Highly dissymmetric chelate coordination of 3,4,7,8-tetramethyl-1,10-phenanthroline to Cu^I(SR)

Andreas F. Stange, Torsten Sixt and Wolfgang Kaim*

Institut für Anorganische Chemie, Universität Stuttgart, Pfaffenwaldring 55, D-70550 Stuttgart, Germany

Not only Au^I and Hg^{II} species but also Cu^I(SR) fragments can bind in a highly dissymmetrical fashion to symmetrical diimine chelate ligands; the 2 + 1 coordination arrangement observed for the metal in two complexes (tmphen)Cu(SR) (tmphen = 3,4,7,8-tetramethyl-1,10-phenanthroline) is characterised by obtuse angles α [N(1)–Cu–S] > 159° and by two very different distances Cu–N(1) and Cu–N(2).

The copper(1) state is characterised by the lack of a clear preference for specific coordination numbers (CN) or coordination geometries, the most common arrangements being close to tetrahedral (CN 4) or trigonal planar (CN 3).^{1,2} Higher and lower coordination numbers, in particular CN 2, have also been documented.²

In probing copper–thiolate–N-chelate ligand chemistry to mimic the Cu_A dinuclear electron transfer center of enzymes³ we reacted the α -diimine ligand 3,4,7,8-tetramethyl-1,10-phenanthroline (tmphen)⁴ with electrolytically⁵ obtained 2,4,6-trimethyl- and 2,6-diphenyl-thiophenolatocopper(I), Cu(SMes) and Cu(SDpp). The result[†] was not a di- or tetra-nuclear arrangement^{3c,d} but mononuclear copper(I) complexes which could be crystallised for structural characterisation (Figs. 1 and 2).[‡]

Copper(I) does not normally display the same strong preference for a coordination number of two with linear coordination geometry as do gold(I) or mercury(II) centres, yet the list in Table 1 illustrates that the complexes (tmphen)Cu(SR) exhibit unusually distorted geometries as evident from very obtuse angles α and large differences between the distances Cu–N(1) and Cu–N(2), despite the formal equivalence of both nitrogen donor sites and the symmetry of the aryl groups, R (Table 1).



Gold(I) or mercury(II) centres which strongly prefer the linear geometry can be forced to accept a third donor atom *via* chelate coordination. Structurally characterised examples related to the neutral species (tmphen)Cu(SR) include the ionic systems

 Table 1 Geometrical parameters for complexes with 2 + 1 coordination arrangement

Complex	α / $^{\circ}$	eta / $^{\circ}$	$\gamma^{\prime \circ}$	M–N(1)/Å	M–N(2)/Å	Ref.
(tmphen)Cu(SDpp)	164.4	115.7	79.9	1.972	2.172	This work
(tmphen)Cu(SMes)	159.1	120.5	80.4	1.976	2.158	This work
(phen)Cu[SSi(OBu ^t) ₃]	144.6	133.5	80.9	2.031	2.108	7(b)
[(bpy)Au(PPh ₃)]+	157.4	130.4	71.4	2.166	2.406	6(a)
[(bpy)HgMe]+	164.0	126.0	69.4	2.236	2.421	6(b)
$(Et_2O)Zn(SC_6H_2Bu^{t_3})_2$	159.6 ^a		_			7(a)

[(bpy)Au(PPh₃)]PF₆^{6a} and [(bpy)HgMe]NO₃ (Table 1; bpy = 2,2'-bipyridine).^{6b} Ligands, especially thiolates, with steric bulk may cause a similar distortion from the trigonal geometry of d¹⁰ metal centres as has been realized in the T-shaped (Et₂O)Z-n^{II}(SC₆H₂Bu^t₃-2,4,6)₂^{7b} and, in attenuated form, with the compound (phen)Cu[SSi(OBu^t)₃] (phen = 1,10-phenanthroline).^{7b}



Fig. 1 Molecular structure of the metal complex in (tmphen)Cu(S-Mes)·0.5C₃H₆O with atom numbering. Selected bond lengths (Å) and angles (°): Cu–N(1) 1.976(2), Cu–N(2) 2.159(2), Cu–S 2.1470(8), S–C(1) 1.787(3); N(1)–Cu–N(2) 80.4(1), N(1)–Cu–S 159.13(8), S–Cu–N(2) 120.48(7), C(1)–S–Cu 98.7(1). Cu lies in the S–N(1)–N(2) plane; torsional angles (°): N(1)–Cu–S–C(1) –166.96(2), N(2)–Cu–S–C(1) 13.1(1).



