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# ФАABONOEIDH KAI $\Sigma Y Г Г E N E I \Sigma$ OMADE $\Phi Y T I K \Omega N$ XP $\Omega \Sigma T I K \Omega N$ 

ェTEAムA TZOYBAPA－KAPAГIANNH


（Еגท்¢өๆ 28 Iovviou 1984）

## Пері́入 $\eta \Psi \eta$



 val $\sigma \eta \mu \alpha v \tau ı к \grave{\prime}$.


## Eıб $\alpha \gamma \omega \gamma \dot{\eta}$









 $\alpha v \tau \iota \kappa \alpha \rho к ı \nu \iota к \grave{~} \delta р \dot{\sigma} \neq .^{14}$






 $\sigma \mu \varepsilon ́ v \varepsilon \varsigma ~ \varphi \lambda \alpha \beta$ óves $\sigma \tau \alpha$ $\varphi \tau \varepsilon \rho \alpha \dot{\alpha} \mu 1 \alpha \varsigma \pi \varepsilon \tau \alpha \lambda о$ ט́ $\alpha \alpha \varsigma .{ }^{17}$



 $\alpha \nu \alpha \gamma \omega \gamma \eta \dot{\eta}$ тоט．








$\Sigma \chi .1$

vouv $\tau \iota \varsigma ~ \chi \alpha \lambda \kappa o ́ v e \varsigma ~ I, ~ \tau ı \varsigma ~ \delta ı v \delta \rho о \chi \alpha \lambda \kappa o ́ v e \varsigma ~ I I, ~ \tau ı \varsigma ~ \alpha o v \rho o ́ v e \varsigma ~ I I I, ~ \tau ı \varsigma ~ \varphi \lambda \alpha \beta o ́ v e \varsigma ~ I V, ~ \tau ı \varsigma ~$
 VIII, 兀ıऽ $\varphi \lambda \alpha \beta \alpha v o ́ v \varepsilon \varsigma ~ I X ~ к \alpha ı ~ \tau \iota \varsigma ~ \varphi \lambda \alpha \beta \alpha v o v o ́ \lambda \varepsilon \varsigma ~ X . ~$

## 















 $\sigma \tau \eta \nu$ 4- ка। 6- $0 \dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \eta .{ }^{23-26}$







 NMR к. $\lambda . \pi$.$) :$

## Фдаßóveç каı Фдаßovó入єя

O ópos «flavone» $\pi \rho о \varepsilon ́ \rho \chi \varepsilon \tau \alpha ı \alpha \pi o ́ ~ \tau o ~ \lambda \alpha \tau ı v ı к o ́ ~ f l a v u s ~(=к i ́ \tau \rho ı v o) . ~ H ~ \pi \rho \dot{\tau \eta ̀ \eta ~} \varphi \lambda \alpha-$




 $\tau \eta \nu \alpha \nu \tau i \delta p \alpha \sigma \eta:$

 $\varepsilon v \delta \dot{\alpha} \mu \varepsilon \sigma \alpha$ проїóv $\alpha \alpha$ $\sigma \tau \eta \nu \pi о \rho \varepsilon i ́ \alpha ~ \tau \eta \varsigma ~ \alpha \nu \tau i \delta \rho \alpha \sigma \eta \varsigma .{ }^{28}$


 $\lambda o ́ \beta \alpha \theta \mu o ́ ~ v \delta \rho o \xi v \lambda i \omega \sigma \eta \varsigma ~ \varepsilon \pi \kappa \kappa \alpha \tau o v ́ v ~ o ı ~ \varphi \lambda \alpha \beta o ́ v \varepsilon \varsigma ~(3-\theta \dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \eta ~ \varepsilon \lambda \varepsilon u ́ \theta \varepsilon \rho \eta), ~ \varepsilon v \dot{\omega}$ ou $\pi о \lambda \cup v-$



 $\sigma \tau \eta v \sigma$ v́v $\alpha \alpha \xi ̆ \eta ~ \tau \omega v ~ \varphi \lambda \alpha \beta о$ voєı $\delta \dot{\omega} v .{ }^{29}$



iv

Ex. 2

















 тov A $\delta \alpha \kappa \tau \nu \lambda$ íou.


Мñко̧ кúuatoş (nm)
$\Sigma \chi .3$


гx. 4 Мп̃коs кú $\mu$ atos ( nm )



 $\rho \varepsilon \dot{\alpha} \zeta \varepsilon ⿺ ~ \tau о ~ \varphi \alpha ́ \sigma \mu \alpha ~ \tau \omega v ~ \varphi \lambda \alpha \beta о \nu о \lambda \dot{\omega} v ~ \alpha \lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha} \zeta о \nu \tau \alpha \varsigma ~ \tau \eta \nu ~ \mu о р ø ̣ \eta ~ \tau о v ~ к \alpha ı ~ \pi \rho о к а \lambda \varepsilon і ́ ~ \beta \alpha \theta v-~$



 $\rho l \alpha \mathrm{AlCl}_{3} / \mathrm{HCl}(\beta), \mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{COONa}(\gamma) \kappa \alpha l \mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{COONa} / \mathrm{H}_{3} \mathrm{BO}_{3}$ ( $\delta$ ).









 $\pi о \lambda \alpha \rho о \gamma \rho \alpha \varphi \iota \kappa \varepsilon \varsigma^{41,42} \kappa \alpha 1 \pi о \tau \varepsilon \vee \sigma 1 \rho \mu \varepsilon \tau \rho \iota \kappa \varepsilon \varsigma^{43,44} \tau \varepsilon \chi \nu \tau \kappa \varepsilon \varepsilon \varsigma$.







 ка1 סívєı $\alpha \kappa р ı \beta \varepsilon є \sigma \tau \varepsilon \rho \alpha ~ \alpha \pi о \tau \varepsilon \lambda \varepsilon ́ \sigma \mu \alpha \tau \alpha$.


 $\gamma i v \varepsilon \tau \alpha i \not \mu o ́ v o ~ \sigma \varepsilon ~ \alpha \lambda \kappa \alpha \lambda ı \kappa o ́ ~ \pi \varepsilon \rho ı \beta \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda о v .{ }^{45,}{ }^{46}$





 $\theta \dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \eta{ }^{47}$



## 






 $\delta \varepsilon \lambda \varphi \iota v ı \delta i v \eta I^{49}(\Sigma \chi .5)$.










 $\gamma \varepsilon v ́ \sigma \eta$, о $\sigma \chi \eta \mu \tau \iota \sigma \mu o ́ \varsigma ~ \alpha \mu о ́ \rho \varphi \omega v ~ \pi о \lambda \nu \mu \varepsilon \rho \omega ் v ~ к \alpha \iota ~ \alpha ́ \lambda \lambda \omega \nu ~ \varphi \alpha ı v o \mu \varepsilon ́ v \omega v, \pi о \nu ~ \alpha \pi о \delta i \delta o v-~$ $\tau \alpha ı \sigma \tau \iota \varsigma ~ \tau \alpha v v i v e \varsigma .{ }^{60}$


 $\tau \varepsilon \dot{\rho} \omega v$ о $\lambda_{1} \boldsymbol{\gamma} о \mu \varepsilon \rho \omega ́ v .{ }^{62,}{ }^{63}$












 ఢıt $\omega$ v.

 ( $\Sigma \chi .6$ ).

$\Sigma \chi .6$













 $\varphi \lambda \alpha \beta о v o \varepsilon \iota \delta \dot{\omega} v(\dot{\alpha} \lambda \alpha \tau \alpha \xi \alpha v \theta \nu \lambda i o v) .{ }^{72,73}$



 $\mu \alpha \nu \sigma \eta .^{79}$




















## 

Ot $\varphi \lambda \alpha \beta \alpha v o ́ v e \varsigma ~ \varepsilon i v a l ~ \alpha \nu \eta \gamma \mu \varepsilon ́ v \varepsilon \varsigma ~ \mu о \rho \varphi \varepsilon ́ \varsigma ~ \tau \omega \nu ~ \varphi \lambda \alpha \beta о v \omega ́ v ~ к \alpha l ~ o l ~ \varphi \lambda \alpha \beta \alpha v o v o ́ \lambda \varepsilon \varsigma ~$



















## 




## a) Iооч $\lambda a \beta о v o \varepsilon t \delta \eta \dot{\eta}$




 C

 $\kappa \alpha \rho \pi \alpha \dot{v} \alpha$ V $\kappa \alpha \iota \tau \alpha \kappa о \cup \mu \varepsilon \sigma \tau \alpha \dot{\nu} \downarrow \alpha \mathrm{VI}^{93}$ ( $\Sigma \chi .7$ ).

$\Sigma \chi .7$







$\Sigma \chi .8$







$\Sigma \chi .9$





 $\gamma \lambda \cup к о \zeta \iota \tau \iota к о ́ ~ \delta \varepsilon \sigma \mu о ́$.




 रouv.




 $\pi о \lambda$ о́ $\lambda \boldsymbol{\lambda} \kappa \varepsilon \varsigma .{ }^{99}$








 $\kappa \eta \dot{~ เ \kappa \alpha v o ́ \tau \eta \tau \alpha . ~}$












## 阝) $\Delta \iota \varphi \lambda a \beta o v o \varepsilon \imath \delta \dot{\eta}$


 vєऽ, $\theta \varepsilon ו \circ \varphi \lambda \alpha \beta i v \varepsilon \varsigma ~ \kappa \lambda \pi$.






 níou. ${ }^{106}$










## ү) $N \varepsilon о \varphi \lambda a \beta о \nu о \varepsilon เ \delta \dot{\eta}$




 ( $\Sigma \chi .11$ ).
$\Sigma \chi .11$





 кочиаріvıка́ о $\xi \dot{\varepsilon} \alpha$.





Mı $\alpha \alpha \pi^{\prime} \alpha v \tau \varepsilon ́ \varsigma ~ v \pi о \sigma \tau \eta \rho i \zeta \varepsilon ı ~ \varepsilon ́ v \alpha \nu ~ \pi \alpha \rho \alpha \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \eta \lambda o ~ \delta \rho o ́ \mu o ~ \mu \varepsilon \tau \eta ~ \beta ı \sigma \sigma v ́ v \theta \varepsilon \sigma \eta ~ \tau \omega \nu ~ \varphi \lambda \alpha-$





## 


 $\sigma \dot{\varepsilon}$ 甲טбルкє́ऽ $\pi \rho \omega \dot{\rho} \varepsilon \varsigma$ ט́ $\lambda \varepsilon \varsigma$.


 $\gamma \rho \alpha \varphi i \alpha \varsigma ~ v \psi \eta \lambda \eta \dot{\varsigma} \pi i \varepsilon \sigma \eta \varsigma$ (HPLC). ${ }^{121}$


 $\sigma \tau \kappa \eta \dot{\eta} \tau \omega v$ крєццибєஸ́v. ${ }^{122}$

 тஸ́v autต́v. ${ }^{123-125}$



$\Gamma \imath \alpha \tau \eta \nu \alpha \pi o \mu o ́ v \omega \sigma \eta \varepsilon \nu \zeta ̧ \dot{v} \mu \dot{\omega} \nu$ (transferases) $\alpha \pi o ́ \mu \alpha i ̈ v \tau \alpha \nu o ́ ~(P e t r o s e l i n u m ~ h o r t e n-~$










 $v \alpha ı \alpha ́ \rho \imath \sigma \tau \alpha \alpha \nu \tau \iota \circ \xi \varepsilon \iota \omega \tau \tau \kappa \alpha \dot{\alpha} \lambda_{1} \pi t \delta i \omega v .{ }^{138}$





 đou. ${ }^{152}$



 бто́ тро́ччца. ${ }^{156}$

## Summary

## Flavonoids and related compounds of plant pigments

This review article covers both the older and recent literature on Flavonoids, which are a group of natural compounds universally distributed among the plants. These compounds are of significance to many industries, especially among the food and drug sectors.
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#### Abstract

Summary The "unified theory" ${ }^{1-6}$ and the way of thinking it introduces have been applied to the question of the structure of the intermediates referred to as non-classical ions.

Predictions have been reached about a reasonable structure and number of intermediates involved in such systems. The proposed intermediate system differs from those of either the classical or the non-classical schools of thought which are argued to be both partly right and partly wrong.

The suggested system allows the existence of a spectrum of possible structurest and behavior governed by a number of factors and by their variation; it may also be used to explain the available experimental data.

Some representative types of systems (three general types are recognized depending on the nature of the participating group) and systems within them are discussed in the light of this theory.

An analysis suggesting some of the causes which have led to the accepted picture of nonclassical carbonium ions and to the controversy on the subject is presented. It is argued that the main cause for the creation of part of the problem is found in some basic features of the "usual approach" to reaction mechanisms - they are not present in the "unified approach" such as the very concept of carbonium ions in solution as reaction intermediates. The same causes are believed to have been partly responsible for the creation (in addition to the solution) of a number of problems in the field of reaction mechanisms in general.

It is suggested that the polemic between the two schools of thought (which schools could be reconciled by way of the proposed intermediate system) be turned instead against the usual approach, or some features of it, and that this approach be șubstituted by the "unified approach", as required by the "unified theory".


Key words: Solvolysis, non-classical carbonium ions, unified theory.

[^1]
## Introduction*

The concept of non-classical carbonium ions as reaction intermediates has found wide use in the field of reaction mechanisms. ${ }^{7}$ These intermediates have generally been represented by a single mesomeric "bridged" structure corresponding to an energy minimum along the reaction coordinate representing rearrangement of II to III.


I


II



III

It was suggested in $1958^{1}$ that reaction intermediates, in particular the first formed intermediate, are not to be treated as carbonium ions, or as other ions, but that reactions proceed instead by way of an intermediate complex.** The representation of this intermediate in addition to differing from that of a carbonium ion differed also, in its general form, from that of either a classical (IV) or a non-classical (I) structure. It was allowed in principle to involve some bridging but this, when present, was only fractional, as a rule, giving rise to an "unsymmetrical" extent of bonding of Z (a neighboring group) to $\mathrm{C}_{\beta}$ and $\mathrm{C}_{a}$.

The above suggestions were part of a unified mechanism introduced at the time ${ }^{1}$ which has been discussed again and developed further ${ }^{26}$ as a unifed approach and theory governing the mechanism of organic reactions in solution and making use of a unified model ${ }^{4}$ (V and VI of Fig. 1) and of a unified intermediate complex (a reaction intermediate described by the unified model) instead of the various classical mechanistic models and the various ionic species (carbonium ions, carbanions, ionpairs etc.) and radicals used as intermediates by the usual approach to reaction mechanisms.

The conclusions derived from the application of the theory to the question of non-classical carbonium ions appeared in these discussions ${ }^{1.5}$ also. According to them, the intermediate (the term will refer to the first formed intermediate) formed in

[^2]the solvolysis of II has to be in principle "unsymmetrical"* and to involve a number of partial bonds as symbolized by the unified model VI.


Fig. 1: (V) A symbolic representation of the "unified model" for organic reactions; (VI) A more detailed but still symbolic representation of the unified model, particularly as it applies to reactions at a saturated carbon (illustrated best for nucleophilic reactions).

