Reaction of Arsoles with Iron Carbonyls. Arsole \rightarrow Ferrole Conversion

G. THIOLLET and F. MATHEY

Equipe IRCHA-CNRS, 2 - 8 rue Henry Dunant, B.P. 28, 94320 Thiais, France Received March 24, 1979

Very few studies have been devoted to arsoletransition metal complexes up to now. In fact most of the work which has been published deals with the synthesis of arsametallocenes *i.e.* π -aromatic complexes of the arsolyl anions [1-3]. In only one instance, a true arsole complex was described [4]; indeed the reaction of pentaphenylarsole with Fe(CO)₅ was shown to yield a diene-Fe(CO)₃ complex. Having in our hands a much simpler and more representative arsole *i.e.* 1-phenyl-2,5-dimethylarsole [5] we thought that a study of its reaction with various iron carbonyls would be worthwhile.

With $Fe_2(CO)_9$ in boiling benzene this arsole gives the As \rightarrow Fe(CO)₄ complex 2 in high yield:



This yellow complex was purified by chromatography (silicagel, hexane-benzene 80:20) and crystallized in hexane at -70 °C (m.p. ~ 70 °C). It was unambiguously characterized by elemental analysis and spectroscopy: Anal. Found: C, 48.24; H, 3.04; Fe, 13.88; calc. for C₁₆H₁₃AsFeO₄: C, 48.04; H, 3.27; Fe, 13.96; ¹H NMR (in CDCl₃, TMS): $\delta = 2.07$ (s, 6H, Me); 6.47 (s, 2H, CH); 7.47 (m, 5H, Ph) ppm; IR (decalin): ν CO: 2054, 1975, 1947, 1941 cm⁻¹; Mass spectrum: m/e (I%): 400 (M, 0.4); 344 (M-2CO, 0.6); 316 (M-3CO, 1.8); 288 (M-4CO, 4); 232 (M-Fe(CO)₄, 100).

The comparison of the IR and mass spectral data of 2 with those of the 1-phenyl-3,4-dimethylphosphole $P \rightarrow Fe(CO)_4$ complex [6] is particularly interesting: the IR spectra suggest the same donor-acceptor ability (same CO frequencies) for the arsole and the phosphole; on the contrary the mass spectra suggest that the strength of the As-Fe bond is far weaker than that of the corresponding P-Fe bond (intensities of the molecular peaks: 0.4 versus 16% and so on for the M-(CO)_n peaks). The explanation is perhaps that the phosphole is both a better donor and a better acceptor than the arsole toward the Fe(CO)₄ moiety.

With $Fe_3(CO)_{12}$ in boiling toluene *I* gives, beside complex 2, another complex 3 in low yield:

This yellow complex was purified by chromatography (first chromatography: hexane-benzene 80: 20; the red band which is eluted after 2 is recovered and rechromatographed: cyclohexane-ether 70:30; the yellow product is eluted after a red band which is discarded) and crystallized in hexane at 15 °C (m.p. ~ 99 °C). The σ , π structure of 3 was unambiguously established by elemental analysis and spectroscopy. Anal. Found: C, 42,46; H, 2.32; Fe, 20.93; calc. for C₁₉H₁₃AsFe₂O₇: C, 42.27; H, 2.43; Fe, 20.69; ¹H NMR (in CDCl₃): $\delta = 1.70$ (s, 6H, Me); 5.50 (s, 2H, CH); 7.27 (s, Br, 5H, Ph) ppm. The shielding of the olefinic protons establishes the π -complexation of the diene. IR (decalin): vCO = 2064, 2052, 1989, 1980, 1973, 1954, 1944; the general pattern is similar to that of the IR spectrum of the 1-phenyl-3,4-dimethylphosphole-Fe₂(CO)₇ complex [6]; Mass spectrum: m/e (I%): 540 (M, 0.3); 512 (M-CO, 0.3); 456 (M-3CO), 0.7); 428 (M-4CO, 0.8); 400 (M-5CO, 1.7); 372 (M-6CO, 3.1); 344 (M-7CO, 23); 288 (M-7CO-Fe, 30.5); 232 (M-7CO-2Fe, 100) (main peaks only).

