

Dichlorophenyl Derivatives of La@C_{3v}(7)-C₈₂: Endohedral Metal Induced Localization of Pyramidalization and Spin on a Triple-Hexagon Junction**

Takeshi Akasaka,* Xing Lu, Hidenori Kuga, Hidefumi Nikawa, Naomi Mizorogi, Zdenek Slanina, Takahiro Tsuchiya, Kenji Yoza, and Shigeru Nagase*

Endohedral metallofullerenes (EMFs), that is, fullerenes with metal atom(s) inside, continue to attract broad interest from the scientific community because of their unique structures, fascinating properties, and potential applications in biomedicine, electronics, photovoltaics, and materials science.^[1]

Although C₆₀ and C₇₀ are the most abundant empty fullerenes, when Smalley and co-workers performed the first toluene extraction of La EMFs in 1991, they surprisingly found that La@C₈₂ is the most accessible EMF in solution.^[2] Thus, 82 has been viewed as a magic number for EMFs, and La@C₈₂ is a prototypical EMF. Electron paramagnetic resonance spectroscopy and HPLC studies revealed that two isomers of La@C₈₂ exist in solution.^[3] Theoretical calculations predicted that La@C_{2v}(9)-C₈₂ and La@C_s(6)-C₈₂ are the two most likely candidates,^[4] and this was soon confirmed by ¹³C NMR data of the anions of La@C₈₂,^[5] as well as X-ray structures of several derivatives of La@C_{2v}(9)-C₈₂.^[6]

It is expected that other C₈₂ isomers can also be found, because as many as nine possible isomers of C₈₂ satisfy the isolated-pentagon rule (IPR).^[7] However, two cages [C_{2v}(9) and C_s(6)] are exclusively found for M@C₈₂ with trivalent M (M = Y, Ce, Pr, Gd, etc.).^[8,9] Only when the type of encapsulated metal species is changed can other C₈₂ cages be formed, because the number of electrons transferred from metal to cage differs. A divalent metal (e.g., Yb) tends to

template the C₂(5)-C₈₂ cage along with the C_{2v}(9)-C₈₂ and C_s(6)-C₈₂ isomers because they are the most stable for C₈₂.^{2–4,10]} When encapsulating two metal atoms or a bimetallic cluster, the C_{3v}(8)-C₈₂ cage is generated; sometimes the C_{2v}(9)-C₈₂ and C_s(6)-C₈₂ cages are also formed. Representative examples are M₂C₂@C₈₂ (M = Sc, Y, or Er)^[11] and M₂S@C₈₂ (M = Sc, Y, Dy, or Lu).^[12] The most impressive example is Gd₃N@C₈₂ which has the non-IPR C_s(39663)-C₈₂ cage.^[13] In summary, four IPR isomers and one non-IPR cage have been isolated for EMFs having a C₈₂ cage together with the only empty isomer C₂(3)-C₈₂.^[14] Because the cage structures substantially alter the physical and chemical properties of EMFs, it is still desirable to discover other new structures having the same metal core, which may have different properties. However, no La@C₈₂ isomer with a cage other than C_{2v}(9)-C₈₂ and C_s(6)-C₈₂ has been reported to date.

Recently, we developed a method to extract EMFs from soot using 1,2,4-trichlorobenzene (TCB).^[15] Because of the presence of highly reactive dichlorophenyl radicals generated by refluxing TCB, which react readily with some insoluble EMF species, several missing-cage EMFs La@C_{2n} (2n = 72, 74, 80) were isolated in the form of their dichlorophenyl derivatives.^[15] This method is so powerful that not only missing-cage species could be isolated, but new cages of other higher EMFs can also be obtained. Here we report the first isolation and unambiguous structural identification of a new C₈₂ cage, namely, C_{3v}(7)-C₈₂, captured as La@C₈₂(C₆H₃Cl₂). More interestingly, NMR and X-ray results reveal that the dichlorophenyl group is singly bonded to a triple-hexagon junction (THJ) carbon atom on the C₃ axis, so that the high C_{3v} symmetry is preserved in the adducts. This is the only example of fullerene derivatives in which a single addend is linked to one of the THJ carbon atoms, which are believed to be the least reactive on a fullerene cage. Theoretical studies unveil that this special THJ carbon atom has pronounced radical character due to strong metal-cage interactions.