This intermediate is not to be the same but to differ from another "unsymmetrical" intermediate formed in the solvolysis of III. Consequently, the reaction intermediates behaving as non-classical carbonium ions cannot necessarily be assigned a single mesomeric structure ("symmetrical"). Thus, if the experimental data suggest the intervention of an apparently symmetrical precursor to the formation of products, their reconciliation with the suggested "unsymmetrical" nature of the intermediates necessitates the assumption that these must be involved in an interconversion more rapid than that of product formation and/or that a symmetrical intermediate is formed subsequently to the formation of the "unsymmetrical" one and again faster than product formation. That the formation and interconversion of two "unsymmetrical" intermediate complexes in which the roles of $\mathrm{C}_{\beta}$ and $\mathrm{C}_{a}$ are reversed should be possible, had been pointed out ${ }^{1}$ as being one of the capabilities of the intermediate complex of the unified mechanism.

Data available in the literature, ${ }^{8-10,14}$ support the predictions of the unitied theory, whereas they cannot be interpreted well with the established concept of non classical carbonium ions. The strong objections to the extensive use of the concept of non-

[^3]classical carbonium ions recently brought up by H.C. Brown ${ }^{8}$ add further support to these predictions. Since the concept of the symmetrical non-classical carbonium ions is a generally accepted one, the consequence of these objections was to render the subject into one of today's very spectacular controversies in the field of reaction mechanisms, with chief opponents H.C. Brown (against the concept) and S. Winstein ${ }^{11}$ (for th; concept). The unified mechanism, however, had provided the basis for an answer even before the subject became controversial, as has been already strongly argued. ${ }^{2-5}$

The non-classical carbonium ion school represents the actual intermediate by a single mesomeric bridged structure I corresponding to an energy minimum (an intermediate). According to the opposite school, the actual intermediate is described by two rapidly equilibrating classical carbonium ions (IV and XI). According to the latter school, the bridged structure assigned to non-classical carbonium ions by the former school corresponds not to an energy minimum but to an energy maximum (a transition state).


XI

The above spectacular problem and controversy as well as most problems and controversies in the field of reaction mechanisms have been claimed ${ }^{1-6}$ not to be real but to have been created partly by the established approach to reaction mechanisms. This established approach will be referred to as the "classical approach" or "usual approach" as differentiated from the "unified approach" or "unified theory".

The purpose of this paper is to illustrate this point in the case of the non-classical carbonium ion problem and to discuss in general terms some among the predictions of the theory concerning questions pertinent to the non-classical carbonium ion concept and problem.

## Discussion

Let us consider the solvolysis of a substrate II, in which X is the leaving group, $R_{1}, R_{2}, R_{3}$, and $R_{4}$ are hydrocarbon residues, and $Z$ is a group the participation of which to form a non-classical intermediate is examined.

According to the unified theory, the solvolysis of II must proceed and obey the following rules. ${ }^{2-5}$ The system must greatly resist the development of any substantial charge (a charge larger than a small fraction of unity) on carbon and hydrogen, and in general must resist the development of any substantial charge (namely of electrophilic potential, according to the terminology of this approach) on atomic residues. The system must react by way of the operation of "paths" (paths of transmission of nucleophilic forces) involving in each one of them not one or two but a great number of atomic residues. The charge on each atomic residue involved in these paths must be governed by the concept of the "gradient". ${ }^{2-5}$ The relative contribution of these paths must be governed by their relative ease of operation. These
and other principles ${ }^{2-5}$ deriving from the theory lead to further requirements which are features of the approach.

Thus the process of rupture of the $\mathrm{C}_{a}-\mathrm{X}$ bond in the solvolysis of II is a process which is studied as being the result of fractional nucleophilic displacements occurring in the substrate and the medium, viewed as one large compound consisting of fractional bonds. The state of the reacting substrate during its transformations is not allowed to be distinguished (e.g. ionic vs. non-ionic) from that of the medium. Thus the substrate looses its entity, and characterization of the substrate as an entity and of the features of such an entity (e.g. of its charge) become meaningless. The focus is instead on paths of transmission of nucleophilic forces (direct, indirect, and side paths) ${ }^{2-5}$ along a series of atomic residues which may belong at the same time to different molecules. This focus abolishes automatically the thinking in terms of entities or ions (carbonium or other).

The concept of ionization, as the formation of ionic entities surrounded by solvent dipoles and/or by a dielectric medium (ion-dipole picture or ion-dielectric medium picture), is abandoned even if mathematical treatments in terms of such pictures give reasonable answers. The process is instead viewed as one involving a number of partial bond formations (partially covalent and partially ionic) and ruptures, and of partial displacements, just as is done for any phenomenon in solution according to this theory.

To simplify the presentation of the arguments concerning the question of a nonclassical intermediate in the solvolysis of II, compound II will be assumed to be a "symmetrical" substrate $\left(\mathrm{R}_{1}, \mathrm{R}_{2}=\mathrm{R}_{3}, \mathrm{R}_{4}\right)$. This does not affect the generality of the validity of the conclusions that will be reached. These conclusions are to apply to "unsymmetrical" substrates as well, provided of course that the definition of the terms "symmetrical" and "unsymmetrical" intermediates given in this paper is kept in mind.

Several "series" of compounds II can be considered, varying in the R groups and structure in general, varying in the Z group, varying in the leaving group, and reacting in various media.

Some essential arguments and "thinking", on the basis of which the non-classical carbonium ion question can be studied and predictions of the effect of a change in the above variables can be made, are given below.

In order to answer the question of the classical vs non-clasical nature of the intermediate in the solvolysis of these compounds, the contribution of the paths to bridging must be compared with that of the other paths. According to the theory, these contributions must be related to the ease of operation of the respective paths.

Thus, in order for the first formed intermediate to be the symmetrically bridged species, the parths leading to bridging should substantially overshadow the others in ease of operation. This requirement is imposed by the postulate of the etiology of the formation of intermediates, ${ }^{4,5,12}$ derived from the unified theory.

One more requirement for the formation of a "symmetrical" intermediate can be recognized: the leaving group X , in addition to the Z group, must be "symmetrically" situated with respect to $C_{a}$ and $C_{\beta}$. This requirement follows from the principles of the theory and the deriving requirement that intermediates be not carbonium ions, nor entities, nor be studied as such. In contrast, the usual approach would allow the formation of a symmetrical non-classical carbonium ion intermediate, even if the
leaving anion group were asymmetrically arranged in the intermediate pair.
Let us now look at the possible paths. They are the direct path, the indirect ones, and the side paths. The side paths are defined, as seen in the unified model VI, by the action of Y (and of the leaving group X ) on the rest of the molecule directly, or indirectly through solvent molecules (depending on the distance and conditions), and on to the medium. Since these attacks are partial displacements, the distance and the number of residues between the nucleophiles ( Y and X ) and the centers of the compound involved, as well as the ease of rupture and formation (both partial) of bonds between the residues involved along the paths, are factors controlling the ease of operation of the paths. In solvolyses reactions, the distance between $Y$ and the compound is usually too large (for reasons understood in terms of, the discussion given in ref. 5) for side paths involving $Y$ to count. Furthermore, for the usual compounds and in particular for saturated hydrocarbons, the operation of such paths, even those paths involving X , should not be easy (if electron attracting groups are involved in side paths, their ease of operation should increase). Thus, their operation can be neglected, at least in the solvolysis of substrates having a saturated hydrocarbon structure. The burden for the reaction is thus placed on the direct and the indirect paths.

The main indirect paths are: the paths utilizing $\mathrm{R}_{3}$ and $\mathrm{R}_{4}$ in a hyperconjugative, inductive, and other sense; the paths utilizing $R_{1}$ and $R_{2}$ in a hyperconjugative sense (and inductive through the entire $C_{\beta}$ residue) diminished however because $R_{1}$ and $\mathrm{R}_{2}$ are out of the plane defined by $\mathrm{C}_{\beta}, \mathrm{C}_{a}$, and X ; the paths utilizing Z in a bridging-hyperconjugative sense, although one of them, -EN-Z-C $a_{a}$-X-EN-, which corresponds to what is described by the resonance form IX, may be called a direct path.

The direct path itself is the one involving nucleophilic attack by the solvent on $\mathrm{C}_{a}$.

The paths leading to bridging are: EN- $\mathrm{R}_{1}-\mathrm{C}_{\beta}-\mathrm{Z}-\mathrm{C}_{\alpha}-\mathrm{X}-\mathrm{EN}$ - (and that using $\mathrm{R}_{2}$ instead of $\mathrm{R}_{1}$ ), -EN-C $\beta_{\beta^{-}}-C_{a^{-}} \mathrm{X}-\mathrm{EN}-,-\mathrm{X}-\mathrm{C}_{\beta^{-}}-\mathrm{Z}-\mathrm{C}_{\alpha^{-}}$, which correspond to what is described by the resonance form VIII; EN-Z- $\left(\mathrm{C}_{\beta}-\mathrm{C}_{a}\right)$-X-EN which corresponds to what is described by the form X ; and the path $\mathrm{EN}-\mathrm{Z}-\mathrm{C}_{\alpha}-\mathrm{X}-\mathrm{EN}$ - which corresponds to what is described by the form IX.

Let us now compare the ease of operation of the paths leading to bridging with that of the paths not leading to bridging.

The first two of the above paths involving bridging, which should not be easy in view of the non-allowance, accorcing to the theory, for carbon and hydrogen to bear any substantial charge, have their respective counterparts in paths not involving bridging, that is, the indirect paths using $\mathrm{R}_{3}$ and $\mathrm{R}_{4}$, as, e.g., path -EN- $\mathrm{R}_{3}-\mathrm{C}_{a}-\mathrm{X}-\mathrm{EN}$-. The latter paths should be favored* over those employing bridging, on the basis of the fact that the former ones utilize the same sources (of nucleophilic contribution) and residues as the latter ones but with two additional residues ( $\mathrm{C}_{\beta}$ and Z ) intervening in the path. Thus, the paths involving bridging have the added energetic disadvantage of requiring also the partial rupture of the $\mathrm{C}_{\beta}-\mathrm{Z}$ bond, which cannot be

[^4]made up but to a fractional extent by the formation of the $\mathrm{Z}-\mathrm{C}_{a}$ bond.
The third bridging path, $-\mathrm{X}-\mathrm{C}_{B^{\prime}}-\mathrm{Z}-\mathrm{C}_{a}$, will be discussed later.
The contribution of the bridging path -EN-Z- $\left(\mathrm{C}_{\boldsymbol{\beta}}-\mathrm{C}_{a}\right)$-X-EN- (form X) can be limited to a small only percent of the extent required for symmetry to be reached, in view of the difficulty in rupturing the $\mathrm{Z}-\mathrm{C}_{\beta}$ bond.

Whereas the contribution of the above discussed paths can only be small, that of the fifth path, -EN-Z-C $a^{-}$-X-EN- (corresponding to form IX), is allowed to become even large depending on the nature of Z , other factors remaining constant.

This leads to a discussion of the role of the type of the bridging group Z in the question of non-classical carbonium ions, which should be large as suggested.

For $\mathrm{Z}=$ hydrogen or a saturated hydrocarbon residue, contribution by way of the path -EN-Z-C $a_{a}-\mathrm{X}-\mathrm{EN}$ - is expected to be poor.

For $\mathrm{Z}=$ unsaturated residue,* e.g., with $\pi$-electrons such as aryl groups, a much easier contribution by the above path can be expected which should be larger or smaller depending on the group and substituents on it.

Analogous considerations apply to groups bearing unshared electron pairs (e.g., Br ). Again contribution by the above path should be variable, and large contributions may be reached for this type of group.

However, even in the above cases, and in spite of the ease of contribution by this path, the first formed intermediate may be expected to be, at least as a rule, "unsymmetrical". Exceptions can be envisaged for extreme and special systems and conditions.

The inability of the system to reach symmetry is argued on the basis of the reasons being discussed, namely because of the inability of the bridging paths to be overwhelmingly easier than those not leading to bridging and because of the role of the leaving group. That the bridging paths cannot be overwhelmingly easier than the others in the case, e.g., of $\mathrm{Z}=$ aryl, is discussed later in this paper.

Attention can now be focused on the role of the leaving group.
The ability of the leaving group to acquire a symmetrical arrangement, as required by this approach if a symmetrical intermediate were to be formed, should be influenced by two factors: the ability of the leaving group to bond to $\mathrm{C}_{\beta}$ while still bound to $\mathrm{C}_{a}$, and the extent of rupture of the $\mathrm{C}_{a}-\mathrm{X}$ bond in the intermediate. This is so because to the extent to which the $\mathrm{C}_{a}-\mathrm{X}$ bond is not ruptured in the intermediate, the latter should be expected to prefer to be "unsymmetrical". Although this point should be examined theoretically, an intuitive argument is based on a comparison between suitable structures, in, e.g., the ground state, and specifically of the structure II with that represented by XII. The former structure should be the more stable one (compound II exists as II and not as XII). That is, a system involving a certain extent of covalency between a group X and a carbon residue is of lower energy than one involving the same total extent of covalent bonding between X and carbon but split equally into two such bonds. Although the case of an intermediate is not quite

[^5]

XII
the same, since it involves only fractional covalency, the same argument can be applied for whatever extent the bond is covalent, by making the reasonable assumption that the above comparison of relative energies can be extended to structures (intermediates) where the covalency ( $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{X}$ ) is fractional.

The emphasis placed on covalency and on its effect in rendering the "symmetrical" structure less stable than "unsymmetrical" ones, is not meant to imply that the ionic nature of the interaction has necessarily an opposite effect. Furthermore, it should be kept in mind that the extent of rupture of the $\mathrm{C}_{a}-\mathrm{X}$ bond should not all lead, according to this theory, to an equivalent (to this rupture) build-up of ionic character on $X$ and on the organic residue, because part of it should be consumed in covalent bonding between X and the medium and between the organic residue and the medium.

Since, according to the present approach, covalency of the $\mathrm{C}_{a}-\mathrm{X}$ bond in the intermediate is expected to play an important role with respect to the question of symmetry in the intermediate, knowledge of the extent of this covalency is important. This extent can be assessed qualitatively by means of the postulate of the etiology of the formation of intermediates. ${ }^{12}$ The postulate leads to the conclusion ${ }^{12}$ that for the same type of incoming EN the greater the contribution of the direct path as compared to that of indirect paths the more extensive the expected bonding between $\mathrm{C}_{a}$ and the leaving group in the intermediate. The fact that such bonding in the first formed intermediate is anticipated and that it is expected to be larger than the usual approach would expect, if and when it does, adds importance to the facto: of covalency in influencing several arguments in reaction mechanisms, including those on the structure of non-classical intermediates.

There still remains to be examined the second factor mentioned earlier about the leaving group, i.e., its ability to bond to $\mathrm{C}_{\beta}$ (while also bound to $\mathrm{C}_{a}$ ). This corresponds to the path $\mathrm{X}-\mathrm{C}_{\beta}-\mathrm{Z}-\mathrm{C}_{a^{-}} \mathrm{X}$ mentioned earlier as one of the paths leading to bridging the role of which was to be examined later. In discussing this factor, the following should be kept in mind further to what has already been said.

The concept of the gradient imposes restrictions on the fate of the charge that would develop on $X$ as a result of the rupture (partial) of the $C_{a}-X$ bond and thus on the extent of it that remains on X . The concept requires that only a fraction of this "would be" charge on X remains on it (actually or potentially), the rest being consumed in bonding with the medium* and with its environment in general (this includes also the $\mathrm{C}_{\beta}$ carbon), to such an extent as to render optimum (for the residues involved) the gradient along the various directions considered.

