster itself gains additional stability from the bridging eight-electron-donating R-DAB.

Reaction Sequence. A prerequisite²⁷ for a reaction of a complex with diazoalkanes to occur seems to be the generation of a coordinatively unsaturated species. Electron-precise Ru₃(CO)₈(R-DAB) indeed can react like an unsaturated species because of the presence of an empty coordination site on Ru(2). This has already been shown in the reaction with CO (see Introduction; Figure 1). The reaction of Ru₃(CO)₈(R-DAB) with CH₂N₂ may start with metal-induced N₂ elimination from CH₂N₂ with concomitant addition of the CH₂ group to the Ru(2) atom. The resulting product is likely to be very unstable because of the presence of the terminal methylene group. A stable product is finally obtained, not through an intramolecular attack of the terminal CH₂ group on the α-diimine function, as we had anticipated, but via a small rearrangement reaction, yielding the bridging methylene derivative. Interestingly, the CH₂ bridge is a very asymmetric one which until now have never been observed in homonuclear complexes. This may have importance in view of the possible electron-balancing capability of the ligand which may be analogous to that of the carbonyl group.

Another possible, stepwise reaction route involves the intermediate formation of a diazomethane derivative, followed by N₂ elimination and formation of the product. Recently, several diazomethane complexes have been reported containing either a μ-N-bridging diazomethane group^{23,28} or a M—N=N—CH₂—M' metallacycle.²⁹ In some instances these products react further to yield methylene derivatives. In the present case, however, this latter reaction sequence seems to be less likely because diphenyldiazomethane, which is indeed a much less reactive carbene precursor than diazomethane, does not react at

all with Ru₃(CO)₈(R-DAB) although complexation seems to be possible.

Conclusions

Reaction of Ru₃(CO)₈(R-DAB) with CH₂N₂ yields the addition product (μ-CH₂)Ru₃(CO)₈(R-DAB) that may gain its stability from the formation of the asymmetrical methylene bridge and from the presence of the strongly bridging, eight-electron-donating R-DAB ligand. No reaction between the CH₂ function and the α-diimine function has been observed.

There seems to be a wide range of possible two-electron-donor ligand addition reactions to Ru₃(CO)₈(R-DAB) which establishes that through the empty coordination site on Ru(2) (see Figure 1) this 48-electron cluster reacts like an unsaturated species. This two-electron donation results in distinct bond breaking of a Ru—Ru bond (this report) or in overall bond weakening of Ru—Ru and Ru—C(OO) bonds.^{8a}

In general the ¹³C NMR chemical shift values of the imine C atoms of R-DAB appear to be a good assignment criterion for the bonding mode of the ligand: i, four-electron coordination, one peak at ca. 160 ppm (±20); ii, six-electron coordination, two peaks, one at ca. 175 ppm (±20) and one at ca. 70 ppm (±20); iii, eight-electron coordination, one peak at ca. 100 ppm.

Acknowledgment. We thank Mr. Heijdenrijk for collecting the X-ray data, Mr. R. Bregman for recording the mass-spectra, and Mr. J. M. Ernsting for recording the 250-MHz NMR spectra. We thank the Netherland Foundation for Chemical Research (SON) and the Netherland Organization for pure Research (ZWO) for their financial support.

Registry No. (±-CH₂)Ru₃(CO)₈(neo-Pen-DAB), 97374-14-6; (μ-CH₂)Ru₃(CO)₈(i-Bu-DAB), 97374-15-7; Ru₃(CO)₈(neo-Pen-DAB), 78199-28-7; Ru₃(CO)₈(i-Bu-DAB), 78199-27-6; CH₂N₂, 334-88-3; Ru, 7440-18-8.

Supplementary Material Available: Listings of observed and calculated structure factors, final anisotropic thermal parameters, all geometric data, and analytical data (% C, H, and N) (28 pages). Ordering information is given on any current masthead page.

(27) Herrmann, W. A. *Pure Appl. Chem.* **1982**, *54*, 65.

(28) Clauss, A. D.; Shapley, J. R.; Wilson, S. R. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1981**, *105* 7387.

(29) See, e.g., ref 13 (p 176) and references therein.