

Journal of Organometallic Chemistry 515 (1996) 155-162



Synthesis, spectroscopic and structural characterisation of $\{(CO)_{3}Fe(\mu-CH_{2})Se\}_{2}$ and $(CO)_{6}Fe_{2}\{\mu-Se(CH_{2})_{n}Se\}$ (n = 1, 2)

Pradeep Mathur *, Bala. Manimaran, Rajiv Trivedi, Md. Munkir Hossain, Mangla Arabatti

Chemistry Department, Indian Institute of Technology, Powai, Bombay 400 076, India

Received 10 October 1995

Abstract

From the room temperature reaction of $(CO)_9Fe_3(\mu_3-Se)_2$ or $(CO)_6Fe_2(\mu-Se_2)$ with diazomethane, four products were isolated; { $(CO)_3Fe(\mu-CH_2)Se\}_2$ (1), $(CO)_6Fe_2(\mu-SeCH_3)_2$ (2), $(CO)_6Fe_2(\mu-SeCH_2Se)$ (3) and $(CO)_6Fe_2(\mu-SeCH_2CH_2Se)$ (4). All four compounds were characterised by IR, ¹H, ¹³C, and ⁷⁷Se NMR spectroscopy. Structures of 1, 3 and 4 were established by single crystal X-ray structure analyses.

Keywords: Iron; Selenium; Methylene; Carbonyl; X-ray diffraction; Crystal structure

1. Introduction

Use of certain main group elements as bridging and stabilizing ligands in designed cluster growth reactions has been extensively demonstrated in recent years [1]. Early work on metal-chalcogenide complexes suggested that while sulfur and selenium showed similar behavior, the reactivity of tellurium was often unique [2]. Recently it has been evidenced that selenium displays some unique reactivity features, in its compounds of iron, towards small organic molecules [3]. The compounds $(CO)_6 Fe_2(\mu - E_2)$, [E = S, Se, Te] are useful starting materials for addition of organic and inorganic species [4]. There is much interest in the synthesis and characterisation of metal complexes containing methylene and other alkylidene groups, because these species are known to be intermediates in many catalytic reactions [5]. Recently, addition of CH₂ groups into S-S and Te-Te bonds of $(CO)_6 Fe_2(\mu - E_2)(E = S \text{ or } Te)$ has been reported [6]. Typically, the reactions of compounds $(CO)_6 Fe_2(\mu - E_2)$ involve addition across the E-E bond. Here we report on the formation of an unusual product arising from the addition of CH₂ groups across the Fe-Se bonds, as well as three other products from the reactions of diazomethane with $(CO)_9Fe_3(\mu_3-Se)_2$ or $(CO)_{6}Fe_{2}(\mu - Se_{2}).$

2. Experimental

2.1. General procedures

All reactions and other manipulations were performed using standard Schlenk techniques under an atmosphere of pre-purified argon. Solvents were rigorously dried prior to use. Infrared spectra were recorded on a Nicolet 5DXB or Impact 400 FT spectrometer as hexane solutions in 0.1 mm pathlength NaCl cells. NMR spectra were all obtained on a Varian VXR-300S spectrometer in CDCl₃. ⁷⁷Se NMR measurements were made at an operating frequency of 57.23 MHz using 90° pulses with 1.0 s delay and 1.0 s acquisition time. The spectra were referenced to Me₂Se ($\delta = 0$). Elemental analyses were carried out using a Carlo Erba automatic analyser. $(CO)_9 Fe_3(\mu_3 - Se)_2$ and $(CO)_6 Fe_2(\mu - Se_2)$ were prepared as previously reported [7]. Diazomethane was prepared by dissolving 2.14 g of N-methyl-Nnitroso-p-toluenesulfonamide in 30 ml of diethyl ether. The solution was cooled to 0°C and to this a solution of 0.4 g of KOH in 10 ml of 96% ethanol was added. After 5 min the ethereal solution was distilled and found to contain 0.32–0.35 g of diazomethane [8].

2.2. Reaction of $(CO)_9 Fe_3(\mu_3-Se)_2$ with diazomethane

To a solution of $(CO)_9Fe_3(\mu_3-Se)_2$ (0.5 g, 0.86 mmol) in dry diethyl ether was added dropwise an

^{*} Corresponding author.

ethereal solution of diazomethane by distilling a basic solution of N-methyl-N-nitroso-p-toluenesulfonamide in diethyl ether. Addition of diazomethane was continued until TLC and IR indicated total consumption of starting material (CO)₉Fe₃(μ_3 -Se)₂. The reaction mixture was stirred at room temperature for a further 30 min. The solution was filtered through Celite and the solvent was evaporated. The mixture was redissolved in hexane and subjected to chromatographic work-up on silica gel TLC plates using hexane as eluent. This yielded the following four orange colored bands, in order of elution: {(CO)₃Fe(μ -CH₂)Se}₂ (1) (62 mg, 12%), (CO)₆Fe₂(μ -SeCH₃)₂ (2) (56 mg, 11%), (CO)₆Fe₂(μ -SeCH₂Se) (3) (42 mg, 8%), and (CO)₆Fe₂(μ -SeCH₂CH₂Se) (4) (32 mg, 6%). 1: IR (ν (CO) cm⁻¹) 2071(w), 2056(s), 2051(m), 2001(s). ¹H NMR: δ 4.59 (d, J = 2.56 Hz), δ 5.03 (d, J = 2.56 Hz) (CH₂), δ 203.9, 208.6, 209.2 (CO); ⁷⁷Se NMR: δ – 362 (m). Anal. Found: C, 20.4; H, 0.82. C₈H₄Fe₂O₆Se₂ Calc.:

