Tritylium ions as initiators and co-initiators in cationic polymerizations

Christian Schade, Herbert Mayr*

Institut für Chemie der Medizinischen Universität zu Lübeck, Ratzeburger Allee 160, D-2400 Lübeck, Federal Republic of Germany

(Date of receipt: February 19, 1988)

Introduction

The unsubstituted tritylium cation (1a) does not initiate the cationic polymerization of isobutene (2)¹⁾. This observation was attributed to the difference of the carbenium ion stabilization of 1a and 3a, which cannot be compensated by the free energy, gained from the conversion of a π - into a σ -bond [Eq. (1)]²⁾.

On the other hand, the less stabilized tris(4-chlorophenyl)methyl cation (1b) was reported to initiate the polymerization of isobutene³⁾. In accordance, *p*-methoxy and *p*-methyl substituted tritylium ions do not initiate the polymerization of α -methyl-styrene, in contrast to the less stable 1a and 1b⁴⁾. Only for few reactive monomers, however, the initiation was proven to proceed via addition of trityl cations 1 to the monomer⁵⁾, and in most of these cases the site of attack at the trityl cation has not been determined⁶⁾. As some nucleophiles were shown to attack the para-position of trityl cations⁷⁾, the reaction might occur either at the central carbon or at one of the aromatic rings. Due to their sluggish addition towards alkenes, tritylium ions have been introduced as Lewis acidic catalysts for the addition of acetals and aldehydes to (silyl) enol ethers and allyltrimethylsilanes by Mukaiyama et al.⁸⁾.

In this work, we have studied electrophilic alkylations of isobutene (2) and allyltrimethylsilane, in which tritylium ions alternatively act as electrophilic alkylating agents or as Lewis acidic catalysts. As in previous investigations, conditions were used under which the reactions terminate after the inclusion of one alkene unit⁹.

Initiation by tritylium ions

The reaction of tritylium perchlorate with isobutene (2) in acetonitrile at 30 °C was reported to yield 28% of 1,1-dimethyl-3,3-diphenylindane (5) along with polymeric material¹⁰. The corresponding $ZnCl_2 \cdot Et_2O$ catalyzed reaction of trityl chloride (4)

0173-2803/88/\$01.00

with 2 in CH_2Cl_2 at 0 °C gave 5 and 2-methyl-4,4,4-triphenyl-1-butene (6) in small yield^{9b)}.



We found now that tritylium tetrachloroborate (7a) does not react with isobutene in CH_2Cl_2 at -10 °C. Under the same conditions, the less stabilized chloro derivative 7b gave 79% of the regular addition product 8b, when treated with 70 equivalents of isobutene.

$$(p-R-C_{6}H_{4})_{3}C^{+}BCl_{4}^{-} + 2 \rightarrow (p-R-C_{6}H_{4})_{3}C-CH_{2}-C-Cl + BCl_{3} \qquad (3)$$

$$7 \qquad 8 \qquad CH_{3}$$

$$-\frac{7a, 8a \qquad 7b, 8b}{H \qquad Cl}$$

Allyltrimethylsilane (9) is more reactive than 2 and gives the expected 4,4,4-triaryl-1-butenes 10a, b with both trityl tetrachloroborates $7a^{11}$ and 7b. The structures of compounds 5, 6, 8b and 10 indicate that both π -nucleophiles 2 and 9 attack tritylium ions at the central carbon atom, not in *p*-position of the aromatic rings.

$$7 + H_2C = CH - CH_2 - Si(CH_3)_3 \xrightarrow{CH_2Cl_2} (p - R - C_6H_4)_3C - CH_2 - CH = CH_2 \qquad (4)$$

$$9 \qquad 10$$

$$= H$$

$$= Cl$$

In contrast to the common viewpoint¹⁾, the sluggishness of tritylium ion additions towards π -systems cannot be explained by the inherent stability of these carbenium ions. Whereas the unsubstituted trityl cation $(pK_{R^+} = -6,63)^{12}$ does not react with 2 below 0°C, the even better stabilized bis(*p*-anisyl)methyl cation $(pK_{R^+} = -5,71)^{13}$ reacts with 2 even at -70°C^{11,14}.

This conclusion is corroborated by kinetic experiments. When the consumption of **7b** by **2** was followed photometrically by monitoring the absorbance at 490 nm, the rate of the reaction was found to decrease considerably after a small degree of conversion. In contrast, the decrease of [**7b**] in presence of a large excess (770 equivalents) of **9** followed a pseudo first order rate law up to 80% conversion of **7b**. The resulting second order rate constant $k_2 = 0,441 \cdot \text{mol}^{-1} \cdot \text{s}^{-1}$ (at $-10 \,^\circ\text{C}$ in CH₂Cl₂) is 5000 times smaller than k_2 of the corresponding reaction of α -(*p*-methoxyphenyl)benzyl tetrachloroborate (BMMT) with **9** (k_2 (at $-10 \,^\circ\text{C}$) = 2040)¹¹, although both

10a: R b: R carbenium ions are of similar stability $(pK_{R} + of 7b = -7,74^{12})$ and $pK_{R} + of \alpha - (p-methoxyphenyl)$ benzyl tetrachloroborate $= -7,9^{13}$). Steric strain, therefore, accounts for the relatively low reactivity of the trityl cation 7b.

