(Z)-Diiodo(2-iodo-2-phenylvinyl)(phenyl)tellurium PhIC=CHTeI₂Ph: Synthesis and Complexing Properties in a Reaction with Iron Pentacarbonyl

Yu. V. Torubaev^a, A. A. Pasynskii^a, and P. Mathur^b

 ^a Kurnakov Institute of General and Inorganic Chemistry, Russian Academy of Sciences, Leninskii pr. 31, Moscow, 119991 Russia
 ^b Indian Institute of Technology, Bombay, India E-mail: hansmail@rambler.ru Received June 4, 2008

Abstract—Electrophilic addition of PhTeI₃ to phenylacetylene (PhC₂H) in boiling THF stereoselectively gave (*Z*)-diiodo(2-iodo-2-phenylvinyl)(phenyl)tellurium PhIC=CHTeI₂Ph (**I**). In a reaction with Fe(CO)₅, this complex easily eliminated two iodine atoms from tellurium to give PhTe–CH=CPhI. This ligand was coordinated to iron in a monodentate fashion through the Te atom in the resulting complex (CO)₃FeI₂(PhTeHC=CPhI) (**II**). The reaction also yielded the known complex Fe(CO)₄I₂ (**III**). The structures of complexes **I**–**III** were determined by X-ray diffraction analysis. The Fe–Te bond in structure **II** is substantially shortened.

DOI: 10.1134/S1070328408110031

Aryltellurium trihalides ArTeX_3 (X = Cl or Br) [1] obtained from stoichiometric amounts of diaryl ditelluride and elemental halogen have found use in organic chemistry because of their tendency toward stereo- and regioselective electrophilic addition to the triple C–C bond of terminal acetylenes, giving (aryl)dihalo(halovinyl)tellurium(IV) [2, 3]. It has been demonstrated that reflux of $ArTeX_3$ with acetylene can yield Z- and E-isomers, depending on the solvent polarity. Further reduction with NaBH₄ or Na₂S₂O₃ can afford the corresponding aryl halovinyl tellurides (Scheme 1):



The behavior of aryltellurium triiodides in such reactions has not been documented hitherto. According to X-ray diffraction data, triiodo(phenyl)tellurium in the crystal forms dimers with bridging iodine atoms [4]. We found it interesting to study its reaction with phenylacetylene and reactions of the resulting (aryl)diiodo(iodovinyl)tellurium(IV) with iron pentacarbonyl. The latter reactions could be assumed to be similar to a known oxidative addition of diiodo(diphenyl)tellurium(IV) to $Fe(CO)_5$ [5]:



Fig. 1. Molecule IA in crystal structure I.



EXPERIMENTAL

All manipulations dealing with the synthesis and isolation of the complexes were carried out under pure argon in dehydrated solvents. IR spectra were recorded on a Specord 75IR spectrophotometer for pellets with KBr and solutions in heptane.

Synthesis of PhTeI₂HC=CPhI (I). Triiodo(phenyl)tellurium (1.15 g, 2 mmol) (prepared from PhTe₂ (0.4 g) and I₂ (0.75 g)) and phenylacetylene (0.22 ml, 2 mmol) were refluxed in THF (30 ml) for 12 h. The solvent was removed in a water aspirator vacuum. The orange red residue was washed with light petroleum. The product was extracted with CH₂Cl₂ and precipitated by concentrating the extract with heptane in a water aspirator vacuum. Crystals suitable for X-ray diffraction analysis were grown from a concentrated solution of complex I in CH₂Cl₂-heptane (1 : 1).

For $C_{14}H_{11}I_3$ Te (M = 687.55) anal. calcd. (%): C, 24.46; H, 1.61.

Found (%): C, 24.70; H, 1.85.

IR (KBr, cm⁻¹): 720 s, 680 s, 650 s.

Synthesis of (CO)₃FeI₂(PhTe–CH=CPhI) (II) and Fe(CO)₄I₂ (III). Iron pentacarbonyl (0.04 ml, 0.28 mmol) was added in one portion at room temperature to a magnetically stirred orange red solution of complex I (0.16 g, 0.23 mmol) in diethyl ether (30 ml). Stirring was continued for an additional 30 min. The reaction mixture turned deep red and homogeneous and no longer contained the starting complex I (TLC data). The solution was concentrated with heptane (5 ml) *in vacuo* to slight turbidity. The concentrate was kept at -10° C for 12 h. The dark red crystalline precipitate that formed consisted of thick needles of complex **II** and prisms of the known complex **III** [6].

Below are the IR spectra and elemental analysis data for complexes **II** and **III**.

IR (KBr, cm⁻¹): 2125 s, 2085 s, 2070 s. IR (heptane, cm⁻¹): 2125 m, 2075 s, 2060 m.

For $C_{17}H_{11}TeI_3O_2Te$	(II) $(M = 827.43)$	
anal. calcd. (%):	C, 24.68;	Н 1.34.
Found (%):	C, 20.88;	H 0.87.
For $C_4 \hat{F}eI_2 O_4(III)$ (M	l = 421.70	
anal. calcd. (%):	C, 11.39.	