Charts of the HPLC separation of La@C₈₂(C₆H₃Cl₂) are shown in Figure S1 of the Supporting Information. Two isomers, **1a** and **1b**, were isolated and their purities were estimated as higher than 99 % by HPLC (Figure S2, Supporting Information) and MALDI-TOF mass spectrometry (Figure S3, Supporting Information). Both **1a** and **1b** are EPR-silent (Figure S4, Supporting Information), and this suggests connection of the dichlorophenyl group by a single bond to the carbon cage, which quenches the paramagnetism of La@C₈₂.^[6b,15]

[*] Prof. Dr. T. Akasaka, Dr. X. Lu, H. Kuga, Dr. H. Nikawa,

Dr. N. Mizorogi, Prof. Dr. Z. Slanina, Dr. T. Tsuchiya

Centre for Tsukuba Advanced Research Alliance

University of Tsukuba, Ibaraki 305-8577 (Japan)

Fax: (+81) 298-53-6409

E-mail: akasaka@tara.tsukuba.ac.jp

Dr. K. Yoza

Bruker AXS K. K., Yokohama, Kanagawa 221-0022 (Japan)

Prof. Dr. S. Nagase

Department of Theoretical and Computational Molecular Science,

Institute for Molecular Science

Okazaki 444-8585 (Japan)

[**] This work was supported in part by a Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research on Innovative Areas (No. 20108001, "pi-Space"), a Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (A) (No. 20245006), The Next Generation Super Computing Project (Nanoscience Project), Nanotechnology Support Project, and a Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research on Priority Area (Nos. 20036008, 20038007) from the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science, and Technology of Japan. H.N. thanks the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (JSPS) for the Research Fellowship for Young Scientists.

Supporting information for this article is available on the WWW under <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/anie.201004318>.

The cage structure of the newly isolated La@C₈₂ isomer inspires considerable curiosity: it might be one of the two known La@C₈₂ isomers [C_{2v}(9) or C_{3v}(6)]^[5,6] or an undiscovered one. ¹³C NMR measurements were first performed to obtain structural information. In sharp contrast to the previous ¹³C NMR data of La@C_{2n}(C₆H₃Cl₂) (2n = 72, 74, 80),^[15] which always display the same number of signals as the number of cage carbon atoms because of C₁ symmetry, the ¹³C NMR spectra of both **1a** and **1b** include only 18 signals in the aromatic region, three of which can be assigned to the dichlorophenyl group (Figures S5 and S6, Supporting Information). Consequently, only 15 signals are from the fullerene cage, among which 12 have full intensity and three half intensity. This [3 × 3 C, 12 × 6 C] pattern does not correspond to either of the two known La@C₈₂ isomers but more likely to one of the two C_{3v}-C₈₂ isomers.^[7] If we assume that the weakest line has not been detected, then it would lead to the C_{3v}(7)-C₈₂ cage. If the weakest line is undetected and one line of full intensity contains two half-intensity lines because of coincidental overlap, then the C_{3v}(8)-C₈₂ cage is also possible (see Figure S7 and Table S1 of the Supporting Information for further details). In either case, addition of the dichlorophenyl group must have taken place on the only carbon atom along the C₃ axis for which the high C_{3v} symmetry is maintained. Therefore, this new La@C₈₂ isomer may have either the C_{3v}(7)-C₈₂ or the C_{3v}(8)-C₈₂ cage.

