Nucleophilicity of Halide Ions in Molten Quaternary Ammonium Salts

By John E. Gordon* and Pothen Varughese (Department of Chemistry, Kent State University, Kent, Ohio 44242)

Summary The relative rates of nucleophilic displacement by halide ions from tetra-n-pentylammonium cations in the molten tetrapentylammonium salts at 180° (Cl⁻: Br⁻: I⁻ = 620:7·7:1) reflect the enhanced nucleophilicity expected for unsolvated, unassociated halide ions.

In molten quaternary ammonium salt media, where deactivation by ion solvation and ion association¹ are absent,² halide ions should show a nucleophilic reactivity in the order: $F^- > Cl^- > Br^- > I^-$. This proposition has not been rigorously tested. The reverse Menschutkin reaction (1) is qualitatively more rapid for X = Br than for X = I in studies in sealed ampoules,³ but the reaction is accompanied by formation of olefin [equation (2)]. It is

$$(n-C_5H_{11})_4N^+X^- \longrightarrow (n-C_5H_{11})_3N + n-C_5H_{11}-X$$
 (1)

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{(n-C}_5H_{11})_4\text{N}^+\text{X}^- & \text{(2a)} \\ & \text{Me-[CH}_2]_2\text{-CH} = \text{CH}_2 + (\text{n-C}_5H_{11})_3\text{NH}^+\text{X}^- \\ & \text{(n-C}_5H_{11})_3\text{N} + \text{n-C}_5H_{11}^-\text{X} & \text{(2b)} \end{array}$$

known that at least part of this olefin is produced via equation (2b) under these conditions,³ but a direct E2 process with X⁻ as base [equation (2a)] has not been ruled out. Pyrolysis of some alkaloid methohalides under the

high-vacuum conditions obtaining in the ionization chamber of a mass spectrometer gives predominantly elimination; 4 since secondary RX-R₃N reaction is unlikely under these conditions, the E2 path (2a) must be the source.

We have now established conditions (180°; 10⁻³ Torr) under which the tetra-n-pentylammonium halides decompose entirely via equation (1), allowing determination of the relative rates of displacement by competition experiments. The results in the Table yield the relative rates: Cl⁻: Br⁻: I⁻ = 620:7.7:1, in accord with the theory of medium effects on X- nucleophilicity which identifies the inversion of the nucleophilicity order I-> Br-> Cl-, observed in hydroxylic solvents, to Cl-> Br-> I- in dipolar aprotic solvents with the structural change: $X - \cdots H - O - R \longrightarrow$ $X^{-,1,5,6}$ The poorly solvated X^- in dipolar aprotic solvents are more reactive than their X-··· H-O-R counterparts by factors ranging from 104 for I- to 107 for the more strongly solvated Cl-. The observed order of secondorder rate constants for the $S_{\rm N}2$ reaction of unassociated Xwith primary alkyl toluene-p-sulphonates is Cl^- : $I^- =$ 8:3:1 (Me₂SO; 25°),6 9:3:1 (HCONMe₂; 0°),7 18:4:1 (Me₂CO; 25°).5 The much greater ratios observed in the molten R₄N+X- show that this medium represents a further increase in dispersion of X- nucleophilicity, presumably both because there is some residual anion solvation (and deactivation) in dipolar aprotic solvents,8 and because

TABLE

Pyrolysis of $(n-C_5H_{11})_4N/X^1,X^2$) mixtures at $180\pm10^\circ$										
		Reactants (mmol)		Products (mmol) ^a			Products (%)			Relative rateb
X^1	X^2	$n^{\circ}(\mathrm{R_4NX^1})$	$n^{\circ}(R_4NX^2)$	$n(RX^2)$	$n(RX^2)$	$n(R_3N)$	RX^1	RX^2	R_3N	$k(\mathrm{X}^2)/k(\mathrm{X}^1)$
I-		0.101		0.096		0.100	95c		100c	
Cl-		0.110		0.111		0.119	101d	_	108a	
I-	Br-	0.105	0.102	0.0034	0.022		$3 \cdot 3$	22		$\frac{7.3}{9.1}$ $\left.\right\}$ 7.7 ± 0.4
I-	Br-	1.005	0.101	0.068	0.044		6.8	44		8.1 7 17 ± 0.4
Br-	Cl-	1.27	0.141	0.0243	0.109		1.9	77		$\frac{76}{25}$ $> 81 + 4$
Br-	C1-	1.03	0.110	0.0027	0.025		0.26	23		85 \rbrace $^{61} \pm ^{4}$