Table 1 Crystallographic data for 1, 3 and 4

Compound 1 3 4 Formula Crystal dimensions (nm ¹) $C_gH_Fe_2Se_2O_g$ $0.12 \times 0.15 \times 0.20$ $C_3H_2Fe_2Se_2O_g$ $0.13 \times 0.015 \times 0.20$ $C_3H_2Se_2O_g$ $0.33 \times 0.30 \times 0.35$ FW 465.73 451.70 $C_3H_2Fe_2Se_2O_g$ monoclinic $C_3H_2Fe_2Se_2O_g$ monoclinic $C_3H_2Fe_2Se_2O_g$ C_3T_2/c P_2/n P_2/n FW 465.73 monoclinic monoclinic monoclinic $monoclinic$ $Space$ group P_2/r P_2/n P_2/n P_2/n P_2/n $a(\hat{A})$ $6.577(2)$ $8.812(4)$ $6.821(64)$ $6.821(64)$ $b(\hat{A})$ $10.930(3)$ $12.306(1)$ $13.545(2)$ $c(\hat{A})$ $c(\hat{A})$ $17.977(7)$ $11.810(1)$ $7.948(1)$ $3.545(2)$ $c(\hat{A})$ 2.44 2.37 2.30 75.32 $P(m^{-1})$ 78.86 79.95 75.32 $P(000)$ 880 60.88 60.88 51.50 $Corrections$ Lorentz and polarization, Lorentz and polarization, Lorentz and polarization, $Lorentz and polarization, P_1 emptrical$	Crystallographic data for 1, 3 an	d 4		
$\begin{array}{l c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	Compound	1	3	4
Crystal dimensions (nm ³) 0.12 × 0.15 × 0.30 0.10 × 0.15 × 0.20 0.33 × 0.30 × 0.35 FW 465.73 451.70 465.73 Crystal system monoclinic monoclinic monoclinic Space group $P_{2_1/c}$ $P_{2_1/n}$ 625.73 $a(\dot{\lambda})$ 6.577(2) 8.8812(4) 68216(4) $b(\dot{\lambda})$ 10.930(3) 12.306(1) 13.545(2) $c(\dot{\lambda})$ 17.977(7) 11.810(1) 7.948(1) $f(dgg)$ 96.43(3) 10.251(3) 11.371(68) $V(\dot{\lambda})$ 1284.1(7) 1266.0(1) 672.4(1) Z 4 4 2 $P_{abc}(g cm^{-1})$ 2.41 2.37 2.30 $P_{abc}(g cm^{-1})$ 7.886 79.95 75.32 $F(000)$ 800 848 440 Corrections Lorentz and polarization, Lorentz and polari2.4 <td>Formula</td> <td>$C_8H_4Fe_2Se_2O_6$</td> <td>$C_7H_2Fe_2Se_2O_6$</td> <td>$C_8H_4Fe_2Se_2O_6$</td>	Formula	$C_8H_4Fe_2Se_2O_6$	$C_7H_2Fe_2Se_2O_6$	$C_8H_4Fe_2Se_2O_6$
FW 465.73 451.70 465.73 Crystal system monoclinic monoclinic monoclinic Space group P_{2_1}/c P_{2_1}/n P_{2_1}/m $a(\dot{\lambda})$ 6.577(2) 8.8812(4) 6.8216(4) $b(\dot{\lambda})$ 19.93(3) 12.306(1) 13.545(2) $c(\dot{\lambda})$ 17.977(7) 18.10(1) 7.948(1) β (deg) 96.43(3) 101.251(3) 113.716(8) $V(\dot{\lambda})$ 128.41(7) 126.60(1) 672.4(1) Z 4 4 2 2.30 $p(cm^{-1})$ 7.8.6 79.95 75.32 F0000 80 848 440 Corrections Lorentz and polarization, linear decay (< 0.9%	Crystal dimensions (mm ³)	$0.12 \times 0.15 \times 0.30$	$0.10 \times 0.15 \times 0.20$	$0.33 \times 0.30 \times 0.35$
Crystal system monoclinic monoclinic monoclinic monoclinic Space group P_1/r^c P_2/r P_2/r P_2/r $a(\hat{\lambda})$ 6.577(2) 8.8812(4) 6.8216(4) $b(\hat{\lambda})$ 10.930(3) 12.306(1) 13.545(2) $c(\hat{\lambda})$ 17.977(7) 11.810(1) 7.948(1) $\beta(deg)$ 96.43(3) 101.251(3) 113.716(8) $V(\hat{\lambda}^3)$ 1284.1(7) 126.60(1) 672.4(1) Z 4 4 2 $p_{ab}(g cm^{-3})$ 2.41 2.37 2.30 $P(000)$ 880 848 440 Corrections Lorentz and polarization, linear decay (< 6.0%	FW	465.73	451.70	465.73
$ \begin{split} & \text{Space group} & P_2, /c & P_2, /n & P_2, /m \\ & a(Å) & 6.577(2) & 8.8812(4) & 6.8216(4) \\ & b(Å) & 10.930(3) & 12.306(1) & 13.545(2) \\ & c(Å) & 17.977(7) & 11.810(1) & 7.948(1) \\ & \beta(\deg) & 96.43(3) & 101.251(3) & 113.716(8) \\ & V(Å^3) & 1284.1(7) & 1266.0(1) & 672.4(1) \\ & Z & 4 & 4 & 2 \\ & D_{ajk}(g\text{cm}^{-1}) & 2.41 & 2.37 & 2.30 \\ & \mu(\operatorname{cm}^{-1}) & 78.86 & 79.95 & 75.32 \\ & F(000) & 880 & 848 & 440 \\ & \text{Corrections} & \text{Lorentz and polarization, } \\ & Lorentz and $	Crystal system	monoclinic	monoclinic	monoclinic
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Space group	$P2_1/c$	$P2_1/n$	$P2_1/m$
$ \begin{split} b(\hat{\lambda}) & 10.930(3) & 12.306(1) & 13.545(2) \\ c(\hat{\lambda}) & 17.977(7) & 11.810(1) & 7.948(1) \\ b(deg) & 96.43(3) & 101.25(13) & 113.716(8) \\ V(\hat{\lambda}^3) & 1284.1(7) & 1266.0(1) & 672.4(1) \\ Z & 4 & 4 & 2 \\ D_{ak}(gcm^{-3}) & 2.41 & 2.37 & 2.30 \\ \mu(cm^{-1}) & 78.86 & 79.95 & 75.32 \\ F(000) & 80 & 848 & 440 \\ Corrections & Lorentz and polarization, Lorentz and polarization, Lorentz and polarization, linear decay (< 6.0% linear decay (< 6.0% linear decay (< 7.8% on F) empirical on F) empirical on F) empirical on F) empirical on F, empirical on F) empirical on F) \\ P(00) & 0.000 & 0.000 & 0.000 & 0.0000 \\ P(00) & 0.0000 & 0.0000 & 0.00000 \\ P(00) & 0.0000 & 0.0000 & 0.00000 \\ P(00) & 0.0000 & 0.0000 \\ P(0) & 0.0000 & 0.000 \\ P(0) & 0.0000 & 0.0000 \\ P(0) & 0.0000 & 0.$	<i>a</i> (Å)	6.577(2)	8.8812(4)	6.8216(4)
$\begin{array}{cccc} (\dot{\lambda}) & 17.977(7) & 11.81(1) & 7.948(1) \\ \beta (\deg) & 96.43(3) & 101.251(3) & 113.716(8) \\ \gamma (\dot{\lambda}) & 128.4(7) & 126.6(1) & 672.4(1) \\ Z & 4 & 4 & 2 \\ D_{alc} (g~cm^{-3}) & 2.41 & 23.67 & 2.30 \\ \mu (cm^{-1}) & 78.86 & 79.95 & 75.32 \\ F(000) & 80 & 848 & 440 \\ Corrections & Lorentz and polarization, \\ linear decay (< 0.9\% & linear decay (< 6.0\% & linear decay (< 7.8\% & 0 & 0 & F), empirical \\ absorption (< 19.3\% & absorption (< 12.8 & absorption (< 36.3\% & 0 & F), empirical \\ absorption (< 19.3\% & absorption (< 12.8 & absorption (< 36.3\% & 0 & F), empirical \\ absorption (< 19.3\% & 0 & F) & 0 & F), empirical \\ absorption (< 12.8 & absorption (< 36.3\% & 0 & F), empirical \\ absorption (< 12.8 & absorption (< 36.3\% & 0 & F), empirical \\ absorption (< 12.8 & absorption (< 12.8 & absorption (< 36.3\% & 0 & F), empirical \\ absorption (< 12.8 & absorption (< 12.8 & absorption (< 36.3\% & 0 & F), empirical \\ absorption (< 12.8 & absorption (< 12.$	b (Å)	10.930(3)	12.306(1)	13.545(2)
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	c (Å)	17.977(7)	11.810(1)	7.948(1)