The ¹H NMR data reveal that **1a** and **1b** are structural isomers with different dichlorophenyl substituents (Figure S8, Supporting Information). Compound **1a** has a 2,5-dichlorophenyl group, as found previously for La@C_{2n}(C₆H₃Cl₂)(**B**) (2n = 72, 74, 80), and **1b** a 3,4-dichlorophenyl group, corresponding to La@C_{2n}(C₆H₃Cl₂)(**C**) (2n = 72, 74, 80).^[15] No 2,4-isomer corresponding to La@C_{2n}(C₆H₃Cl₂)(**A**) (2n = 72, 74, 80) was isolated in this work, that is, formation of the regioisomers is a random process.

¹³⁹La NMR spectrometry was used to characterize the behavior of the internal La atom. A broad peak is observed at δ = −456 ppm for **1a** and δ = −468 ppm for **1b** (Figure S9, Supporting Information). As summarized in Table 1, the above values are very close to that determined for the anion of La@C_{2v}(9)-C₈₂ (δ = −470 ppm),^[6a] which has the same cage size. However, these values are all more positive than those of La@C₇₂(C₆H₃Cl₂)(**B**) (δ = −603 ppm), La@C₇₄(C₆H₃Cl₂)(**B**) (δ = −513 ppm), and La@C₈₀(C₆H₃Cl₂)(**B**) (δ = −500 ppm) with smaller cages.^[15] These results show that the cage size strongly affects the chemical shift of the internal ¹³⁹La nucleus. Furthermore, the line widths of the ¹³⁹La NMR signals of **1a**

and **1b** at 300 K are 502 and 568 Hz (Table 1), respectively, and thus they are much sharper than those of La@C₇₂-(C₆H₃Cl₂)(**B**) (2100 Hz), La@C₇₄(C₆H₃Cl₂)(**B**) (2000 Hz), and La@C₈₀(C₆H₃Cl₂)(**B**) (5500 Hz),^[15] that is, the high symmetry (C_{3v}) of **1a** and **1b** endows the ¹³⁹La nucleus with a much longer transverse relaxation time (T₂) in NMR measurements than in La@C_{2n}(C₆H₃Cl₂) (2n = 72, 74, 80) with a lower (C₁) molecular symmetry. These findings shed new light on the structures and properties of EMFs, especially the strong interactions between the single metal atom and the fullerene cage in mono-EMFs; they will be useful for the application of EMFs as molecular devices.

Since the NMR data are not conclusive for a definite assignment of the cage structure, crystallization of **1a** and **1b** was performed. Single crystals of **1a** suitable for X-ray analysis were obtained. From the ORTEP of **1a** presented in Figure 1,^[16] it is unambiguous that the cage is C_{3v}(7)-C₈₂, not




Figure 1. ORTEP drawing of **1a** with thermal ellipsoids at 50% probability. Only one orientation of the cage is shown and the toluene molecule is omitted for clarity.^[16]

C_{3v}(8)-C₈₂. The 2,5-dichlorophenyl group is singly bonded to THJ carbon atom C(1). The distances between C(1) and the three adjacent cage carbon atoms are similar (1.56, 1.57, 1.58 Å), consistent with the C_{3v} symmetry. Although orientational disorder of the cage exists, only one position of La is observed. The La atom is located closely under C(1) where the addend is bonded, and the C₃ axis passes through both C(1) and La. The La–C(1) distance of 2.72 Å indicates a strong metal–cage interaction.

The THJ carbon atoms are well known to be the least pyramidal C atoms on a fullerene cage and are accordingly less reactive than other types, for example, triple-pentagon junctions (TPJs) and pentagon–pentagon–hexagon junctions (PPHJs), both of which only exist in non-IPR fullerenes, as well as pentagon–hexagon–hexagon junctions (PHHJs).^[17] As a result, no fullerene derivative having fewer than 38 substituents has substituents singly bonded to THJs.^[18] Only upon severe derivatization are some THJs substituted to stabilize the resulting molecule by, for example, formation of local aromaticity. Such cases are only found for C_{2n}F₃₈ (2n = 70, 74).^[19] The structures of EMFs are more complicated because of the presence of metal atoms. Nevertheless, both experimental and theoretical results reflect that the internal

Table 1: ¹³⁹La NMR data of **1a**, **1b**, La@C_{2n}(C₆H₃Cl₂)(**B**) (2n = 72, 74, 80),^[15] and [La@C_{2v}(9)-C₈₂][−]nBu₄N⁺.

