2239 1975

Weak Complexes of Sulphur and Selenium. Part IV.1 Complex of Selenium Dioxide and Seleninyl Dichloride with Halide lons

By Saad Wasif,* Department of Chemistry, Faculty of Science, University of Tripoli, Libya S. B. Salama, Department of Chemistry, Faculty of Science, University of Khartoum, Sudan

The formation of 1:1 complexes between SeO₂ and SeOCl₂ and Cl-, Br-, and I- ions is reported. The stability constants and nature of the complexes are correlated with those of SO2 and SOCI2 and the role of dimethyl sulphoxide as solvent is discussed.

The tendency of SeO₂ to form complexes was reported by Carnevali 2 who studied the formation of R₄NCl·SeO₂ (R = alkyl) adducts. No work has been reported on the nature of such species which is the aim of the present study.

EXPERIMENTAL

Following recent investigations 1,3,4 of weak chargetransfer complexes, we report the new species SeO₂·X⁻ and ${\rm SeOCl_2 {}^{\textstyle \bullet} X^-} \ (X = {\rm Cl}, \ {\rm Br}, \ {\rm or} \ {\rm I}). \ \ {\rm Both} \ {\rm SeO_2} \ {\rm and} \ {\rm SeOCl_2}$ presented some difficulty in the choice of suitable solvent. Acetonitrile, nitromethane, tetrahydrofuran, and NNdimethylformamide were not suitable either for solubility (particularly for SeO₂) or for oxidising reactions (for I⁻). Dimethyl sulphoxide (dmso) solutions were more stable and were used for this study, spectra being recorded on fresh solutions only (Table 1). The absorbance peaks were

TABLE 1 Absorption peaks (nm) of SeO₂·X⁻ and SeOCl₂·X⁻ in dmso

	•	CLILLOO		
	X	Cl	Br	I
Complex $SeO_2 \cdot X^ SeOCl_2 \cdot X^-$	260 260	312 310	334 330	380 370

obtained in the presence of R_4NX and KX (R = alkyl; X =halide), indicating that they correspond to new complexes between the selenium compound and the halide ligand.

Stoicheiometry of the Complexes.-Job's 5 method was

Part III, S. B. Salama and S. Wasif, J.C.S. Dalton, 1975, 151.
 F. Carnevali, Atti. Acad. naz. Lincei, 1908, 5, 11, 17, 385.

adopted. Table 2 gives data for the SeO₂·I⁻ species for which equimolar solutions of SeO₂ and iodide were used.

Table 2

Stoicheiometry of method. [SeO ₂] =					
Solution	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Volume of SeO ₂ (cm ³)	2.0	1.5	1.25	1.0	0.5
Volume of I- (cm³)	0.5	1.0	1.25	1.5	2.0
Volume of dmso (cm³)	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5
Mol fraction of I^- , x_I	0.2	0.4	0.5	0.6	0.8
$D_{ m obs}$	0.080	0.125	0.133	0.125	0.080

A maximum absorbance at $x_t = 0.5$ suggests that the species is a 1:1 complex. Similar results were obtained for all the other species. For SeOCl₂·I⁻ the observed peak changed with time and was unusually high, indicating a reaction (possibly oxidation of I- by SeOCl2), and the data for SeOCl₂·I⁻ were thus abandoned.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

- (a) Evaluation of Stability Constants.—The selenium species are formed between a polar compound and a halide ion which permits only the use of polar solvents such as dmso. In all spectroscopic runs the halide ion (i.e. the donor ligand) was in excess of the selenium compound (i.e. the acceptor) and in the ratio $[X^-]$: [Se] = 1.3:16. This ensured the formation of one
- A. Salama (the late), S. B. Salama, M. Sobeir, and Saad Wasif, J. Chem. Soc. (A), 1971, 1112.
 S. B. Salama and Saad Wasif, J.C.S. Dalton, 1973, 2148.
 - ⁵ P. Job, Ann. Chim., 1928, **10**, 113.

2240 J.C.S. Dalton

species only which was a 1:1 complex and it makes the correlation of stability constants significant.

