UNUSUAL CHEMICAL BEHAVIOR OF 1,2-DITHIAACENAPHTHENE IN THE REACTIONS WITH DINITROGEN TETRAOXIDE AND AQUEOUS BROMINE —— IN CONTRAST TO THE ORDINARY OXIDATION WITH FENTON REAGENT

Shigeru Oae*, Tatsuya Nabeshima, and Toshikazu Takata
Department of Chemistry, The University of Tsukuba, Sakura-Mura,
Ibaraki-Ken 305, Japan

Abstract —— Unlike open chain disulfides or even cyclic disulfides, which are readily oxidized by N_2O_4 and aqueous bromine to sulfinyl and/or sulfonyl derivatives, 1,2-dithiaacenaphthene is readily nitrated with N_2O_4 and brominated with aqueous bromine at the naphthalene ring. Other oxidants, such as Fenton system: H_2O_2-$TiCl_3$, gave predominantly 1,2-dithiaacenaphthene 1-oxide as in the oxidation with H_2O_2.

1,2-Dithiaacenaphthene is an interesting disulfide in that both sulfur atoms are confined rigidly at two peri-positions of naphthalene ring without ring strain, since the bond distance of the S-S linkage is considered to be nearly equal to that between the two peri-positions of naphthalene.[1,2] Yet the dihedral angle around the S-S linkage is nearly zero, which is very much apart from the average dihedral angle of the disulfidic linkage, i.e. 103°.[3] Therefore, due to the repulsion of lone electron pairs of the two divalent sulfur atoms, the S-S bond should be substantially energy-rich and hence would be highly reactive. Another unique feature of 1,2-dithiaacenaphthene is that the two sulfur atoms are rigidly confined in juxtaposition and cannot move away. Due to this situation,[4] neither nucleophilic nor homolytic substitution reaction on the sulfur atom would be favoured, while electrophilic reactions on the S-S bond such as oxidation and carbene insersion would take place quite readily. Although there has been no direct comparion of the rates of nucleophilic substitution of 1,2-dithiaacenaphthene with that of the analogous open chain disulfide, the alkaline hydrolysis of the monooxy derivative, i.e. 1,2-dithiaacenaphthene monooxide, is known to be 10^3 times slower than that of the open chain analogue, phenyl benzenethiolsulfinate,[1] while the equilibrium constants for ring opening of the dioxy derivative, 1,2-dithiaacenaphthene 1,1-dioxide, with both of CN^- and SO_3^{2-} ion are about 20 times smaller than those for the six-membered thiolsulfonates, biphenylene 2,2-disulfide-S-dioxide.[5] The most typical example to illustrate the cohesive effect may be found in the relative ratio of the three equilibrium constants,



$K_1 \ll K_3 \ll K_2$.[6-9] Meanwhile, the energy-rich S-S bond of 1,2-dithiaacenaphthene readily reacts with such an electrophile as diethyl diazomalonate to afford the carbene insersion product[10] and is also readily oxidized with $NaIO_4$ to the monooxide.[1]



Therefore, the S-S bond is considered to be oxidized very readily by more electrophilic oxidants, such as N_2O_4, aqueous bromine and the Fenton reagent since the possible ring nitration, bromination and hydroxylation are rather incredible in view of the facile reaction of disulfide linkage of diphenyl disulfide with N_2O_4,[11] and the markedly larger reactivity of disulfide bond toward bromine and other electrophiles such as peroxy acids.[12-14] Indeed, the Fenton system, $TiCl_3$-H_2O_2 in aqueous methanol which generates hydroxy radical, was found to oxidize 1,2-dithiaacenaphthene mainly affording the monooxide together with a small amount of the dioxide. For example, when one equivalent of the disulfide was treated with two equivalents of $TiCl_3$ and 7 equivalents of H_2O_2 in five minutes at room temperature, the following result



was observed. Similar results were observed in the oxidations of 1,2-dithiane, diphenyl disulfide and others.