$\begin{array}{cccccccc} V\left(\dot{\lambda}^{3}\right) & 1284.1(7) & 1266.0(1) & 672.4(1) \\ Z & 4 & 4 & 2 \\ D_{abc}\left(g{\rm cm}^{-3}\right) & 2.41 & 2.37 & 2.30 \\ \mu\left({\rm cm}^{-1}\right) & 78.86 & 79.95 & 75.32 \\ \mu\left({\rm cm}^{-1}\right) & 78.86 & 79.95 & 75.32 \\ F(000) & 880 & 848 & 440 \\ Corrections & Lorentz and polarization, \\ Inear decay (< 0.9\% & Inear decay (< 6.0\% & Inear decay (< 7.8\% & 0 & F), empirical \\ absorption (< 19.3\% & absorption (< 12.8 & absorption (< 36.3\% & 0 & F) \\ on F) & on F) & on F) & on F) \\ 2\theta_{max}\left(deg\right) & 60.88 & 60.88 & 51.50 \\ T(K) & 296(1) & 296(1) & 296(1) & 296(1) \\ hkl ranges & h = -9 to 9 & h = -12 to 12, & h = -8 to 8 \\ k = -15 to 0 & k = 0 to 17 & k = 0 to 16 \\ 1 = -25 to 0 & 1 = 0 to 16 & 1 = 0 to 9 \\ E.s.d. of observation f & 2.495 & 1.144 & 1.198 \\ unit weight & Convergence, largest & 0.00002 & 0.00001 & 0.00000 \\ shift (Å) & \\ Himitation factor & \sum w(F_{g} - F_{c})^2 & \sum w(F_{g} - F_{c}) & \sum w(F_{g} - F_{c})^2 \\ Least-squares weights & 1/\sigma(F_{g})^2 & 1/\sigma(F_{g})^2 & unit weights \\ Least-squares suctoff & 3\sigma(1) & 3\sigma(1) & 3\sigma(1) \\ Instrument instability & 0.040 & 0.040 & n.a. \\ factor & & \\ High peak in final difference & -1.223 & -0.357 & -0.915 \\ map (e^{\frac{\lambda}{A}^{-3}}) & K_{a}(W) & 5.62 & 3.25 & 3.00 \\ R_{a}(W) & 5.62 & 3.25 & 3.00 \\ R_{a}(W) & 5.62 & 3.25 & 3.00 \\ R_{a}(W) & 5.62 & 3.25 & 3.00 \\ N_{a}(W) & 7.31 & 3.68 & 3.39 \\ N_{a}(Ge) & 7.31 & 3.68 & 3.39 \\ $	β (deg)	96.43(3)	101.251(3)	113.716(8)
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$V(Å^3)$	1284.1(7)	1266.0(1)	672.4(1)
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Ζ	4	4	2
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$D_{\text{calc}} (\text{g cm}^{-3})$	2.41	2.37	2.30
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	μ (cm ⁻¹)	78.86	79.95	75.32
	F(000)	880	848	440
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Corrections	Lorentz and polarization,	Lorentz and polarization,	Lorentz and polarization,
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		linear decay (< 0.9%	linear decay (< 6.0%	linear decay (< 7.8%
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		on F), empirical	on F), empirical	on F), empirical
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		absorption (< 19.3%	absorption (< 12.8	absorption ($< 36.3\%$
$\begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$		on F)	on F)	on F)
$T(\mathbf{k})$ 296(1) 296(1) 296(1) 296(1) hkl ranges $h = -9$ to 9 $h = -12$ to 12, $h = -8$ to 8 $k = -15$ to 0 $k = 0$ to 17 $k = 0$ to 16 $l = -25$ to 0 $l = 0$ to 16 $l = 0$ to 9 standard $l = 0$ to 16 $l = 0$ to 9 unit weight 0.00002 0.00001 0.00000 shift (Å) M $l = 0$ to 17 $k = 0$ to 9 shift (Å) M $l = 0$ to 16 $l = 0$ to 9 Least-squares weights $l / \sigma(F_0)^{l/2}$ $\Sigma w(F_0 - F_c)^2$ $\Sigma w(F_0 - F_c)^2$ Least-squares weights $l / \sigma(F_0)^{l/2}$ $l / \sigma(F_0)^{l/2}$ unit weights Least-squares cut-off $3\sigma(l)$ $3\sigma(l)$ $3\sigma(l)$ $a\sigma(l)$ Instrument instability 0.040 0.040 n.a. factor I I/ $\sigma(F_0)^{-2}$ $a\sigma(l)$ $a\sigma(l)$ Ibip beak in final difference 1.292 0.412 0.576 map (e Å^{-3}) I $a\delta = 3$ $a\sigma = 3$ Low peak in final difference -1.223 -0.357 -0.915 </td <td>$2\theta_{max}$ (deg)</td> <td>60.88</td> <td>60.88</td> <td>51.50</td>	$2\theta_{max}$ (deg)	60.88	60.88	51.50
hkl ranges $h = -9$ to 9 $h = -12$ to 12, $h = -8$ to 8 $k = -15$ to 0 $k = 0$ to 17 $k = 0$ to 16 $l = -25$ to 0 $l = 0$ to 16 $l = 0$ to 9 E.s.d. of observation of 2.495 1.144 1.198 unit weight 0.00002 0.00001 0.00000 Shift (Å) V $V = [F_c ^2]^2$ $Vw(F_o - F_c)^2$ Least-squares weights $1/\sigma(F_o)^2$ $1/\sigma(F_o)^2^2$ unit weights Least-squares weights $1/\sigma(F_o)^2$ $1/\sigma(F_o)^2$ unit weights Least-squares weights $1/\sigma(F_o)^2$ 0.040 n.a. factor T T $3\sigma(I)$ $3\sigma(I)$ Instrument instability 0.040 0.040 n.a. factor T T T Low peak in final difference 1.223 -0.357 -0.915 map (e Å^{-3}) $R_w(\%)$ 3.68 3.39 No. of reflections 4194 4173 1286 measured V V V V No. of parameters $1/93$ 2	$T(\mathbf{K})$	296(1)	296(1)	296(1)
$k = -15$ to 0 $k = 0$ to 17 $k = 0$ to 16 $l = -25$ to 0 $l = 0$ to 16 $l = 0$ to 9E.s.d. of observation of2.4951.1441.198unit weightConvergence, largest0.000020.000010.00000shift (Å) V $V = (F_o - F_c)^2$ $V = (F_o - F_c)$ $V = (F_o - F_c)^2$ Least-squares weights $1/\sigma(F_o)^2$ $1/\sigma(F_o)^2$ unit weightsLeast-squares weights $1/\sigma(F_o)^2$ $1/\sigma(F_o)^2$ unit weightsLeast-squares cut-off $3\sigma(I)$ $3\sigma(I)$ $3\sigma(I)$ Instrument instability0.0400.040n.a.factorImage (Å^{-3})Image (Å^{-3})Image (A^{-3})Low peak in final difference1.223 -0.357 -0.915 map (eÅ^{-3})Image (A^{-3})Image (A^{-3})Image (A^{-3})No. of reflections419441731286measuredImage (A^{-3})Image (A^{-3})No. of reflections observed219221111236No. of parameters17516094Scale factor1.6932.4601.130	hkl ranges	h = -9 to 9	h = -12 to 12,	h = -8 to 8
l = -25 to 0 $l = 0$ to 16 $l = 0$ to 9E.s.d. of observation of2.4951.1441.198unit weight	e	k = -15 to 0	k = 0 to 17	k = 0 to 16
E.s.d. of observation of 2.495 1.144 1.198 unit weight		l = -25 to 0	l = 0 to 16	l = 0 to 9