The evaluation of the stability constants of the species from spectral data was as outlined before 1,3,6,7 and in nearly all cases a graphical K value was supplemented by one calculated from an equation such as that in Table 3. Table 3 gives a typical example of the calculation of K for $SeO_2 \cdot Br^-$, Table 4 detailed data for the

TABLE 3 Stability constants of SeO₂·Br⁻ in dmso at 25, 35, and 45 °C a

Solution	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
$10^{3}[Br^{-}]/mol l^{-1}$	4.27	8.53	12.8	14.9
$10^{3}[SeO_{2}]/mol l^{-1}$	3.08	3.08	3.08	3.08
$D_{ m obs}$ at $\overline{25}$ °C	0.26	0.48	0.68	0.76
35 °C	0.29	0.51	0.71	0.83
45 °C	0.34	0.615	0.84	0.96
$10^3/(\varepsilon_a - \varepsilon_A)$ at 25 °C b	13.38	6.83	4.73	4.23
35 °C ₺	11.84	6.41	4.52	3.86
45 °C [₺]	9.88	5.24	3.80	3.31
10 ⁴ [DA]/mol 1 ⁻¹ at 25 °C	1.49	2.92	4.23	4.73
$K/1 \text{ mol}^{-1}$	12.4	12.7	12.9	12.6
10 ⁴ [DA]/mol l ⁻¹ at 35 °C	1.69	3.12	4.42	5.20
$K/l \text{ mol}^{-1}$	14.2	13.7	13.6	14.1
10 ⁴ [DA]/mol l ⁻¹ at 45 °C	2.025	3.81	5.27	6.04
$K/l \text{ mol}^{-1}$	17.3	17.3	16.8	17.1

 $\epsilon_{DA}=$ 1 548, $\epsilon_{A}=$ 9.75 l mol $^{\!-1}$ cm $^{\!-1}$ at 334 nm

⁶ Calculated from the equations $1(\varepsilon_h - \varepsilon_A) = \{K[Br^-] (\varepsilon_{DA} - \varepsilon_A)\}^{-1} + (\varepsilon_{DA} - \varepsilon_A)^{-1}$ and K = [DA]/[D][A], where [A], [D], and [DA] are the concentration of the acceptor, donor, and complex at equilibrium. ^b Values of K from the graphical method 3 , 4 , 6 , 7 are 12.3, 13.4, and 16.3 1 mol⁻¹ at 25, 35, and 45 °C representations.

other species studied, Table 5 a summary of K data at 25 °C together with those for SO₂·X⁻ and SOCl₂·X⁻, and Table 6 the thermodynamic constants for formation of SeO2·X- and SeOCl2·X-. All chemicals used were of AnalaR quality except dmso which was twice distilled. Mixtures were prepared immediately before the spectra were recorded on a Unicam SP 700 machine. The cell compartment was thermostatted to ± 0.01 °C and matched silica cells were used. Data processing was as outlined before.6,7

(b) Correlations between the Stability Constants of the Complexes.—The data in Table 5 show that the order of stability constants for SeO $_2$ ·X $^-$ is Cl $^- > Br^- > I^-$ and for SeOCl₂·X⁻ it is Cl⁻ < Br⁻ (the stability constant for SeOCl₂·I⁻ was not obtainable due to possible reaction.) The same order was also noted for SO₂·X⁻ and SOCl₂·X⁻ in dmso.1 In order to explain this order we should remember that both sulphur and selenium have d orbitals that act as acceptors for the halide ligands, resulting in formation of the complex species. The difference in the order of stability constants suggests that the factors responsible for the observed behaviour are related to differences in the bonding properties of the acceptors, the nature of the donors, and the role of dmso as a solvent.

71, 2703.

⁶ J. A. A. Ketalaar, C. van de Stoppe, A. Goudsmit, and W. Dzcubas, *Rec. Trav. chim.*, 1952, **71**, 1104.

