SOLVENT EFFECTS ON HALONIUM ION=CARBONIUM ION EQUILIBRIA

Samuel P. McManus*

Department of Chemistry, The University of Alabama in Huntsville, Huntsville, Alabama 35807 Paul E. Peterson*

Department of Chemistry, University of South Carolina, Columbia, South Carolina 29208 (Received in USA 8 May 1975; received in UK for publication 26 June 1975)

Although the polar bromination of alkenes has long been postulated' to involve ethylenebromonium ion intermediates, some product studies have led to suggestions2-4 of the intermediate's solvent dependence. These reports originated from studies of stilbene derivatives² and now include a variety of types.^{3,4} The conclusion is that there is more bromonium ion char**acter, as opposed to carbonium ion character, as the solvent polarity decreases.5 One of us recently proposed4 that the observed solvent dependence of polar bromination reactions may be the result of differential solvation requirements of the bromonium ion and the carbonium ion in their equilibria, eq. (1). It was inferred that owing to differences in electronic configura-**

tions,^o the ethylenebromonium ion derivative can better accommodate the positive charge in the **absence of strong solvation.**

Beauchamp and his coworkers7 have now determined that relative to simple carbonium ions, cyclic halonium ions exhibit a greater relative stability in the gas phase than in fluorosulfuric acid.⁸ Following a logic in common with that of McManus and Ware,⁴ Beauchamp <u>et al</u> ⁷ attributed **the increased relative bromonium ion stability to internal solvation of the carbonium ion by** the neighboring bromine atom. We now report quantitative data on halonium = carbonium ion equilibria in solution which lends support to the proposals of Beauchamp⁷ and McManus.⁴

Olahg and PetersonlO and their coworkers have previously suggested that the temperature dependence of the 'H and l3 C nmr spectra of certain halonim ions, e.g. l-4, results from a halonium \implies carbonium ion equilibria, e.q. eq.(1), which is fast on the nmr time scale. Employing FT ¹³C techniques, Henrichs and Peterson¹⁰ quantified this equilibria for several halonium ions in SO₂. We now report temperature dependence of the C-1 chemical shift of ions 3 and 4 in SO₂ClF.¹¹ Using estimated chemical shifts (eq. 2) of the halonium ions (3h and 4h)

and the carbonium ions (3c and 4c) obtained as previously discussed,¹⁰ the characteristics of the $3h \rightleftharpoons 3c$ and $4h \rightleftharpoons 4c$ equilibria were calculated (Table 1).¹²

A comparison of the equilibria of 3 and 4 in the SO₂ and SO₂ClF at -60⁰ (Table II) reveals a **13 measurable solvent effect on the equilibria. The preference for the halonium ion relative to the carbonium ion in SO2ClF is further evidenced by our failure to generate cation 2 in SO2ClF.** Rearrangement of the ethyl derivative 5 to 2 in SO₂ occurs in 20 min at -20^{0 9} or 1.25 hr at -27^{0.10} In SO₂ClF, however, no detectable rearrangement of 5 to 2 occurred upon warming 5 to **-400 for 4.5 hr or upon storage at -700 for 15 days. Warming of 5 at -20' or above was accom**panied by decomposition and again no 2 was detected by ¹³C nmr.

While we were unable to find any useful quantitative comparison of SO₂ and SO₂ClF in the literature, Olah and Olah¹⁴ have stated that SO₂ClF is the preferred solvent for the formation of stable carbonium ions since SO₂ reacts with some carbonium ions to yield sulfinic acids or

sulfonyl fluorides. Thus, the oxygen atoms in SO₂ are apparently more nucleophilic than those **in sO2ClF allowing the former to better solvate carbonium iws.**

In **swmwy, our results indicate that cyclic halonium ions become relatively more stable than carbonium ions as the solvent becomes less capable of nucleophilic solvation. Hence the numerous literature reports of increased stereoselectivity in electrophilic alkene halogenations** in non-polar solvents and at low temperature serve as qualitative examples of solvent and temperature effects on halonium \implies carbonium ion equilibria.

Cations	Temperature (°c) $-100 + 2$	eg. 0.118 ± 0.036	ΔG (Kcal/mole) 0.735 ± 0.1	x_n^a 0.895 ± 0.025	ն-1 (ppm) " $168.6 + 0.1$
$3h \rightleftharpoons 3c$	-94	0.130	0.726	0.885	170.4
	-85	0.141	0.732	0.877	171.9
	-82	0.145	0.735	0.874	172.4
	-61	0.206	0.666	0.829	180.6
	-47	0.222	0.677	0.818	182.6
	-33	0.327	0.533	0.754	194.5
$4h \rightleftharpoons 4c$	-102 ± 2	0.013 ± 0.008	1.483 ± 0.2	0.987 ± 0.012	149.8 ± 0.1
	-92	0.016	1.479	0.984	150.5
	-82	0.020	1.486	0.980	151.1
	-73	0.025	1.460	0.975	152.1
	-36	0.059	1.336	0.944	157.8

Table I. Experimental and Calculated Parameters for Halonium-Carbonium Ion Equilibria in SO₂ClF.