unit weight 0.00002 0.00001 0.00000 shift (Å) $Minimization factor \Sigma w(F_o - F_c)^2 \Sigma w(F_o - F_c) \Sigma w(F_o - F_c)^2 Least-squares weights 1/\sigma(F_0)^2 1/\sigma(F_0)^2 unit weights Least-squares weights 1/\sigma(F_0)^2 J/\sigma(F_0)^2 unit weights Least-squares weights 1/\sigma(F_0)^2 J/\sigma(F_0)^2 unit weights Least-squares cut-off 3\sigma(I) 3\sigma(I) 3\sigma(I) Instrument instability 0.040 0.040 n.a. factor High peak in final difference 1.292 0.412 0.576 map (e Å^{-3}) -1.223 -0.357 -0.915 Low peak in final difference -1.223 -0.357 -0.915 map (e Å^{-3}) -0.368 3.39 3.00 R_w(\%) 7.31 3.68 3.39 No. of reflections 4194 4173 1286 measured W W W W No. of parameters 175 160 94 Scale factor 1.693 <$	E.s.d. of observation of	2.495	1.144	1.198
Convergence, largest 0.00002 0.00001 0.00000 shift (Å)	unit weight			
shift (Å) $\sum w(F_o - F_c)^2$ $\sum w(F_o - F_c)$ $\sum w(F_o - F_c)^2$ Least-squares weights $1/\sigma(F_o)^2$ $1/\sigma(F_o)^2$ unit weights Least-squares cut-off $3\sigma(I)$ $3\sigma(I)$ $3\sigma(I)$ Instrument instability 0.040 0.040 n.a. factor -0.357 -0.915 map (e Å^{-3}) -0.357 -0.915 Low peak in final difference -1.223 -0.357 -0.915 map (e Å^{-3}) -0.357 -0.915 -0.915 No of reflections 4194 4173 1286 measured - - - - No. of reflections observed 2192 2111 1236 - No. of parameters 175 160 94 - - Scale factor 1.693 2.460 1.130 -	Convergence, largest	0.00002	0.00001	0.00000
Simical Minimization factor $\sum w(F_0 - F_c)^2$ $\sum w(F_0 - F_c)$ $\sum w(F_0 - F_c)^2$ Least-squares weights $1/\sigma(F_0)^2$ $1/\sigma(F_0)^2$ unit weightsLeast-squares cut-off $3\sigma(I)$ $3\sigma(I)$ $3\sigma(I)$ Instrument instability 0.040 0.040 n.a.factorHigh peak in final difference 1.292 0.412 0.576 map (e Å^{-3})Low peak in final difference -1.223 -0.357 -0.915 map (e Å^{-3}) $R(\%)$ 5.62 3.25 3.00 $R_w(\%)$ 7.31 3.68 3.39 No. of reflections 4194 4173 1286 measuredNo. of reflections observed 2192 2111 1236 No. of parameters 175 160 94 Scale factor 1.693 2.460 1.130	shift (Å)			
Inimitation letter $Dr(T_0)^{-1} T(r)$ $Dr(T_0)^{-1} T(r)$ $Dr(T_0)^{-1} T(r)$ Least-squares weights $1/\sigma(F_0)^2$ unit weightsLeast-squares cut-off $3\sigma(I)$ $3\sigma(I)$ Instrument instability0.0400.040factor1High peak in final difference1.292Low peak in final difference-1.223 -0.357 -0.915 map (e Å ⁻³) -1.223 Low peak in final difference -1.223 $r(\%)$ 5.62 $R(\%)$ 5.62 $R(\%)$ 7.31 $R(\%)$ 3.68 $No.$ of reflections4194 $H73$ 1286Measured $No.$ of reflections observed $No.$ of parameters175 160 94Scale factor1.693 2.460 1.130	Minimization factor	$\sum w(F - F)^2$	$\sum w(F_1 - F_1)$	$\sum w(F_{1} - F_{1})^{2}$
Least squares cut-off $3\sigma(I)$ $3\sigma(I)$ $3\sigma(I)$ Instrument instability 0.040 0.040 n.a. factor 1292 0.412 0.576 map (e Å ⁻³) -0.357 -0.915 Low peak in final difference -1.223 -0.357 -0.915 map (e Å ⁻³) -0.357 -0.915 K (%) 5.62 3.25 3.00 R_w (%) 7.31 3.68 3.39 No. of reflections 4194 4173 1286 measured - - - No. of reflections observed 2192 2111 1236 No. of parameters 175 160 94 Scale factor 1.693 2.460 1.130	Least-squares weights	$1/\sigma(F)^2$	$1/\sigma(F)^2$	unit weights
Lease split is the offSO (1)SO (1)SO (1)Instrument instability0.0400.040n.a.factor	Least-squares cut-off	$3\sigma(1)$	$3\sigma(I)$	$3\sigma(I)$
Instantion in submity0.0100.0100.0100.010factor1.2920.4120.576map (e Å ⁻³) -0.357 -0.915 Low peak in final difference -1.223 -0.357 -0.915 map (e Å ⁻³) -0.357 -0.915 $R (\%)$ 5.623.253.00 $R_w (\%)$ 7.313.683.39No. of reflections419441731286measured $-0.00000000000000000000000000000000000$	Instrument instability	0.040	0.040	n a
High peak in final difference1.2920.4120.576map (e Å ⁻³)-0.357-0.915Low peak in final difference-1.223-0.357-0.915map (e Å ⁻³) -0.357 3.00 $R (\%)$ 5.623.253.00 $R_w (\%)$ 7.313.683.39No. of reflections419441731286measuredNo. of reflections observed219221111236No. of parameters17516094Scale factor1.6932.4601.130	factor	0.010		
map (e Å ⁻³)-0.357-0.915Low peak in final difference -1.223 -0.357 -0.915 map (e Å ⁻³) R_{*} (%) 5.62 3.25 3.00 R_{*} (%) 7.31 3.68 3.39 No. of reflections 4194 4173 1286 measured -0.915 1286 No. of reflections observed 2192 2111 1236 No. of parameters 175 160 94 Scale factor 1.693 2.460 1.130	High peak in final difference	1.292	0.412	0.576
Low peak in final difference -1.223 -0.357 -0.915 map (e Å ⁻³) $R(\%)$ 5.62 3.25 3.00 $R(\%)$ 7.31 3.68 3.39 No. of reflections 4194 4173 1286 measured 1292 2111 1236 No. of reflections observed 2192 2111 1236 No. of parameters 175 160 94 Scale factor 1.693 2.460 1.130	map (e $Å^{-3}$)			
map (e Å ⁻³) $R(\%)$ 5.623.253.00 $R(\%)$ 7.31 3.68 3.39 No. of reflections 4194 4173 1286 measured 1292 2111 1236 No. of reflections observed 2192 2111 1236 No. of parameters 175 160 94 Scale factor 1.693 2.460 1.130	Low peak in final difference	-1.223	-0.357	-0.915
$R(\%)$ 5.623.253.00 $R_w(\%)$ 7.313.683.39No. of reflections419441731286measured1286No. of reflections observed219221111236No. of parameters17516094Scale factor1.6932.4601.130	map $(e Å^{-3})$			
$R_w(\%)$ 7.313.683.39No. of reflections419441731286measured 1292 21111236No. of reflections observed219221111236No. of parameters17516094Scale factor1.6932.4601.130	R (%)	5.62	3.25	3.00
No. of reflections 4194 4173 1286 measured	R (%)	7.31	3.68	3.39
measured219221111236No. of parameters17516094Scale factor1.6932.4601.130	No of reflections	4194	4173	1286
No. of reflections observed 2192 2111 1236 No. of parameters 175 160 94 Scale factor 1.693 2.460 1.130	measured			
No. of parameters 175 160 94 Scale factor 1.693 2.460 1.130	No. of reflections observed	2192	2111	1236
Scale factor 1.693 2.460 1.130	No. of parameters	175	160	94
	Scale factor	1.693	2.460	1.130