Fig. 2 Molecular structure of (tmphen)Cu(SDpp) with atom numbering. Selected bond lengths (Å) and angles (°): Cu–N(1) 1.972(4), Cu–N(2) 2.172(4), Cu–S 2.1687(14), S–C(1) 1.775(5), C(21)–C(22) 1.388(7); N(1)–Cu–N(2) 79.9(2), N(1)–Cu–S 164.37(12), S–Cu–N(2) 115.68(12), C(1)–S–Cu 97.8(2). Cu lies 0.026(2) Å over the S–N(1)–N(2) plane; torsional angles (°): N(1)–Cu–S–C(1) -136.1(5), N(2)–Cu–S–C(1) 50.2(2).

^{*a*} Angle S(1)–Zn–S(2).



Fig. 3 Temperature-dependent 1H NMR spectra of (tmphen)Cu(SDpp) in CD_2Cl_2 (300, 253 and 198 K, from top to bottom; 250 MHz)

The unsymmetrical coordination of the chelate ligand to the Cu^I center as observed in the solid state is probably responsible for the selective broadening in the ¹H NMR spectrum of (tmphen)Cu(SDpp) (Fig. 3).

These observations suggest a low but non-negligible barrier for the 'movement' of Cu between two equivalent energy minimum sites, separated by *ca*. 0.28 Å. No intermolecular interactions were recognised in the crystal structures which can be made responsible for this unusual copper(1)–thiolate³*c*:*d*.8 coordination arrangement. To rationalise the observed dissymmetry we thus invoke the strong σ and π donor effect of thiolate groups SR and the donor substitution of the α -diimine tmphen.⁴ There appears to be no need then for full coordination of a third donor atom to the electron-rich copper(1) centres, leaving the inevitably close second nitrogen atom N(2) of the chelate ligand as a lesser coordinated donor centre to result in the observed coordination number 2 + 1.

Notes and References

* E-mail: kaim@iac.uni-stuttgart.de

 \dagger Synthesis: Arylcopper(1) precursors were obtained by electrolysing⁵ solutions of the thiophenols^{9,10} in acetonitrile–2 mmol dm⁻³ NBu₄ClO₄ in a cell containing a copper anode.

(2,4,6-Trimethylthiophenolato)(3,4,7,8-tetramethyl-1,10-phenanthroline)copper(1) was prepared by adding 250 mg (1.18 mmol) of the thiolatocopper precursor to a suspension of 278 mg (1.18 mmol) tmphen in 20 ml toluene. After reflux for 2.5 h the clear brownish solution was filtered hot, cooling produced 352 mg (62%) of (tmphen)Cu(SMes)·C₇H₈. Single crystals suitable for X-ray diffraction were obtained from acetone as (tmphen)Cu(SMes)·0.5C₃H₆O (correct C, H, N elemental analysis). ¹H NMR (CD₂Cl₂, 300 K): δ 2.16 (s, 6 H, Mes-4-CH₃), 2.41 (s, 24 H, tmphen-3,8-CH₃ and Mes-2,5-CH₃), 2.65 (s, 6 H, tmphen-4,7-CH₃), 6.66 (s, 4 H, Mes-3,5-H), 8.03 (s, 4 H, tmphen-5,6-H), 8.34 (s, 4 H, tmphen-2,9-H).

(2,6-Diphenylthiophenolato)(3,4,7,8-tetramethyl-1,10-phenanthroline)copper(1) was prepared by adding 120 mg (0.37 mmol) of the thiolatocopper precursor to a solution of 87 mg (0.37 mmol) tmphen in 25 ml toluene. After reflux for 1 h the clear brownish solution was filtered hot, and careful cooling produced 50 mg (24%) of the compound, partially as single crystals suitable for X-ray diffraction. Correct elemental analysis (C, H, N). ¹H NMR (CD₂Cl₂, 300 K): δ 2.45 (s, 6 H, 3,8-CH₃), 2.70 (s, 6 H, 4,7-CH₃), 6.79 (t, *J* 7.4 Hz, 2 H, aryl-H), 6.96–7.05 (m, 5 H, aryl-H), 7.35–7.50 (m, 6 H, aryl-H), 8.11 (s, 2 H, 5,6-H), 8.40 (br s, 2 H, 2,9-H). Selective broadening of the resonances was observed upon cooling to 198 K (Fig. 3).

