Tetrahedron Letters No. 23, pp. 1531-1534, 1%3. Pergamon Press Ltd. Printed in Great Britain.

## P.M.R. SPECTRUM OF P-HYDROXYRTHYL MRRCURY(I1) HYDROXIDE. P.R. Wells and W. Kitching. Department of Chemistry, University of Queensland, (Received 16 July 1963)

The proton magnetic resonance spectra of mercury(I1) addition compounds of ethylene have been examined by Cotton and Leto(1) to provide evidence for the formulation as Q-bonded compounds. The simplest compound ?-hydroxyethylmercury(II) hydroxide, examined in KOH/D<sub>2</sub>0 solution at 40 Mc/s, provided such evidence but "the appearance of shoulders on the central components of the triplets" was considered puzzling and was unexplained,

The carbon bound protons of

$$
\begin{array}{cccc}\n\text{H}_\text{B} & \text{H}_\text{A} & \text{H}_\text{B} \\
\text{H}_\text{C} & \text{H}_\text{C} & \text{H}_\text{C} & \text{H}_\text{B} \\
\text{H}_\text{B} & \text{H}_\text{A} & \text{H}_\text{A} & \text{H}_\text{B}\n\end{array}
$$

2-hydroxyethylmercury(II)hydroxide constitute a four spin system classified as  $A_2B_2$  if there is rapid rotation about the C-C bond or if rotation is restricted with the molecule in the trans conformation. (The symmetrical appearance of the spectrum excludes a gauche conformation). Under these circumstances with two different  $H_A-H_B$  spin-spin coupling constants (transoid  $J_T$  and cisoid  $J_C$ ) the more complex pattern observed by Cotton and Leto is the expected one.

We have re-examined the spectrum at  $60$  Mc/s, obtaining greater peak separations, and successfully analysed

1531

the spectrum as a simplified  $A_2X_2$  system. The simplification arises from the facts that the two coupling constants  $J_{AA}$  and  $J_{BR}$  are essentially equal and that their sum is considerably greater than the difference  $J_{T}-J_{C}$ . A pattern of two quintets centred on the resonance positions of  $H_A$  and  $H_B$  each with intensities in the ratio 2:1:2:1:2 is expected. The observed pattern differs slightly since  $H_A$  and  $H_B$  are not sufficiently different to completely satisfy the  $A_2X_2$ condition.

By comparison with the p.m.r. spectrum of 1-propanol(2) the observed resonance positions may be assigned as below.

CH<sub>3</sub>-CH<sub>2</sub>-CH<sub>2</sub>-OH in CDCl<sub>3</sub>  
\n8.43 
$$
\tau
$$
 6.42  $\tau$   
\nHO Hg - CH<sub>2</sub> - CH<sub>2</sub> - OH in D<sub>2</sub>O  
\n8.27  $\tau$  6.34  $\tau$ 

These are in good agreement with the findings of Cotton and Leto. It may also be deduced from the spectra that  $J_T = 9.8$ and  $J_C$  = 6.4 c/s in agreement with the values  $J_T$  = 9 and  $J_{\rho}$  = 6 c/s found by Pople, Schneider and Bernstein(3) for 1,2-chlorobromoethane.

The observation in our spectrum of low intensit patterns on the high field and low field sides of the two quintets due to <sup>199</sup>Hg – <sup>1</sup>H couplings provides final proof of the presence of a Hg-C  $\sigma$ -bond(4). The magnitudes of the observed coupling constants are  $J_{199\mu_{\alpha}-\mu_{\alpha}}$  = 217.5 c/s and

$$
- Hg \xrightarrow[\text{H}_\text{ext}]{\text{C}} \xrightarrow[\text{H}_\text{ext}]{\text{H}_\text{ext}} \xrightarrow[\text{H}_\text{ext}]
$$

 $J_{199Hg-Hg}$  = 159 c/s. For a series of compounds of the type CH<sub>3</sub>HgX the methyl resonance positions and  $^{199}$ Hg - <sup>1</sup>H coupling constants are **recorded** in Table **1.** 

$\underline{x}$ in $CH_3$ HgX	$D_2$ O solution	$\tau$ -value $J_{199_{\text{Hg}-1\text{H}}}$		Dioxane solution $\tau$ value $J_199_{Hg-}1_H$
$c_{10}$	8.79	260		
OCOCH <sub>3</sub>	9.05	232	9.08	220
C1			9.07	211
Br			8.98	207
$\mathbf T$			8.91	
CN	9.40	188	8,88	175

TABLE 1.

