Acknowledgment. This research was supported by the National Cancer Institute DHEW (CA 13689-06).

References and Notes

(1) K. C. Nicolaou, Tetrahedron, 33, 683 (1977).

- (2) Recent reports in the literature have described the synthesis of selenol esters by reaction of (a) carboxylic acid-imidazoles with aliphatic and ar-omatic selenols,^{3,4} (b) carboxylic acid-1,2,4-triazoles with selenols,³ (c) cyclohexanecarboxylic acid diethylphosphoric anhydride, acid chloride, or imidazole with the Tl(I) salt of benzeneselenol,⁵ and (d) cyclohexane-(a) Influence with the H(f) sait of penzeneselenol,^o and (d) cyclohexane-carboxylic acid with benzeneselenenyl chloride or diphenyl diselenide in the presence of tri-*n*-octylphosphine.⁵
 (3) H.-J. Gais, Angew. Chem., Int. Ed. Engl., 16, 244 (1977).
 (4) G. S. Bates, J. Diakur, and S. Masamune, Tetrahedron Lett., 4423 (1977).
 (5) Sociation 2 and 47 in 160.
- See footnotes 3 and 17 in ref 6i.
- (6) For recent reports describing the synthesis of thiol esters see: (a) E. J. Corey and D. J. Beames, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 95, 5829 (1973); (b) T. Mukaiyama, T. Takeda, and K. Atsumi, Chem. Lett., 187 (1974); (c) S. Masamune, S. Kamata, J. Diakur, Y. Sugihara, and G. S. Bates, Can. J. Chem., 53, 3693 Kamata, J. Diakur, Y. Sugihara, and G. S. Bates, Can. J. Chem., 53, 3693
 (1975); (d) T. Mukaiyama, Angew. Chem., Int. Ed. Engl., 15, 94 (1976); (e)
 F. Souto-Bachiller, G. S. Bates, and S. Masamune, J. Chem. Soc., Chem. Commun., 719 (1976); (f) R. P. Hatch and S. M. Weinreb, J. Org. Chem., 42, 3960 (1977); (g) S. Masamune, S. Kamata, and W. Schilling, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 97, 3515 (1975); (h) H.-J. Gais, Angew. Chem., Int. E. Engl., 16, 244 (1977); (i) S. Masamune, Y. Hayase, W. Schilling, W. K. Chan, and G. S. Bates, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 99, 6756 (1977); (j) S. Yamada, Y. Yokoyama, and T. Shioiri, J. Org. Chem., 39, 3302 (1974).
 (7) P. A. Grieco, S. Gilman, and M. Nishizawa, J. Org. Chem., 41, 1485 (1976).
- (1) P. A. Grieco, S. Giman, and M. Nisilizawa, J. Org. Chem., 41, 1483 (1976).
 (8) P. A. Grieco and Y. Yokoyama, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 99, 5210 (1977).
 (9) O. Behaghel and H. Seibert, Ber., 65, 812 (1932).
 (10) K. Kottke, F. Friedrich, and R. Pohloudek-Fabini, Arch. Pharm., 300, 583

- (1967).
 (11) F. Challenger, C. Higginbottom, and A. Huntington, J. Chem. Soc., 26 (1930).
- (12) Fellow of the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation.

Paul A. Grieco,*12 Yuusaku Yokoyama **Eric Williams**

Department of Chemistry, University of Pittsburgh Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15260 Received December 20, 1977

Favored Reduction of α -Chlorosilanes vs. α -Chloroalkanes with Tri-*n*-butyltin Hydride

Summary: The reduction of 1-chloro-2,2-dimethyl-2-silapropane, neopentyl chloride, and 1,6-dichloro-2,2,5,5-tetramethyl-2-silahexane with tri-n-butyltin hydride under freeradical conditions is described.