[^6]Applying also the postulate of the etiology of the formation of intermediates ${ }^{12}$ one can see that for the above and other reasons, especially because of the fact that other paths in addition to $\mathrm{X}-\mathrm{C}_{\beta}-\mathrm{Z}-\mathrm{C}_{a}$ should operate, the conclusion should be reached that to whathever extent X becomes bound to $\mathrm{C}_{\beta}$, this extent does not have to have progressed in the formation of the first intermediate to a degree equal to the extent of the bonding of X to $\mathrm{C}_{a}$. Thus, lack of symmetry in the bonding of X to $\mathrm{C}_{\alpha}$ and $\mathrm{C}_{\beta}$ should be the rule.

It is thus concluded that the leaving group also along with the other factors, works against symmetry in the first formed intermediate. However, it can also be seen that the bonding of the leaving group to $\mathrm{C}_{\beta}$ is allowed and allowed to be variable of course and that the path $\mathrm{X}-\mathrm{C}_{\beta}-\mathrm{Z}-\mathrm{C}_{\boldsymbol{a}}$ may be an important one in contributing to bridging.

One can thus recognize a small paradox: the leaving group may work against bridging (by Z) in the intermediate (e.g., by way of its covalent bonding to $\mathrm{C}_{a}$ ) but may also work for this bridging (e.g., by bonding itself to $\mathrm{C}_{\beta}$ ). Various factors, such as the nature of the leaving group, the medium, the structure of the compound, should influence the above opposing effects and certain trends can be predicted.

The above allow one to anticipate differences between various leaving groups which could reach pronounced extents such as for example between a tosylate group (solvolysis of a tosylate) and a nitrogen leaving group (deaminations). For nitrogen as a leaving group, both factors should work against bridging, namely the factor of bonding to both $\mathrm{C}_{a}$ and $\mathrm{C}_{\beta}$, which should not be as easy (if we are still referring to intermediates with nitrogen as the leaving group), as well as the factor of the extent of covalency to $\mathrm{C}_{a}$ (bonding of $\mathrm{C}_{\boldsymbol{a}}$.to the leaving group and to the incoming solvent). The latter is expected ${ }^{1}$ to be more pronounced in deaminations than in solvolyses, as argued previously, ${ }^{5}$ in terms of the unified theory. We have argued ${ }^{1,4,5}$ that deaminations are less so carbonium ion* reactions (e.g., increased covalency) than solvolyses, a fact which is in sharp contrast to what is accepted ${ }^{13}$ by the usual approach. Thus, non-classical behavior can be anticipated to be less pronounced in deamination reactions than in solvolyses. However, other factors must be considered also. Finally, variation in the solvent plays its role by way of its effect on the ease of operation of the paths discussed.

The preceding discussion has presented the paths and the factors influencing their ease of operation which favor bridging and those working against it. It has been argued (discussed also later in this paper) that the former cannot, as a rule, be overwhelmingly easier than the latter ones. Since chemical transformations follow, according to this approach, a road corresponding to the sum of the contributions of

[^7]all operating paths,* and these in turn contribute according to their ease of operation, the paths working against bridging should operate, thus contributing toward an "unsymmetrical". intermediate.**

Having discussed the paths involved, one can argue about the effect various variables (e.g., R -groups and structure, Z groups, leaving groups, medium etc.) should exert upon the ease of operation of the paths. Thus, one can finally predict trends in the extent of bridging in the intermediate (or in the probability that bridging may occur).

One can mention as a simple example the effect of changing R groups. As their number and ability for nucleophilic contribution increase (e.g. $\mathrm{R}=\mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}_{3}, \mathrm{C}_{2} \mathrm{H}_{5}$, etc.), the contribution of indirect paths should increase, thus working against bridging. As they decrease, the contribution of the direct path and the extent of bonding of the leaving group in the intermediate should increase (as mentioned already) thus again working against bridging. It may be repeated that bonding to the leaving group and to an incoming molecule of the solvent has to be involved, according to the theory, in essentially all the usual media and usual solvolyzing compounds, whether characterized by a primary, a secondary, or even a tertiary carbon as a reacting center.

The conclusion that the first formed intermediate may be "unsymmetrical" renders necessary the existence of another intermediate in which the roles of $\mathrm{C}_{a}$ and $\mathrm{C}_{\beta}$ are reversed. This would be the intermediate predicted to be formed in the solvolysis of compound III. Whether these two "unsymmetrical" intermediates can be converted to each other, as well as the relative rates of this interconversion are expected to be a function of the relative ease of operation of the various paths, including of course those leading to product formation, and of their relative contribution in the intermediate which is a consequence of their relative ease of operation. Thus, on the basis of the analysis presented, one could make predictions about trends which would favor rapid or slow interconversion as such, as well as with respect to the rate of formation of products or starting material. A rapid, with respect to product formation, interconversion of two such intermediates has to be involved when the system

[^8]behaves as if a symmetrical intermediate system were involved, as was pointed out earlier.

The interconversion between the two intermediates, just as any other change in a liquid system, is to be studied as a reaction obeying the principles of this approach. One can focus his attention on the process of the rupture of the $\mathrm{C}_{\beta}-\mathrm{Z}$ bond and of the formation of the $\mathrm{Z}-\mathrm{C}_{a}$ one, which is a section of the entire process of the rearrangement. This latter process, just as any other reaction process, is to be viewed as a cyclic one, one of the cycles being in this system the cycle $\mathrm{Z}-\mathrm{C}_{a}-\mathrm{X}-\mathrm{C}_{\beta}-\mathrm{Z}$. By focusing attention on the $\mathrm{C}_{\beta}-\mathrm{Z}-\mathrm{C}_{a}$ part of the cycie, e.g., electrophilic attack of $\mathrm{C}_{a}$ on $\mathrm{Z}-\mathrm{C}_{\beta}$, one can think of it as a displacement reaction. This displacement reaction in addition to employing a direct path ( $\mathrm{C}_{\alpha}-\mathrm{Z}-\mathrm{C}_{\beta}$ ) must employ additional paths, indirect ones, which decrease the energy requirements of the direct path. To avoid going into a detailed description of these paths, one may refer to them as being those the sum of the contribution of which corresponds to what in usual terms would be referred to as the contribution of the structure X and IX (in those systems in which the latter type of contribution is possible) to a resonance hybrid. According to the postulate of the "etiology of the formation of intermediates", ${ }^{12}$ the operation of paths other than the main one is expected to give an energy profile which can be viewed as being the sum of i) a convex curve representing the operation of the main path (the direct path in the process considered), as if it were the only one operating and ii) a concave one (with a negative sign) representing the operation of the other paths. The superposition (actually subtraction) of the concave curve on the convex one, which can be considered according to the postulate to give the overall energy curve, may result in the formation of a minimum in the latter curve.*

Somewhat analogous, at least qualitatively, considerations, apply to the other section of the cycle, namely the section $\mathrm{C}_{a}-\mathrm{X}-\mathrm{C}_{\beta}-$ migration of Z from $\mathrm{C}_{\beta}$ to $\mathrm{C}_{a}$ to give the other intermediate is expected (on the basis of the non-ionic concept ${ }^{5}$ ) to be accompanied by a concerted migration of X from $\mathrm{C}_{a}$ to $\mathrm{C}_{\beta}$. For similar reasons, the energetics of this path are expected to be characterized by a minimum in this curve, and again at about the halfway point. There are some very important reasons regarding why this migration of $X$ from $C_{a}$ to $C_{\beta}$ may go through a minmum but this will not be discussed. It may be pointed out, however, that they are related to the fact that this migration is part of other paths as well which have as a net result

[^9]the development, during the rearrangement, of a nucleophilic potential, say charge, on $\mathbf{X}$, different from what it has in the first intermediate. One such path is the direct one, the contribution of which can change during the process. Competition between this path and the bridging ones is another important factor.* The fact that more than one paths are involved contributes to the formation of an intermediate as deduced from the postulate. ${ }^{5,12}$

The overall curve representing the rearrangement of the first "unsymmetrical" intermediate to the other one is thus allowed to include a minimum.**

Concerning the probability of formation and the depth of the minimum, the previous discussion and other considerations based on the postulate ${ }^{5,12}$ and the theory suggest that the larger the ease of operation, during the rearrangement, of paths other than the direct one (certain other factors must also be considered) the more likely the formation of an energy minimum and the larger the energy dip. One can thus devise systems where this will be enhanced. Whether the contribution*** of these paths other than the direct one, is sufficient in all systems to form a dip big enough to cause the formation of a third intermediate, the "symmetrical" one, cannot be predicted on the basis of this approach. However, a dip in the free energy curve is expected in principle and, thus, the system is to be treated as involving in principle the formation of an intermediate with the allowance that under given conditions the dip could also be small enough to render it indistinguishable from a transition state, for practical purposes. Thus, the question of formation and significance of the third intermediate, just as other aspects of reaction mechanisms, becomes under this approach a matter of "trends" to be observed as factors are varied, and also a matter of probability (in this case the probability that an intermediate is formed) rather than a subject of the study of specific and distinct mechanisms or the rigid adoption or exclusion of certain fixed structures.

The conclusion reached so far is that the formation of two "unsymmetrical" intermediates - varying in structure from a classical one to a partially bridged one, with the extent of bridging varying between extremes although not necessarily in a smooth way - and of a symmetrical one intervening (in principle but not necessarily) in importance) in the isomerization between these two, can be expected in the solvolysis of systems behaving as proceeding through non-classical carbonium ions. This conclusion and the application of this approach and of its derived postulate of the etiology of the formation of intermediates to solvolysis reactions in general, from

[^10]the point of view of the formation of non-classical intermediates, are described graphically and in general terms by the curves of Figures 2, 3 and 4, which represent isomerization between compounds II and III during solvolysis. Transition between the three types of curves can be expected. Differences and trends in the distance BB' can also be expected. The trend between these curves could be extended further. One form of extention is one whereby the dip CDC would not form. In the other direction, the dip CDC' could increase to the point where the $\operatorname{dip} \mathrm{ABC}$ corresponding to the first formed intermediate may become insignificant and for practical purposes not even an intermediate (e.g., point of inflection or not even just that).



Fig. 2, 3, 4: Energy-Reaction Coordinate diagrams for the isomerization between II and III during solvolysis.

The intermediates appearing in these curves are expected to be common to this isomerization and to formation of solvolysis products (a greater ease for one among these intermediates to give products can be expected). In the formation of products from the above intermediate system, additional intermeđiates* can be expected to be formed along the process of further rupture of the $\mathrm{C}_{a}-\mathrm{X}$ bond. Furthermore, the actual behavior of the system is expected to be also governed by the relative height of the peaks in these curves as compared between them and with the height of the peaks of the curves leading to product formation. Thus, in addition to the types represented by the three curves, the types of actual behavior of a system are expected to be increased further by a variation in the activation energy leading to product formation (and by the intervention of additional intermediates).

One can predict from the analysis of the problem trends in the behavior of chemical system with respect to non-classical behavior. One can recognize trends in the variation of factors which would or would not enhance the probability of: expecting bridging and the extent of it; observing internal return and product formation

[^11]with or without loss of optical acrtivity (or generally with observations suggesting "symmetry" or lack of it in the intermediate system); observing anchimeric assistance and the extent of it; affecting the rate and extent of it; rendering the formation of the first and "unsymmetrical" intermediate (whether classical or partially bridged) or the second and "symmetrical" one rate determining; enhancing the dip and probability of formation of the "symmetrical" intermediate; observing product formation involving frontside attack only or backside attack also and the relative extent of the two; intervention (or not) of rotation around the $\mathrm{C}_{\alpha}-\mathrm{C}_{\beta}$ bond and extent of it; etc. A detailed discussion of such predictions will be deferred for another paper, although much can be deduced by direct application of what has been discussed.

The conclusions reached on the subject of non-classical carbonium ions can be symmarized as follows:

In the solvolysis of the usual systems supposed to give cationic intermediates for which the formation of a single or symmetrical non-classical ionic intermediate has been postulated, this discussion suggests the following:
a. The first formed intermediate is not a carbonium ion (or other cation) and not a pair of ions, but a "unified intermediate complex", governed by the principles of the theory and thus, among other features, involving extensive covalencies and obeying the "non-ionic concent", Extreme systems are required before this conclusion could be modified as a limit.
$b$. The first formed intermediate is expected in prineiple to be "unsymmetrical", exceptions being allowed for special systems, and conditions. This is the main conclusion. Depending on the system and on various factors, fractional bridging by $Z$ may be involved, the extent of which is expected to be variable, but not necessarily smoothly, for a number of reasons such as, $e . \mathrm{g}_{\mathrm{g}}$, a compeltion between the bridging group and the incoming solvent which was mantioned earlier. Equilibration, between this first intermediate and the other "unsymmetrical" intermediate, more rapid than product formation is invoived when the system behaves as procecding through a "symmetrical" intermediate. The rearrangement between the two "unsymmetrical" intermediates is to proceed through a symmetrical struc-

[^12]ture which can be expected to be an intermediate, in principle, but not necessarily always in importance. This should depend strongly on various factors.
In all this behavior, trends can be anticipated as various factors (structural, the bridging and the leaving group, the medium, etc.) are varied along a given sequence. These trends can be predicted by application of this approach and of the unified model.

The discussion has dealt so far with the problem of non-classical intermediates using as a working model a symmetrical compound, as was pointed out earlier in this paper. The discussion is meant to apply qualitatively (in extreme cases even qualitative differences are possible) to "unsymmetrical" substrates as well, as was also pointed out earlier, provided the definition of the term "symmetrical" intermediate, as given earlier in this paper, is kept in mind. A feature that should be pointed out in the case of "unsymmetrical" substrates is that the curves of Figures 2, 3 and 4 will no longer be expected to be symmetrical. Thus, shifting of the transition states and intermediates and their accumulation toward one or the other end (starting material or rearranged product) as well as a decrease in the horizontal distance (along the isomerization reaction coordinate) between the various transition states and intermediates is anticipated. The larger the deviation from symmetry the larger the expected shift. This feature plus that of an expected change in the relative heights of the transition states and intermediates are anticipated to lead to a number of possible features. One of them is, of course, that the relative rates of conversion of each one of the two "unsymmetrical" intermediates to each other, to starting and rearranged materials respectively, and to products will not be the same, whereas, this was the case with symmetrical substrates. Another one is that it may become possible for some of those intermediates to become of no practical significance (their conversion to the next one being much more rapid than the rate of any other change they may undergo) or to become single inflection points. Thus, their number may decrease below three, either actually or for all practical purposes.

It may be instructive at this point to illustrate briefly the application of the preceding discussion to some among the representative systems for which the formation of non-classical carbonium ion intermediates has been claimed. Systems for which non-classical carbonium ion (or cationic) intermediates have been postulated belong to three possible general types, in the acyclic or cyclic series; namely, to those for which (a) Z is hydrogen or alkyl, (b) Z is an aromatic of olefinic residue ( $\pi$-systems), and (c) Z is a residue having unshared electrons (e.g., halogens). Systems belonging to the second type will be examined first.