The complexes are unstable under the conditions of column chromatography. The crystals of complexes **II** and **III** for X-ray diffraction analysis were selected by mechanical separation.

X-ray diffraction analysis. Selected crystallographic parameters and a summary of data collection and refinement for structures **I–III** are given in Table 1. All structures were solved by the direct method and refined by the least-squares method on F^2 in the anisotropic (for H atoms, isotropic) approximation with the SHELXTL program package [7]. The hydrogen atoms were located geometrically. Selected bond lengths and angles in structures **I–III** are given in Tables 2 and 3. Atomic coordinates and other structural parameters of complexes **I–III** have been deposited with the Cambridge Crystallographic Data Center (CCDC nos. 688683 (I), 690063 (II), and 688684 (III); see http://www.ccdc.cam.ac.uk/data_request/cif).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

We carried out a reaction of PhTeI₃ with phenylacetylene in boiling THF. More prolonged reflux was required, in contrast to analogous reactions with (aryl)dibromotellurium(IV) and (aryl)dichlorotellurium(IV) usually completed in 3–10 h. The resulting dark orange crystals of the adduct were stable in air and soluble in polar organic solvents. According to X-ray

Doromatar	Value					
i arameter	Ι	II	III			
Diffractometer	Bruker APEX II CCD					
Radiation (λ , Å)	MoK_{α} (0.71073)					
Temperature	296(2)					
Space group	$P2_1/c$	C2/c	C2/c			
a, Å	11.2403(5)	7.078(2)	26.375(5)			
b, Å	8.5755(4)	10.906(2)	10.0848(16)			
<i>c</i> , Å	36.3256(17)	12.633(3)	17.701(3)			
β, deg	98.068(1)	92.268(5)	103.441(4)			
$V, Å^3$	3466.8(3)	974.4(4)	4579.3(13)			
Ζ	8	2	8			
ρ (calcd), g/cm ³	2.635	2.137	2.400			
μ , mm ⁻¹	7.042	5.816	5.964			
F(000)	2448	580	2992			
θ scan range, deg	2.01-29.00	3.23–28.98	1.59–29.00			
Scan mode	ω					
Number of measured reflections	37252	3653	24582			
Number of independent reflec-	9193 = 0.0562)	$1277 (R_{int} = 0.0320)$	$6079 (R_{int} = 0.0300)$			
tions (N_1)						
Number of reflections with	5294	1076	4810			
$I > 2(I) (N_2)$						
Number of parameters refined	325	51	226			
$\operatorname{GOOF}(F^2)$	0.973	1.033	1.023			
R_1 for N_2	0.0415	0.0264	0.0364			
wR_2 for N_1	0.0919	0.0686	0.1006			
$\Delta \rho_{\rm max} / \rho_{\rm min}, e \ { m \AA}^{-3}$	1.326/-1.604	0.871/-0.590	1.926/-1.230			

Table 1. Selected crystallographic parameters and a summary of data collection and refinement for structures I–III

diffraction data, the adduct is the (Z)-isomer of diiodo(2-iodo-2-phenylvinyl)(phenyl)tellurium(IV) (I):



The unit cell of crystal structure I comprises two crystallographically independent molecules **IA** (Fig. 1) and IB. In their two sublattices, the Te-I distances are 2.9098(7)-2.9308(7) Å and 2.8777(7)-2.9723(7) Å. These values are close to the sum of the covalent Te and I radii [8] and to normal bond lengths in diorganotellurium(IV) diiodides [4]. The Te-I distances differ only slightly; this can be explained by the packing effect in the crystal, viz., nonvalent Te…I and I…I interactions. Independent molecules IA are united in the crystal through the I(1)…Te(1) contacts (3.665(1) Å). Molecules IB are linked by the $Te(1A)\cdots I(2A)$ contacts (3.752(1) Å) into centrosymmetric dimers, which form chains via the $I(1A) \cdots I(3A)$ contacts (3.775(1) Å). It should be noted that the interactions in chains differ in both contact length and direction. For instance, the angle C(1)Te(1)I(1) is 165.7(1)° for the chains of molecules IA and 175.8° for molecules IB (Fig. 2).

Table 2. Selected bond lengths and angles in the crystallographically independent molecules IA and IB of complex I

Bond	<i>d</i> , Å	Bond	<i>d</i> , Å		
IA		IB			
Te(1)–C(1)	2.109(6)	Te(1A)–C(1A)	2.097(6)		
Te(1)–C(10)	2.126(6)	Te(1A)–C(10A)	2.129(6)		
Te(1)–I(2)	2.9098(7)	Te(1A)-I(1A)	2.8777(7)		
Te(1)–I(1)	2.9308(7)	Te(1A)-I(2A)	2.9723(7)		
C(1)–C(2)	1.310(8)	C(1A)–C(2A)	1.299(8)		
C(2)–I(3)	2.110(6)	C(2A)–I(3A)	2.113(6)		
Angle	ω, deg	Angle	ω, deg		
I(2)Te(1)I(1)	178.14(2)	I(1A)Te(1A)I(2A)	175.04(2)		
C(2)C(1)Te(1)	124.3(5)	C(2A)C(1A)Te(1A)	123.8(5)		
C(1)C(2)I(3)	118.1(5)	C(1A)C(2A)I(3A)	117.0(5)		