a Trapped at -196° and determined by gas chromatography: all analyses in duplicate, precision $\pm 2\%$. b Calculated from the expression $k(X^2)/k(X^1) = \log\{n^\circ(R_4NX^2)/[n^\circ(R_4NX^2) - n(RX^2)]\}/\log\{n^\circ(R_4NX^1)/[n^\circ(R_4NX^1) - n(RX^1)]\}$, which follows from the integrated first-order rate law. This assumes constant volume of the reacting melt; consequently we arranged the experiments to keep the decrease in volume during reaction {as judged from $[n^\circ(R_4NX^1) - n(RX^1) + n^\circ(R_4NX^2) - n(RX^2)]/[n^\circ(R_4NX^1) + n^\circ(R_4NX^2)]$ } less than ca 10%. c Trace of pent-1-ene detected.

the less reactive substrate, R₄N⁺, causes a lower decrease in selectivity. We suggest that the fused-salt results provide the best model for the intrinsic relative nucleophilicities of the X- toward saturated carbon.

The ratios of substitution [equation (1)] to elimination [equation (2)]† products observed in mass-spectrometrically monitored pyrolyses of alkaloid methohalides were interpreted in terms of diminishing $S_{\rm N}2$ and increasing E2reactivity in the order I-, Br-, Cl-, F,4,9 but the present results show that, instead, it is due to a greater increase in the E2 rate constants in the order $I^- < Br^- < Cl^- < F^$ than that for the $S_{\rm N}2$ rate constants. Comparison of the data for the strychnine methohalides at 330-360° with

those in the Table indicates the following relative E2 rates (temperature difference being ignored): Cl⁻:Br⁻:I⁻= 2400:15:1. These ratios are again much greater than those typical (e.g. 6:2:1 for X- dehydrobromination in acetone at 69.9°)10 of dipolar aprotic solvents; they are perhaps more in line with the probably larger differences in basicity of X-.11

Acknowledgement is made to the donors of the Petroleum Research Fund, administered by the American Chemical Society, for support of this research.

(Received, July 5th, 1971; Com. 1133.)

- † Elimination competes with substitution in many of these alkaloid methohalide pyrolyses in contrast to our results; whether this is due to the structural difference in R₄N+, the temperature difference (350-400° vs. 180°), or both, is not known.
 - ¹ J. F. Bunnett, Ann. Rev. Phys. Chem., 1963, 14, 271.
- ² J. E. Gordon, in 'Techniques and Methods of Organic and Organometallic Chemistry', ed. D. B. Denney, vol. 1, Dekker, New York, 1969, ch. 3.

 - J. E. Gordon, J. Org. Chem., 1965, 30, 2760.
 M. Hesse, W. Vetter, and H. Schmid, Helv. Chim. Acta, 1965, 48, 674.
 S. Winstein, L. G. Savedoff, S. Smith, I. D. R. Stevens, and J. S. Gall, Tetrahedron Letters, 1960, No. 9, 24.
 R. Fuchs and K. Mahendran, J. Org. Chem., 1971, 36, 730.
 W. M. Weaver and J. D. Hutchison, J. Amer. Chem. Soc., 1964, 86, 261.

 - 8 A. J. Parker, Chem. Rev., 1969, 69, 1
 - ⁹ M. Hesse and H. Schmid, Annalen, 1966, 696, 85.
- D. Eck and J. F. Bunnett, J. Amer. Chem. Soc., 1969, 91, 3099.
 J. O. Edwards, J. Amer. Chem. Soc., 1954, 76, 1540; A. Allerhand and P. v. R. Schleyer, ibid., 1963, 85, 1233; I. M. Kolthoff, S. Bruckenstein, and M. K. Chantooni, jun., ibid., 1961, 83, 3927.