Compound	Molecular symmetry	Chemical shift [ppm]	Line width [Hz]
1a	C _{3v}	−456	502
1b	C _{3v}	−468	568
La@C ₇₂ (C ₆ H ₃ Cl ₂)(B)	C ₁	−603	2100
La@C ₇₄ (C ₆ H ₃ Cl ₂)(B)	C ₁	−513	2000
La@C ₈₀ (C ₆ H ₃ Cl ₂)(B)	C ₁	−500	5500
[La@C ₈₂] [−] nBu ₄ N ⁺	C ₁	−470	2600

metal atoms tend to coordinate with PPHJs and PHHJs instead of THJs (no TPJs have been found for EMFs).^[20] For EMF derivatives containing singly bonded substituents reported to date, no addend was found to connect to THJs, with the sole exception of $\text{Sc}_3\text{N}@\text{C}_{80}(\text{CF}_3)_x$ ($x = 14, 16$), in which four THJs are substituted for $x = 14$ and eight for $x = 16$.^[21] Because a large number of addends exists for $\text{Sc}_3\text{N}@\text{C}_{80}(\text{CF}_3)_x$, it does not appear surprising that formation of negatively charged aromatic pentagons and their coordination with the internal Sc atoms are the main driving forces for such addition patterns. However, in the case of **1a** and **1b**, the only substituent prefers to append to one of the THJ carbon atoms, instead of any PHHJ.

The abnormal addition pattern of **1a** and **1b** stimulated us to resort to theoretical calculations for a reasonable explanation. The p-orbital axis vector (POAV) values^[22] and SOMO spin densities of $\text{La}@\text{C}_{3v}(7)\text{-C}_{82}$ were calculated. Detailed data are presented in Figure S10 of the Supporting Information. Figure 2 shows a plot of POAV values against SOMO




Figure 2. Left: Plot of SOMO spin densities against POAV values of $\text{La}@\text{C}_{3v}(7)\text{-C}_{82}$. Right: Optimized structure of $\text{La}@\text{C}_{3v}(7)\text{-C}_{82}$.

spin densities of the 16 types of nonequivalent carbon atoms of $\text{La}@\text{C}_{3v}(7)\text{-C}_{82}$. Both values of C(1) are evidently higher than those of the others. Accordingly, such an exceptionally high radical character of C(1) makes it very reactive toward dichlorophenyl radicals during the extraction process. In the optimized structure of $\text{La}@\text{C}_{3v}(7)\text{-C}_{82}$ (Figure 2, right), the La atom is located closely to C(1) along the C_3 axis. The La–C(1) distance of 2.714 Å is identical to that determined by X-ray analysis. Accordingly, the close contact between C(1) and La atom must be the origin of the localization of high pyramidalization and high spin on C(1).

One more interesting finding is that the X-ray results presented above do not support the theoretical prediction that $\text{La}@\text{C}_{3v}(8)\text{-C}_{82}$ should be obtained because it is 16.1 kcal mol^{−1} more stable than $\text{La}@\text{C}_{3v}(7)\text{-C}_{82}$. In fact, a similar phenomenon was found previously for $\text{La}@\text{C}_{80}$: $\text{La}@\text{C}_{2v}(3)\text{-C}_{80}$ is 12.4 kcal mol^{−1} less stable than $\text{La}@\text{C}_{2v}(5)\text{-C}_{80}$, but only the former was isolated as its dichlorophenyl derivatives.^[15c] The reason is now clear: derivatization changes the energy order so that $\text{La}@\text{C}_{2v}(3)\text{-C}_{80}$ binds strongly with substituents and its derivatives prevail in solution. This explanation is also applicable to the current findings. The pronounced radical character makes $\text{La}@\text{C}_{3v}(7)\text{-C}_{82}$ fairly reactive toward dichlorophenyl radicals during the extraction process, so that it was

extracted as derivatives. In contrast, the POAV values and SOMO spin densities of the cage carbon atoms of $\text{La}@\text{C}_{3v}(8)\text{-C}_{82}$ (Figure S11 and S12) are more uniform, so they have decreased radical character and the overall reactivity of the molecule toward radicals is lower. Consequently, $\text{La}@\text{C}_{3v}(8)\text{-C}_{82}$ is not extracted and may still exist in the soot.