2 Mole fraction of cyclic haloniun ion(halonium ion ecarbonium ion equilibriunk values calcu-lated as discussed in ref. 10. b Relative **to TMS (ext. cap). _____~__~____~_____~~~-~~~--~~-~~-~~~----**

Table II. **Comparison of Halonium-Carbonium Ion Equilibria in Sulfur Dioxide and Sulfuryl Chloride Fluoride at -600 (see ref. 13)** .

&The lJC chmnical shift of C-3 of 3 in SO2ClF is 36.38 f 0.07 (rel to TliS, ext) and temp independent; in SO₂ (ref 10), it is at 40.0 ± 0.5 ppm. In <u>4</u>, the C-4 group is essentially temp inde**pendent with respectively.** the values at -60° in SO2 (ref 10) and SO₂ClF being 22.1 ± 0.1 and 21.11 ± 0.04,
Data from ref 10. <u>C</u> C-1 compared to C-3. Q C-1 compared to the C-4 methyl **-C-l compared to the C-4 methyl.**

Acknowledgements

S.P.M. kindly acknowledges the hospitality of the Department of Chemistry of the University of South Carolina where the experimental portion of this research was ccmpleted. The Petroleum Research Fund, administered by the American Chemical Society, is acknowledged for partial financial support (to **S.P.M.).**

References

- **1. (a) I. Roberts and G. E. Kimball, <u>J</u>. <u>Amer. Chem. Soc</u>. Mare and R. Bolton, 2, 947 (1937); (b) P. 8. 0. de la "Electrophflfc-Admons to Unsaturated Systems", Elsevier, New York, 1966; (c) R. C. Fahey in "Topics in Stereochemistry", vol. 3, E. L. Eliel and N. L. Allinger, Ed., Wiley-Interscience, New York, 1968, p. 280.**
- **2. (a) R. E. Buckles, J. L. Forrester, R. L. Burham, and T. W. McGee, J. a. Chem., 25, 24 (1960); (b) G. Heublein, J. Prakt. Chem., 31, 84 1966); 2.** *Or* **Chem., (c) M. F. Ruasse an E. Bubofs,** $\overline{38}$, $\overline{49}$ 3 (1973). <u>37</u>, 1770 (1972); <u>39</u>, 2441 (1974); (d) J. E. Dubois and M. F. Ruasse, <u>ib</u>
- **3. (a) R. C. Fahey and H. J. Schneider, 2. Aner. Chem. Sot.. 90, 4429 (1968); (b) T. Okuyama.** K. Uhashi, K. Izawa, and T. Fueno, <u>J</u>. <u>Org</u>. <u>Chem</u>. **-+ Chem.,<u>39</u>,2255(19**7 **6. E. Heasley R. A. Loghry, and M. R. McConnell, <u>ibid</u> (c) V. L. Heasley, K. Yates, <u>J</u>. <u>Amer. Chem</u>. <u>Soc.</u>, <u>91</u>, 1477 (1969). _., 37. 2228 (1972); J. H. Rolston and**
- **4.** S. P. McManus and D. W. Ware, Tetrahedron Lett., 4271 (1974).
- **5.** To our knowledge there has been no correlation with a specific parameter such as μ , ε , or Y. but see M. F. Ruasse and J. E. Dubois, J. Amer. Chem. Soc., 97, 1977 (1975).
- **6. Solvatfon of the carbonium ion and bromonfum ion would be quite different. The carbonfum ion contains only six electrons in its outer shell and would accept a solvent electron pair in its empty p orbital. The bromonfum ion, however, has fully occupied 3d, 4s, and 4p orbftals, hence it would likely accept a pair of solvent electrons in a 4d orbital.**
- **7.** R. D. Wieting, R. H. Staley, and J. L. Beauchamp, <u>J. Amer. Chem. Soc., 96</u>, 7552 (1974).
- **8.** J. W. Larsen and A. V. Metzner, ibid., 94, 1614 (1972).
- **9.** G. A. Olah, P. W. Westerman, E. G. Melby, and Y. K. Mo, ibid., 96, 3565 (1974) and earlier **papers.**
- **10.** P. M. Henrichs and P. E. Peterson, ibid., 95, 7449 (1973) and earlier papers.
- **11.** The ions were prepared as \sim 0.7M solutions by adding the dihalide precursor (ref 10)to a **SO2ClF solution 2.5M in SbF5. Vigorous stirring during the additions (at -70 to -780) prevented overheating and discoloration.**
- **12. The model compounds, the tetramethylenechloronium ion and its l-methyl derivative, showed little solvent dependence of their chemical shifts. Assumed chemical shift values were calculated using the method described in ref. 10.**
- **13.** Ine errors shown for K, AG, and X in Table I result predominantly from an uncertainty in
v_c and v_h (ref. 10), This error vanishes for comparison purposes. So that the statistical **dffference will be obvfws, the constant error is not included in the AG values in Table II.**
- **14. 6. A. Olah and J. A. Olah in "Carbonfum Ions", vol. 2. 6. A. Olah and P. v. R. Schleyer, Ed., Wiley-Interscience, New York, 1970. p. 750.**