Several claims have been made ${ }^{14}$ for the direct. formation of the symmetrical bridged intermediate for $Z=$ aryl or olefinic group. In fact, studies on the acetolysis of the 3-phenyl-2-butyl system gave rise to the concept of the phenonium ion. ${ }^{15}$ Fifteen years have elapsed since then, and a large volume of work has been carried out on phenonium ions. This system and several others are always believed ${ }^{7,14}$ to solvolyze by direct ionization to the single symmetrical phenonium ion intermediate. This belief should be questioned. The first formed intermediate may be an unsymmetrical species, as deduced by simple application to this system of the arguments already presented. As argued, if in the intermediate (a) the $\mathrm{CH}_{3}$ group on the $a$ carbon contributes nucleophilically to $\mathrm{C}_{a}$ (b) an incoming solvent molecule con-
tributes similarly, (c) the leaving group remains covalently bound to $\mathrm{C}_{a}$ to a certain extent, and (d) the ability of the phenyl group for nucleophilic contribution to a $\mathrm{C}_{a}$ (through its $\pi$-clectron system) is not overwhelmingly favored over all other forms of contribution, then the intermediate may be "unsymmetrical" for every one of these reasons and even more so for all of them together. As for the contribution to $\mathrm{C}_{a}$ from the aryl- $\mathrm{C}_{\beta} \sigma$-bond, this, as argued already, cannot compete favorably with the ones through the direct path and the indirect paths (through the $\mathrm{CH}_{3}$ group on $\mathrm{C}_{a}$ ), and, thus, can hardly contribute overwhelmingly more than the latter ones. This factor also should contribute to lack of symmetry.

All above factors contributing against symmetry are expected to operate in this system. That this must be so for factors (a) and (d) is deduced from simple chemical experience. Thus, e.g., solvolysis of $a$-( $p$-tolyl) ethyl chloride in acetic acid exhibits a $\beta$-secondary deuterium isotope effect (for a $\mathrm{CD}_{3}$ group) of a magnitude of the order of $\mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{H}} / \mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{D}}=1.35 .{ }^{16}$ Since $\beta$-secondary hydrogen isotope effects are to be interpreted ${ }^{4}$ as being mainly the result of the operation of "indirect paths" (and "side paths", when these operate) which include what is referred to as hyperconjugation, the exhibition of such a definite isotope effect proves two points: One is that even though the aryl group is attached directly to the reaction center, the $\mathrm{CH}_{3}$ group on the $\alpha$-carbon still contributes nucleophilically to $\mathrm{C}_{a}$ in the transition state and thus must do so in the intermediate as well (Hammond's postulate). The other point is that the contribution of the $p$-tolyl group is anything but overwhelmingly larger than that of the methyl group, because if this were so, such an isotope effect would not be observed. By the term overwhelmingly larger is meant a contribution to the point where it inhibits or masks the contribution with which it is compared.

Since these two points apply to the $a$-( $p$-tolyl)ethyl system where the aryl group is attached directly to $\mathrm{C}_{a}$, one can reasonably expect that they should apply even more so in the 3-phenyl-2-butyl system where the contribution to $\mathrm{C}_{a}$ through space from the $\pi$-system of the aryl group cannot be as easy as the one from the $\pi$-system when directly attached to $\mathrm{C}_{a}$, as in $a$-( $p$-tolyl)ethyl chloride. If examples for this latter argument are needed, one may say that it is common knowledge (it is also intuitively reasonable) that an aryl group directly attached to the rection center in a solvolysis reaction has a much larger accelerating effect, that is a larger contribution, (provided all other features of the reaction are the same) than the same group attached on a $\beta$-carbon atom and supposed to contribute by way of formation of a non-classical intermediate.

The remaining two factors - contribution by incoming solvent (factor b), and partial covalency between the leaving group and $\mathrm{C}_{a}$ in the intermediate (factor c ) have been argued ${ }^{5}$ to operate, on the basis of the "non-carbonium ion" concept ${ }^{5,6}$ and the postulate of the etiology of formation of intermediates. ${ }^{5,12}$ As a result of these, the usual systems (except extremes) solvolysing in the usual media have to make use of covalent bonding of $C_{a}$ with the medium in giving the first formed intermediate. They also have to have the leaving group still bound covalently to $C_{a}$, and this to an appreciable extent. Since these factors operate, they should contribute against symmetry in the intermediate for the reasons already discussed. Some problems, however, resulting from the competition between bridging and the incoming solvent, factor $b$, have been discussed already.

For all above four factors, the first formed intermediate in the solvolysis of the type of system under examination is reasonably expected to be "unsymmetrical".5. 11, * Needless of course to repeat that fractional bridging is allowed and expected and that its magnitude has to be a variable. The larger the nucleophilic character of the aryl group, and the poorer the ability of the $\mathrm{R}_{3}, \mathrm{R}_{4}$ groups attached to $C_{a}$ and of the medium to contribute to $C_{a}$, the larger the allowed extent of bridging by the $\beta$-aryl group.

There is a number of systems for $Z=$ aryl or olefinic group for whielathe direct formation of a "symmetrical" non-classical intermediate has longbeen the accepted interpretation. ${ }^{7,}{ }^{14,} 15,16$ Some of these systems are the 3 -phenyl 22 butyl, ${ }^{15}$ the cholesteryl and 3,5 -cyclocholestan- 6 -yl system, ${ }^{16}$ and of course the symmetrical allylic system ${ }^{19}$ as well as a number of others. Such systems we have predicted ${ }^{2,4,5}$ should give in principle as a first intermediate an "unsymmetrical" intermediate complex. When bridging is involved, it must be fractional. However, steric and other interactions between the bridging group and the incoming solvent may introduce problems, especially for large extents of bridging. Under such circumstances, and for some systems the direct path could suffer (vide supra), thus conceivably introducing some discontinuous transitions toward the "symmetrical" intermediate.

The difference between the intermediate system (XIII) suggested by the nonclassical carbonium ion school and the one suggested by the classical carbonium ion school (XIV-XV) as well as that (XVI-XVIII) suggested (as a model and in principle) on the basis of this discussion which actually includes the structures suggested by the former two schools but as extreme cases, is illustrated below for the case of the 3-phenyl-2-butyl system (the forms XVI-XVIII are simplified, e.g., the action of the solvent is mostly omitted, in order to avoid getting into a detailed discussion of other factors as well).


The unfinished dotted line in the aryl- $\mathrm{C}_{a}$ general direction in XVI stands for an interaction between the aryl group and $C_{a}$ (or aryl and the incoming solvent in ex-

[^13]treme cases) which is to vary in extent and type* - so should also the distance between them - along with a change in the variables discussed, including the nature of the Y group. The $\mathrm{C}_{\beta}$-aryl bond in XVI, even though allowed in principle to be partly ruptured, is nevertheless expected to be mostly intact in such systems, in view of the expected much greater ease of operation of the path - $\mathrm{Z}-\mathrm{C}_{\alpha}-\mathrm{X}$ - over $-\mathrm{C}_{\beta}-\mathrm{Z}-\mathrm{C}_{a}-\mathrm{X}$ (the $\pi$-electron system of the phenyl group can contribute much easier than the $\mathrm{C}_{\beta^{-}}$ aryl bond $\sigma$-electrons). The extent of the total carbon-X bonding (the total bonding of both $C_{a}$ and $C_{\beta}$ to $X$ ) can be expected to be different in XVII than in XVI, in which case equilibration between XVI nd XVIII would go through a change in the elongation of the $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{X}$ bond (a change in the nucleophilic potential on X ).

Analogous considerations apply to the intermediates predicted to be formed in the case of the other systems mentioned above, including even the symmetrical allylic system. Here too, in fact even more so than in many other systems, even though the obstacles to bridging present in other systems (e.g. steric, bonding of the $\mathrm{C}_{\boldsymbol{\beta}}-\mathrm{Z}$ bond,

$x \mid x$
partial $\sigma$-bond rupture, e.t.c.) should hardly be present, it is again expected that the first intermediate (XIX) will have to be "unsymmetrical". This is concluded on the basis of the same general arguments discussed already, in particular, e.g., of an anticipated strong contribution by the direct path (because of diminished steric obstacles** to the approach of the incoming solvent molecule, the non-ionic concept requires that the first formed intermediate deviates ${ }^{5}$ substantially from a carbonium ion and so should also the covalency of the $\mathrm{C}_{\alpha}-\mathrm{X}$ bond for analogous reasons, etc.).

Analogous considerations should apply to the cholesteryl - i-cholesteryl system. On this basis, the first formed intermediate from a cholesteryl derivative should differ from that formed from an $i$-cholesteryl one.

In going to the type of compound II where $Z=$ hydrogen or alkyl, similar arguments lead one to expect that again the first formed intermediate would be "unsymmetrical". The difference from the type just discussed is that here the path -EN-Z-$\mathrm{C}_{a}-\mathrm{X}$-, which corresponds to contribution by the Z group itself without severance of the $\mathrm{Z}_{-} \mathrm{C}_{\beta}$ bond, is hardly as easy as in the case $\mathrm{Z}=$ unsaturated group. Thus, bridging, to whatever extent involved, could be more difficult, since it would have to rely more heavily on the indirect paths involving partial rupture of the $\mathrm{C}_{\beta}$ - Z bond which, as mentioned earlier, cannot complete well with the corresponding paths not involving

[^14]bridging. The cyclic path Z-C ${ }_{\alpha}-\mathrm{X}-\mathrm{C}_{\beta}$-Z should be, as suggested already, a good contributor to bridging, possibly more here than in the previous type.

A great many systems giving symmetrical non-classical intermediates for $\mathrm{Z}=$ hydrogen or alkyl in particular have been proposed. A few among them are ethylene protonium ions, ${ }^{20.21}$ the norbornyl ${ }^{22}$ and similar bicyclic non classical ions, ${ }^{14}$ the tricyclobutonium ion, ${ }^{23}$ the bicyclobutonium ion, ${ }^{34}$ the tris-homocyclopropenyl cation, ${ }^{25}$ and other systems. The same general conclusions discussed in this paper are to apply to all these systems. Differences, however, due to predictable trends in the ability of bridging vs non-bridging paths to operate, can be expected, resulting in differences in the extent of bridging and in the probability for it to occur.

By way of an illustration, one can mention, e.g., that whereas for $Z=H$ the contribution by the direct path should be easy, thus working against bridging or extensive bridging, in the exo-norbonyl system the operation of the direct path should be much more difficult. Differences exist also in the ease of operation of other paths as well, most of them in the same direction. One can thus expect, for analogous structure and conditions, a higher probability for bridging to occur and greater extent of it, if it occurs, in the latter system.

It can be seen that the exo-norbonyl system should be a very good system among those for $\mathrm{Z}=$ saturated alkyl (and hydrogen) residue for bridging to occur, if it can occur in these systems. This should be so both because of the difficulties in the operation of the direct path and the indirect ones through $\mathrm{R}_{3}, \mathrm{R}_{4}$ and because of proper geometry, a rigid structure etc.

It may also be pointed out that bridging and hyperconjugation are expected to be interrelated (the relation being governed by the concept of the gradient ${ }^{4}$ ) and thus not really separable for small extent of bridging. High values for the contribution by Z , such as high isotope effects for $\mathbf{Z}=$ deuterium, higher than usually ascribed to hyperconjugation, can be interpreted not only in terms of the formation of a symmetrically bridged non-classical intermediate, e.g., ethylenoprotonium ions, but also in terms of weak bridging-strong hyperconjugation. There is no need to expect a fixed value for hyperconjugation and assign everything higher to the formation of the symmetrical intermediate. The case of the norbornyl system could perhaps also be thought along these lines (partial bridging-hyperconjugation) as part of the interpretation of its behavior. Such cases can also be understood if the system belongs to the type of Fig. 2 (or Fig. 2 - Fig. 3) where the rate determining step is the second one. Several literature data on non-classical carbonium ions may have to be studied in this light. This point will be examined in future papers.

The case of the cyclopropylcarbinyl-cyclobutyl system is also of interest. It was supposed originally to give rise to the tricyclobutonium ion intermediate. ${ }^{23}$ While collecting literature experimental data to use them in order to argue* against the formation (at least direct) of this intermediate, it was found that this proposed structure had already been changed to the bicyclobutonium ion picture. ${ }^{24}$ This was a change in

[^15]the direction predicted in terms of the present discussion but it did not proceed far enough. Thus, whereas the bicyclobutonium ion is a "symmetrical" species, being the same whether formed from a cyclopylcarbinyl or a cyclobutyl derivative starting material, this discussion suggests the formation of two different "unsymmetrical" species formed from the two different starting materials. The rapid interconversion of these intermediate complexes, which could also proceed through a "symmetrical" one, could substitute each bicyclobutonium ion.

Similar conclusions should apply to the tris-homocyclopropenyl cation ${ }^{25}$ in particular (because of the lack of the steric factor, vide supra). According to the present discussion, this symmetrical species can not be the intermediate. The solvolysis of the parent compound must form an "unsymmetrical" intermediate, one in which C-1 is not equivlent to $\mathrm{C}-3$ and $\mathrm{C}-5$, in addition to having the leaving group still bound to $\mathrm{C}-1$ (and an incoming solvent on $\mathrm{C}-1$ ). Contribution by the $\mathrm{C}_{3}-\mathrm{C}_{5}$ bond (the type is another subject for discussion) is allowed but it can only be fractional. Instead, rapid equilibration of such "unsymmetrical" intermediates is to account for the apparent symmetry of the intermediate system.

The evidence against a tris-homocyclopropenyl cation in deaminations ${ }^{26}$ is in agreement with the above predictions. Furthermore; the fact that the deamination reaction does not proceed through even just a symmetrical system whereas the solvolysis reaction does ${ }^{25}$ supports both the prediction (discussed earlier in this paper) that deaminations should involve even less bridging or probability for it than solvolysis reactions (for the reasons discussed), and the prediction ${ }^{1-6}$ that both deaminations and solvolyses should not proceed through carbonium ions (there should be covalent bonding with the leaving group, etc.).

Coming now to the third type of system for which Z is a group with unshared electron pairs (e.g. halogens, etc.), considerations similar to those for the two other types are to apply. However, here again and possibly even more so than in the case $\mathrm{Z}=$ aryl or alkene residue (provided proper groups and conditions are involved), the important bridging path ' $-\mathrm{EN}-\mathrm{Z}-\mathrm{C}_{a}-\mathrm{X}$ should be much easier than for $\mathrm{Z}=\mathrm{alkyl}$, and this should reflect in its extent (other factors must also be considered) as well as in the probability of formation and stability of the "symmetrical" intermediate and the probability that the "symmetrical" one may be formed directly in proper systems. On this basis, the direct formation of symmetrical bromonium and other similar ions ${ }^{14}$ is to be questioned, "unsymmetrical" intermediates being generally expected (exceptions being allowed) to be the first formed ones.

The conclusions reached so far concerning the classical vs non-classical nature of intermediates are to apply to free radical type of reaction as well, which too are to be treated ${ }^{4}$ in terms of the unified approach (the first formed intermediate in free radical reactions is also expected in terms of this approach not to be a free radical). Thus, here too, the first formed intermediate is expected (in general) to be "unsymmetrical".

The conclusions reached on the non-classical carbonium ion question allow the following discussion on the controversy about this subject.

The controversy has centered on the question whether the intermediate system is to be described by a single symmetrical mesomeric intermediate or by two rapidly equilibrating classical structures. Furthermore, either school of thought treats these in-
termediates as carbonium ions or as ion-pairs. Even in the latter case however, although some covalency between the pair is allowed by some authors in some cases, the "thinking" associated with a carbonium ion picture persists throughout the arguments on the classical vs non-classical nature of intermediates, as it does in treating most other aspects of reaction mechanisms. This very "thinking" may be claimed to be the major cause for part of the problem, at least in the form in which it stands. It is concluded instead that neither one of the two schools of thought describes fully the intermediate system. Both schools may be only partly correct. Both schools may be partly wrong.