Electronic properties of **1a** and **1b** were characterized by UV/Vis/NIR spectrometry (Figure S13, Supporting Information). The spectra of **1a** and **1b** are fundamentally identical, with distinct absorptions at 490, 590, 710, and 800 nm. The onset observed at 900 nm corresponds to a large band gap (1.38 eV). These results indicate that 1) dichlorophenyl substitution has made pristine $\text{La}@\text{C}_{3v}(7)\text{-C}_{82}$ fairly stable and 2) the substitution pattern of the dichlorophenyl group has a negligible effect on the electronic structures of the adducts.

Electrochemical properties of **1a** and **1b** were also examined. Both exhibit three reversible reduction processes and one oxidation wave that is less reversible (Figure S14, Supporting Information), consistent with our previous findings that the cations of mono-EMFs are less stable than the anions.^[5,8] Table 2 summarizes the redox potentials of **1a** and

Table 2: Redox potentials^[a] [V vs. Fc/Fc^+] of **1a**, **1b**, $\text{La}@\text{C}_{2n}(\text{C}_6\text{H}_3\text{Cl}_2)(\text{B})$ ($2n = 72, 74, 80$),^[15] and $\text{La}@\text{C}_{2v}(9)\text{-C}_{82}$.

Compound	Ox E_1	Red E_1	Red E_2	Red E_3
1a	0.65	−1.12	−1.42	−1.94
1b	0.66	−1.11	−1.42	−1.92
$\text{La}@\text{C}_{72}(\text{C}_6\text{H}_3\text{Cl}_2)(\text{B})$	0.42	−1.00	−1.36	−1.64
$\text{La}@\text{C}_{74}(\text{C}_6\text{H}_3\text{Cl}_2)(\text{B})$	0.24	−1.08	−1.38	−1.93
$\text{La}@\text{C}_{80}(\text{C}_6\text{H}_3\text{Cl}_2)(\text{B})$	0.36	−1.07	−1.43	−1.89
$\text{La}@\text{C}_{2v}(9)\text{-C}_{82}$	0.07	−0.42	−1.34	−1.53

[a] Determined by differential pulse voltammetry in 1,2-dichlorobenzene with 0.1 M $n\text{Bu}_4\text{NPF}_6$ at a Pt working electrode.

1b, as well as those of $\text{La}@\text{C}_{2n}(\text{C}_6\text{H}_3\text{Cl}_2)(\text{B})$ ($2n = 72, 74, 80$)^[15] and $\text{La}@\text{C}_{2v}(9)\text{-C}_{82}$ for comparison. The identical redox potentials of **1a** and **1b** confirm the same cage structure and the same position of the substituent. Moreover, the reduction potentials of these dichlorophenyl derivatives with different cage sizes are all similar to each other, but the oxidation potentials vary with the cage size. If the value of $\text{La}@\text{C}_{72}(\text{C}_6\text{H}_4\text{Cl}_2)$, which has a pair of unconventional fused pentagons, is excluded, the oxidation potentials of $\text{La}@\text{C}_{2n}(\text{C}_6\text{H}_3\text{Cl}_2)$ ($2n = 74, 80, 82$) increase concomitantly with increasing cage size. Although the reason remains somewhat unclear, the results are informative for the synthesis of EMF-based materials applicable in electronics and photovoltaics.

