

Multinuclear NMR study of compounds resulting from the silylation of indole; evidence for a 4,5-disilylation

Claude Biran, Michel Fourtinon, Blaise Efendene et Jacques Dunoguès

Laboratoire de Chimie organique et organométallique (U.A. 35 CNRS), Université de Bordeaux I, 351, Cours de la Libération, F-33405 Talence Cédex (France)


(Received September 30th, 1987)

Abstract

Complete assignments of the ^1H , ^{13}C and ^{29}Si NMR data of 1-, 4- and 5-trimethylsilyl-, 1,4- and 1,5-bis(trimethylsilyl)- and 1,4,5-tris(trimethylsilyl)-indoles allowed unambiguous confirmation of the structures proposed for these products. For the trisilylated derivative it was found that silylation had occurred at the 1,4,5 and not at the 1,4,7 positions as previously suggested.

Introduction

In view of the importance of indole derivatives in chemistry and biochemistry and the potential use of organosilicon compounds for functionalization of organic




substrates we examined a few years ago the possibility of silylating indole or *N*-trimethylsilylindole and reported the preliminary results [1]. There was a problem of unambiguous identification of the formed products, and thus we postulated that the disilylation of *N*-trimethylsilyl indole **1** took place at the positions 4 and 5, (**2**), not 4 and 7 (**2a**) as previously suggested by Barrett et al. [1,2].

We present here the results of a study involving assignments of ^1H , ^{13}C and ^{29}Si NMR data for 1-trimethylsilyl indole (**1**), 1,4,5-tris(trimethylsilyl)[*4H*],[*5H*]indole (**2**), 1,4-bis(trimethylsilyl)indole (**3**), 1,5-bis(trimethylsilyl)indole (**4**), 4-trimethylsilyl indole (**5**) and 5-trimethylsilylindole (**6**); all these are attractive precursors for the functionalization of the indole system, silicon intermediates having already been used for that purpose [3]. Identification of **3–6** confirms the structure of **2**.


Experimental

(1) Syntheses

Compound **1** was obtained quantitatively by the following procedure [1]:



Compound **2** was made as described previously [1]:



Compounds **3** and **4** were made from **2** by aromatization in the presence of benzoquinone (excess), and separated by HPLC (**3/4** ca. 70/30, 95% overall yield) [4].

Compounds **5** and **6** were made in almost quantitative yields by refluxing methanol solutions of **3** and **4** respectively.

(2) Identification of **1–6**

Compound **1** was identified by comparison of its properties IR, NMR, and mass spectra, with those of an authentic sample [5], but in order to make available additional information to help in the characterization of the other products, a complete NMR study was carried out (see below and Tables 3–5).

Compound **2**, a new product (it was not isolated by Barrett et al. [2]) gave a satisfactory elemental analysis and mass spectrum (molecular peak at 335, signals at 262 ($[M - \text{SiMe}_3]^+$), 189 ($[M - 2\text{SiMe}_3]^+$), 174 ($[M - 2\text{SiMe}_3 - \text{Me}]^+$), 73 $[\text{Me}_3\text{Si}]^+$, etc., but its complete structure was assigned by multinuclear NMR spectroscopy.

Results

(1) NMR study of **2**

The ^1H NMR spectra were recorded on a Bruker AM 360 apparatus (references: A 603006 H, A 603006 H and A 603 0008 C) (360 MHz) with CDCl_3 or C_6D_6 as solvent and Me_4Si as internal standard (δ (ppm); J (Hz); s, singlet; d, doublet; t, triplet; m, multiplet; dd, double doublet; dt, double triplet). $J \approx 0$, after expansion

Table 1

Proton chemical shifts (δ , ppm) and coupling constants (Hz) for **2**^a

Solvent	N-SiMe ₃	C(4)-SiMe ₃	C(5)-SiMe ₃	H(2)	H(3)	H(4)	H(5)	H(6)	H(7)
CDCl ₃	0.32	-0.09	-0.16	6.39	5.73	2.05	1.71	5.35	6.04
	s	s	s	d <i>J</i> ₂₃ 2.5	d	-s <i>J</i> ₄₅ = 0	d <i>J</i> ₅₆ 6.5	dd <i>J</i> ₆₇ 9.5	d
C ₆ D ₆	0.14	0.15	0.03	6.47	6.00	2.30	1.87	5.44	6.17
	s	s	s	d	d	s	d	dd	d

^a Double resonance and differential NOE techniques were used for assignments.

at 10 Hz cm⁻¹, i.e. $J \ll 2$ Hz. Results are summarized in Table 1. In the case of **7** and **8** only one allylic proton is coupled (²*J*) to an ethylenic one whereas in **9–11** the two allylic protons show similar coupling. Compound **2** behaves in this respect like **7** and **8** and so cannot be 1,4,7- (as assumed by Barrett et al. [2]) or 1,5,6-tris(trimethylsilyl)indole. Moreover application of the NOE technique to the Me₃SiN signal in the ¹H NMR spectrum produced response for positions 2 and 7, thus revealing the presence of a proton in position 7. Furthermore the identities of **3–6** formed from **2** by desilylation confirm the positions 1,4 and 5 for the silyl groups in **2**.

