

Table I. Reduction of 3 to 4

compd no.	mp, °C	substituents		temp, °C	$t_{1/2}$, min	product	mp, °C [bp, °C (mm)]
		β	α				
3a	108.5-109	<i>p</i> -chlorophenyl	<i>p</i> -chlorophenyl	0	too fast	4a	89-90
3b	110-110.5	phenyl	<i>p</i> -chlorophenyl	0	0.2	4b	84-85
3c	101-101.5	<i>p</i> -chlorophenyl	phenyl	0	2.8	4c	110-111.5
3d	85-86.5	phenyl	phenyl	0	27	4d	51-51.5
3e	110-111	<i>p</i> -fluorophenyl	phenyl	25	1.25	4e	85.5-87.5
3f	127.5-128.5	<i>p</i> -anisyl	<i>p</i> -chlorophenyl	25	1.00	4f	111-112.5
3d		phenyl	phenyl	25	1.46	4d	
3g	57.5-59	<i>p</i> -tolyl	phenyl	25	3.32	4g	[137 (1)]
3h	93.5-94.5	<i>p</i> -anisyl	phenyl	25	13.5	4h	85.5-87
3i	92.5-93.5	phenyl	<i>p</i> -anisyl	25	105	4i	68-69
3j	137-138	<i>p</i> -(dimethylamino)phenyl	phenyl	25	518	4j	76-77.5
3k	107-107.5	<i>p</i> -anisyl	<i>p</i> -anisyl	25	615	4k	115-116.5
3l	108.5-109	<i>p</i> -chlorophenyl	<i>p</i> -anisyl			4l	69.5-71
3m	189-190	<i>p</i> -(dimethylamino)phenyl	<i>p</i> -chlorophenyl			4m	112-114
3n	149.5-150	<i>p</i> -(dimethylamino)phenyl	<i>p</i> -anisyl			4n	102-104
3o	110-110.5	α -naphthyl	phenyl			4o	82-83
3p	174-175	α -naphthyl	<i>p</i> -chlorophenyl			4p	63-64
3q	104.5-105	α -naphthyl	<i>p</i> -anisyl			4q	94.5-96.5
3r	42.5-43	α -furyl	phenyl			4r	[176-177 (21)]
3s	80-80.5	α -furyl	<i>p</i> -chlorophenyl			4s	[196-197 (21)]
3t	61-62	α -furyl	<i>p</i> -anisyl			4t	[207-208 (21)]
3u	90-90.7	α -thienyl	phenyl			4u	[206-207 (21)]
3v	135-136	α -thienyl	<i>p</i> -chlorophenyl			4v	84.5-86
3w	76.5-77	α -thienyl	<i>p</i> -anisyl			4w	[191-192 (2)]

sponding increase at 2245 cm^{-1} (saturated CN) occurred. While the intensity of the conjugated nitrile absorbances is approximately twice as great as that of the nonconjugated analogues, this had no effect on the rate equation derived. Least-squares regression gave k and $t_{1/2}$ with typical correlation coefficients of 0.998.

The data for these reductions are recorded in Table I. The relative rates correlate very well with the data of Schauble.⁴ The parent compound (3d) reacts ≈ 18 times faster at 25 than at 0 °C. Electron-withdrawing substituents (3a, 3b, 3c, 3e, and 3f) increase the rate. A substituent on the α -phenyl is more effective than one on the β -phenyl. For example, the relative rates of compounds 3d:3h:3i:3k at 25 °C are 1:9:70:420.

A Hammett plot by computer for compounds 3d, 3e, 3g, 3h, and 3j gave $\rho = 3.86$ with a correlation coefficient of 0.984. It is clear that there is substantial negative charge development on the nitrogen of the nitrile, and the β -carbon of the α,β -acrylonitrile is more susceptible to hydride attack as its positive charge is increased by the appropriate substituents. Our ρ value is much higher than that for the corresponding acrylates⁴ but not as high as some other ρ values (5.3 and 6.0).⁷

Experimental Section

Infrared spectra were recorded on a Perkin-Elmer Model 237B instrument. Melting points were determined on a Mel Temp apparatus. All compounds gave NMR and IR spectra consistent with those expected for the formula. These spectra will be included in the Sadtler series at a later date. All new compounds gave analyses (by G. I. Robertson Laboratories, Florham Park, N.J.) within $\pm 0.30\%$ of theory.

α,β -Disubstituted Acrylonitriles (3). These compounds were prepared by a literature method⁸ from the arylacetonitriles and aromatic aldehydes with 40% aqueous NaOH. Table I lists the melting points for the compounds utilized. The yields were consistently in the 80-90% range. These compounds were purified by recrystallization from ethanol.

α,β -Diarylpropanenitriles (4). **General Synthetic Procedure.** A solution of 4 g (0.1 mol) of NaBH_4 dissolved in 100

Table II

time, min	absorbance A	absorbance B	$\ln(1 + B/A)$
15.0	0.208	0.031	0.1389
20.0	0.198	0.038	0.1756
30.0	0.221	0.051	0.2076
40.0	0.210	0.069	0.2841
50.0	0.179	0.073	0.3420
60.0	0.145	0.078	0.4304
80.0	0.115	0.085	0.5534
90.0	0.105	0.092	0.6292
100.0	0.081	0.081	0.6931

mL of DMF was added to a solution of the appropriate α,β -diarylacrylonitrile (0.05 mol in 50 mL of DMF or THF). The mixture was stirred overnight at ambient temperature, poured over ice, neutralized with 6 M HCl, and filtered or extracted with ether. The products were purified by recrystallization or distillation, and their melting points are recorded in Table I. Many solids were sufficiently pure as isolated and did not require further purification. The yields were consistently in the 90% range. Recrystallizations were done from ethanol.

Kinetics. (a) Four grams of NaBH_4 (0.1 mol) was dissolved by vigorous shaking in 100 mL of DMF, and the solution was filtered. A solution of 0.05 mol of the appropriate conjugated nitrile in 50 mL of DMF was prepared and filtered. The two solutions were added to a 500-mL round-bottom flask equipped with a magnetic stirrer. At appropriate time intervals, based on the speed of the reaction, 10-mL aliquots were removed by pipet and quenched in 50 mL of ice water. The solution was neutralized with 2 M HCl, and the solid precipitate was extracted with 6 mL of either CCl_4 or CHCl_3 . The organic layer was washed twice with water to remove DMF. A portion of the organic layer was transferred to a 75-mm test tube containing anhydrous MgSO_4 . After the solution was shaken and left to settle, a syringe was used to inject some of the solution into a sealed sodium chloride cell with a 0.2-mm path length. A matched solvent filled cell was the reference. Typical data are listed in Table II.

(b) For very rapid reactions at 0 °C, the two solutions were prepared as above. To 10 mL of the NaBH_4 solution in a 150-mm test tube containing a thermometer was added 5 mL of the nitrile solution, and a stopwatch was started. At selected time intervals, the reaction mixture was quenched in 50 mL of cold water. Workup was the same as that in procedure a but required 9-10 mL of extraction solvent.

Infrared Data and Calculations. The absolute concentrations of reactant and product were not necessary. However, the

(7) C. D. Johnson, "The Hammett Equation", Cambridge University Press, New York, 1973, pp 97 and 181.

(8) S. Wawzonek and E. M. Smolin, "Organic Synthesis", Collect. Vol. III, Wiley, New York, 1953, p 715.