In conclusion, an unprecedented isomer of $\text{La}@\text{C}_{82}$ with the $\text{C}_{3v}(7)\text{-C}_{82}$ cage has been isolated as dichlorophenyl derivatives. The NMR and X-ray crystallographic results show that the dichlorophenyl group is singly bonded to a THJ carbon atom on the C_3 axis, whereby high C_{3v} symmetry is maintained. Density functional calculations reveal that this special THJ carbon atom is considerably more reactive toward radicals than others as a result of strong metal–cage interactions. This is the only example of a fullerene derivative in which a single substituent is linked to one of the THJ carbon atoms, which are believed to be the least reactive.

Furthermore, comparison of La@C_{2n}(C₆H₃Cl₂) (2n = 72, 74, 80, 82) revealed that the chemical shift of the internal ¹³⁹La nucleus and the oxidation potential of these dichlorophenyl derivatives depend on cage size. These results have provided new insights into the interplay between the structures and properties of EMFs. They are expected to be useful in future design and creation of EMF-based materials for molecular electronic devices and photovoltaics. The isolation of La@C_{3v}-C₈₂ derivatives suggests that other unknown EMF species remain in raw soot, and more powerful extraction methods should be devised to access them.^[23]

Experimental Section

Experimental details are similar to those reported in reference [15] and are given in the Supporting Information.

Black single crystals of **1a** were obtained by layering a toluene solution with hexane. X-ray data were collected with an AXS SMART APEX machine (Bruker Analytik, Germany) at 90 K. CCDC 783962 (**1a**) contains the supplementary crystallographic data for this paper. These data can be obtained free of charge from The Cambridge Crystallographic Data Centre via www.ccdc.cam.ac.uk/data_request/cif.

Theoretical calculations were conducted with the Gaussian 03 program package.^[24] The molecular structures were optimized at the B3LYP level^[25] with the relativistic effective core potential (ECP)^[26] and the LANL2DZ basis set for La and 6-31G(d) basis set^[27] for C, H, and Cl.

Received: July 15, 2010

Published online: November 9, 2010

Keywords: density functional calculations · fullerenes · lanthanum · structure elucidation