Sir: In 1965 it was suggested that α -silyl radicals may be specially stabilized compared to their all-carbon analogues, possibly by vicinal (d-p) π overlap.¹ Such stabilization was invoked to explain the absence of rearrangement in α -silyl radicals.² Although ESR studies appear to confirm this stabilization,³ it seemed desirable to investigate it further. We describe here external and internal competition studies that show the heretofore unreported preferential reduction of certain α -chlorosilanes over their all-carbon analogues with tri-*n*-butyltin hydride. These results strongly suggest that some α -silyl radicals are indeed more stable than their allcarbon congeners.

In the external competition, mixtures of 1-chloro-2,2dimethyl-2-silapropane ("silaneopentyl chloride", 1) and neopentyl chloride (2) were dissolved in dry benzene, sealed in ampules after degassing, and reduced with tri-*n*-butyltin hydride,⁴ using di-tert-butyl peroxide as the free-radical initiator. The results are given in Table I.

It may be seen that 1 is nearly two orders of magnitude faster in this reduction than is 2. Because the chlorine abstraction step (eq 1) determines the rate of these reductions,⁵ it would appear that $(CH_3)_3SiCH_2$. (1.) is more easily formed than $(CH_3)_3CCH_2$ (2) and therefore that 1 might be more Table I. Competitive Reduction of 1 and 2^a

Ratio 1/2, mM	$k_{\rm Si}/k_{\rm C}{}^{b,c}$
1:2 ^d	78
$1:1.5^{d}$	81

^a On a 10–20 mmol scale. In benzene at 151–152 °C for 20 h. Ratio of materials (1 + 2)/tri-n-butyltin hydride/di-tert-butyl peroxide = 10:3:1. ^b Competitive rate ratio, calculated from calibrated initial and final ¹H NMR spectra by a standard method (M. J. Hutchinson and M. W. Mosher, J. Chem. Educ., 48, 629 (1971)). The results are for several runs and are $\pm 3\%$. ^c The reductions afforded tetramethylsilane from 1 and neopentane from 2, each in >90% yield. d Excess 2 was employed to increase the precision of the results.

stable than 2. External competition experiments can be misleading, however. The competitive rate ratio, which only measures the relative activation barriers, might actually reflect a less stable reactant (i.e., 1) rather than a more stable intermediate (i.e., $1 \cdot$).

$$(CH_{3})_{3}MCH_{2}Cl + \cdot Sn(n \cdot C_{4}H_{9})_{3}$$

$$1, M = Si$$

$$2, M = C$$

$$\xrightarrow{k_{Cl}} (CH_{3})_{3}MCH_{2} \cdot + ClSn(n \cdot C_{4}H_{9})_{3} \quad (1)$$
fast HSn(n \cdot C_{4}H_{9})_{3}

Because literature data applicable to the free-energy content of 1 appear to vary significantly,⁶ another approach to the selectivity in eq 1 was used, viz., internal competition. Here the problem of possible ground-state-energy differences between reactants disappears. The model chosen was 1,6-dichloro-2,2,5,5-tetramethyl-2-silahexane (8). Its synthesis (eq 2) commenced with the oxidation of the chloro alcohol 4 (Aldrich) to the chloro aldehyde 5: pyridinium chlorochromate in methylene chloride;¹² 80% yield; bp \sim 100 °C (150 mm) (Kugelrohr); 2,4-DNP, mp 137-138 °C. Anal. Calcd for C11H13ClN4O4: N, 18.63. Found: N, 18.69. Conversion of aldehyde 5 to olefin 6 was accomplished via the Wittig reaction: dimsyl sodium;¹³ methyltriphenylphosphonium bromide (or tosylate¹⁴); 30% yield; bp 108-109 °C (atm); ¹H NMR (CCl₄) δ 5.83, 5.12, 4.90 (-CH=CH₂) (ABX, $J_{\text{trans}} = 18, J_{\text{cis}} = 9, J_{\text{gem}}$ = 3 Hz), 3.30 (s, -CH₂Cl), 1.10 (s, -CH₃); IR (neat) 3110, 1642, 928 (-CH==CH₂), 1382, 1368 (CH₃) cm⁻¹. Anal. Calcd for C₆H₁₁Cl: C, 60.76; H, 9.35. Found: C, 61.08; H, 9.50. Addition of silane 7¹⁵ to 6 in the presence of chloroplatinic acid afforded 8: 71% yield, collected by GLC on DC-200 at 150 °C; ¹H NMR $(CCl_4) \delta 3.33 \text{ (s, >CCH_2Cl)}, 2.73 \text{ (s, >SiCH_2Cl)}, 1.53-1.17 \text{ (m,}$ >SiCH₂CH₂C<), 0.97 (s, >C(CH₃)₂), 0.70–0.30 (m, >SiCH₂CH₂C<), 0.13 (s, >Si(CH₃)₂); IR (neat) 1390, 1370 $(>C(CH_3)_2)$, 1260 $(>Si(CH_3)_2)$ cm⁻¹. Anal. Calcd for C₉H₂₀Cl₂Si: C, 47.57; H, 8.87. Found: C, 47.83; H, 8.89.

