Chiral Recognition in the Michael Addition Reaction between Lithium *N*-3,4-Dimethoxybenzyl- α -methylbenzylamide and the Chiral Iron Crotonoyl Complex [(C₅H₅)Fe(CO)(PPh₃)(COCH=CHMe)]

Stephen G. Davies* and Osamu Ichihara

The Dyson Perrins Laboratory, South Parks Road, Oxford OX1 3QY, UK

Chiral recognition in the Michael addition reaction between lithium N-3,4-dimethoxybenzyl- α -methylbenzylamide and the chiral iron crotonoyl complex [(C₅H₅)Fe(CO)(PPh₃)(COCH=CHMe)] (matched pair R + R, S = 15) allows the kinetic resolution of the latter.

We have previously demonstrated the stereoselective addition of lithium amides to α , β -unsaturated acyl ligands attached to the chiral iron auxiliary [(C₅H₅)Fe(CO)(PPh₃)] for the asymmetric synthesis of β -amino acids and β -lactams.^{1.2} We report herein a high degree of chiral recognition in the Michael addition reaction between lithium amides derived from α -methylbenzylamine and the chiral iron crotonoyl complex 1.

Treatment of the racemic iron crotonoyl complex 1^3 with excess of racemic lithium α -methylbenzylamide gave a 1:1 mixture of the two diastereoisomers 2 consistent with the expected complete stereocontrol by the iron in the formation of the β -chiral centre, but with no discrimination by the iron chiral auxiliary between the enantiomers of lithium α -methyl-







Fig. 1 Enantiomeric excess of recovered acryloyl complex 1 vs. % conversion for the reaction between racemic 1 and excess homochiral (R)-3 (——, calculated for a stereoselectivity factor⁷ of 15; \bigcirc , experimental values)

benzylamide. Although formation of the β -centre is nominally under the influence of two auxiliaries, the iron and the α -methyl benzylamine, the dominance of the iron auxiliary is not surprising given the known very poor control exerted by α -methylbenzylamine in Michael reactions.^{4–6}

Addition of excess of the lithium amide 3, derived from racemic N-3,4-dimethoxybenzyl- α -methylbenzylamine, to racemic 1 gave only three of the four possible product diastereoisomers in the ratio 94:3:3. These products were identified as (*RRR*,*SSS*)-4, (*RRS*,*SSR*)-5 and (*RSS*,*SRR*)-6 respectively by reaction of homochiral (*R*)-1 and (*S*)-1 with

homochiral (*R*)-**3**. The former reaction gave (*RRR*)-**4** (90%) as a single diastereoisomer (>100:1) whereas the latter gave a 1:1 mixture (55%) of (*SSR*)-**5** and (*SRR*)-**6**.

Monitoring yield against equivalents of lithium amide (25%, 0.5 equiv.; 50%, 1 equiv.; >90%, 2 equiv.) indicated a stoichiometry of 1:2 for complex 1: amide 3 for these Michael additions. Furthermore the above results indicate a 15:1 rate difference between the matched [(R)-1 + (R)-3] and mismatched [(S)-1 + (R)-3] pairs. This rate difference was confirmed by a kinetic resolution of racemic 1 by homochiral (R)-3 (Fig. 1). Thus at 75% conversion recovered crotonoyl complex 1 was found to be essentially homochiral.

The exact mechanism of this chirality recognition remains to be determined, but the stoichiometry implies the intermediacy of an aggregate $(1 + 2 \times 3)_n$. Furthermore the consistency of the results for the racemic and homochiral series implies that the reactive aggregates in the racemic case must be homo- not hetero-chiral.

We thank the Idemitsu Petrochemical Co., Japan for sabbatical leave (to O.I.) and for support.

Received, 18th June 1990; Com. 0/02726J

References

- 1 S. G. Davies, J. Dupont and R. J. C. Easton, *Tetrahedron* Asymmetry, 1990, 1, 279.
- 2 S. G. Davies, I. M. Dordor-Hedgecock, K. H. Sutton, J. C. Walker, R. H. Jones and K. Prout, *Tetrahedron*, 1986, 42, 5123.
- 3 S. G. Davies, R. J. C. Easton, J. C. Walker and P. Warner, *Tetrahedron*, 1986, **42**, 175.
- 4 R. Kinas, K. Pankiewicz, W. J. Stec, P. B. Farmer, A. B. Foster and M. Jarman, J. Org. Chem., 1977, 42, 1650.
- 5 M. Furukawa, T. Okawara and Y. Terawaki, *Chem. Pharm. Bull.*, 1977, **25**, 1319.
- 6 J. d'Angelo and J. Maddaluno, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 1986, 108, 8112.
- 7 H. B. Kagan and J. C. Fiaud, Topics Stereochem., 1988, 18, 249.