- [1] For recent reviews, see a) T. Akasaka, F. Wudl, S. Nagase, *Chemistry of Nanocarbons*, Wiley-Blackwell, London, **2010**; b) T. Akasaka, S. Nagase, *Endofullerenes: A New Family of Carbon Clusters*, Kluwer, Dordrecht, **2002**; c) M. Yamada, T. Akasaka, S. Nagase, *Acc. Chem. Res.* **2010**, *43*, 92–102; d) M. N. Chaur, F. Melin, A. L. Ortiz, L. Echegoyen, *Angew. Chem.* **2009**, *121*, 7650–7675; *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **2009**, *48*, 7514–7538; e) L. Dunsch, S. F. Yang, *Small* **2007**, *3*, 1298–1320.
- [2] Y. Chai, T. Guo, C. M. Jin, R. E. Haufler, L. P. F. Chibante, J. Fure, L. H. Wang, J. M. Alford, R. E. Smalley, *J. Phys. Chem.* **1991**, *95*, 7564–7568.
- [3] a) K. Yamamoto, H. Funasaka, T. Takahashi, T. Akasaka, *J. Phys. Chem.* **1994**, *98*, 2008–2011; b) K. Yamamoto, H. Funasaka, T. Takahashi, T. Akasaka, T. Suzuki, Y. Maruyama, *J. Phys. Chem.* **1994**, *98*, 12831–12833.
- [4] a) K. Kobayashi, S. Nagase, *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **1998**, *282*, 325–329; b) Z. Slanina, S. L. Lee, F. Uhlik, L. Adamowicz, S. Nagase, *Theor. Chem. Acc.* **2007**, *117*, 315–322.
- [5] a) T. Akasaka et al., *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2000**, *122*, 9316–9317; b) T. Akasaka et al., *J. Phys. Chem. B* **2001**, *105*, 2971–2974.
- [6] a) Y. Maeda et al., *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2004**, *126*, 6858–6859; b) X. Lu, H. Nikawa, T. Tsuchiya, T. Akasaka, M. Toki, H. Sawa, Mizorogi, N. S. Nagase, *Angew. Chem.* **2010**, *122*, 604–607; *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **2010**, *49*, 594–597.
- [7] P. W. Fowler, D. E. Manolopoulos, *An Atlas of Fullerenes*, Clarendon, Oxford, **1995**.
- [8] a) T. Wakahara et al., *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **2002**, *360*, 235–239; b) T. Wakahara et al., *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2004**, *126*, 4883–4887;
- c) T. Akasaka et al., *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2008**, *130*, 12840–12841; d) X. Lu, H. Nikawa, L. Feng, T. Tsuchiya, Y. Maeda, T. Akasaka, N. Mizorogi, Z. Slanina, S. Nagase, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2009**, *131*, 12066–12067.
- [9] a) T. Akasaka, S. Okubo, M. Kondo, Y. Maeda, T. Wakahara, T. Kato, T. Suzuki, K. Yamamoto, K. Kobayashi, S. Nagase, *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **2000**, *319*, 153–156; b) Y. Rikiishi, Y. Kubozono, T. Hosokawa, K. Shibata, Y. Haruyama, Y. Takabayashi, A. Fujiwara, S. Kobayashi, S. Mori, Y. Iwasa, *J. Phys. Chem. B* **2004**, *108*, 7580–7585; c) X. Lu, Z. J. Shi, B. Y. Sun, X. R. He, Z. N. Gu, *Fullerenes Nanotubes Carbon Nanostruct.* **2005**, *13*, 13–20.
- [10] X. Lu, Z. Slanina, T. Akasaka, T. Tsuchiya, N. Mizorogi, S. Nagase, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2010**, *132*, 5896–5905.
- [11] a) Y. Iiduka et al., *Angew. Chem.* **2007**, *119*, 5658–5660; *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **2007**, *46*, 5562–5564; b) E. Nishibori, M. Ishihara, M. Takata, M. Sakata, Y. Ito, T. Inoue, H. Shinohara, *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **2006**, *433*, 120–124; c) M. M. Olmstead, H. M. Lee, S. Stevenson, H. C. Dorn, A. L. Balch, *Chem. Commun.* **2002**, 2688–2689.
- [12] a) L. Dunsch, S. F. Yang, L. Zhang, A. Svitova, S. Oswald, A. Popov, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2010**, *132*, 5413–5421; b) N. Chen, M. N. Chaur, C. Moore, J. R. Pinzon, R. Valencia, A. Rodriguez-Fortea, J. M. Poblet, L. Echegoyen, *Chem. Commun.* **2010**, *46*, 4818–4820.
- [13] B. Q. Mercado, C. M. Beavers, M. M. Olmstead, M. N. Chaur, K. Walker, B. C. Holloway, L. Echegoyen, A. L. Balch, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2008**, *130*, 7854–7855.
- [14] a) K. Kikuchi, N. Nakahara, T. Wakabayashi, S. Suzuki, H. Shiromaru, Y. Miyake, K. Saito, I. Ikemoto, M. Kainosho, Y. Achiba, *Nature* **1992**, *357*, 142–145; b) G. Y. Sun, M. Kertesz, *J. Phys. Chem. A* **2001**, *105*, 5468–5472.
- [15] a) T. Wakahara et al., *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2006**, *128*, 14228–14229; b) H. Nikawa et al., *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2005**, *127*, 9684–9685; c) H. Nikawa, T. Yamada, B. P. Cao, N. Mizorogi, Z. Slanina, T. Tsuchiya, T. Akasaka, K. Yoza, S. Nagase, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2009**, *131*, 10950–10954.
- [16] Crystal data of a black needle of **21a**·C₇H₈: C₁₈₃H₁₄Cl₄La₂, FW = 2631.56, 0.27 × 0.18 × 0.03 mm, orthorhombic, *P*2₁2₁1, *a* = 11.260(5), *b* = 28.242(5), *c* = 28.523(5) Å, *V* = 9070.5(5) Å³, *Z* = 4, *ρ*_{calcd} = 1.927 g cm^{−3}, *μ*(MoKα) = 1.130 mm^{−1}, *θ* = 3.04–27.48°, *T* = 90 K; *R*₁ = 0.1225, *wR*₂ = 0.2810 for all data; *R*₁ = 0.1098, *wR*₂ = 0.2734 for 18444 reflections (*I* > 2.0σ(*I*)) with 1177 parameters. Maximum residual electron density 12.317 e Å^{−3}.
- [17] a) A. Hirsch, M. Brettreich, *Fullerenes: Chemistry and Reactions*, Wiley-VCH, Weinheim, **2005**; b) O. V. Boltalina, A. A. Popov, S. H. Strauss in *Strained Hydrocarbons. Beyond the Van't Hoff and Le Bel Hypothesis* (Ed.: H. Dodziuk), Wiley-VCH, Weinheim, **2009**, pp. 225–238; c) Y. Z. Tan, S. Y. Xie, R. B. Huang, L. S. Zheng, *Nat. Chem.* **2009**, *1*, 450–460.
- [18] I. E. Kareev, I. V. Kuvychko, N. B. Shustova, S. F. Lebedkin, V. P. Bubnov, O. P. Anderson, A. A. Popov, O. V. Boltalina, S. H. Strauss, *Angew. Chem.* **2008**, *120*, 6300–6303; *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **2008**, *47*, 6204–6207.
- [19] a) P. B. Hitchcock, A. G. Avent, N. Martsinovich, P. A. Troshin, R. Taylor, *Chem. Commun.* **2005**, 75–77; b) A. A. Goryunkov, V. Y. Markov, I. N. Ioffe, L. N. Sidorov, R. D. Bolskar, M. D. Diener, I. V. Kuvychko, S. H. Strauss, O. V. Boltalina, *Angew. Chem.* **2004**, *116*, 1015–1018; *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **2004**, *43*, 997–1000.
- [20] a) X. Lu et al., *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2008**, *130*, 9129–9136; b) X. Lu et al., *Angew. Chem.* **2008**, *120*, 8770–8773; *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **2008**, *47*, 8642–8645; c) A. A. Popov, L. Dunsch, *Chem. Eur. J.* **2009**, *15*, 9707–9729.
- [21] N. B. Shustova, Y. S. Chen, M. A. Mackey, C. E. Coumbe, J. P. Phillips, S. Stevenson, A. A. Popov, O. V. Boltalina, S. H. Strauss, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2009**, *131*, 17630–17637.