Force field calculations (MMPMI)¹⁵⁾ have been used to estimate the steric strain generated in such reactions¹⁶⁾.

$$(C_{6}H_{5})_{2}RC-CI + H_{2}C=C(CH_{3})_{2} \rightarrow (C_{6}H_{5})_{2}RC-CH_{2}-C-CI \qquad (5)$$

$$2 \qquad CH_{3}$$

$$R = C_{6}H_{5}: \Delta H = -61 \text{ kJ} \cdot \text{mol}^{-1}$$

$$R = H: \quad \Delta H = -85 \text{ kJ} \cdot \text{mol}^{-1}$$

$$(C_{6}H_{5})_{2}RC-CI + H_{2}C=CH-C_{6}H_{5} \rightarrow (C_{6}H_{5})_{2}RC-CH_{2}-C_{6}H_{5} \qquad (6)$$

$$R = C_{6}H_{5}: \Delta H = -68 \text{ kJ} \cdot \text{mol}^{-1}$$

$$R = H: \quad \Delta H = -82 \text{ kJ} \cdot \text{mol}^{-1}$$

Eqs. (5) and (6) show that the addition reactions of trityl chloride to 2 and styrene are less exothermic than the corresponding diarylmethyl chloride additions. The difference is much more pronounced in the additions to 2 ($\Delta\Delta H = 24 \text{ kJ} \cdot \text{mol}^{-1}$) than in the additions to styrene ($\Delta\Delta H = 14 \text{ kJ} \cdot \text{mol}^{-1}$), indicating that steric hindrance is more important in additions to isobutene. Therefore, styrene polymerization in contrast to isobutene polymerization can be initiated by the unsubstituted trityl cation^{5, 17}, although diarylcarbenium ions were shown to react faster with isobutene than with styrene¹⁸.

Co-initiation by tritylium ions

The discussion in the previous section has shown that trityl cations, though not having an extraordinarily high stability (pK_{R^+}) , exhibit a very low reactivity towards olefinic π -systems. They can, therefore, act as Lewis acids and accept halide anions from other alkyl halides. Since the carbenium ions, thus generated, may be capable of attacking olefins, trityl salts can act as co-initiators for the carbocationic polymerization of alkenes (Scheme 1).

Scheme 1:

$$Ar_{3}C^{*} + RX = R^{*} + Ar_{3}CX$$

$$\downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow = C$$

$$R - C - C'$$

Experimental evidence for these conclusions comes from the formation of 94% of 12 from 11 and 2 in presence of tritylium tetrachloroborate (7a). Whereas 11 and 2 do

not react in dichloromethane in absence of a Lewis acid, the reaction proceeds at considerably lower temperatures $(-78 \,^{\circ}\text{C})$ when 7a is replaced by the stronger Lewis acid BCl₃¹⁴.

$$(p-H_{3}C-C_{6}H_{4})_{2}HC-Cl+2 \xrightarrow[]{7a/-25^{\circ}C} (p-H_{3}C-C_{6}H_{4})_{2}HC-CH_{2}-Cl \qquad (7)$$
11
12
12
12
13

Since the rates of electrophilic alkylations of alkenes (*Scheme 1*) depend on the equilibrium concentration of R^+ , the co-initiating efficiency of trityl salts can be controlled by appropriate substituents in the tritylium ions. Co-initiation by tritylium tetrachloroborates may either proceed via direct Cl^- abstraction of tritylium ions from R—Cl or via the small equilibrium concentration of BCl₃ ($7a \neq 4 + BCl_3$). Assuming fast Cl^- transfer processes, both mechanisms are in agreement with our conclusions.

Experimental part

 CH_2Cl_2 was dried with $CaCl_2$, washed with conc. H_2SO_4 , stirred over K_2CO_3 , distilled over P_2O_5 and finally CaH_2 .