Thus the general behaviour of l toward iron carbonyls is very similar to that of 1-phenyl-3,4-dimethylphosphole [6] since, in both cases, LFe(CO)₄ and LFe₂(CO)₇ complexes are obtained. However a closer inspection of the products of the reaction of l with Fe₃(CO)₁₂ allowed us to discover a major difference. Indeed, at higher temperature (140-150 °C), a ferrole complex is formed by an original As \rightarrow Fe exchange:

$$I + Fe_{3}(CO)_{12} \xrightarrow{xy|ene}{4h, reflux} 2 + 3 + Me \xrightarrow{Fe}_{(CO)_{3}} Fe(CO)_{2}$$

$$Fe_{(CO)_{3}} \xrightarrow{V}_{0} Fe(CO)_{2}$$

$$4 \qquad yield 19 \%$$

The yellow ferrole was purified by chromatography (hexane; $R_f \sim 0.7$) and crystallized in methanol at -70 °C (m.p. ~84 °C). It can be further purified by sublimation under vacuum (35 °C, 0.01 mm Hg). Its structure was established beyond any doubt by elemental analysis and spectroscopy. *Anal.* Found: C, 40.05; H, 2.06; Fe 31.28; calc. for $C_{12}H_8Fe_2O_6$: C, 40.05; H, 2.24; Fe, 31.04; ¹H NMR (in CDCl₃): $\delta = 2.40$ (s, 6H, Me); 5.96 (s, 2H, CH) ppm; ¹³C NMR (¹H decoupled, in CDCl₃ + Cr(Acac)₃, TMS): $\delta = 32.4$ (s, Me); 110.7 (s, CH); 178.5 (s, *C*-Me); 207.2 (s, CO); 210.6 (s, CO); 213.8 (s, CO) ppm; IR (decalin): ν CO = 2070, 2032, 1994, 1988, 1944 cm⁻¹. The IR and NMR data are in perfect agreement with those reported by Hübener and Weiss [7] for the 2-methylferrole-hexacarbonyl complex. Mass spectrum: m/e (I%): 360 (M, 55); 332 (M-CO, 36); 304 (M-2CO, 39); 276 (M-3CO, 36); 248 (M-4CO, 100); 220 (M-5CO, 76); 192 (M-6CO, 67).

Thus in the same way as thiophens [7, 8] (but with a much better yield) and in contrast with phospholes, arsoles can undergo an heteroatom \rightarrow Fe exchange. These results probably reflect the fact that the As-C bond is weaker than the P-C bond as substantiated hereafter:

 $D(As-C) = 62.8 \text{ kcal/mol in } Me_3As [10]$ $D(P-C) = 68.3 \text{ kcal/mol in } Me_3P [9]$

Finally it is interesting to note that, while using the same experimental conditions (boiling xylene), $Mn_2(CO)_{10}$ cleaves the exocyclic [2] and $Fe_3(CO)_{12}$ the endocyclic As-C bonds of 1.

References

- 1 E. W. Abel, I. W. Nowell, A. G. J. Modinos and C. Towers, Chem. Commun., 258 (1973).
- 2 G. Thiollet, F. Mathey, R. Poilblanc and D. Voigt, Inorg. Chim. Acta, 30, L294 (1978).
- 3 G. Thiollet, F. Mathey and R. Poilblanc, Inorg. Chim. Acta, 32, L67 (1979).
- 4 E. H. Braye, W. Hübel and I. Caplier, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 83, 4406 (1961).
- 5 G. Märkl and H. Hauptmann, Tetrahedron Letters, 3257 (1968).
- 6 F. Mathey and G. Muller, J. Organometal. Chem., 136, 241 (1977).
- 7 P. Hübener and E. Weiss, J. Organometal. Chem., 129, 105 (1977).
- 8 H. D. Kaesz, R. B. King, T. A. Manuel, L. D. Nichols and F. G. A. Stone, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 82, 4749 (1960).
- 9 K. W. Egger and T. L. James, Trans. Faraday Soc., 66, 2560 (1970).
- 10 S. J. W. Price and J. P. Richard, Can. J. Chem., 48, 3209 (1970).