 Table 2

 Atomic coordinates and isotropic displacement coefficients for 1

Atom	x	y	z	$B(\dot{A}^2)$
Sel	0.98439(8)	0.09500(6)	0.77434(3)	2.30(1)
Se2	0.50989(8)	0.05351(6)	0.73129(3)	2.26(1)
Fel	0.7005(1)	0.09140(8)	0.85073(4)	2.16(2)
Fe2	0.7933(1)	0.05803(8)	0.65485(4)	2.12(2)
011	0.8801(7)	-0.1352(5)	0.9174(3)	5.9(1)
012	0.8998(7)	0.2827(5)	0.9471(2)	5.0(1)
013	0.3514(6)	0.0755(5)	0.9377(2)	4.5(1)
O21	1.1491(6)	0.0698(5)	0.5715(2)	4.4(1)
O22	0.6212(8)	0.2865(5)	0.5894(3)	5.4(1)
O23	0.5830(7)	-0.1252(5)	0.5556(2)	4.9(1)
Cl	0.5463(9)	0.2084(6)	0.7791(3)	2.8(1)
C2	0.9518(9)	~ 0.0608(6)	0.7274(3)	2.4(1)
C11	0.8122(9)	-0.0473(7)	0.8918(3)	3.5(2)
C12	0.8247(9)	0.2071(6)	0.9105(3)	3.1(1)
C13	0.488(1)	0.0813(6)	0.9023(3)	3.1(1)
C21	1.0131(9)	0.0667(6)	0.6038(3)	2.6(1)
C22	0.6860(8)	0.1996(6)	0.6141(3)	2.9(1)
C23	0.6641(9)	-0.0505(7)	0.5927(3)	3.4(2)
H11	0.463(8)	0.237(5)	0.794(2)	4.0 *
H12	0.605(9)	0.279(5)	0.744(3)	4.0 *
H21	0.883(8)	-0.123(5)	0.767(3)	4.0 *
H22	0.953(7)	- 0.106(5)	0.688(2)	4.0 *

* Refined isotropically.

Anisotropically refined atoms are given in the form of the isotropic equivalent displacement parameter, defined as: $(4/3)^*[a2^*B(1, 1) + b2^*B(2, 2) + c2^*B(3, 3) + ab(\cos \gamma)^*B(1, 2) + ac(\cos \beta)^*B(1, 3) + bc(\cos \alpha)^*B(2, 3)].$

Table 3

Selected bond distances (Å) a	and bond angles (deg) for 1
-------------------------------	-----------------------------

C, 20.6; H, 0.86%. M.p. 95–97°C (dec.). 2: IR (ν(CO)
cm ⁻¹) 2064(m), 2031(vs), 1991(s), 1986(s). ¹ H NMR:
δ 2.09 (s, ${}^{2}J_{H-Se} = 9.8$ Hz) (CH ₃). ${}^{13}C({}^{1}H)$ NMR: δ
7.9 (q, $J = 143.3 \text{ Hz}$) (CH ₃), δ 209 (CO); ⁷⁷ Se NMR:
δ 45.5 (q, ${}^{2}J_{se-H} = 9.8$ Hz). Anal. Found: C, 20.54; H,
1.29. C ₈ H ₆ Fe ₂ O ₆ Se ₂ Calc.: C, 20.62; H, 1.34%. M.p.
134–136°C. 3: IR (ν (CO) cm ⁻¹) 2071(m), 2032(vs),
1999(vs), 1992(s), 1980(w). ¹ H NMR: δ 4.02 (s, ² J_{H-Se}
= 10.8 Hz) (CH ₂). ¹³ C(¹ H) NMR: δ 27.6 (t, J_{C-H} =
160.5 Hz) (CH_2) , 209.4 (CO). ⁷⁷ Se NMR: δ 67.6 (t.
${}^{2}J_{\text{Se-H}} = 10.3$ Hz). Anal. Found: C, 18.72; H, 0.48.
C ₈ H ₄ Fe ₂ O ₆ Se ₂ Calc.: C, 18.6; H, 0.44%. M.p. 79-
81°C. 4: IR (ν (CO) cm ⁻¹) 2070(s), 2031(vs), 1998(s),
1990(s). ¹ H NMR: δ 2.65 (s, CH_2-CH_2). ¹³ C(¹ H)
NMR: δ 27.6 (t, $J_{C-H} = 143.4 \text{ Hz})(CH_2 - CH_2)$, 210
(CO). ⁷⁷ Se NMR: δ 528 (m). Anal. Found: C, 20.6; H,
0.84. C ₈ H ₄ Fe ₂ O ₆ Se ₂ Calc.: C, 20.7; H, 0.81%. M.p.
94–96°Č.

2.3. Reaction of $(CO)_6 Fe_2(\mu-Se_2)$ with diazomethane

Reaction of $(CO)_6 Fe_2(\mu - Se_2)$ (0.5 g, 1.14 mmol) with diazomethane was carried out by following the above method. Chromatographic work-up on silica gel TLC plates using hexane as eluent yielded four compounds: 1 (46 mg, 9%), 2 (42 mg, 8%), 3 (31 mg, 6%), and 4 (22 mg, 4%).

Se(1)-Fe(1)	2.439(1)	Fe(2)-C(2)	2.042(6)	
Se(1)-Fe(2)	2.3984(9)	Fe(1) - C(11)	1.806(7)	
Se(1)-C(2)	1.902(6)	Fe(1)-C(12)	1.796(6)	
Se(2)-Fe(1)	2.3981(9)	Fe(1) - C(13)	1.764(6)	
Se(2)-Fe(2)	2.437(1)	Fe(2) - C(21)	1.800(6)	
Se(2)-C(1)	1.901(6)	Fe(2)-C(22)	1.820(6)	
Fe(1) - C(1)	2.007(6)	Fe(2)–C(23)	1.779(6)	
Fe(1) - Se(1) - Fe(2)	98.30(3)	Se(1)-Fe(2)-C(2)	49.9(2)	
Fe(1)-Se(1)-C(2)	100.4(2)	Se(1)-C(2)-Fe(2)	74.8(2)	
Fe(2) - Se(1) - C(2)	55.3(2)	Se(2)-C(1)-Fe(1)	75.6(2)	
Fe(1)-Se(2)-Fe(2)	98.34(3)	Se(2)-Fe(2)-C(2)	89.7(2)	
Fe(1)-Se(2)-C(1)	54.2(2)	Se(2)-Fe(2)-C(21)	176.0(2)	
Fe(2)-Se(2)-C(1)	99.9(2)	Se(2)-Fe(2)-C(22)	87.6(2)	
Se(1)-Fe(1)-Se(2)	81.67(3)	Se(2) - Fe(2) - C(23)	89.9(2)	
Se(1)-Fe(1)-C(1)	89.6(2)	C(1)-Fe(1)-C(11)	161.8(3)	
Se(1)-Fe(1)-C(11)	86.7(2)	C(1)-Fe(1)-C(12)	95.6(3)	
Se(1)-Fe(1)-C(12)	90.0(2)	C(1)-Fe(1)-C(13)	90.2(3)	
Se(1) - Fe(1) - C(13)	176.4(2)	C(2)-Fe(2)-C(21)	88.8(2)	
Se(2) - Fe(1) - C(1)	50.2(2)	C(2)-Fe(2)-C(22)	160.9(2)	
Se(2)-Fe(1)-C(11)	111.6(2)	C(2) - Fe(2) - C(23)	98.7(3)	
Se(2)-Fe(1)-C(12)	144.5(2)	C(11) - Fe(1) - C(12)	102.1(3)	
Se(2) - Fe(1) - C(13)	95.4(2)	C(11) - Fe(1) - C(13)	92.5(3)	
Se(1)-Fe(2)-Se(2)	81.69(3)	C(12)-Fe(1)-C(13)	93.6(3)	
Se(1)-Fe(2)-C(21)	94.5(2)	C(21)-Fe(2)-C(22)	92.7(3)	
Se(1)-Fe(2)-C(22)	111.0(2)	C(21)-Fe(2)-C(23)	94.0(3)	
Se(1)-Fe(2)-C(23)	147.2(2)	C(22)-Fe(2)-C(23)	100.2(3)	

Numbers in parentheses are estimated standard deviations in the least significant digits.