Table 3.	Selected	bond	lengths	and	angles	in	structure II	Ĺ
			<u> </u>		<u> </u>			

Bond	<i>d</i> , Å		
III			
Te(1)–C(1)	2.100(5)		
Te(1)–C(9)	2.110(6)		
C(1)–C(2)	1.325(7)		
C(2)–I(3)	2.120(5)		
Fe(1)–I(1)	2.6335(9)		
Fe(1)–I(2)	2.6349(9)		
Te(1)–Fe(1)	2.5815(8)		
Angle	ω, deg		
C(1)Te(1)C(9)	97.2(2)		
C(1)Te(1)Fe(1)	103.35(14)		
C(9)Te(1)Fe(1)	100.16(15)		
C(2)C(1)Te(1)	126.1(4)		

In a room-temperature reaction of complex I with $Fe(CO)_5$ in ether, two iodine atoms are transferred from tellurium to iron with elimination of one CO group to give the known complex $Fe(CO)_4I_2$ (II) [6]. It was isolated and structurally characterized by X-ray diffrac-

tion data (the lengths of two *cis*-arranged Fe–I bonds are 2.6375(6) Å) (Fig. 3).

Replacement of another CO group in complex I by in situ generated (Z)-2-iodo-2-phenylvinyl phenyl telluride gives complex III. Its black red crystals are relatively stable in air and soluble in most organic solvents.



According to X-ray diffraction data, the Te and I atoms in complex III are in opposition to the carbonyl groups (Fig. 4). The Fe–I distances (2.6335(9) and 2.6349(9) Å) correspond to the single bonds found in the complexes (CO)₃FeI₂(L): e.g., 2.6482(7) and 2.6541(6) Å in (CO)₃FeI₂(Te₂Ph₂) (IV) or 2.6478(7) and 2.6541(7) Å in (CO)₃FeI₂(PhTeI) (V) [9]. At the same time, the Te–Fe distance (2.5815(8) Å), as in complexes IV and V, is substantially shorter than the sum of the covalent Fe and Te radii (2.70 Å) [8]. This is probably due to a dative interaction of the lone electron pairs on the Fe atom with the vacant *d* orbital of the Te atom, in addition to the donor–acceptor bonding between tellurium and iron.

Note that complexes II and III cannot be separated by crystallization and are unstable under the conditions of column chromatography. According to elemental analysis data, the ratio II : III is close to 30 : 70. Their



Fig. 2. Molecular packing of (a) IA and (b) IB in crystal structure I.



Fig. 3. Molecular structure **II** (Fe(1)–I(1) 2.6375(6) Å, Fe(1)–C(2) 1.811(4) Å, Fe(1)–C(1) 1.850(4) Å, O(1)–C(1) 1.111(5) Å, O(2)–C(2) 1.128(5) Å).



Fig. 4. Molecular structure III.

total IR spectrum is obviously a superposition of the known spectrum of complex II (2131, 2086, 2062, and

2047 cm⁻¹) in hexane [6] and the spectrum of complex **III**, which should be similar to the IR spectra of com-

plexes IV and V in the range of CO stretching vibrations (v, cm⁻¹: 2080 s, 2040 s, 2025 s [7]).

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was supported by the Russian Foundation for Basic Recearch (project no. 06-03-32891), the Division of the Chemistry and Materials Sciences of the Russian Academy of Sciences (grant no. OKh 1.5), and the RAS Presidium (project no. 8P15).

REFERENCES

1. Sadekov, I.D. and Minkin, V.I., *Zh. Org. Khim.*, 1999, vol. 35, no. 7, p. 981.

- Zeni, G., Ludtke, D.S., Panatieri, R.B., and Braga, A.L., *Chem. Rev.*, 2006, vol. 106, p. 1032.
- 3. Huang, X. and Wang, Y.-P., *Tetrahedron Lett.*, 1996, vol. 37, p. 7417.
- 4. Alcock, N.W. and Harisson, W.D., J. Chem. Soc., Dalton Trans., 1984, p. 869.
- Liaw, W.-F., Chiang, M.-H., Lai, C.-H., et al., *Inorg. Chem.*, 1994, vol. 33, p. 2493.
- 6. Brauer, G. Handbook of Preparative Inorganic Chemistry, New York: Academic, 1983, vol. 6.
- Sheldrick, G.M., SHELXTL-97. Version 5.50, Madison (WI, USA): Bruker AXS Inc., 1997.
- Cordero, B., Gomez, V., Platero-Prats, A.E., et al., *Dalton Trans.*, 2008, p. 2832.
- 9. Torubaev, Yu.V., Pasynskii, A.A., and Matur, P., *Koord. Khim.*, 2008, vol. 34, no. 11, in press.