However, contrary to our expectation, no S-oxygenation product was obtained in the treatment of 1,2-dithiaacenaphthene with either N_2O_4 in CCl_4 or bromine in H_2O-pyridine-AcOH mixture. Instead, electrophilic substitution took place on naphthalene ring of 1,2-dithiaacenaphthene. Although the possibility of the S-monooxide or the dioxide as an intermediate in the nitration may be ruled out since the monooxide reacted with N_2O_4 only at room temperature while 1,1-dioxide is quite inert to N_2O_4 at room temperature, it is interesting to note that treatment of the monooxide with one equivalent of N_2O_4 at room temperature also gave mainly ring-nitrated dithiaacenaphthene together with a small amount of the dioxide, recovering some of the monooxide. The formation of ring nitrated dithiaacenaphthene may be rationalized by the following mechanistic scheme.





Pedulle et al. reported[15] that the monobromo derivatives were obtained quantitatively in the treatment of 1,2-dithiaacenaphthene and the open-chain analogue, 1,8-dimethylthionaphthalene, with bromine with in carbon tetrachloride-acetic acid(3:1) at room temperature. In the presence of water, however, 1,8-dimethylthionaphthalene gave mainly the monooxide while only ring bromination took place with 1,2-dithiaacenaphthene. The reactivity of dithiaacenaphthene toward bromine is so high that when a 1:1 mixture of dithiaacenaphthene and naphthalene is treated with one equivalent of bromine, only 1,2-dithiaacenaphthene was brominated without touching naphthalene. The enormously large reactivity of the naphthalene ring of dithiaacenaphthene toward N_2O_4 or Br_2 clearly indicates that there is a strong interaction between the non-bonding p-orbitals of



the two sulfur atoms and the π-system of the naphthalene ring and the lone pairs of the two sulfur atoms are delocalized over the entire molecule as the earlier theoretical treatments,[16-19] UV spectra,[19-21] and others [15,16,19,20] have suggested. If each one lone pair of the two sulfur atoms of 1,2-dithiaacenaphthene participates in the electron-delocalization over the entire molecule, the whole molecule should gain π-aromaticity with 14 electrons.

REFERENCES AND FOOTNOTE

1. S. Tamagaki, H. Hirota, and S. Oae, Bull. Chem. Soc. Jpn., 1973, 46, 1247.
2. S. Tamagaki, H. Hirota, and S. Oae, ibid., 1974, 47, 2075.
3. C. C. Price and S. Oae, 'Sulfur Bonding', Ronald Press, New York, 1962, p. 42.
4. We call this situation as "Kusare-en Koka" in Japanese literally meaning the cohesive effect.
5. M. M. Chau and J. L. Kice, J. Org. Chem., 1978, 43, 914.
6. M. M. Chau and J. L. Kice, ibid., 1977, 42, 3265.
7. J. L. Kice and H. Margolis, ibid., 1975, 40, 3623.
8. J. L. Kice, G. Guaraldi, and C. G. Venier, ibid., 1966, 31, 3561
9. J. L. Kice, and G. Guaraldi, ibid., 1966, 31, 3568.
10. S. Tamagaki and S. Oae, Bull. Chem. Soc. Jpn., 1972, 45, 960.
11. N. Kunieda and S. Oae, ibid., 1968, 41, 233.
12. H. Morita and S. Oae, Heterocycles, 1976, 5, 29.
13. H. Morita, unpublished results.
14. a. S. Oae, Y. Ohnishi, S. Kozuka, and W. Tagaki, Bull. Chem. Soc. Jpn., 1966, 39, 364.
    b. W. Tagaki, K. Kikukawa, N. Kunieda, and S. Oae, ibid., 1966, 39, 614.
15. G. F. Pedulli, P. Virarelli. P. Dembech, A. Ricci, and G. Seconi, Int. J. Sulfur Chem., 1973, 8, 255.
16. A. Zweig and A. K. Hoffmann, J. Org. Chem., 1965, 30, 3997.
17. R. Zahraduik and C. Parkanyi, Coll. Czech. Chem. Comm., 1965, 30, 3016.
18. U. Miotti, G. Modena, and L. Sedea, J. Chem. Soc. B, 1970, 802.
19. D. J. Sandmann, G. P. Ceason, P. Nielsen, A. J. Esptein, and T. J. Holmes, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 1978, 100, 202.
20. B. I. Stepanov, W. Ya. Rodinov, A. Ya. Zhelton, and V. V. Orlov, Tetrahedron Letters, 1971, 1079.
21. H. S. Desai and B. D. Tilak, J. Sci. Ind. Res. (India), 1960, 19B, 390.

Received, 29th July, 1981