3-Chloro-3-methyl-1, 1, 1-tris(4-chlorophenyl)butane (8b): Isobutene (2) (28,1 g; 500 mmol) was condensed into a flask which contained 2,64 g (6,91 mmol) of the chloride of 1b. After dilution with 100 ml of CH_2Cl_2 , 50 ml (2,0 mmol) of gaseous BCl_3 was added. The reaction mixture was stored for 70 h at $-10^{\circ}C$, washed with 6N HCl, dried over $CaCl_2$, and the solvent was evaporated. The residue (3,02 g; 6,89 mmol; 99%) was purified by recrystallization from petroleum ether; colorless crystals, which decompose at 159–160°C with elimination of HCl. Yield: 2,4 g (79%).

¹H NMR (90 MHz, CDCl₃): $\delta = 1,18$ (s; 6H, CH₃), 3,33 (s; 2H, CH₂), 7,27 (mc; 12H, Ar-H).

¹³C NMR (CDCl₃): δ = 34,55 (q; 2CH₃), 52,34 (t; C-2), 55,58 (s; C-1), 70,10 (s; C-3), 128,10, 130,56 (2d; ortho-C, meta-C), 132,28 (s; para-C), 144,51 (s; ipso-C).

MS (70 eV): $m/z = 402, 400 (3\%, 3\%, M^+ - 36), 349 (31), 348 (20), 347 (94), 346 (21), 345 (100), 277 (6), 275 (17), 239 (20), 235 (10), 233 (15).$

4,4,4-Tris(4-chlorophenyl)-1-butene (10 b): Gaseous BCl₃ (100 ml; 4,0 mmol) and 1,0 ml (6,3 mmol) of 9 were successively added to a solution of 1,11 g (2,90 mmol) of the chloride of 1 b in 50 ml of CH₂Cl₂ at -20 °C. After 24 h, another 1 ml of 9 was added, and the solution was kept at -20 °C for 24 h. The mixture was washed with 25% aq. NH₄Cl, dried over CaCl₂, and the solvent was evaporated. Purification was done by MPLC (Merck Lichroprep Si 60 RP-18, MeOH, 12,5 ml/min, 12 bar, $t_R = 16,3$ min). Yield: 0,94 g (84%) of a colorless oil.

¹H NMR (200 MHz, CDCl₃): δ = 3,33 (br. d; J = 6,6 Hz, 2H, 3-H), 4,94-5,08 (m; 2H, 1-H), 5,47-5,67 (m; 1H, 2-H), 7,01, 7,27 (AA'BB' system; J_{AB} = 8,8 Hz, 12H, Ar-H).

¹³C NMR (CDCl₃): $\delta = 45,33$ (t; C-3), 55,26 (s; C-4), 118,45 (t; C-1), 128,15, 130,51 (2 d; ortho-C, meta-C), 132,33 (s; para-C), 134,58 (d; C-2), 144,85 (s; ipso-C).

MS (70 eV): m/z = 349, 347, 345 (5%, 13%, 14%, $M^+ - C_3H_5$), 88 (12), 86 (77), 84 (100), 75 (15), 73 (45).

IR (neat): 3065, 3025, 2960, 2919, 1660, 1588, 1570, 1490, 1444, 1400, 1094, 1011, 975, 916, 811, 748, 732 cm⁻¹.

4,4,4-Triphenyl-1-butene (10a): It was prepared as described by R. Schneider¹¹ in an analogous manner; m. p. 68-68,5 °C.

¹H NMR (200 MHz, CDCl₃): δ = 3,43 (br. dt; J = 6,6 Hz, J = 1,5 Hz, 2H, 3-H), 4,89-5,07 (m; 2H, 1-H), 5,55-5,75 (m; 1H, 2-H), 7,21 (mc; 15H, Ar-H).

Kinetic experiment¹⁴: Compound 9 (3,16 mmol) was added to a solution of 7b (0,0041 mmol) in 100 ml of CH_2Cl_2 , and the decreasing absorbance of 7b was subsequently monitored at 490 nm. The reaction followed a pseudo first order rate law, and the second order rate constants k_2 were derived from the pseudo first order rate constants $k_{1\psi}$, using the equation $k_2 = k_{1\psi}/[Alkene]$. Two independent experiments gave $k_2 = 0,436$ and $0,4531 \cdot mol^{-1} \cdot s^{-1}$.

Tritylium tetrachloroborate catalyzed additions of bis(p-tolyl)methyl chloride (11) towards isobutene (2): Compound 11 (258 mg; 1,12 mmol) was added to a solution of 7a prepared from 4 (52,2 mg; 0,187 mmol) and BCl₃ (4 ml; 0,16 mmol) in 100 ml of CH₂Cl₂. After the addition of isobutene (50 ml; 2,3 mmol), the mixture was kept at -25 °C for 24 h and worked up with 6 M HCl. After removal of the solvent, 144 mg (1,33 mmol) of anisole was added as internal standard. ¹H NMR analysis showed the formation of 94% of 12.