- [22] R. C. Haddon, *Science* **1993**, 261, 1545–1550.
- [23] a) M. D. Diener, J. M. Alford, *Nature* **1998**, 393, 668–671; b) R. D. Bolskar, J. M. Alford, *Chem. Commun.* **2003**, 1292–1293; c) T. Tsuchiya, T. Wakahara, S. Shirakura, Y. Maeda, T. Akasaka, K. Kobayashi, S. Nagase, T. Kato, K. M. Kadish, *Chem. Mater.* **2004**, 16, 4343–4346; d) X. Lu, H. J. Li, B. Y. Sun, Z. J. Shi, Z. N. Gu, *Carbon* **2005**, 43, 1546–1549.
- [24] Gaussian03 (Revision C.01), M. J. Frisch et al., Gaussian, Inc., Wallingford, CT, **2004**.
- [25] a) A. D. Becke, *Phys. Rev. A* **1988**, 38, 3098–3100; b) A. D. Becke, *J. Chem. Phys.* **1993**, 98, 5648–5652; c) C. Lee, W. Yang, R. G. Parr, *Phys. Rev. B* **1988**, 37, 785–789.
- [26] P. J. Hay, W. R. Wadt, *J. Chem. Phys.* **1985**, 82, 299–310.
- [27] W. J. Hehre, R. Ditchfield, J. A. Pople, *J. Chem. Phys.* **1972**, 56, 2257–2261.
-