÷ **No** coupling is observed since a rapid methyl group exchange between  $^{199}$ Hg and  $^{200}$ Hg is presumably taking place (cf. 5).

It can be seen that the effect of the mercury atom on the resonance position of a methylene group is small and towards high field justifying our assignments. (The methylene groups of paraffins absorb at  $ca. 8.8\tau$  in CDC13 solution(2).

A marked dependence of  $J_1g g_{H_{\infty}-1H}$  on the nature of X in  $CH_{\mathcal{R}}HgX$  is evident from the data of Table 1. From a more detailed study by Schneider(F) it appears that the present value of  $J_1$ 99 $_{\text{Hg}-1}$ H is characteristic of the system HO-Hg-CH.

The value of  $J_{199Hg-Hg}$  is however distinctly different from those previously observed. Schneider(6) finds that in CH<sub>3</sub>CH<sub>2</sub>HgX,  $J_{199Hg-H<sub>6</sub>}$  is consistently 30-40% larger than  $J_{1}99_{\text{Hg-Hat}}$ . Similar observations have been made for

mercury dialkyls(7). Baker(8) reports that in  $(C_2H_5)_4Pb$ , J<sub>207Pb-Ha</sub> exceeds J<sub>207Pb-Ha</sub>, and Burke and Lauterbur(9) report similar finding for  $^{119}$ Sn-<sup>1</sup>H couplings. It is noteworthy that in all these compounds there are no substituents on  $C_{\beta}$  while in the present example this carbon bears a hydroxygroup. We are at present investigating compounds of the type XHg.CHR-CHRR to determine the extent to which d and  $\beta$ **-substituents modify the <sup>199</sup>Hg - <sup>1</sup>H coupling constants.** Present results indicate that the methyl-group in  $CH_3$ .  $CH_2HgX$ leads to a very small increase in  $J_1g_{Hg-Haf}$ , while the  $-CO_2^$ group in HO-Hg-CH<sub>2</sub>CO<sub>2</sub><sup>-</sup> (10) (J<sub>199Hg-1H</sub> = 265 c/s) leads to a considerable increase.

## REFERENCES

- (1) F.A. Cotton and J.R. Leto, <u>J. Amer. Chem. Soc</u>. 80, 4823  $(1958).$
- (2) N.S. Bhacca, L.F. Johnson and J.N. Shoolery, "NMR Spectre Catalog", Varian Associates 1962.
- (3) J.A. Pople, **W.C.** Schneider and H. J. Bernstein, Canad. J. Chem. 22, 1060 (1957)*.*
- (4) cf. P.R. Wells and W. Kitching, Aust. J. Chem. (1963) in press.
- (5) M.D. Rausch, Abstracts of Papers, "Current trends in Organometallic Chemistry", University of Cincinnati, Ohio,<br>U.S.A., June 1963.
- (6) W.G. Schneider, personal communication.
- (7) **R.E.** Dessy, **T.J.** Flautt, **H.H.** Jaffe and C.F. Reynolds, J. Chem. Phyq. 2, 1422 (1959).
- (8) E.B. Baker, <u>J. Chem. Phys</u>. <u>26</u>, 960 (1957)
- (9) J.J. Burke and P.C. Lauterbur, <u>J. Amer. Chem. Soc</u>. 83 326 **(1961).**
- (10) P.R. Wells and W. Kitching, <u>Aust. J. Chem</u>. 16, 508 (1963)