⁷ H. A. Benesi and J. Hildebrand, *J. Amer. Chem. Soc.*, 1949,

TABLE 4

Stability constants	e in dmeo	at differe	nt tempe	roturec *
				atures
Solution	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
(a) SeO ₂ •Cl ⁻				
108[Cl-]/mol l-1	1.22	2.45	3.67	4.28
$10^{4} [SeO_{2}]/mol 1^{-1}$	9.37	9.37	9.37	9.37
$D_{ m obs.}$ $(25{}^{\circ}{ m C})$	0.135	0.24	0.335	0.375
(45 °C)	0.155	0.26	0.36	0.41
$K/1 \text{ mol}^{-1} \text{ at } 25 ^{\circ}\text{C}$	31.3	32.8	32.8	32.5
		00	02.0	(31.5)
45 °C	37.6	36.0	35.8	35.8
,				(35.0)
$\varepsilon_{\mathrm{DA}} = 3 157, \varepsilon_{\mathrm{A}} =$	32.01 mol	-1 cm-1 at 3	312 nm	(55.5)
	32.02			
(b) SeO ₂ ·I-				
$10^2[I^-]/\text{mol } l^{-1}$	1.307	2.614	3.921	4.575
$10^{3}[SeO_{2}]/mol 1^{-1}$	7.532	7.532	7.532	7.532
$D_{\mathrm{obs.}}$ (25 °C)	0.28	0.55	0.75	0.835
(35 °C)	0.335	0.63	0.845	0.92
(45 °C)	0.405	0.70	0.905	1.025
K/l mol ⁻¹ at 25 °C	8.3	9.0	8.9	8.8
2 × 2 0				(8.5)
35 °C	10.2	10.8	10.5	10.1
				(10.0)
45 ℃	12.9	12.4	12.5	11.9
		_		(11.6)
$ \epsilon_{\mathrm{DA}} = 400 \mathrm{l \; mol^{-1}} $	cm ⁻¹ at 31:	2 nm		
(c) SeOCl ₂ ·Cl ⁻				
10 ³ [Cl-]/mol l-1	8.1	16.2	24.3	32.4
103[SeOCl ₂]/mol l ⁻¹	5.1	5.1	5.1	5.1
$D_{ m obs.}$ (15 °C)	0.32	0.46	0.58	0.73
(25 °C)	0.41	0.58	0.73	0.88
(35 °C)	0.48	0.72	0.82	1.02
K/l mol ⁻¹ at 15 °C	7.42	7.91	7.88	8.73
,				(6.6)
25 °C	13.2	12.0	11.8	12.1
				(10.2)
35 °C	17.6	17.5	14.4	16.0
				(14.0)
$\varepsilon_{\mathrm{DA}} = 540, \varepsilon_{\mathrm{A}} = 4$	10 l mol ⁻¹ cr	n ⁻¹ at 310	nm	(
(d) SeOCl ₂ ·Br				
	- 00	11.04	15.50	20.00
103[Br-]/mol l-1	5.92	11.84	17.76	23.68
10^3 [SeOCl ₂]/mol l ⁻¹	1.31	1.31	1.31	1.31
$D_{\text{obs.}} (15 ^{\circ}\text{C})$		0.27	0.30	0.36
(25 °C)		0.30	0.36	0.41
(35 °C)		0.34	0.40	0.47
$K/l \text{ mol}^{-1} \text{ at } 15 ^{\circ}\text{C}$		25.5	22.1	24.8
95.00		99.4	99.4	(17.5)
25 °C		33.4	33.4	34.2
25 00		49.7	46.0	(24.1)
35 °C		42.7	46.0	46.5
				(31.1)

 $\epsilon_{\rm DA} = 607$, $\epsilon_{\rm A} = 107.2 \ \rm 1 \ mol^{-1} \ cm^{-1} \ at \ 330 \ nm$

TABLE 5 Summary of stability constant data (1 mol-1) in dmso at 25 °C

-	X C1-	Br-	1-
Complex	_		
$SeO_2 \cdot X^-$	32 ± 0.4	13 ± 0.2	9 ± 0.2
SO₂•X−	26 ± 0.5	21 ± 0.4	12 ± 0.1
SeOCl ₂ ·X-	12 ± 0.4	31 ± 4	
SOCl ₂ ·X-	18 ± 0.5	21 ± 0.4	35 ± 0.7

TABLE 6

Thermodynamic constants of SeO₂·X⁻ and SeOCl₂·X⁻ *

	$-\Delta G^{\Theta}$	$-\Delta H^{\oplus}$	$-\Delta S^{\Theta}$
Complex	kcal mol-1	kcal mol-1	cal K-1 mol-1
SeO.I-	1.27	-2.92	14
SeO. Br	1.49	2.67	14
SeO.·C1-	2.05	0.99	10
SeOCl ₂ ·Br-	1.87	-5.10	-23
SeOCl ₂ ·Cl-	1.38	-5.80	24
	* 1 001 -	4 194 T	