Thus, the non-classical school is thought to be right in suggesting the concept of bridging in principle. It is also thought to be right, in principle at least, in suggesting that the symmetrical structure (should actually be refered to as "symmetrical") corresponds to some intermediate. It may be wrong however, (a) in suggesting that a single (symmetrical) structure represents the intermediate system, and (b) in suggesting that the symmetrical structure is an intermediate formed directly from starting materials and that it does so in all such systems.

On the other hand, the classical carbonium ion school is thought to be right in suggesting that rapidly equilibrating species are involved (at least in several systems), instead of a single symmetrical intermediate. It may be wrong, however, in eliminating the contribution of bridging in these equilibrating species and in considering them necessarily classical. It also may be wrong, at least in principle, in suggesting that the symmetrical structure corresponds necessarily to a transition state and not to an intermediate.

Finally, the present approach does not agree with the treatment of the classical $v s$ non-classical carbonium ion question in terms of ions or pairs of ions, ${ }^{16}$ or even of the ion-pairs as thought of even today by some authors.

A consequence of the usual approach and of the adoption by the two schools of thought of two extreme positions is the fact that all criteria suggesting non-classical behavior, e.g., rate acceleration, racemization of the product resulting from $\mathrm{C}_{a}, \mathrm{C}_{\beta}$ equivalence, retention of configuration at the carbon atom where substitution occurs, have been "forced" to become synonymous with, and interpretable in all cases in terms of a fixed single symmetrical non-classical structure (or in terms of a classical structure by the other school). Thus, e.g., even weakly anchimerically assisted ionizations are interpreted ${ }^{14}$ as giving necessarily rise directly to a symmetrical intermediate (or to a classical ion by the opposite school) provided of course that the stereochemical criteria are also positive. Furthermore, even when the stereochemical criteria suggest only partial equivalence between $\mathrm{C}_{a}$ and $\mathrm{C}_{\beta}$, it is still believed ${ }^{14}$ that ionization gives directly the symmetrical ion, the partial only equivalence being interpreted as being the result of a competing $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{N}} 2$ reaction or of an ionization to a classical ion. It can be seen that even if the data do not necessarily suggest that the structure of the transition state resembles a symmetrical one, still the thought persists that the intermediate which follows is the symmetrical one.

All these observations can be interpreted in other ways as well. Thus, e.g., racemization of the product resulting from $\mathrm{C}_{a}, \mathrm{C}_{\beta}$ equivalence does not necessarily have to result from a single symmetrical intermediate (or from rapidly equilibrating classical species) but can do so from rapidly equilibrating "unsymmetrical" species
as well (whether partly bridged or classical). On the other hand, lack of complete racemization does not necessarily have to be interpreted as resulting from the simultaneous operation of two mechanisms, one proceeding through the single symmetrical intermediate and the other through a classical intermediate or an $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{N}} 2$ reaction. Such results can also be understood in terms of only partial equilibration of the two unsymmetrical intermediates in addition to being understandable in terms of a competing formation of a partly bridged and of a non-bridged intermediate. However, this latter competition can be understood as a probable one, at least as a rule (exceptions are allowed), when the extent of bridging in the intermediate is small. The smaller the extent of bridging (the greater its resemblance to a classical structure) the more likely the occurence of such a competition.*

In the same way, retention of configuration at the seat of substitution, and lack of rotation around the $\mathrm{C}_{a}-\mathrm{C}_{\beta}$ bond can be understood in terms of partial bridging, not necessitating the formation of a fully bridged intermediate. Similarly, partial retention and partial lack of rotation can still be understood in terms of such an intermediate. The smaller the extent of bridging (involving in extreme cases simple interaction of Z with the incoming solvent) the greater the possibility for allowance of inversion of configuration and even rotation around the $\mathrm{C}_{a}-\mathrm{C}_{\beta}$ bond (at weak bridging). Such results can of course be also understood in terms of the competing formation of a non-bridged intermediate.

Finally, and most important, this duscussion suggests that rate acceleration, when due to bridging, does not necessarily mean that symmetry is reached in the intermediate. The idea of symmetry reflects a feature of the usual approach, according to which if the first transition state involves some bonding (bridging) between Z and $\mathrm{C}_{a}$, the intermediate following this transition state is thought to be necessarily a symmetrically bridged species; i.e., once the bond between Z and $\mathrm{C}_{a}$ has started forming, its formation does not stop (by giving an intermediate) before it has proceeded to such an extent as to be equal to the $\mathrm{Z}-\mathrm{C}_{\beta}$ bond. This explains the belief that the intermediate formed is either classical or a single symmetrical non-classical species.

The above attitude of the "usual approach" to reaction mechanisms reflects one of its most general and essential features, the thinking of the formation of all intermediates by full bond formations and/or full bond ruptures, or of their formation or rupture to extents fixed by some preconceived geometrical picture. This thinking has dominated the field of reaction mechanisms and can be traced to other features of the usual approach, such as, e.g., the concept of carbonium ions and carbanions in solution; namely the concept of ionic entities and the association of intermediates with this picture. It is only through extensive work for almost two decades, that this view has been modified, but only partly and in a limited number of cases.

[^16]Opposition to the above feature of the classical approach and emphasis on a concept of variable and fractional as well as non-fixed extent of bond formations and ruptures in the formation of intermediates* in general, and in particular of the first formed intermediate, whether from starting materials or from other intermediates, is a basic consequence of the unified theory and had been pointed out in $1958^{1}$ in addition to having been emphasized in more ways since. ${ }^{2,-6}$ This consequence is best illustrated in terms of the "postulate of the etiology of the formation of intermediates". ${ }^{12}$

The formation of an "unsymmetrical" bridged intermediate (equilibrating with a second one), although recognized at times in the past as a possible alternative interpretation instead of that of the symmetrical intermediate, has nevertheless not been given any serious consideration by the usual approach. Furthermore, the very fact that the usual approach, even though it recognized this as a possibility, has nevertheless discarded it completely in favor of the single symmetrical intermediate, instead of considering it at least along with the symmetrical picture, reflects an inherent disadvantage of the usual approach to reaction mechanisms evident throughout the field. This point will be brought up later in this paper.

As seen from the previous discussion, the two schools of thought on the subject of non-classical carbonium ions support views which lie on either side of what has been suggested long ago in terms of the unified theory. The two schools could thus be reconciled by mutual modification, or actually expansion of their views toward these suggestions. Furthermore, their polemic against each other is suggested to be turned instead against the concept of carbonium ions and the usual approach to reaction mechanisms which, as claimed, may be partly responsible for this problem.

On the basis of the preceding and earlier ${ }^{1-6}$ discussions, one can see some of the causes responsible for the non classical carbonium ion controversy. Analysis with the object to find out the "cause behind the cause, etc." leads one to conclude that the basic cause is the established approach to reaction mechanisms, particularly its concept of carbonium ions (and other ions or radicals) and the approach in terms of it. To justify the above statement in the case of the non-classical ion problem requires repeating much of what has been discussed already, ${ }^{1-6}$ which cannot be done here. A short analysis however is given below.

1. One of the direct results of the concept and original picture of carbonium ions in solution, which in turn stems from the original picture of inorganic ions in solution, has been the approach to reaction mechanisms in terms of full bond (or to a fixed preconceived extent) formations or ruptures in the formation or transformation of an intermediate (originally the carbonium ion intermediates, extended later to all organic cations, anions, and radicals) or in any step in a chemical transformation in general.
[^17]This is apparently a direct result of the concept of carbonium ions, because in the usual approach an intermediate is formed because an ion is formed, or to put it in other terms "the etiology of the formation of intermediates" is assumed to be the formation of ions. Since the picture of carbonium ion formation involved a full rupture of the bond to the leaving group, the picture of full bond ruptures and formations has spread and dominated the field, regardless of the fate of the original picture of a carbonium ion.

Thus, once a bond starts forming or breaking in almost any reaction type considered, it is generally or as a rule believed not to stop forming or breaking by giving an intermediate until the full bond has formed, or broken, or done so to a fixed and standard preconceived extent. This latter "thinking" is apparently applied to the case of non-classical intermediates, and it is believed that once a bond of a neighboring group with $\mathrm{C}_{a}$ starts forming, its formation in all cases (not in some only) does not stop until a symmetrical species is reached. According to the present discussion, however, such a happening, being considered as something abnormal, should be treated as an exception rather than as a rule and substantial justification would have to accompany it. If the steric factor mentioned earlier could operate in some systems, it could provide some such justification.

The unified theory leads to a different "etiology" of the formation of intermediates, ${ }^{5,12}$ which predicts fractional as well as non fixed bond formations and ruptures. This constitutes a substantially different way of "thinking", with several consequences in mechanistic arguments and predictions.
2. Again because of the carbonium ion concept and the usual approach and its rationalization of the formation of intermediates, a non-classical intermediate is considered to be a carbonium ion or an ion-pair, but even in the latter case the picture of ions persists (even though some people believe there is some covalency to the leaving group). What is also serious, is the fact that even in the cases where some covalency is anticipated (this is generally too little as compared to what this theory suggests), there still persists at least the "thinking" in terms of the picture of ions and its effect on all types of mechanistic arguments.

As a result of the above features of the usual approach, the role which the leaving group, and especially the extent of its covalent bonding should play in causing "unsymmetrical" or "symmetrical" bridging is, of course, not considered.
3. Again as a result of the concept of carbonium ions and the usual approach, bonding of the solvent directly to the reaction center in the formation of this intermediate is either believed not to be involved in some systems, or by some workers, or at some stages of the development of the field, or is believed to be involved by way of the solvent's dielectric properties, or finally is believed all right in some cases to include covalency, but even in this case the picture of an ion, and especially the "thinking" in terms of an ion persists, and thus the role of such a bond in causing "unsymmetrical" or "symmetrical" bridging is, of course, overlooked.
4. Even the arguments on why the symmetrically bridged structure should be more stable than the classical one rest on the concept of carbonium ions and the usual approach. Thus the argument, whether intuitive or actually expressed qualitatively or quantum mechanically, is based on a comparison of the energy of formation of a bridged carbonium ion as compared to a classical one. Since ac-
cumulation of charge on one carbon atom leads to an unstable structure, the "symmetrically" bridged one is considered to be more stable, because it provides a menas for distribution of the charge.

This argument could be correct, but in any case comparison is made with the wrong structure, that is, a carbonium ion (classical). Supposing, instead, that in the formation of the first intermediate, some percentage, say e.g. $60 \%$, of the would be charge on the $a$-carbon atom were dissipated by way of covalent bonding to the leaving group, to an incoming solvent molecule, by hyperconjugation, etc. In this case, only part of the remaining charge, say e.g. $40 \%$, could be distributed through, say, bridging. This situation as such could not result in a symmetrically bridged species but only in an "unsymmetrically" bridged one. So, comparison of stabilities is made with an unreal structure, and this happens because the organic residue of the intermediate is treated as an "entity" and specifically a carbonium ion. The idea of "entities" is a major feature of the usual approach and misleading as argued., ${ }^{4,5}$ The idea of entities stems, as pointed out, from the concept of ions in solution.
5. The misleading influence of the concept of carbonium ions can be recognized also in the extension -intuitive or other- of information about the bridged or not so structure of intermediates formed in very strong acid media, as compared to the structure of the corresponding intermediates formed in the usual solvolytic media, or in the extension from one starting material to another differing only in the leaving group.

This attitude is exactly analogous to an argument of the usual approach used as one of the basic sources of evidence which have established the concept of carbonium ion intermedites in the usual media. This is the inference of the formation of unstable carbonium ion intermediates from evidence for the formation of stable carbonium ions. This inference rests on the assumption (more or less evident even today) that the two types of species differ only more or less in the degree of stability and not in their intrinsic nature. ${ }^{27,28}$ According to the unified theory, however, there has to be a large difference between the structure of the first formed intermediate in the usual media and its structure in the very strong acid media (and even between various media any way). Thus, extension of information - be that about the classical or non-classical nature or about the question of formation of a carbonium ion intermediate or not - from the latter media to the former ones (and in a way from one medium to another) is not justified. ${ }^{5}$
6. In addition to the above features, a major factor which is argued to have contributed to the problem is the "non-continuity" of the usual approach in both the micro and the macro level, as well as the use by this approach of artificial basic models and of a resulting artificial way of arguing from the models to reach conclusions (see, e.g., ref 5). This contrasts with the continuity of the unified approach regarding both the micro level (use of the concept of the gradient, of the non formation of entities, of the operation of paths, etc.) and, consequently, at the macro level as well. Thus, reaction mechanisms (e.g. $\mathrm{E} 1-\mathrm{E} 2, \mathrm{E} 1 \mathrm{cb}, \mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{N}} 1-\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{N}} 2$, cis vs trans eliminations, etc.) and their features (e.g., bond ruptures, extent of bridging, etc.) become a matter of, and subject to trends rather than belonging to fixed preconceived types.

In concluding the analysis of the "cause behind the cause" which has contributed to the non-classical carbonium ion problem, two comments should be made. One is
that the claim that the usual approach has created part of the non-classical carbonium ion problem is not implying that there are not real questions about the problem. The latter questions, however, differ from the problem as treated by the usual approach which employs one or another extreme solution excluding trends. The questions are said instead to be questions of "degree" and of "trends", and require appropriate study in terms of gradual modification of various factors to establish points of transition, whether from one to the other extreme (e.g., equilibrating classical vs symmetrical non-classical) or between them, (e.g., various degrees in the extent of bridging or contribution by Z in general). In other words, the problem becomes mostly quantitative rather than qualitative.

The second comment is that even though the unified theory provides certain principles, model, and approach (type of "thinking"), the conclusions and predictions are reached from them by way of a sequence of arguments. This latter fact allows for errors to be made also. If wrong predictions are sometimes reached, it is the arguments which may be wrong, and they should be checked first before questioning the theory. It is hoped that such errors have not been committed in reaching the predictions discussed in this paper.

In concluding the present discussion of the subject of non-classical intermediates - detailed discussion* of individual systems will appear elsewhere - the following comments should be emphasized or repeated:

The subject of non-classical carbonium ions has used up considerable amount of effort in the field of reaction mechanisms during the last fifteen years and this effort seems to be increasing. Still, and in spite of this, the field is divided into two groups and a spectacular controversy has been created. Even though this problem has become such a spectacular one it is not the only one; a great number of other problems concerning many aspects of the field have had a qualitatively similar fate during the last fifteen years.

Analysis by way of the "cause behind the cause" in terms of this approach has led ${ }^{1}$ the author to the conclusion, emphasized and presented better in $1962,{ }^{2,3-6}$ that several of the problems and questions of the field had not been exactly real but had been partly created by the very approach on which the study of organic reaction mechanisms has been built. This was argued to have been the result of the use of artificial and misleading basic models - e.g., the concept of carbonium ions. This has

[^18]necessarily resulted in a somewhat artificial way of "arguing back" from these models: E.g., "because the intermediate is a carbonium ion and has a large charge, it is unstable and it quickly reacts further" (see ref. 5).*

One of the consequences has been the lack of a broad basis for predictions. Thus the approach has often devised individual interpretations to fit the experimental data, rather than really predict them qualitatively. These interpretations have often been the result of the ingenuity of individual researchers rather than devised by the principles of the approach, and in many cases in fact have been reached in spite of these principles. Thus the field has constantly been surprised with "new" (not quite so to this theory) findings. These interpretations, furthermore, kept being modified, as new experimental evidence came to light, often along with strong controversies as a result.