Further confirmation of the proposed structure of **2** is provided by the excellent ¹H/¹³C 2D correlation (see Fig. 1).

The ¹³C NMR spectra were recorded on the same spectrometer (90 MHz for the ¹³C); the spectra were completely decoupled or gated-non decoupled (the ¹H/¹³C 2D correlation was carried out with the Bruker AM 360 (δ (ppm); *J* (Hz); P, primary; S, secondary; T, tertiary; Q, quaternary carbon atom). The data are summarized in Table 2 and the ¹H/¹³C NMR correlation is shown in Fig. 1, which confirms our assignments for C(2), C(3), C(6) and C(7). The ²⁹Si NMR spectra recorded on a Bruker AC 200 apparatus (39.76 MHz for ²⁹Si) (δ (ppm), CDCl₃ as solvent and TMS as internal standard). There were signals at δ 9.4 (SiN) and δ 2.6 and 1.3 (these were from SiC₄ and SiC₅, but could not be separately assigned).


Fig. 1. ¹³C-2D NMR/¹³C-H correlation for compound **2**.

Table 2

¹³C chemical shifts (δ, ppm) for **2** in C₆D₆ and ¹J(¹H¹³C) coupling constants (Hz) for the olefinic carbons

N-SiMe ₃	C(4)-SiMe ₃	C(5)-SiMe ₃	C(2)	C(3)	C(4)	C(5)	C(6)	C(7)	C(8)	C(9)
-0.2 ^a	2.5	-3.2	122.0	110	24.5	27.9	123.8	117.5	132.0	122.0
P	P	P	T	T	T	T	T	T	Q	Q
			d, J 181	m, J 166			m, J 157	d, J 157		


^a Assigned by comparison with **1**.

Table 3

¹H NMR data for **1**, **3**, **4**, **5**, **6** (δ, ppm, J, Hz)

Products	N-SiMe ₃ (9H)	C-SiMe ₃ (9H)	H(2)	H(3)	H(4)	H(5)	H(6)	H(7)	NH ^b
1	0.52 s	—	7.11	6.53	7.58	7.06	7.12	7.43	—
3 ^a	0.53 s	0.38 s	7.15 d, (J 3.5)	6.68 d	—	7.25 dd, J 8.1	7.12 dd, J 9.8	7.47 dt, J 4.1	—
4	0.53 s	0.30 s	7.14 dd, J 3.2	6.59 dd	7.84 s	—	7.34 dd, J 9.2	7.50 dd, J 8.2	—
5 ^a	—	0.41 s	7.23 dd, J 3.2	6.68 m	—	7.29 dd, J 7.2	7.20 m	7.40 dt, J 1.5	8.0–8.3 broad
6	—	0.30 s	7.13 dd, J 2.75	6.53 m	7.82 s	—	7.33 m	7.33 m	8.0–8.3 broad

^a Previously reported by Barretti et al. [2]. ^b The chemical shift for this proton depends on the concentration.



From the data we identify the trisilylated derivative as **2** not as **2a** or any other isomer. We reached this conclusion because (a) no trimethylsilyl groups are bonded to $C(sp^2)$ atoms, and for several reasons (involving comparison with the spectra of the *N*-silyl indole); (b) they cannot be in position 2 or 3, and (c) comparison of the 1H NMR spectrum of **2** with those of **7** [6], **8** [7], **9** [8], **10** [6], and **11** [9], confirmed the proposed formulation.

As we showed previously for other cases, the 2J coupling constants (1H NMR) give useful information about the HC_xC_yH dihedral angle in silylated cycloolefins [10]. Although the Karplus [11] or Teisseire [12] models have to be used with caution, when $^2J = 0$ the dihedral angle is near 90° . Since $J_{45} \approx 0$ we suggest that the two silyl groups are in a *trans*-pseudo-axial/pseudo-axial disposition, as depicted in Fig. 2.





Fig. 2.

(2) NMR study of 3–6

The identities of compounds **3,4,5,6** were established by their elemental analysis, mass spectra, the molecular peak was present in each case, and their multi-nuclear NMR data. The 1H NMR data were obtained for solutions in $CDCl_3$ (which served as lock and reference) on a Bruker WH90 spectrometer.