$$ClCH_2C(CH_3)_2CH_2OH$$

4

$$\begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\text{pyrH}^{+} \text{CrO}_{3}\text{Cl}^{-}} & \text{ClCH}_{2}\text{C}(\text{CH}_{3})_{2}\text{CHO}} \\ \xrightarrow{\text{CH}_{2}\text{Cl}_{2}} & 5 \\ & \downarrow \text{IPh}_{3}\text{P}=\text{CH}_{2}\text{I} \\ & \downarrow \text{IPh}_{3}\text{P}=\text{CH}_{2}\text{I} \\ & \text{ClCH}_{2}\text{SiH}(\text{CH}_{3})_{2} (7) & 6 \\ & \text{ClCH}_{2}\text{SiH}(\text{CH}_{3})_{2} \text{CH}_{2}\text{CH}_{2}\text{C}(\text{CH}_{3})_{2}\text{CH}=\text{CH}_{2} \\ & 6 \\ & \text{ClCH}_{2}\text{Si}(\text{CH}_{3})_{2}\text{CH}_{2}\text{CH}_{2}\text{C}(\text{CH}_{3})_{2}\text{CH}_{2}\text{CI} (2) \\ & 8 \end{array}$$

0022-3263/78/1943-1285\$01.00/0 © 1978 American Chemical Society

A sample reduction of 8 is described. In an NMR tube were placed 8 (45 mg, 0.198 mmol), tri-n-butyltin hydride (freshly prepared,¹⁶ 61 mg, 0.209 mmol), azobisisobutyronitrile (Aldrich, 10 mg), and benzene (distilled Spectrograde material, $300 \,\mu\text{L}$). Nitrogen was bubbled through the material briefly and the tube was capped. The solution was then irradiated in a small irradiation apparatus (Bradford Scientific Co.) at 366 nm and 37 °C (ambient) for 6.5 h. Processing the mixture directly by GLC (DC-200, 150 °C) afforded 9 in essentially quantitative yield based upon consumed reactants (94% reaction), with <5% (if any) of 10, along with benzene and tri*n*-butyltin chloride (eq 3).¹⁷ For confirmation of their struc-

tures, chlorosilanes 9 and 10 were synthesized by the routes shown in eq 4. Chloro silane 9 was identical (spectra, GLC)