All this state of affairs has often perhaps left many chemists in a state of confusion or behind the development of the field, not to mention what it has done to the students of chemistry.

There is finally the question whether the field could have devised a shortcut to the qualitative side of today's picture. It has been argued ${ }^{2-6}$ that it could have done so, if it were to have used a more realistic approach (e.g., the unified approach), instead of that used and instead of the concept of carbonium and other ions as such.

To understand and be convinced of the above claims one could do two things: The first one is to think in terms of the unified theory - after having depolarized his thinking from the concept of carbonium ions and from some other features of the usual approach - about many aspects of reaction mechanisms, be they the mechanism of $S_{N} 1-S_{N} 2$ reactions, the question of duality in the $S_{N} 1-S_{N} 2$ sense, the structure of intermediates in solution, whether the so called carbonium ions (cations in general) or carbanions (anions in general) or radicals, the question of carbonium ions vs ion-pairs, carbonium mechanisms, the mechanism of eletrophilic reactions in saturated or unsaturated systems including aromatic substitution, the mechanism of additions to double bonds, the mechanism of elimination reactions, the mechanism of hydrolysis of esters, solvolysis reactions in general, the role of the medium, relative nucleophilicities, or other aspects of reaction mechanisms. In so doing, one will come up with a number of predictions (qualitative and relative trends, not absolute). One can then compare the predictions on each subject with the development of the views on this subject in the field. He will find that these predictions differ from what was accepted about these subjects in the past, that the latest views about them are already covered by the predictions, and that the latter may in several cases disagree with the latest views also, or be predictions beyond what is accepted. The second

[^19]thing to do is to wait to compare these latter predictions with further developments in the field on these subjects as they come; he will find that when there is a correction of past views, these new developments agree with, or are closer to the predictions.

Developments in the field since $1958^{1}$ keep verifying these claims, and steadily change the general "thinking" in the direction of what is proposed by this theory they do so, "however, at a high cost: they start from the periphery, that is from the many individual problems, and are forced to slowly move toward the central picture, rather than starting from the one central picture itself as approached and answered with a single effort by this theory. On the other hand, these verifications of its predictions render at the same time even more difficult, demanding, and frustrating the work of reinterpreting the field in terms of this theory and putting it in writing on time.*

## $\Pi \varepsilon \rho і \lambda \eta \psi \eta$



 к $\lambda \alpha \sigma \sigma \iota \kappa \alpha ́$ tóv $\tau \alpha$.



 $\sigma \omega \sigma \tau \varepsilon ́ \varsigma ~ к \alpha \iota ~ \varepsilon v ~ \mu \varepsilon ́ p \varepsilon \iota ~ \sigma \varphi \alpha ́ \lambda о o v . ~$

 $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha ́ \gamma о v \tau \varepsilon \varsigma ~ \kappa \alpha \iota \alpha \pi o ́ ~ \tau \iota \varsigma ~ \mu \varepsilon \tau \alpha \beta о \lambda \varepsilon ́ \varsigma ~ \tau о \cup \varsigma . ~ Е \pi ı \tau \rho \varepsilon ́ \pi \varepsilon ı ~ \varepsilon \pi i \sigma \eta \varsigma ~ \tau о ~ \sigma ט ́ \sigma \tau \eta \mu \alpha ~ \tau \eta \nu ~ \varepsilon \rho \mu \eta \nu \varepsilon i \alpha ~$ $\tau \omega v \pi \varepsilon \iota \rho \alpha \mu \alpha \tau \kappa \omega \dot{\nu} \delta \varepsilon \delta о \mu \varepsilon \dot{v} \omega \nu \tau \eta \varsigma \beta \iota \beta \lambda_{1} \gamma \rho \alpha \varphi i \alpha \varsigma$.
 тоט $\sigma \cup \sigma \tau \dot{\eta} \mu \alpha \tau \circ \varsigma$ поט $\pi \rho о \tau \varepsilon i v \varepsilon \tau \alpha \iota ~ \alpha \pi o ́ ~ \tau \eta \nu ~ \varepsilon v i \alpha i \alpha ~ \theta \varepsilon \omega р i ́ \alpha . ~$







 $\pi о \lambda \lambda \dot{\omega} \nu \pi \rho о \beta \lambda \eta \mu \alpha \tau \omega \nu \sigma \tau о \pi \varepsilon \delta i o ~ \tau \omega \nu \mu \eta \chi \alpha \nu 1 \sigma \mu \dot{\omega} \nu$.

[^20]


 $\pi \rho о \tau \varepsilon i v \varepsilon \tau \alpha l \mu \varepsilon \beta \dot{\alpha} \sigma \eta \tau \eta \nu \varepsilon v / \alpha i \alpha \quad \theta \varepsilon \omega \rho i \alpha$.
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# ENת£EIธ MIKTOY APIOMOY OEEIA $\Sigma E \Omega \Sigma ~ K A I ~ H ~ X P H \Sigma I M O T H T A ~$ TOY天 ЕTH MEAETH TQN ANTIAPAEEQN METAФOPAE HAEK－ TPONIRN 

 TAKH工

Eрүабтท́pıo Avóрүаипц Xпиєiаs



## Періл $\eta \psi \eta$







1．Eı $\sigma \gamma \omega \gamma \bar{\eta}$－Optбиоi．

 tósゅc（II）．

 $\mu \varepsilon \tau \alpha \varphi о р \dot{c} \varsigma ~ \eta \lambda \varepsilon к \tau \rho о v i o v$.
6．Мє $\lambda \lambda \sigma \downarrow \tau \tau \kappa \varepsilon ́ \zeta \pi \rho о о \pi \tau 七 \varepsilon \varepsilon \varsigma$.

## Eıбaүळүй




 $\kappa \alpha \tau \alpha ́ \sigma \tau \alpha \sigma \eta$ 》 к $\alpha ะ ~ « \mu \eta ~ \alpha к \dot{\varepsilon} \rho \alpha 10 ~ \sigma \theta \dot{\varepsilon} v \circ \zeta$ »．








 $\dot{\varepsilon} v \alpha \mu \varepsilon \tau \alpha \lambda \lambda 1 \kappa o ́$ к $\varepsilon \cup \tau \rho \circ \sigma \varepsilon \alpha \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \circ{ }^{(2,3)}$



＇Eva véo $\pi \varepsilon \delta$ ío $\sigma \tau \eta \chi \eta \mu \varepsilon i \alpha ~ \tau \omega v ~ \varepsilon v ஸ ́ \sigma \varepsilon \omega v ~ \mu ı \kappa \tau o v ́ ~ \sigma \theta \varepsilon ́ v o v ~ \alpha \rho \chi i ́ \zeta \varepsilon ı ~ v ’ ~ \alpha v \alpha \pi \tau ט ́ \sigma \sigma ் \varepsilon \tau \alpha ı ~$



 $\lambda ı \xi \eta$ тทऽ X $\eta \mu \varepsilon i \alpha \varsigma ~ \mu ı к \tau о и ́ ~ \sigma \theta \varepsilon ́ v o v s . ~$




ПINAKAE 1


| $\alpha / \alpha$ | Tá̧n I | Táģn II | Tḑ̧n III－A | Tágn Hil－B |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Metandlká Lóvta <br>  тьки́ бuциєтріа． | Meta入入lкá Lóvta <br>  бuииєт $\rho$ ia． | Metalılká tóvta <br>  ад $\lambda \lambda$ d́ биббшцатш－ $\mu \varepsilon ́ v a$ бє подumn－ pıvıká ouøtínua－ ta（Clusters）． | Mとta入入lкá Lóvta un бтакрібьца |
| 2 | $\alpha=0 \quad \sum \theta \varepsilon ́ v \eta \tau^{\tau} \varepsilon \lambda \varepsilon \tau$ wS $\varepsilon$ vtomıoućva． | $a>0$ бө́vvn $\delta \iota a-$ <br>  лачри́́s апоеvто－ $\pi \iota \sigma \mu \varepsilon ́ v a$ ． | Mévlotoc anoev－ топьбиós． |  бuós． |
| 3 | Amouoia xapa－ кtnplotıkns $\mu \varepsilon$－ тапти́бधшऽ $\mu \mathrm{L}$ ктoú öévous oto opató． |  <br>  ulktoú o日évous б兀ŋ́v opatń $\pi \varepsilon \rho\llcorner$ ox tos． | MLa п п $\varepsilon \rho\llcorner\sigma \sigma \delta t \varepsilon$ рєऽ $\mu \varepsilon \tau \alpha \pi т ひ ゙ \sigma \varepsilon \iota \varsigma ~$ нLкtoú o日évous $\sigma \tau \eta \nu$ opatn $\pi \varepsilon$－ рlox＇t． |  бтько́tns $\sigma \tau \eta v$ o－ рatń пeploxń． |
| 4 | Mowatńs．Avii－ oraon $10^{10} 0 \mathrm{hm}$ ． cm ท̆ $\mu \varepsilon \gamma a \lambda u ́ t \varepsilon \rho n$ | ницаүшүós，avti otaon tnc tágns 10－10 ${ }^{7}$ ohm－cm． | $\Omega \varsigma \varepsilon \pi i$ to $\pi \lambda \varepsilon i$ бтоv เठเótntes uovetou． |  inta．Avtiotaon tns túदews $10^{-2}$ $10^{-6} 0 \mathrm{hm}-\mathrm{cm}$ ． |
| 5 |  ouata tũ̌ ouvı－ otúvtav ióvtav （I．R．Raman－uu）． |  olo ekelvo twv ouvlotávtav l－ óvtev（I．R．Ra－ man．UU）． |  кó ámó tav＊$\mu \varepsilon$－ hovaúzvav cóv－ twv． |  amó tà ouvilotúvta tóvta． |
| 6 | Mayvntıkáa apalá параиаүиптька́ <br>  Өєриокрабієऽ． | Mavvntıká apalá | Mavvnil ${ }^{\text {a }}$ apalá |  бпроиаүvпtцкф ：$\mu \varepsilon$ <br>  Curie． |









 бө́́vous＊ка兀д́ $\mathrm{Daỳ}^{(6)}$ ．






ПINAKAE II

| a．Xnuغia <br>  <br> Hлектохпиعia <br>  <br> Фатохпиعia <br>  <br> Ava入utlкń xпuعia <br>  <br>  |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| B．Фuolkń <br>  <br> Үпераүаучио́tпร <br>  <br> Mopıaк $\AA \mu \varepsilon ் \tau \alpha \lambda \lambda \alpha$ |  |
| v．Metajioupvia | Biotitns－Kрокьбо入itns Bıßlavíns |
| б．BLONOVia <br>  <br>  | $\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{~S}_{4}$ <br> Cu，Aluokuavives |
|  | 之úйплока Pt． |

[^21] $\tau \omega \nu \varepsilon \nu \omega ் \sigma \varepsilon \omega \nu \mu \kappa \tau \circ$ и́ $\sigma \theta \dot{\varepsilon} v \circ \cup \varsigma^{(50)}$.


$\Sigma \tau \eta$ $\sigma 0 v \varepsilon ́ \chi \varepsilon 1 \alpha:$


 $\kappa \varepsilon ́ v \tau \rho \omega v$ (Tá $\xi \underline{\eta}$ (II) к $\alpha \tau \alpha \dot{\alpha}$ Day).
 viov.
 $\sigma \theta \varepsilon ́ v o u \varsigma ~ \sigma \tau \eta \mu \varepsilon \lambda \varepsilon ́ \tau \eta ~ \alpha v \tau \iota \delta \rho \dot{\alpha} \sigma \varepsilon \omega v \mu \varepsilon \tau \alpha \varphi \circ \rho \alpha \dot{\varsigma} \eta \lambda \varepsilon \kappa \tau \rho \circ v i \omega v$.

##  

 $\tau \alpha \mathfrak{\varepsilon} \xi \varepsilon \omega \varsigma$ II $\mu \pi$ орои́ $\mu \varepsilon$ va $\varepsilon \xi \varepsilon \tau \alpha ́ \sigma o v \mu \varepsilon$ то $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha \kappa \alpha ́ \tau \omega ~ \sigma v ́ \sigma \tau \eta \mu \alpha$.

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{LxM}^{\mathrm{m}}-\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{B}}-\mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{n}} \mathrm{~L}_{\mathrm{y}}^{\dot{\prime}} \quad \mathrm{m} \neq \mathrm{n} \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

 $\pi \omega \varsigma \pi \cdot \chi$. $\sigma \tau$ o tov $\tau \omega \nu$ Greutz $\kappa \alpha$ Taube.



 vous.





 vía" $\mu \varepsilon ́ \sigma \alpha \alpha$ ало́ $\tau \eta \gamma \dot{\varepsilon} \varphi \cup \rho \alpha$.







$\pi о \lambda \lambda \varepsilon ́ \varsigma ~ \alpha \pi о ́ ~ \tau \iota \varsigma ~ \pi \rho \dot{\omega} \tau \varepsilon \varsigma ~ \varepsilon ́ \rho \varepsilon \cup v \varepsilon \varsigma ~ \pi \alpha ́ v \omega ~ \sigma \tau о \nu ~ \tau о \mu \varepsilon ́ \alpha ~ \tau \eta \varsigma ~ X \eta \mu \varepsilon i \alpha \varsigma ~ m . v . ~ \dot{\alpha} \rho \chi \downarrow \sigma \alpha \nu \alpha \pi \dot{\alpha}$


 $\mu \varepsilon \tau \alpha \varphi о \rho \alpha ́ \alpha \pi o ́ ~ \tau о ~ \varepsilon ́ v \alpha ~ \mu \varepsilon \tau \alpha \lambda \lambda ı \kappa o ́ ~ к \varepsilon ́ v \tau \rho о ~ \sigma \tau о ~ \alpha ́ \lambda \lambda о . ~$

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|M^{m}, M^{\mathrm{n}}\right| \underset{\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{IT}}}{\mathrm{hv}}\left|\mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{m}+1}, \mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{n}-1}\right| \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$


 $\alpha \pi o ́ \mu \varepsilon ́ \tau \alpha \lambda \lambda o ~ \sigma \varepsilon \mu \varepsilon ́ \tau \alpha \lambda \lambda o$ (M.M.C.T) $\delta i v o v \tau \alpha \iota ~ \sigma \tau o v ~ \pi i v \alpha \kappa \alpha ~ I I I . ~$