Table 4					
Atomic coordinates	and	isotropic	displacement	coefficients	for 3

Atom	x	у	z	B (Å ²)
Se1	0.29769(5)	0.28900(4)	0.29925(4)	3.382(9)
Se2	0.43476(5)	0.20639(4)	0.52342(4)	3.102(9)
Fe1	0.17827(7)	0.26833(6)	0.46127(6)	3.24(1)
Fe2	0.28348(7)	0.10824(5)	0.36752(5)	3.01(1)
011	-0.1343(4)	0.2682(4)	0.3239(4)	6.3(1)
O12	0.1948(5)	0.4965(4)	0.5354(5)	8.6(1)
O13	0.0774(5)	0.1591(5)	0.6528(3)	8.6(1)
O21	0.0214(5)	0.0562(3)	0.1857(4)	7.2(1)
O22	0.2137(5)	-0.0681(3)	0.5150(4)	6.9(1)
O23	0.5236(4)	0.0101(4)	0.2637(4)	7.0(1)
Cl	0.4945(6)	0.3034(4)	0.4085(5)	4.3(1)
C11	-0.0114(5)	0.2691(4)	0.3771(5)	4.1(1)
C12	0.1881(6)	0.4079(5)	0.5091(5)	5.3(1)
C13	0.1164(5)	0.2036(6)	0.5787(4)	5.3(1)
C21	0.1228(6)	0.0755(4)	0.2574(5)	4.6(1)
C22	0.2431(5)	0.0007(4)	0.4577(4)	4.3(1)
C23	0.4303(6)	0.0471(4)	0.3044(5)	4.5(1)
Hl	0.590(5)	0.265(3)	0.379(4)	4.2 *
H2	0.531(4)	0.386(3)	0.440(4)	4.2 *

* Refined isotropically.

Anisotropically refined atoms are given in the form of the isotropic equivalent displacement parameter, defined as: $(4/3)^*[a2^*B(1, 1) + b2^*B(2, 2) + c2^*B(3, 3) + ab(\cos \gamma)^*B(1, 2) + ac(\cos \beta)^*B(1, 3) + bc(\cos \alpha)^*B(2, 3)].$

2.4. Crystal structure determination of 1, 3 and 4

The crystallographic data of 1, 3 and 4 are given in Table 1. The data were fully automatically collected on

Table 5

Table	6
-------	---

Atom	x	y	z	$B(Å^2)$
Sel	-0.4582(1)	-0.250	-0.5034(1)	3.29(2)
Se2	0.0363(1)	-0.250	-0.3732(1)	2.94(1)
Fe1	-0.1901(1)	- 0.34397(5)	-0.27571(9)	2.79(1)
011	0.1710(8)	-0.3858(4)	0.0719(6)	6.1(1)
012	-0.2151(8)	-0.5289(3)	-0.4730(7)	6.7(1)
013	- 0.4854(7)	-0.3932(4)	-0.1043(6)	6.3(1)
Cl	-0.356(2)	-0.250	-0.703(1)	5.6(3)
C2	-0.122(1)	-0.250	-0.641(1)	4.6(2)
C11	0.0316(9)	-0.3695(4)	-0.0666(7)	3.8(1)
C12	-0.2042(9)	-0.4574(4)	- 0.3964(7)	3.9(1)
C13	-0.3721(9)	-0.3730(4)	-0.1732(7)	3.8(1)
HI	-0.442(8)	-0.293(4)	-0.793(6)	5.6 *
H2	- 0.080(8)	- 0.197(4)	- 0.696(6)	4.6 *

* Refined isotropically.

Anisotropically refined atoms are given in the form of the isotropic equivalent displacement parameter, defined as: $(4/3)^*[a2^*B(1, 1) + b2^*B(2, 2) + c2^*B(3, 3) + ab(\cos \gamma)^*B(1, 2) + ac(\cos \beta)^*B(1, 3) + bc(\cos \alpha)^*B(2, 3)].$

a Nonius CAD4MACH diffractometer employing Mo K α radiation at 296(1) K. The entire measurement, from peak search, centering, recentering, indexing, cell-transformation, Laue symmetry check, selection of data collection parameters, selection of *hkl*-borders, selection of standard reflections, data collection, selection and measurement of empirical absorption correction and determination of final unit-cell, was conducted by CAD4EXPRESS [9]. Data processing as well as refinement

Selected bond distances (Å) a	and bond angles (deg) for 3			
$\frac{\text{Se}(1) - \text{Fe}(1)}{\text{Se}(1) - \text{Fe}(1)}$	2.3755(9)	Fe(1)-C(11)	1.782(4)	
Se(1) - Fe(2)	2.3778(8)	Fe(1)-C(12)	1.805(6)	
Se(1) - C(1)	1.967(5)	Fe(1)-C(13)	1.777(6)	
Se(2)-Fe(1)	2.3783(7)	Fe(2)-C(21)	1.779(5)	
Se(2)-Fe(2)	2.3851(7)	Fe(2)-C(22)	1.779(5)	
Se(2) - C(1)	1.957(6)	Fe(2)-C(23)	1.789(6)	
Fe(1)-Fe(2)	2.527(1)			
Fe(1)-Se(1)-Fe(2)	64.22(3)	Se(1)-Fe(2)-Fe(1)	57.84(3)	
Fe(1) - Se(1) - C(1)	87.7(2)	Se(1)-Fe(2)-C(21)	93.0(2)	
Fe(2)-Se(1)-C(1)	87.8(2)	Se(1)-Fe(2)-C(22)	158.3(2)	
Fe(1)-Se(2)-Fe(2)	64.07(3)	Se(1)-Fe(2)-C(23)	99.3(2)	
Fe(1)-Se(2)-C(1)	87.9(1)	Se(2)-Fe(2)-Fe(1)	57.83(2)	
Fe(2)-Se(2)-C(1)	87.8(1)	Se(2)-Fe(2)-C(21)	158.4(2)	
Se(1)-Fe(1)-Se(2)	74.43(3)	Se(2)-Fe(2)-C(22)	93.6(2)	
Se(1) - Fe(1) - Fe(2)	57.94(3)	Se(2)-Fe(2)-C(23)	100.8(2)	
Se(1)-Fe(1)-C(11)	94.1(2)	Fe(1)-Fe(2)-C(21)	100.6(2)	
Se(1)-Fe(1)-C(12)	98.5(2)	Fe(1)-Fe(2)-C(22)	100.5(2)	
Se(1) - Fe(1) - C(13)	158.7(2)	Fe(1)-Fe(2)-C(23)	150.7(2)	
Se(2)-Fe(1)-Fe(2)	58.10(2)	Se(1)-C(1)-Se(2)	94.2(2)	
Se(2) - Fe(1) - C(11)	156.7(2)	C(11)-Fe(1)-C(12)	98.7(2)	
Se(2) - Fe(1) - C(12)	102.9(2)	C(11)-Fe(1)-C(13)	92.0(2)	
Se(2) - Fe(1) - C(13)	92.2(2)	C(12)-Fe(1)-C(13)	100.7(3)	
Fe(2) - Fe(1) - C(11)	98.6(2)	C(21)-Fe(2)-C(22)	92.5(2)	
Fe(2) - Fe(1) - C(12)	151.6(2)	C(21)-Fe(2)-C(23)	98.4(2)	
Fe(2) - Fe(1) - C(13)	100.9(2)	C(22)-Fe(2)-C(23)	100.7(2)	
Se(1)-Fe(2)-Se(2)	74.27(2)			

Numbers in parentheses are estimated standard deviations in the least significant digits.