$$6 + HSi(CH_3)_2Cl^{18}$$

$$H_2PtCl_6$$

$$CH_2=CHC(CH_3)_3^{19} + 7$$

$$H_2PtCl_6$$

$$CISi(CH_3)_2CH_2CH_2C(CH_3)_2CH_2Cl$$

$$CH_3Li, \text{ ether} \qquad (4)$$

$$10 (79\%) \quad 9 (21\% \text{ from } 6)$$

with the reduction product: ¹H NMR (CCl₄) δ 3.30 (s, $-CH_2Cl$), 1.53–1.17 (m, $>SiCH_2CH_2C<$), 1.0 (s, $>C(CH_3)_2$), $0.67-0.23 \text{ (m, >SiCH}_2CH_2C \le), 0.07 \text{ (s, >Si(CH_3)}_3); \text{ IR (neat)}$ 1383, 1367 (>C(CH₃)₂), 1252, 840-870 (>Si(CH₃)₃) cm⁻¹. Anal. Calcd for C₉H₂₁ClSi: C, 56.06; H, 10.98, Found: C, 55.72; H. 10.96. Chlorosilane 10 was distinguished from its isomer

9 most readily by its NMR spectrum: ¹H NMR (CCl₄) δ 2.73 (s, $-CH_2Cl$), 1.40–1.03 (m, $>SiCH_2CH_2C<$), 0.90 (s, $-C(CH_3)_3$, 0.77–0.32 (m, $>SiCH_2CH_2C <$), 0.12(s, $>Si(CH_3)_2$); IR (neat) 1392, 1362 ($-C(CH_3)_3$), 1252 ($>Si(CH_3)_2$) cm⁻¹. Anal. Calcd for C₉H₂₁ClSi: C, 56.06; H, 10.98. Found: C, 55.67; H. 10.74.

Work is in progress on the reduction of other α -chlorosilanes and α -chloroalkanes, both by external and internal competition techniques, to establish the generality of the present findings.

References and Notes

- (1) J. W. Wilt and O. Kolewe, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 87, 2071 (1965). (2) J. W. Wilt, O. Kolewe, and J. F. Kraemer, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 91, 2624
- P. J. Krusic and J. K. Kochi, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 91, 6161 (1969).
- (4) H. G. Kulvila, Acc. Chem. Res., 1, 299 (1968).
 (5) D. J. Carlsson and K. U. Ingold, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 90, 7047 (1968).
- E.g., the standard heat of formation of tetramethylsilane (a value needed to calculate the energy content of 1 by the method of O'Neal and Ring⁷) has literature values of: -26,⁸ -33,⁹ -68,¹⁰ -69,¹¹ and -73^7 kcal mol⁻

- mol⁻¹.
 (7) H. O'Neal and M. Ring, *Inorg. Chem.*, **5**, 435 (1966).
 (8) M. Tribble and N. Allinger, *Tetrahedron*, **28**, 2147 (1972).
 (9) P. Potzinger and F. Lampe, *J. Phys. Chem.*, **74**, 719 (1970).
 (10) S. Band, I. Davidson, and C. Lambert, *J. Chem. Soc. A*, 2068 (1968).
 (11) S. Tannenbaum, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, **76**, 1027 (1954).
 (12) E. J. Corey and J. W. Suggs, *Tetrahedron Lett.*, 2647 (1975).
 (13) R. Greenwald, M. Chaykovsky, and E. J. Corey, *J. Org. Chem.*, **28**, 1128 (1982). (1963).
- D. Klamann and P. Weyerstahl, Angew, Chem., **75**, 89 (1963).
 D. Seyferth and E. G. Rochow, J. Am. Chem. Soc., **77**, 907 (1955).
 H. G. Kuivila and O. F. Beumel, Jr., J. Am. Chem. Soc., **83**, 1246 (1961).
- (17) Control experiments showed that 5% of 10 in 9 could be easily observed by ¹H NMR analysis. Analysis by IR or GLC was less useful. Work in prog ress on larger scale reactions will establish the extent of formation of 10.
- (18) Obtained from Silar Laboratories.
- Obtained from Aldrich Chemical Co. (19)
- A portion of this work comes from the M. S. Thesis of P.M.A., Loyola Uni-(20)versity of Chicago, 1974.

James W. Wilt,* Peter M. Aznavoorian²⁰

Department of Chemistry Loyola University of Chicago Chicago, Illinois 60626 Received January 6, 1978