## MINAKAE III



| ミúиплоко | Ref. | $\mathrm{v}_{\text {IT }}$ | $\Delta_{\pi \varepsilon \iota \rho .}$ | $\Delta_{\text {®ewp. }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\left(\mathrm{NH}_{3}\right)_{5} \mathrm{Ru}-\mathrm{pyz}-\mathrm{Ru}\left(\mathrm{NH}_{3}\right)_{5}^{5+}$ | 24-52 | 6370 | 1500 | 3840 |
| $\left(\mathrm{NH}_{3}\right)_{5} \mathrm{Ru}-4,4^{4} \sim$ bipy $-\mathrm{Ru}\left(\mathrm{NH}_{3}\right)_{5}^{5+}$ | 45-50 | 9700 | 5200 | 4730 |
| $\left(\mathrm{NH}_{3}\right)_{5} \mathrm{Ru}-\mathrm{pyz}-\mathrm{RuCl}(\mathrm{bipy})_{2}^{4+}$ | 49 | 10400 | 5800 | 4900 |
| (bipy) ${ }_{2} \mathrm{ClRu}$-pyz-RuCl ${ }^{\text {(bipy }}{ }^{3+}$ | 37 | 7700 | 4900 | 4220 |
| $\left(\mathrm{NH}_{3}\right)_{5} \mathrm{Ru}-\mathrm{NC}-\mathrm{CN}-\mathrm{Ru}\left(\mathrm{NH}_{3}\right)_{5}^{5+}$ | 53 | 7000 | 1610 | 4020 |
| $(\text { bipy })_{2} \mathrm{Mn}^{\prime} \mathrm{V}_{0}^{0} \backslash_{\mathrm{Mn}(\text { bipy })_{2}^{3+}}$ | 17 | 12000 | 4600 | 5260 |
| (CN) ${ }_{5} \mathrm{Fe}-\mathrm{pyz}-\mathrm{Fe}(\mathrm{CN})_{5}^{5-}$ | 16 | 8300 | 4800 | 4400 |
|  | 51 | 7700 | 5100 | 4220 |
| $\left(\mathrm{NH}_{3}\right)_{5} \mathrm{Ru}-\mathrm{NC}-\mathrm{Fe}(\mathrm{CN})_{5}^{-}$ | 51 | 10400 | 4600 | 4900 |
| $\left(\mathrm{NH}_{3}\right)_{5} \mathrm{Ru}-\mathrm{NC}-\mathrm{Os}(\mathrm{CN})_{5}^{-}$ | 51 | 12600 | 6500 | 5400 |



 тعivel o Hush ${ }^{(7)}$.
 $\alpha v \tau o ́, \gamma 1 \alpha$ ह́v $\alpha$ $\sigma \nu \mu \varepsilon \tau \rho ı к o ́ ~ \sigma v ́ \sigma \tau \eta \mu \alpha^{(7)} \mu \varepsilon \alpha \sigma \theta \varepsilon v \eta \quad \alpha \lambda \lambda \eta \lambda \varepsilon \pi i \delta \rho \alpha \sigma \eta \tau \omega \nu \mu \varepsilon \tau \alpha \lambda \lambda ı \kappa \omega ́ v$ $\kappa \varepsilon ́ v \tau \rho \omega \nu$ ( $\tau \dot{\alpha} \xi ̧ \eta$ II к к $\alpha \dot{\alpha}$ Day).







 $\kappa \alpha ́) ~ \kappa \alpha \tau \alpha ́ \sigma \tau \alpha \sigma \eta$.
 тро $\bar{\eta}$ тou $\left[\mathrm{M}^{2}, \mathrm{M}^{3}\right] \sigma \varepsilon\left|\mathrm{M}^{3}, \mathrm{M}^{2}\right|$ عival $\eta$ Eth.



$$
\begin{equation*}
\text { Eth }=\frac{1}{4} \text { Eop } \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$



 $\tau \eta v$ Eop.

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{Ein} \simeq \operatorname{Eop} \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$





$$
\begin{equation*}
\text { Eop }=\operatorname{Ein}+\text { Eout } \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$




$$
\begin{equation*}
\text { Eout }=\mathrm{e}^{2}\left(\frac{1}{2 \mathrm{a}_{1}}+\frac{1}{2 \mathrm{a}_{2}}-\frac{1}{\mathrm{~d}}\right) \quad\left(\frac{1}{\mathrm{n}^{2}}-\frac{1}{\mathrm{D}}\right) \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$







 $\tau \alpha \iota \pi \alpha \rho \alpha \kappa \alpha ́ \tau \omega)$.
 عи́pos тоия ${ }^{(6-7-9)}$ ( $\pi$ ivaкац III).
 Franck-Condon $\mu \varepsilon \tau \eta \sigma \chi \varepsilon \in \sigma \eta$

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Delta(\mathrm{T})=\Delta(\mathrm{O})\left|\operatorname{Coth} \frac{\mathrm{hv}}{2 \mathrm{KT}}\right|^{1 / 2} \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$



 $\tau \eta \nu \alpha \pi \lambda \dot{\eta} \sigma \chi \varepsilon ́ \sigma \eta:$

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{I} . \mathrm{T}}=\frac{\Delta^{2}}{2310} \quad \mu \varepsilon|\mathrm{hv} \ll \mathrm{KT}| \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$


 ро甲ท́бєшऽ каı то аvтiӨєто.


 Pyr - $\left.\mathrm{Fe}(\mathrm{CN})_{5}\right|^{5-(1 \mathrm{II})}$.


 Souéva.



 $\eta \lambda \varepsilon \kappa \tau \rho o$ víou $^{(13,14)}$.


 tov Hush ${ }^{(7)}$.

$$
\begin{equation*}
\alpha^{2}=\frac{4.24 \times 10^{-4} \mathrm{E}_{\max } \cdot \Delta}{\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{I} . \mathrm{T}} \mathrm{~d}^{2}} \tag{9}
\end{equation*}
$$



 $\mu \varepsilon ́ \varsigma \mu \varepsilon \tau \alpha \xi \dot{v} 0,01 \kappa \alpha 1 \quad 0,1$.

To $\alpha \pi \lambda o ́ ~ \delta \dot{\alpha} \gamma \rho \alpha \mu \mu \alpha$ тov Hush ( $\sigma \chi \dot{\eta} \mu \alpha$ 1) $\mu \varepsilon \tau \alpha \tau \rho \alpha ́ \pi \eta \kappa \varepsilon \gamma ı \alpha$ va $\varepsilon \varphi \alpha \rho \mu о \sigma \theta \dot{\eta}$ к $\alpha \iota ~ \sigma \varepsilon$

 тo $\mathrm{kT} / \mathrm{hv}$.







1. $\Delta \varphi \varepsilon \rho \dot{\eta} \sigma \dot{\mu} \mu \pi \lambda$ ок $\alpha$ ó $\pi \omega \varsigma$ to to $v$ tov Greutz-Taube.
2. Еvต்бєıऽ $\pi о \lambda \nu \mu \varepsilon \rho \varepsilon i \varsigma ~ о ́ \pi \omega \varsigma ~ \tau о ~ П \rho \omega \sigma \sigma เ к о ́ ~ \mu \pi \lambda \varepsilon . ~$
 $\chi \circ v v \mu \varepsilon \lambda \varepsilon \tau \eta \theta \dot{\eta} \pi \varepsilon \rho \iota \sigma \sigma o ́ \tau \varepsilon \rho \circ$ $\sigma \varepsilon \delta \dot{\alpha} \lambda \nu \mu \alpha^{(25)}$.
 $\sigma \eta \kappa \alpha \imath \sigma \varepsilon \delta \iota \alpha ́ \lambda \nu \mu \alpha \kappa \alpha \iota$

$\Sigma \tau \eta \nu \mu \varepsilon \lambda \dot{\varepsilon} \tau \eta \tau \omega \nu \alpha \nu \tau \iota \delta \rho \alpha \dot{\eta} \varepsilon \omega \nu \mu \varepsilon \tau \alpha \varphi \circ \rho \alpha ́ \varsigma ~ \eta \lambda \varepsilon \kappa \tau \rho \circ v i o v \quad \chi \rho \eta \sigma \mu \rho \pi \sigma$ ท́ $\theta \eta \kappa \alpha \nu \omega \varsigma$ $\tau \dot{\rho} \alpha$ кирí $\omega$ о о $\tau \rho \varepsilon เ \varsigma ~ к \alpha \tau \eta \gamma о р і ́ \varepsilon \varsigma . ~$

To tóv Creudz-Taube $\left[\left(\mathrm{H}_{3} \mathrm{~N}\right)_{5} \mathrm{Ru}-\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{O}}^{\mathrm{O}} \mathrm{N}-\mathrm{Ru}\left(\mathrm{NH}_{3}\right)_{5}\right]^{5+} \alpha \pi о \tau \varepsilon \lambda \varepsilon i \quad \tau \eta \nu \alpha \varphi \varepsilon-$
 $\pi \varepsilon \rho \iota \gamma \rho \alpha \varphi \varepsilon i^{(24)}$.
 ol:


$\left(\mathrm{NH}_{3}\right)_{5} \mathrm{Ru}(\mathrm{II}, \mathrm{III})^{15},\left(\mathrm{NH}_{3}\right)_{5} \mathrm{O}_{5}(\mathrm{II}, \mathrm{III})^{15},(\mathrm{CN})_{5} \mathrm{Fe}(\mathrm{II}, \mathrm{III})^{16}$ (bipy) ${ }_{2} \mathrm{Mn}\left(\right.$ III, IV) ${ }^{17}$, (bipy) ${ }_{2} \mathrm{CIRu}$ (II, III) ${ }^{18}$.
 $\pi \circ \cup \quad \alpha \nu \alpha \varphi \dot{\rho} \rho \alpha \mu \varepsilon$.





 $\pi i \alpha \varsigma$

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{M}_{(\mathrm{III})}-\mathrm{L}_{\beta}-\mathrm{M}_{(\mathrm{III})}+\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{II}}-\mathrm{L}_{\beta}-\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{II}} \leftrightarrows 2 \mathrm{M}_{(\mathrm{III})}-\mathrm{L}_{\beta}-\mathrm{M}_{(\mathrm{II})} \tag{10}
\end{equation*}
$$

$\pi о \cup \sigma \cup ́ v \tau о \mu \alpha \mu \pi о \rho \varepsilon i ́ v \alpha \quad \gamma \rho \alpha \varphi \varepsilon i:$

$$
\begin{equation*}
|3,3|+|2,2| \stackrel{\mathrm{kc}}{\rightleftarrows} 2|2,3| \tag{11}
\end{equation*}
$$


 $\gamma \omega \gamma \eta)^{\prime}$ :

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
|3,3|+\mathrm{e}^{-} \rightarrow|2,3| & \mathrm{E}_{1} \\
|2,3|+\mathrm{e}^{-} \rightarrow|2,2| & \mathrm{E}_{2}
\end{array}
$$

$\mu \varepsilon \kappa \cup \kappa \lambda ı \kappa \eta ์ ~ \beta о \lambda \tau \alpha \mu \varepsilon \tau \rho i \alpha$.

 (m.v.) $\mu \kappa \tau \tau 0 \leq \dot{\sigma}^{\sigma} \theta \dot{\varepsilon} v o u s$.
 $\mu \pi \lambda \varepsilon » \mathrm{Fe}_{4}\left|\mathrm{Fe}(\mathrm{CN})_{6}\right|_{3} \mathrm{XH}_{2} \mathrm{O}$. X $\alpha \rho \alpha \kappa \tau \eta \rho \iota \tau \iota \kappa \alpha ́ ~ \lambda \varepsilon ́ \gamma \varepsilon \tau \alpha \iota$, ó $\tau \iota \delta \varepsilon v$ vла́ $\rho \chi \varepsilon \iota ~ \sigma \cup ́ \mu \pi \lambda о к о$





 $\mathrm{Fe}^{11}$ ( $\Sigma \chi \eta \dot{\eta} \mu \alpha$ ) .




 $\mathrm{Fe}(\mathrm{III}) \mathrm{N}_{4.5}-\mathrm{O}_{1.5}{ }^{(20)}$.




 $\kappa \alpha \tau \alpha ́ \sigma \tau \alpha \sigma \eta$ סivéal $\alpha \pi o ́ ~ \tau \eta v ~ \sigma u v \alpha ́ \rho \tau \eta \sigma \eta:$

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Psi_{\mathrm{G}}=\left(1-\alpha^{2}\right)^{1 / 2} \Psi_{0}+\alpha \Psi_{1} \quad \dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \tau \omega \quad \Psi_{0}=\left|\mathrm{C}^{6}, \mathrm{~N}^{30}\right| \tag{12}
\end{equation*}
$$

 ( $\sigma \chi \eta \dot{\mu} \mu$ 5).

 $\kappa \alpha \tau \alpha ́ \sigma \tau \alpha \sigma \eta \Psi_{\mathrm{G}}=\left(1-\alpha^{2}\right)^{1 / 2} \Psi_{0}+\alpha \Psi_{1} \pi \rho о \kappa \dot{\pi} \tau \varepsilon \varepsilon \alpha \pi o ́ \mu i \xi \eta \eta \tau \omega \nu \Psi_{0} \kappa \alpha ı \Psi_{1} . \mathrm{H} \tau \alpha \iota v i ́ \alpha$ офві $\lambda \varepsilon \tau \alpha \iota \sigma \tau \eta \nu \varepsilon \pi \iota \tau \rho \varepsilon \pi \tau \eta \dot{\mu} \mu \tau \alpha \dot{\alpha} \pi \tau \omega \sigma \eta$

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Psi_{\mathrm{G}}\left(\mathrm{~A}_{\mathrm{lg}}\right) \rightarrow \Psi_{\mathrm{i}}\left(\mathrm{~T}_{\mathrm{iu}}\right) \tag{13}
\end{equation*}
$$

ó $\pi о \cup \eta \Psi_{i} \pi \rho о \kappa v ́ \pi \tau \varepsilon \tau ~ \alpha \pi o ́ ~ \mu i \xi \eta ~ \tau \eta \varsigma ~ \Psi_{0} \mu \varepsilon \kappa \alpha \tau \alpha ́ \sigma \tau \alpha \sigma \eta \Psi_{i} \sigma v \mu \mu \varepsilon \tau \rho i \alpha \varsigma \mathrm{~T}_{\mathrm{lu}}$.










$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{Eth}=\frac{\text { Eop }^{2}}{4(\text { Eop }- \text { Eo })} \tag{14}
\end{equation*}
$$


Н в $\xi \alpha \gamma \omega \gamma \eta \eta^{\tau} \eta \varsigma ~ \sigma \chi \varepsilon ́ \sigma \varepsilon \omega \varsigma ~ \delta i v \varepsilon \tau \alpha l ~ \pi \alpha \rho \alpha к \alpha ́ \tau \omega . ~$

 $\delta \dot{\alpha} \tau \omega \sigma \eta$. Avтó $\sigma \cup \mu \beta \alpha i v \varepsilon \iota ~ \kappa \alpha \iota ~ \sigma \tau \eta \mu \varepsilon \lambda \varepsilon ́ \tau \eta ~ \tau \eta \varsigma ~ \alpha \gamma \omega \gamma \mu o ́ \tau \eta \tau \alpha \varsigma ~ \tau \omega \nu ~ \sigma \tau \varepsilon \rho \varepsilon \dot{\omega} \nu \chi \lambda \omega \rho о \varepsilon v \omega ́-$ $\sigma \varepsilon \omega v \mu$ ıктои́ $\sigma \theta \dot{\varepsilon} v o \cup \varsigma^{(6)}$.

Н $\varepsilon \xi \mathfrak{i} i \sigma \omega \sigma \eta$ (7) $\gamma \iota \alpha \tau \eta \nu \varepsilon \pi i \delta \rho \alpha \sigma \eta \tau \eta \varsigma ~ \theta \varepsilon \rho \mu о к \rho \alpha \sigma i \alpha \varsigma \sigma \tau \eta \nu \tau \mu \eta \dot{\eta} \tau о \nu \Delta$ ( $\eta \mu \iota \varepsilon \dot{\rho} \rho о \varsigma)$,







## 

 $\tau \iota \kappa \eta ் ~ \beta \alpha ́ \sigma \eta ~ \omega \varsigma ~ \varepsilon \xi ŋ ் \varsigma: ~$





 $\kappa \cup ́ \mu \alpha \tau \sigma \varsigma)^{(27)}$.
 qov Hush ${ }^{(7)}$.