 $(tmphen)Cu(SMes) \cdot 0.5C_3H_6O: C_{25}H_{27}CuN_2S$ -Crystallography: $0.5C_3H_6O$, M = 480.16, crystal size $0.4 \times 0.4 \times 0.4$ mm, monoclinic, space group $P2_1/n$ (no. 14), a = 8.1319(7), b = 14.8164(12), c = 14.8164(12)19.6605(12) Å, $\beta = 98.388(8)^\circ$, U = 2343.5(3) Å³, $D_c = 1.351$ g cm⁻³, μ (Mo-K α) = 1.039 mm⁻¹, *F*(000) = 994, Wyckoff scans, 6561 measured reflections, 6156 independent reflections, 5830 reflections used for refinement, Lorentz polarisation, R = 0.0501 for 4244 reflections with I > $2\sigma(I)$; 183 K, Siemens P4 diffractometer with graphite monochromator and Mo-K α radiation ($\lambda = 0.71073$ Å). The structure was solved by direct methods (Siemens SHELXTL-PC) and refined (SHELXL-93) by fullmatrix least squares on F^2 (362 parameters). One half equivalent of a solvent molecule had to be included. Hydrogen atoms were introduced at calculated positions and refined freely; (tmphen)Cu(SDpp): C₃₄H₂₉CuN₂S, M = 561.19, crystal dimensions $0.4 \times 0.4 \times 0.3$ mm, monoclinic, space group $P2_1/n$ (no. 14), a = 11.949(2), b = 13.284(2), c = 17.636(2) Å, $\beta =$ $104.56(1)^\circ$, U = 2709.5(6) Å³, $D_c = 1.376$ g cm⁻³, μ (Mo-K α) = 0.909 mm⁻¹, F(000) = 1168, Wyckoff scans, 6188 measured reflections, 5971 independent reflections, 5499 reflections used for refinement, Lorentz polarisation, R = 0.0687 for 3490 reflections with $I > 2\sigma(I)$; 183 K, Siemens P4 diffractometer with graphite monochromator and Mo-Ka radiation ($\lambda = 0.71073$ Å). The structure was solved by direct methods (Siemens SHELXTL-PC) and refined (SHELXL-93) by full-matrix least squares on F^2 (430 parameters). Hydrogen atoms were introduced at calculated positions and refined freely. CCDC 182/737.

- H. tom Dieck and L. Stamp, Z. Naturforsch., Teil B, 1990, 45, 1369;
 M. J. Begley, P. Hubberstey, C. E. Russell and P. H. Walton, J. Chem. Soc., Dalton Trans., 1994, 2483; A. Müller, H. Bögge and U. Schimanski, Inorg. Chim. Acta, 1980, 45, L249.
- 2 C. E. Holloway and M. Melnik, Rev. Inorg. Chem., 1995, 15, 147.
- 3 (a) H. Bertagnolli and W. Kaim, Angew. Chem., 1995, 107, 847; Angew. Chem., Int. Ed. Engl., 1995, 34, 771; (b) W. Kaim and J. Rall, Angew. Chem., 1996, 108, 47; Angew. Chem., Int. Ed. Engl., 1996, 35, 43; (c) A. F. Stange, E. Waldhör, M. Moscherosch and W. Kaim, Z. Naturforsch., Teil B, 1995, 50, 115; (d) A. F. Stange, K.-W. Klinkhammer and W. Kaim, Inorg. Chem., 1996, 35, 4087.
- 4 A. Klein, W. Kaim, E. Waldhör and H.-D.Hausen, J. Chem. Soc., Perkin Trans. 2, 1995, 2121.
- 5 M. C. Chakravorti and G.V. B. Subrahmanyan, *Coord. Chem. Rev.*, 1994, **135/136**, 65.
- 6 (a) W. Clegg, Acta Crystallogr., Sect. B, 1976, **32**, 2712; (b) A. J. Canty, A. Marker and B. M. Gatehouse, J. Organomet. Chem., 1975, **88**, C31; A. J. Canty and A. Marker, Inorg. Chem., 1976, **15**, 425.
- 7 (a) P. P. Power and S. C. Shoner, Angew. Chem., 1990, 102, 1484;
 Angew. Chem., Int. Ed. Engl., 1990, 29, 1403; (b) B. Becker, W. Wojnowski, K. Peters, E.-M. Peters and H. G. von Schnering, Polyhedron, 1992, 11, 613.
- 8 M. D. Janssen, D. M. Grove and G. van Koten, Prog. Inorg. Chem., 1997, 46, 97.
- 9 P. J. Blower, J. R. Dilworth, J. P. Hutchinson and J. A. Zubieta, J. Chem. Soc., Dalton Trans., 1985, 1533.
- 10 P. T. Bishop, J. R. Dilworth, T. Nicholson and J. Zubieta, J. Chem. Soc., Dalton Trans., 1991, 385.

Received in Basel, Switzerland, 12th June 1997; revised manuscript received 2nd December 1997; 7/08867A