2241 1975

The reversed order of stabilities for SeO₂X⁻ and $SO_2 \cdot X^-$ from that for $SeOCl_2 \cdot X^-$ and $SOCl_2 \cdot X^-$ leads one to assume that the d orbitals of sulphur and selenium must be involved to different extents in the bonding of SeO₂ and SO₂ molecules than they are in SOCl₂ and SeOCl₂. In SO₂ and SOCl₂, d-orbital participation is different because in the former the orbital used is $(2p-3d)_{\pi}$ while in SOCl₂ the orbitals used are $(3p-3d)_{\pi}$ or σ with greater overlap. Estimates of d-orbital participation in SO₂ have been made by Guest et al.8 from quantum-mechanical calculations and by Urch 9 from X-ray fluorescence spectroscopy. Chadwick and other workers 10-16 studied a number of sulphur-oxygen molecules by photoelectron spectroscopy and found that the S-O bond order is different in SO₂ and SOCl₂. It is thus possible that d-orbital overlap is different in SO₂ and SOCl₂.

No similar studies have been made for SeO₂ and SeOCl₂, but by comparison of the stability-constant data for $SeO_2 \cdot X^-$ and $SeOCl_2 \cdot X^-$ with those of $SO_2 \cdot X^-$ and $SOCl_2 \cdot X^-$ it is not unreasonable to assume that the d orbitals have a different degree of overlap in SeO₂ from that of SeOCl₂. For SeO₂·X⁻, the chloride species is the most stable and the iodide is the least. Here, like SO₂·X⁻,⁶ back bonding is expected to be the principal stabilising factor. The Cl- ion, being a hard base, whereas I⁻ is a soft polarisable base, favours this situation

⁸ M. F. Guest, I. H. Hillier, and V. R. Saunders, J.C.S.

Faraday II, 1972, **68**, 114.

9 D. S. Urch, J. Chem. Soc. (A), 1969, 3026.

10 D. Chadwick, D. C. Frost, F. G. Herring, A. Katrib, C. A. McDowell, and R. A. N. McLean, Canad. J. Chem., 1973, 51, 1893.

11 D. Chadwick, A. B. Cornford, D. C. Frost, F. G. Herring, A.

Katrib, C. A. McDowell, and R. A. N. McLean, Electron Spectroscopy, 1972, 453.

12 D. Kivelson, J. Chem. Phys., 1954, 22, 904.

resulting in SO₂·Cl⁻ and SeO₂·Cl⁻ being the most stable species despite the strong solvating property of dmso towards Cl⁻ ligands.

The reversed order for SeOCl₂·X⁻ and SOCl₂·X⁻ where the chloride species is the least stable suggests that the d orbitals in SOCl₂ and SeOCl₂ are more involved in the bonding than they are in SeO₂ or SO₂. This makes the d orbitals of SOCl₂ and SeOCl₂ less available for back bonding (which stabilises the halide complex species) and thus results in lower stability constants for SeOCl₂. Cl⁻ or SOCl₂·Cl⁻. In this situation dmso becomes more effective in lowering the stability constants of the Se-OCl₂·Cl⁻ or SOCl₂·Cl⁻ species due to its greater solvating power towards Cl⁻ than Br⁻ or I⁻, d orbitals being more readily available than those of the acceptors used.

This shows that although dmso is the principal environment for the complex species SeO2.X-, SO2.X-, SeOCl2. X⁻, and SOCl₂·X⁻ its effect on their stability is selective. Its effect as solvating agent (or alternatively as a competing acceptor) varied according to the degree of dorbital involvement in each acceptor molecule in internal bonding and their availability to external association with halide ligands which are themselves differently affected by dmso.1

We thank Dr. A. Katrib of this department for assistance.

[4/2226 Received, 28th October, 1974]

D. C. Frost, F. G. Herring, A. Katrib, R. A. N. McLean, J. E. Drake, and P. C. Westwood, (a) Chem. Phys. Letters, 1971, 10, 347; (b) Canad. J. Chem., 1971, 49, 4033.
 D. C. Frost, A. Katrib, C. A. McDowell, and R. A. N. McLean, Internat. J. Mags. Spectroscipts, 1971, 27, 485.

Internat. J. Mass Spectrometry Ion Phys., 1971, 7, 485.

15 J. H. D. Eland and C. J. Danby, Internat. J. Mass Spectrometry Ion Phys., 1971, 1, 111.

¹⁶ M. Jonathan, D. J. Smith, and K. J. Ross, Chem. Phys. Letters, 1971, 9, 217.