Table 7

Selected bond distances (A) a	ind bond angles (deg) for 4			
Se(1)-Fe(1)	2.3615(8)	Fe(1)-C(13)	1.781(7)	
Se(1) - C(1)	1.98(1)	Fe(1) - C(12)	1.792(6)	
Se(2)-Fe(1)	2.360(1)	Fe(1) - C(11)	1.774(4)	
Se(2)-C(2)	1.959(7)	C(1)-C(2)	1.47(1)	
Fe(1)-Se(1)-C(1)	101.6(2)	Se(2)-Fe(1)-C(12)	100.8(2)	
Fe(1)-Se(2)-C(2)	102.0(3)	Se(2) - Fe(1) - C(13)	159.7(2)	
Se(1) - Fe(1) - Se(2)	82.26(3)	Se(1)-C(1)-C(2)	114.5(5)	
Se(1)-Fe(1)-C(11)	158.2(2)	Se(2)-C(2)-C(1)	114.8(7)	
Se(1)-Fe(1)-C(12)	101.2(2)	C(11) - Fe(1) - C(12)	100.1(2)	
Se(1)-Fe(1)-C(13)	90.1(2)	C(11) - Fe(1) - C(13)	91.0(3)	
Se(2)-Fe(1)-C(11)	89.3(2)	C(12) - Fe(1) - C(13)	99.1(3)	

Numbers in parentheses are estimated standard deviations in the least significant digits.

 $\begin{pmatrix} \lambda \end{pmatrix}$ and here λ are the $(\lambda + \lambda)$ for A

and presentation were carried out using MolEN [10]. The structures were solved by SIR92 [11]. Tables 2, 4 and 6 list the atomic coordinates of 1, 3 and 4 respectively. Tables 3, 5 and 7 list the selected bond distances and bond angles of compounds 1, 3 and 4 respectively. For all compounds thermal parameters and complete lists of bond lengths and angles have been deposited at the Cambridge Crystallographic Data Centre.

3. Results and discussion

3.1. Synthesis and spectroscopic characterisation of 1-4

When an ether solution containing $(CO)_9Fe_3(\mu_3-Se)_2$ or $(CO)_6Fe_2(\mu-Se_2)$ was stirred with diazomethane at room temperature, the following four products were isolated: { $(CO)_3Fe(\mu-CH_2)Se\}_2$ (1), $(CO)_6Fe_2(\mu-SeCH_3)_2$ (2), $(CO)_6Fe_2(\mu-SeCH_2Se)$ (3) and $(CO)_6Fe_2(\mu-SeCH_2CH_2Se)$ (4) (Scheme 1). Compounds 1-4 were separated and isolated in pure form by chromatographic work-up and were found to be stable in solid form. Compound 2 has been reported previously and was identified by comparison of its IR and ¹H NMR spectra with that reported [12]. The new compounds 1, 3, and 4 were characterised by IR and ¹H, ¹³C and ⁷⁷Se NMR spectroscopy. Their compositions were confirmed by elemental analysis.

The infrared spectra of 1, 3 and 4 indicated the presence of only terminally bonded carbonyl ligands. The ¹H NMR spectrum of 1 showed two doublets for the CH₂ groups. Its proton-decoupled ¹³C NMR spectrum showed a single peak, whereas the proton-coupled ¹³C NMR spectrum showed a doublet of doublets. These features are consistent with the presence of non-equivalent H atoms on each CH₂ group of 1. The ¹³C NMR spectrum of 1 also displayed three peaks for the CO ligands, indicating that at room temperature CO rearrangement at each Fe center is slow on the NMR timescale. The ⁷⁷Se NMR spectrum of 1 displayed a single signal with a complex splitting pattern due to



Scheme 1.



Fig. 1. ORTEP drawing of the molecular structure of 1 with thermal ellipsoids drawn at 50% probability.

short range and long range coupling with the non-equivalent protons of the two CH_2 groups.

The ¹H NMR spectrum of **3** showed a singlet, with ⁷⁷Se satellites, for the CH₂ group. Its proton coupled ¹³C NMR spectrum displayed a triplet for the CH₂ group and a single peak due to the CO groups. The ⁷⁷Se NMR spectrum showed a triplet due to the coupling of Se atoms with CH₂ protons.

The ¹H NMR spectrum of 4 showed a singlet due to the CH₂ groups. Its proton coupled ¹³C NMR spectrum displayed a triplet for the CH₂ group and a single peak due to the CO groups. The ⁷⁷Se NMR spectrum showed a multiplet indicating the short range and long range Se-H coupling.

3.2. Molecular structures of 1, 3 and 4

Dark red crystals of 1, 3 and 4 were grown from their hexane/ CH_2Cl_2 solutions at 0°C and X-ray structure analyses were carried out. The molecular structure of 1 is shown in Fig. 1. The structure consists of a planar arrangement of FeSeFeSe in which each Fe-Se bond is bridged by CH_2 groups, one on either side of the Fe_2Se_2 plane. Three carbonyl groups are terminally bonded to each Fe atom. The bonding of each Fe atom



Fig. 2. ORTEP drawing of the molecular structure of 3 with thermal ellipsoids drawn at 50% probability.

to two Se atoms, one CH₂ group and three CO groups gives a distorted octahedral geometry around it. The Fe-Se bonds in 1 which are bridged by CH₂ groups, (Fe(1)-Se(2) = 2.3981(9) Å, Fe(2)-Se(1) = 2.3984(9) Å) are shorter than the unbridged Fe-Se bonds, (Fe(1)-Se(1) = 2.439(1) Å, Fe(2)-Se(2) = 2.437(1) Å). The average Fe-Se-Fe angle in compound 1 (98.3°) is larger than the average Fe-Se-Fe angle in (CO)₆-Fc₂{ μ -SeC(Ph)=C(H)Se} (63.6°), {(CO)₆Fe₂(μ -Se₂)]₂-C(Ph)-C(H)(64.5°), (CO)₆Fe₂(μ -SeCH₃)₂(65.1°), (CO)₆Fe₂Se₂Pt(PPh₃)₂(63.7°) [13].

