REACTIONS OF TRIARYLMETHYL CARBOCATIONS WITH HYDRIDE DONORS AND OTHER NUCLEOPHILES C. A. Runton*, 8. K. Huang and C. H. Paik

Department of Chemistry, University of California, Santa Barbara, California **93106**

(Received in USA 1 December 1975; received in UK for publication 23 March 1976)

The N₁ scale of nucleophilicity, evaluated from reactivities toward carbocations, was initially interpreted in terms of anionic desolvation.¹ The scale also fits diazonium ion capture and deacylations, provided that allowauce is made for partitioning of tetrahedral intenuediatee. However, nucleophilicities, especially towards esters, have often been correlated with basicity,² and for different series of reagents they have been rationalized using the hard-soft principle, 3 but the success of the N_L scale illustrates the importance of desolvation of anionic, and by implication, nonionic, nucleopales, e.g., amines.

Cur aim was to examine nucleophiles which discriminate markedly between carbocations and acyl centers, and we have followed reactions of malachite green (M_5^+) and tri-p-anisylmethyl cation (R^+) with BH₄, BH₃CN and N-benzyldihydronicotinamide (1), which are reactive towards carbocations,^{4'5} but not in deacylation⁶⁸,^b (Table 1). The reactions were followed using a stopped flow spectrophotometer for reactions of R^+ , and a Gilford spectrophotometer for those of M_2^+ .⁷¹⁸ We also

$$
M3^{+} \longrightarrow M3H
$$

$$
X = -BH_{3}^{-}, -BH_{2}C\overline{N}, \sum_{H}MCH_{2}P_{H}
$$

Table 1

Reactivities of Carbocations with Hydride Donors and Nucleophiles⁸

 $BH₃CN$ $BH₄^{-b}$ OH^{-b} PhO^{-c} PhS p-MeC_eH₄S p-MeC_eH₄S p-NH₂C_eH₄S $\mathbf{1}$ Reagent R^+ (ke 2.1 x 10⁵ 9000 1.3 x 10⁶ 6600 1.1 x 10⁵
1.6 k_{rel} 1.5 0.1 2.2 0.0 1.2 $\frac{1}{2}$ **R** 2.1 x 10³ 9000 1.3 x 10⁵ 6600 1.1 x 10³ 1.8 x 10⁵ 2.4 x 10⁵ 3.6 x 10⁵ 1.8 x 1 **4.4 4.6 4.7 4.4** $\frac{1}{4}$ (k₂ 27 2.7 32 1.64 $log k_{\text{real}}$ 1.2 0.2 1.2 0.0

> (a) In water at 25.0° ; $k_{\mathcal{Z}}$ (1. mole⁻¹ sec⁻¹) is corrected where necessary for reaction with OH $_{5}$ (b) ref. 7; (c) ref. 8.

measured rate constants of reactions of R⁺ with thiophenoxide ions which approach the diffusion controlled limit. The limit of ca. 10^{10} is reached with diazonium ions,¹ but that for a bulky carbocation may be lower. The values of log_{req} (Table 1) differ from N_+ only in the choice of reference reaction and the fitting of the data to give the best overall agreement.¹ The high reactivities of the thiophenoxide ions are consistent with the generally high nucleophilicity of thiolate ions, and the lower solvation of thiolate ion as compared with hydroxide ion, and electronic effects on reactivity are relatively small. As for reactions with phenoxide ions, ⁸ dispersive and hydrophobic interactions probably assist reactions of both 1 and thiophenoxide ions with carbocations (cf. ref. 7,9), but the difference between the reactivities of BH₄ and BH₃CN is due largely to electron withdrawal by the cyano group. However the dihydronicotinamide (1) is very reactive towards the carbocations although there is no coulombic attraction between the reagents.

Solvent effects on hydride transfer to M_3^+ (Figure 1) are readily understandable in terms of qualitative solvent theory,¹⁰ and anionic solvation.¹¹ Reaction with BH₄ is markedly speeded by addition of organic solvent, but that of 1 is slowed, possibly because solvation of the

forming pyridinium ion in the transition state assists reaction, so that although the dihydronicotinamide (1) is almost as reactive as BH₄ in water, the differential solvent effect makes BH₄ very much more reactive in aqueous MeCN.

The rate minima for reaction of OH^- with M_2^+ in aqueous acetonitrile or t-butanol are understandable in terms of the effects of organic solvents on water structure, 13 because there are strong interactions between water and the highly solvated hydroxide ion which is acting as a nucleophile or a general base, so that solvent effects are completely different from that on reaction of BH₄. For reactions of MG the solvent isotope effects, $k_{\text{O}\bar{\text{H}}}$ / $k_{\text{O}\bar{\text{D}}}$ = 1.10 and k_{He} / $k_{\text{De} \text{O}}$ $= 1.50$, in the ranges observed earlier for attacks on carbocations,¹⁴ whereas inverse solvent hydrogen isotope effects are often found for nucleophilic attack by OH, so that the evidence is consistent with hydroxide ion giving general base catalysis of the attack of $H₂O$ on the carbocation¹ (cf. ref. 15, 16 for catalysis of reactions with R^+ by tertiary amines).