Table 4

¹³C NMR data for **1**, **3**, **4**, **5**, **6** (δ, ppm)

Compound	C(2)	C(3)	C(4)	C(5)	C(6)	C(7)	C(8)	C(9)	C(10) ^b	C(11) ^b	C(12) ^b
1	129.7 T	104.5 T	120.8 T	121.0 T	119.8 T	112.8 T	140.0 Q	131.5 Q	-0.14 P	-	-
3	129.7 T	105.6 T	131.9 Q	125.7 T	120.8 T	113.8 T	139.0 Q	135.0 Q	-0.05 P	-0.51 P	-
4	129.6 T	104.4 T	126.0 or 126.3	129.9 Q	126.3 or 126.0	112.4 T	140.6 Q	131.3 Q	-0.21 P	-	-0.77
5	123.8 T	103.6 T	131.7 Q	125.6 T	121.8 T	112.0 T	134.5 Q	131.5 Q	-	-0.66 P	P
6	123.9 T	102.5 T	126.1 or 126.6	129.9 Q	126.6 or 126.1	110.5 T	134.6 Q	128? ^a Q	-	-	-0.76
	T	T	T	Q	T	T	Q				P

^a Very weak signal. ^b C(10): carbon atoms of eventual SiMe₃ bonded to N. C(11): carbon atoms of eventual SiMe₃ bonded to C(4). C(12): carbon atoms of eventual SiMe₃ bonded to C(5).

Table 5

²⁹Si NMR chemical shifts for **1**, **3**, **4**, **5**, **6**

Compounds	$\delta(\text{N-Si})$ (ppm)	$\delta(\text{C-Si})$ (ppm)
1	+10.8	—
3	+11.0	—4.9
4	+10.9	—4.0
5	—	—4.7
6	—	—4.0

The ¹³C NMR spectra were determined on a Bruker AC 200 spectrometer (50.327 MHz) with freshly prepared CDCl₃ solutions containing TMS as internal standard (δ (ppm); P, primary; S, secondary; T, tertiary; Q, quaternary carbon atom).

The ¹H and ¹³C NMR data are shown in Tables 3 and 4.

The ²⁹Si NMR spectra were recorded on a Bruker AC 200 spectrometer (39.76 MHz) with freshly prepared CDCl₃ solutions containing TMS as the internal standard.

The ²⁹Si chemical shifts are shown in Table 5.

Conclusion

Complete structures of the species under consideration have been assigned starting from data for the known compound species **1** and from the previously reported ¹H NMR data for **3** and **5** [2]; the latter data were not decisive by themselves but were important because the structure of **5** has been unambiguously established by X-ray diffraction [2]. All the signals have been attributed: in particular, the ¹H shift, known from study of compounds **1**, **9** and **5**, can be assigned in the cases of **4** and **6**. In the spectra of **4** and **6**, the singlets at 7.84 and 7.82 ppm (which is not from H(7)) show that the silicon is in the 5 position and rules out the isomer with silicon in the 6 position. The ¹³C and ²⁹Si data are not decisive in themselves but they are consistent with the proposed structures.

The studies have established with certainty the structures of the new species **2**, **4** and **6**, and serve as a basis for interpretation of NMR data for further organosilicon derivatives of indole. This will be useful in studies of preparation of functional derivatives of indole at present under way.

Acknowledgements

We are indebted to Drs. F. Gobert (Rhône-Poulenc Recherches, Centre de Recherches de Saint-Fons, BP 62, 69192 Saint-Fons Cédex (France) and E. Colomer (Directeur de recherche au CNRS, Laboratoire des Organométalliques, Université des Sciences et Techniques du Languedoc, Place Eugène Bataillon 34062 Montpellier Cédex) for their assistance in the physico-chemical studies.

References

- 1 C. Biran, B. Efendene and J. Dunoguès, *J. Organomet. Chem.*, 253 (1983) C13.
- 2 A.G.M. Barrett, D. Dauzonne and D.J. Williams, *J. Chem. Soc. Chem. Commun.*, (1982) 636.

- 3 A.G.M. Barrett, D. Dauzonne, I.A. O'Neil and A. Renaud, *J. Org. Chem.*, 49 (1984) 4409.
- 4 G. Félix, C. Bertrand, M. Fourtinon et C. Biran, *J. Liq. Chrom.*, 10 (1987) 853.
- 5 L. Birkofer, P. Richter and A. Ritter, *Chem. Ber.*, 93 (1960) 2810.
- 6 J. Dunoguès, Thesis Bordeaux 1973; J. Dunoguès, R. Calas, C. Biran et N. Duffaut, *J. Organomet. Chem.*, 23 (1970) C50.
- 7 L. Birkofer and N. Ramadan, *Chem. Ber.*, 104 (1971) 138.
- 8 R. Calas and J. Dunoguès, *C.R. Acad. Sci. Paris, Ser. C*, 272 (1971) 554.
- 9 M. Laguerre, J. Dunoguès, R. Calas and N. Duffaut, *J. Organomet. Chem.*, 112 (1976) 49.
- 10 M. Laguerre, J.M. Léger, D. Youhouvoulou N'Gabe, C. Biran and J. Dunoguès, *Tetrahedron*, 42 (1984) 669.
- 11 M. Karplus, *J. Chem. Phys.*, 30 (1959) 11.
- 12 P. Teisseire, A. Galfre, M. Plattier and B. Corbier, *Recherches*, 15 (1966) 52.