The molecular structure of 3 is shown in Fig. 2. The structure consists of an Fe₂Se₂ butterfly core, and the CH₂ group is bridged between the wingtips of two Se atoms. Each Fe atom has three terminal carbonyl groups. Overall the structure of 3 is similar to that of $(CO)_6 Fe_2(\mu$ -TeCH₂Te) and $(CO)_6 Fe_2(\mu$ -SCH₂S) [6]. The average Fe-Se bond distance in 3 (2.379 Å) is somewhat longer than the average Fe-Se bond distances in $\{(CO)_6 Fe_2(\mu - Se_2)\}_2 C(Ph) - C(H)(2.368 \text{ Å})$ and shorter than the average Fe-Se bond distances in $(CO)_{6}Fe_{2}\{\mu-SeC(Ph)=C(H)Se\}$ (2.385 Å), $\{(CO)_{5} Fe_{2}(\mu - Se_{2})_{2}C(Ph) - C(H)(\mu - dppe)(2.394 \text{ Å})$ [14], and $(CO)_6 Fe_2(\mu - Se_2) Pt(PPh_3)_2(2.401 \text{ Å})$. The average Fe-Se–Fe angle (64.1°) is larger than the average Fe–Te–Fe angle in $(CO)_6 Fe_2(\mu - TeCH_2 Te)$ (61.1°), $(CO)_6 Fe_2\{\mu TeC(Ph) = C(H)Te\}$ (61.3°) [15], (CO)₆Fe₂(μ -TeCH₃)₂ (62.3°) [16], and $(CO)_{6}Fe_{2}(\mu - Te(CH_{2})_{2}Te)(62.6^{\circ})$ [17], indicating a larger degree of opening of the Fe₂Se₂ butterfly in 3. The Se-C-Se bridging angle in 3 is 94.2(2)°, which is, similar to the S-C-S angle of 94.6(3)° reported for $(CO)_6Fe_2(\mu$ -SCH₂S) and more than the Te-C-Te angle of 92.1(4)° reported for $(CO)_6Fe_2(\mu$ -TeCH₂Te). The two bridging Se atoms, three carbonyl groups and the Fe-Fe bond define a distorted octahedral geometry around each Fe atom.

Fig. 3 shows the molecular structure of compound 4. Its geometry can be described as consisting of an Fe_2Se_2 butterfly core with a CH₂-CH₂ group inserted between the Se atoms. Each Fe has three terminal carbonyl groups. The average Fe-Se bond distance in 4 (2.36 Å) is shorter than the average Fe-Se bond distance in $\{(CO)_6 Fe_2(\mu - Se_2)\}_2 C(Ph) - C(H) (2.37 \text{ Å}) \text{ and } (CO)_6 - C(H) (2.37 \text{ A}) (2.37 \text{ A}$ Fe₂{ μ -SeC(Ph)–C(H)Se} (2.3836 Å). The average Se–C bond length in 4 (1.965 Å) is slightly shorter than the average Se-C bond distance in $\{(CO)_6 Fe_2(\mu - Se_2)\}_2$ C(Ph)-C(H) (2.016 Å), but similar to the average Se-C bond distance in $(CO)_6$ Fe₂{ μ -SeC(Ph)=C(H)Se} (1.963) Å). The C–C bond distance in 4 (1.47 Å) is shorter than the C-C bond distance in $(CO)_6 Fe_2(\mu - Te(CH_2)_2 Te)$ (1.494 Å) and the average C-C bond distance in $(CO)_6 Fe_2(\mu-Te(CH_2)_3 Te)$ (1.483 Å). All other bond metricals are unexceptional.

4. Conclusion

The reaction of $(CO)_9 Fe_3(\mu_3 - Se_2)$ and $(CO)_6 Fe_2(\mu - Se)_2$ with the organic intermediate CH_2N_2 has been studied. In the reaction with diazomethane, four prod-

Fig. 3. ORTEP drawing of the molecular structure of 4 with thermal ellipsoids drawn at 50% probability.



ucts could be isolated, of which compound 1 represents the first example of an Fe-Se bond bridged by a methylene group. Although the coupling of methylene groups with alkynes on cluster compounds is well known [18], the coupling of two methylene groups in the formation of compound 4 is unusual [19].

Acknowledgments

We thank Dr. Frank van Meurs, Nonious BV, Application Laboratory, 2600 AV Delft, Netherlands, for carrying out the crystallographic analyses. One of us (RT) acknowledges the Department of Atomic Energy, Government of India for the award of a Dr. K.S. Krishnan Fellowship.

References

- K.H. Whitmire, J. Coord. Chem., 17 (1988) 95; L. Linford and H.G. Raubenheimer, Adv. Organomet. Chem., 32 (1991) 1; N.A. Compton, R.J. Errington and N.C. Norman, Adv. Organomet. Chem., 31 (1990) 91.
- [2] L.E. Bogan, G.R. Clark and T.B. Rauchfuss, *Inorg. Chem.*, 25 (1986) 4050; R.D. Adams, J.E. Babin and M. Tasi, *Inorg. Chem.*, 26 (1987) 2807; P. Mathur, I.J. Mavunkal and V. Rugmini, *J. Organomet. Chem.*, 367 (1989) 243; P. Mathur, D. Chakrabarty and I.J. Mavunkal, *J. Cluster, Sci.*, 4 (1993) 351.
- [3] P. Mathur and M.M. Hossain, Organometallics, 12 (1993) 2398.
- [4] D. Seyferth and G.B. Womack, Organometallics, 5 (1986) 2360; D. Seyferth, G.B. Womack, R.S. Henderson, M. Cowie

and B.M. Hames, Organometallics, 5 (1986) 1568; D. Seyferth, R.S. Henderson, L.-C. Song and G.B. Womack, J. Organomet. Chem., 292 (1985) 9.

- [5] M.E. Garcia, N.H. Tran-Huy, J.C. Jeffrey, P. Sherwood and F.G.A. Stone, J. Chem. Soc., Dalton Trans., (1987) 2201; R.C. Brady and R. Pettit, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 102 (1980) 6181; R.H. Grubbs, Progr. Inorg. Chem., 24 (1978) 1.
- [6] A. Shaver, P.J. Fitzpatrick, K. Steliou and I.S. Butler, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 101 (1979) 1313; P. Mathur, V.D. Reddy and R. Bohra, J. Organomet. Chem., 401 (1991) 339.
- [7] P. Mathur, D. Chakrabarty, M.M. Hossain, R.S. Rashid, V. Rugmini and A.L. Rheingold, *Inorg. Chem.*, 31 (1992) 1106.
- [8] A.I. Vogel, Textbook of Practical Organic Chemistry, ELBS, Longman, 4th edn., 1984, p. 291.
- [9] CAD4EXPRESS, A program for automatic collection of diffraction data for CAD4 / MACH3, Nonius, Delft, Netherlands, 1994.
- [10] MolEN, An interactive structure solution procedure, Enraf-Nonius, Delft, Netherlands, 1990.
- [11] A. Altomare, G. Cascarano, C. Giacovazzo, A. Guagliardi, M.C. Burla, G. Polidori and M. Camalli, J. Appl. Cryst., 27 (1994) 435.
- [12] D. Seyferth and H.S. Henderson, J. Organomet. Chem., 204 (1981) 333; P. Mathur, R. Trivedi, Md.M. Hossain, S.S. Tavale and V.G. Puranik, J. Organomet. Chem., 491 (1995) 291.
- [13] P. Mathur, M.M. Hossain, K. Das and U.C. Sinha, J. Chem. Soc., Chem. Commun., (1993) 46.
- [14] P. Mathur, M.M. Hossain and M.F. Mahon, J. Organomet. Chem., 471 (1994) 185.
- [15] T. Fassler, D. Buchholz, G. Huttner and L. Zsolnai, J. Organomet. Chem., 369 (1989) 297.
- [16] R.E. Bachman and K.H. Whitmire, Organometallics, 12 (1993) 1988.
- [17] M. Shieh and M.-H. Shieh, Organometallics, 13 (1994) 920.
- [18] For example: A.D. Clauss, J.R. Shapley and S.R. Wilson, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 103 (1981) 7387.
- [19] J.R. Shapley, A.C. Sievert, M.R. Churchill and H.J. Wasserman, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 103 (1981) 6975.