An all embracing nucleophilicity scale appears to be a chimera, even for reactions in a single solvent, although strong hydration of anionic nucleophiles often presents such a large barrier to reaction that there is a close correlation between nucleophilicity and anionic solvation,¹¹ and it may obscure other structural effects. For anion-cation recombination no existing covalencies are broken, and desolvation may then be the major barrier to reaction, but proton transfers are important in reactions of some amines and probably of water, $1,15,16$ and C-H or B-H bonds are broken in hydride transfers. Although the N_{+} scale can be applied to attack of some nucleophiles on carbonyl compounds there is little or no correlation between the reactivities of OH, BH₄ and the dihydronicotinsmide (1) towards carbonyl compounds and carbocations, in that 1 is reactive towards carbonyl groups only under biological conditions, and the borohydrides are relatively ineffective deacylating agents. But there is also little correlation between the reactivity of these nucleophiles towards carbocations and their kinetic or equilibrium basicity. For example carbooations compete very effectively with H^+ for cyanoborohydride ion^{4b, 17} and we find that considerable amounts of RH are formed when a solution of ROH + BH₄ is added to excess dilute H₂SO₄.

Acknowledgements. Support of this work by the National Science Foundation and the Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases Institute of the U.S. Public Health Service is gratefully acknowledged.

References

- 1) C. D. Ritchie, Accounts Chem. Res., 5.348 (1972); C. D. Ritchie and P. O. I. Virtanen, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 94 , 1589 (1972); C. D. Ritchie, ibid., 97 , 1170 (1975).
- 2) a) T. C. Bruice and S. Benkovic, "Bioorganic Mechanisms," Benjamin, New York, 1966, Chapter 1; b) W. P. Jencks, "Catalysis in Chemistry and Enzymology," McGraw-Hill, Eew York, 1969, Chapter 10.
- 3) R. G. Pearson, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 95 , 3533 (1963); R. G. Pearson and J. Songstad, ibid., 99 $(1967).$
- 4) a) H. C. Brown and J. M. Bell, J. Am. Chem. Soc., $\underline{\partial}\underline{\partial}$, 1473 (1966); b) M. M. Kreevoy and D. C. Johnson, Croat. Chem. Acta, $\frac{1}{2}$, 511 (1973).
- 5) G. W. Rafter and S. P. Colowick, J. Biol. Chem., 206 , 129 (1954); D. Mauzerall and F. H. Westheimer, J. Am. Chem. Soc., II, 2261 (1955); cf., D. J. Creighton, J. Hajdu, G. Mooser and D. S. Sigman, ibid., 95, 6855 (1973).
- 6) a) H. 0. House, "Modern Synthetic Reactions," Benjamin, Menlo Park, Ca., 19'72, Chapter 1; b) ref. 2a, Chapter 9.
- 7) C. A. Bunton, S. K. Huang and C. H. Paik, J. Am. Chem. Soc., $9J_1$ 6262 (1975).
- 8) C. A. Bunton and S. K. Huang, J. Am. Chem. Soc., $9¹$, $3¹$,
- 9) M. J. Postle and P. A. H. Wyatt, J. Chem. Soc., Perkin Trans. 2, 474 (1974).
- 10) C. K. Ingold, "Structure and Mechanism in Organic Chemistry," 2nd ed., Cornell Univ. Press, Ithaca, N. Y., 1969, p. 457.
- 11) A. J. Parker, Chem. Rev., 69, 1 (1969).
- 12) The reaction with OH- does not go to completion in the less **aqueous** t-BuOH+0 mixtures, and our **rate** constants are for the forward reaction. The other reactions go to completion.
- 13) For discussion of solvent structure and reactivity see J. F. J. Engbersen and J. B. F. N. Engbert J. Am. Chem. Soc., 96 , 1231 (1974) and ref. cited.
- 14) C. D. Ritchie, G. A. Skinner and V. G. Badding, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 89, 2063 (1967); E. A. Hill and W. J. Mueller, Tetrahedron Lett., 2564 (1968).
- 15) C. A. Bunton and S. K. Huang, J. Am. Chem. Soc., $96, 515$ (1974).
- 16) J. H. Ride, P. A. H. Wyatt and Z. M. Zochowski, J. Chem. Soc., Perkin Trans. 2, 1188 (1974).
- 17) M. M. Kreevoy and J. E. C. Hutchins, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 91, 4329 (1969).