Conclusion

Tritylium ions can attack at the double bond of isobutene and thus are potential initiators of the polymerization of isobutene. Their additions to alkenes are considerably retarded, however, by the steric strain, generated during the addition reactions. Diarylcarbenium ions attack alkenes with rate constants several orders of magnitude higher than trityl cations of similar stability (derived from pK_{R^+}).

Because of their Lewis acidity and low reactivity towards CC π -bonds, tritylium ions may also act as co-initiators of alkene polymerizations. They may ionize other types of alkyl halides to give less bulky carbenium ions, which add to CC π -bonds and thus initiate polymerization. The main advantage of such initiating systems is the well-defined character of the individual steps, for which thermodynamic and kinetic data are frequently available¹⁹.

C. S. wishes to thank the Stiftung Volkswagenwerk/Fonds der Chemischen Industrie for a Kekulé grant.

- a) J. P. Kennedy, E. Maréchal, "Carbocationic Polymerization", Wiley, New York 1982, p. 94; b) A. Gandini, H. Cheradame, "Cationic Polymerization", Adv. Polym. Sci. 34/35, 1 (1980)
- ²⁾ a) S. D. Pask, P. H. Plesch, Eur. Polym. J. 18, 839 (1982); b) ref.^{1a)}, p. 58 and 94

- ⁴⁾ G. Heublein, P. Hallpap, P. Adler, Acta Polym. 30, 582 (1979)
- ⁵⁾ See, e.g. a) G. Sauvet, J. P. Vairon, P. Sigwalt, J. Polym. Sci., Part A-1, 7, 983 (1969); b) R. Cotrel, G. Sauvet, J. P. Vairon, P. Sigwalt, Macromolecules 9, 931 (1976); c) N. G. Gaylord, M. Svestka, J. Macromol. Sci., Chem. A3, 897 (1969); d) A. F. Johnson, D. A. Pearce, J. Polym. Sci., Polym. Symp. 56, 57 (1976); e) T. Kunitake, K. Takarabe, S. Tsugawa, Polym. J. 8, 363 (1976); f) P. M. Bowyer, A. Ledwith, D. C. Sherrington, Polymer 12, 505 (1971); g) M. Villesange, G. Sauvet, J. P. Vairon, P. Sigwalt, Polym. Bull. (Berlin) 2, 131 (1980)
- ⁶⁾ a) A. Ledwith, Adv. Chem. Ser. **91**, 317 (1969); b) J. A. Kampmeier, R. P. Geer, A. J. Meskin, R. M. D'Silva, J. Am. Chem. Soc. **88**, 1257 (1966)

³⁾ Ref.^{1b)}, p. 255

- ⁷⁾ a) G. A. Olah, J. J. Svoboda, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 95, 3794 (1973); b) R. H. Heck, P. S. Magee, S. Winstein, Tetrahedron Lett. 1964, 2033
- 8) Review: T. Mukaiyama, M. Murakami, Synthesis 1987, 1043
- ⁹⁾ a) H. Mayr, R. Schneider, R. Pock, *Makromol. Chem.*, *Macromol. Symp.* 3, 19 (1986); b)
 H. Mayr, W. Striepe, J. Org. Chem. 48, 1159 (1983)
- ¹⁰⁾ H. G. Richey Jr., R. K. Lustgarten, J. M. Richey, J. Org. Chem. 33, 4543 (1968)
- ¹¹⁾ R. Schneider, *Dissertation*, Erlangen 1987
- ¹²⁾ N. C. Deno, J. J. Jaruzelski, A. Schriesheim, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 77, 3044 (1955)
- ¹³⁾ N. C. Deno, A. Schriesheim, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 77, 3051 (1955)
- ¹⁴⁾ R. Schneider, U. Grabis, H. Mayr, Angew. Chem. 98, 94 (1986); Angew. Chem., Int. Ed. Engl. 25, 89 (1986)
- ¹⁵⁾ a) U. Burkert, N. L. Allinger "Molecular Mechanics"; ACS Monograph 177, ACS Washington, DC, 1982; b) J. J. Gajewski, K. E. Gilbert, "Molecular Mechanics Package (MS-DOS Computers)", Serena Software, Bloomington, Indiana
- ¹⁶⁾ For experimental values of related reactions see: C. Schade, H. Mayr, E. M. Arnett, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 110, 567 (1988)
- ¹⁷⁾ T. Higashimura, T. Fukushima, S. Okamura, J. Macromol. Sci., Chem. A1, 683 (1967)
- ¹⁸⁾ a) H. Mayr, R. Pock, Chem. Ber. 119, 2473 (1986); b) R. Pock, H. Mayr, Chem. Ber. 119, 2497 (1986)
- ¹⁹⁾ Review: H. Mayr, R. Schneider, C. Schade, Makromol. Chem., Macromol. Symp. 13/14, 43 (1988)