Мє к $\alpha \tau \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \eta \lambda \varepsilon \varsigma ~ \pi \alpha \rho \alpha \delta о \chi \varepsilon ́ \varsigma ~ \kappa \alpha ı ~ \alpha \pi \lambda о \pi о ı \eta ́ \sigma \varepsilon ı \varsigma ~ \beta \alpha ́ \sigma \varepsilon є ~ \tau \eta \zeta ~ \theta \varepsilon \omega \rho i \alpha \varsigma ~ \tau о ט ~ H u s h ~ к \alpha \tau \alpha-~$ $\lambda \dot{\eta} \gamma о \cup \mu \varepsilon$ бтıৎ $\sigma \chi \varepsilon ́ \sigma \varepsilon ⿺ \varsigma$

$$
\begin{gather*}
\mathrm{E}_{\text {th }}^{*}=\left[\mathrm{E}+\frac{1}{2} \omega^{2}\left(\Delta_{1}^{2}+\Delta_{2}^{2}\right)\right]^{2}\left[2 \omega^{2}\left(\Delta_{1}^{2}+\Delta_{2}^{2}\right)\right]  \tag{15}\\
\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{op}}=\mathrm{h} v_{\max }=\mathrm{E}_{0}+\frac{1}{2} \omega^{2}\left(\Delta_{1}^{2}+\Delta_{2}^{2}\right) \tag{16}
\end{gather*}
$$




 $\tau \alpha$ о́ ó 1 :

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{th}}=\left\{\frac{\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{op}}^{2}}{4} /\left(\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{op}}-\mathrm{E}_{0}\right)\right\} \tag{17}
\end{equation*}
$$


 чора́ $\varepsilon \vee о ́ \varsigma ~ \eta \lambda \varepsilon \kappa \tau \rho o v i ́ o v ~ o ́ \pi \omega \varsigma ~ \pi . \chi . ~ \sigma \tau о ~ \sigma ט ் \sigma \tau \eta \mu \alpha ~$

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{Fe}^{2+}+\mathrm{Fe}^{3+} \rightarrow \mathrm{Fe}^{3+}+\mathrm{Fe}^{2+} \tag{18}
\end{equation*}
$$




$$
\begin{gather*}
\mathrm{Eop}=\omega^{2} \Delta^{2}  \tag{19}\\
\mathrm{E}^{*} \mathrm{th}=\frac{1}{4} \omega^{2} \Delta^{2} \tag{20}
\end{gather*}
$$



$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{Eop}=4 \mathrm{E} \text { th } \tag{21}
\end{equation*}
$$



 $\neq 0$ ката入ท่ $\gamma о \cup \mu \varepsilon$ бтוऽ $\sigma \chi \varepsilon ́ \sigma \varepsilon ו \varsigma$

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{th}}^{*}=\frac{1}{4} \omega^{2} \Delta^{2}+\frac{1}{2} \text { Eo } \tag{22}
\end{equation*}
$$

$\kappa \alpha 1$

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{Eop}=4 \mathrm{E} \text { th }-\mathrm{Eo} \tag{23}
\end{equation*}
$$











$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{exp}}^{*}=\mathrm{E}_{1}^{\mathrm{t}}-\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{i}}^{\mathrm{i}}=\mathrm{p} \Delta^{\mathrm{t}} \mathrm{E}+{ }^{\mathrm{i}} \Delta^{\mathrm{p}} \mathrm{E} \tag{25}
\end{equation*}
$$





$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{E}^{*} \mathrm{~h}=\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{exp}}^{*}-{ }^{\mathrm{i}} \mathrm{\Delta}^{\mathrm{p}} \mathrm{E} \tag{26}
\end{equation*}
$$











$$
\begin{equation*}
\text { Eop }=\frac{1}{8 \pi}\left(\frac{1}{K o}-\frac{1}{K}\right) \int\left(E_{k^{\prime \prime}}-E_{k^{\prime}}\right)^{2} d_{\mathrm{E}}+E O \tag{27}
\end{equation*}
$$





$$
\begin{equation*}
E_{t h}^{*}=\frac{E o+\left[\frac{1}{8 \pi}\left(\frac{1}{K o}-\frac{1}{K}\right) \int\left(\dot{E}_{k^{\prime \prime}}-E_{k^{\prime}}\right)^{2} d_{r}\right]^{2}}{\frac{1}{2 \pi}\left(\frac{1}{K o}-\frac{1}{K}\right) \int\left(E_{k^{\prime \prime}}-E_{k^{\prime}}\right)^{2} d_{r}} \tag{28}
\end{equation*}
$$

 $4 E_{t h}^{*}$.

 коט́ ( $\varphi$ aıvó $\mu \varepsilon$ vo $\sigma \mathfrak{\eta} \rho \alpha \gamma \gamma \circ \varsigma)$.

Eí $\alpha \mu \varepsilon$ доıло́v óтı oı $\alpha v \tau \iota \delta \rho \alpha ́ \sigma \varepsilon ı \varsigma ~ \mu \varepsilon \tau \alpha \varphi о р \alpha ́ \varsigma ~ \eta \lambda \varepsilon к \tau \rho о v i ́ \omega v ~ к \alpha ı ~ o ı ~ \varphi \alpha \sigma \mu \alpha \tau о \sigma к о \pi ı-~$

 $\tau \omega \nu \quad \theta \varepsilon \omega \rho \stackrel{\omega}{ } \nu$.

##  $\mu \varepsilon \lambda \varepsilon ́ \tau \eta ~ \tau \eta \varsigma ~ \mu \varepsilon \tau \alpha \varphi о \rho \alpha ́ \varrho ~ \eta \lambda \varepsilon к \tau \rho о v i ́ o v . ~$



 $\sigma \cup ́ \mu \pi \lambda о \kappa \alpha \dot{\circ} \pi \omega \varsigma^{(27,28)}$

$$
\left[\left(\mathrm{NH}_{3}\right)_{5} \mathrm{Co}^{\mathrm{III}}-\mathrm{N}^{\bigcirc} \bigcirc-\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{Ru}^{\mathrm{II}}\left(\mathrm{NH}_{3}\right)_{5}\right]^{5+}
$$



$$
\left[\mathrm{Co}^{\mathrm{III}}\left(\mathrm{NH}_{3}\right)_{6}, \mathrm{Fe}^{\mathrm{II}}(\mathrm{CN})_{6}\right]
$$




$\left[\mathrm{Ru}^{\mathrm{II}}\left(\mathrm{NH}_{3}\right)_{5} \mathrm{Py}^{2+}+\left[\mathrm{Ru}^{\mathrm{III}}\left(\mathrm{NH}_{3}\right)_{5} \mathrm{Py}\right]^{3+} \xlongequal{\mathrm{K}}\left[\mathrm{Ru}^{\mathrm{II}}\left(\mathrm{NH}_{3}\right)_{5} \mathrm{Py}, \mathrm{Ru}^{\mathrm{III}}\left(\mathrm{NH}_{3}\right)_{5} \mathrm{Py}\right]^{5+}\right.$ . $ү р \eta ์ \gamma о \rho \eta$
$\left[\mathrm{Ru}^{\mathrm{II}}\left(\mathrm{NH}_{3}\right)_{5} \mathrm{Py}, \mathrm{Ru}^{\text {III }}\left(\mathrm{NH}_{3}\right)_{5} \mathrm{Py}\right]^{5+} \xrightarrow{\mathrm{ket}}\left[\mathrm{Ru}^{\text {III }}\left(\mathrm{NH}_{3}\right)_{5} \mathrm{Py}, \mathrm{Ru}^{\text {II }}\left(\mathrm{NH}_{3}\right)_{5} \mathrm{Py}\right]^{5+}$ $\alpha \rho \gamma \dot{\eta}$
$\left[\mathrm{Ru}^{\mathrm{III}}\left(\mathrm{NH}_{3}\right)_{5} \mathrm{Py}, \mathrm{Ru}^{\mathrm{II}}\left(\mathrm{NH}_{3}\right)_{5} \mathrm{Py}^{5+} \rightarrow \quad\left[\mathrm{Ru}^{\mathrm{III}}\left(\mathrm{NH}_{3}\right)_{5} \mathrm{Py}\right]^{3+}+\left[\mathrm{Ru}^{\mathrm{II}}\left(\mathrm{NH}_{3}\right)_{5} \mathrm{Py}\right]^{2+}\right.$,
$\gamma \mathrm{\rho} \boldsymbol{\eta} \gamma \mathrm{o} \mathrm{\rho} \mathrm{\eta} \quad$ (31)
 $\tau о \varsigma \gamma 1 \alpha \tau \eta \mu \varepsilon \tau \alpha \varphi о \rho \alpha$ тоט $\eta \lambda \varepsilon \kappa \tau \rho о$ viou.



## IIINAKAE IV


(IV) ${ }^{(9)}$.

| Súumioka | $\triangle$ cadútns | $V_{C T / 10 \mathrm{~cm}^{3}-1}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{U}(\mathrm{V})-\mathrm{U}(\mathrm{VI})$ | $0.1 \mathrm{MHClO}_{4}$ | 13.6 |
| Ti(III)-Ti(IV) | 12 MHCT | 14.9,20.1 |
| Ti(III)-Ti(IV) | . $20 \% \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$ | 21.2 |
| ( NC$)_{6} \mathrm{~V}$ (III) $\mathrm{OHV}(\mathrm{III})(\mathrm{CN})_{5}-$ | $\mathrm{CN}^{-}(\mathrm{aq})$ | 17.0 |
| $\mathrm{Fe}(\mathrm{II})-\mathrm{Fe}(\mathrm{III})$ | 12 MHCl | Ca.12.5-18 |
| $\mathrm{Cu}(\mathrm{I})-\mathrm{Cu}(\mathrm{II})$ | 10 MHCl | Ca. 17 |
| $\mathrm{Cu}(\mathrm{I})-\mathrm{Cu}(\mathrm{II})$ | $\mathrm{CH}_{3}$ OH, $\mathrm{OAc}^{-}$ | 11.1 |
| $\mathrm{Sn}(\mathrm{II})-\mathrm{Sn}(\mathrm{IV})$. | 12 MHCl | Ca. 25-30 |
| Sb(III)-Sb(V) | HCl | Ca. 20 |
| Sn (II)-U(IV) | 6 MHCl | $>24$ |
| $\mathrm{Cl}_{5} \mathrm{~W}$ (III) $\mathrm{OW}(\mathrm{V}) \mathrm{Cl}_{5}^{4-}$ | 12 MHCl | 19.5 |
| $\mathrm{Cu}(\mathrm{I})-\mathrm{Cu}(\mathrm{II})$ | $\mathrm{NH}_{3}(\mathrm{aq})$ |  |
| $\mathrm{Fe}(\mathrm{CN})_{6}{ }^{4-} \mathrm{Fe}(\mathrm{CN})_{6}^{3-}$ | aq (? ) | ठEv $\alpha \lambda \lambda \cap \lambda E \pi L \delta \rho o u v ~$ |

## MINAKAE V

 $\sigma$ ह́vouc.

| इи́иплока | Aladútns | $\begin{gathered} \Delta \mathrm{G}_{\mathrm{CT}} \\ \text { [Kcal mole } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (phen) ${ }_{2} \mathrm{~V}$ (II) . $\mathrm{OH} . \mathrm{V}$ ( III $)$ (phen) ${ }_{2}^{4+}$ | $\mathrm{SO}_{4}^{2-}(\mathrm{aq})$ | - |
| (phen) $2^{2} \mathrm{Mn}$ ( IIII) (0) ${ }_{2} \mathrm{Mh}$ ( IV ) (phen ${ }^{\frac{3}{2}}$ | $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}$ | - |
| $(\mathrm{NC}) 4 \mathrm{Fe}(\mathrm{II}) \mathrm{CN}_{\mathrm{NC}} \mathrm{Fe}(\mathrm{III})(\mathrm{CN})_{4}^{5-}$ | aq | 22.2 |
| $\left(\mathrm{C}_{5} \mathrm{H}_{5}\right) \mathrm{Fe}(\mathrm{II})\left(\mathrm{C}_{5} \mathrm{H}_{4}-\mathrm{C}_{5} \mathrm{H}_{4}\right) \mathrm{Fe}(\mathrm{III})\left(\mathrm{C}_{5} \mathrm{H}_{5}\right)^{+}$ | $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}$ | 15.0 |
| $\mathrm{Fe}(\mathrm{II})\left(\mathrm{C}_{5} \mathrm{H}_{4}-\mathrm{C}_{5} \mathrm{H}_{4}\right)_{2} \mathrm{Fe}(\mathrm{III})^{+}$ | $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}$ | 18.5, 25.1 |
| $\left(\mathrm{C}_{5} \mathrm{H}_{5}\right) \mathrm{Fe}(\mathrm{II}) \mathrm{C}_{5} \mathrm{H}_{4} \mathrm{C}=\mathrm{CC}_{5} \mathrm{H}_{4} \mathrm{Fe}(\mathrm{III})\left(\mathrm{C}_{5} \mathrm{H}_{5}\right)^{+}$ | $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{Cl}$ | 18.3 |
| $\mathrm{Fe}(\mathrm{II})\left(\mathrm{C}_{5} \mathrm{H}_{4}-\mathrm{CH}_{2}-\mathrm{C}_{5} \mathrm{H}_{4}\right)_{2} \mathrm{Fe}(\mathrm{III})^{+}$ | $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}$ | 38.0 |
|  | $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~N}_{5} \mathrm{NO}_{2}$ | 20.3, 24, 3 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{2} \mathrm{CO}(\mathrm{I})\left(\mathrm{Ph}_{2} \mathrm{PCH}: \mathrm{CHPPh}_{2}\right) \mathrm{Co}(\mathrm{II}) \mathrm{L}^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ | 19.6 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{2} \mathrm{Co}$ (I) $\left.\mathrm{Ph}_{2} \mathrm{PCHEHPPh} 2\right) \mathrm{Co}$ (II) $\mathrm{L}_{2}{ }^{-}$ | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ | 21.0 |
| $\left(\mathrm{H}_{3} \mathrm{~N}\right)_{5 R \mathrm{Ru}}(\mathrm{II}) \mathrm{NC.CNRu}(\mathrm{III})\left(\mathrm{NH}_{3}\right)_{5}^{5+}$ |  | 20.0 |
|  | $\mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ | 19.5 |
|  | $\mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ | 17.3 |
| $\mathrm{L}\left(\mathrm{H}_{3} \mathrm{~N}\right) 4 \mathrm{Ru}(\mathrm{II})(\mathrm{pyz}) \mathrm{Ru}(\mathrm{III})\left(\mathrm{NH}_{3}\right)_{4} \mathrm{~L}^{5+}$ | $\mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ | 17.3 |
| (bip) ( $\left.\mathrm{H}_{3} \mathrm{~N}\right)_{3} \mathrm{Ru}(\mathrm{II})(\mathrm{pyz}) \mathrm{Ru}(\mathrm{III})\left(\mathrm{NH}_{3}\right)_{3} \mathrm{bip}^{5}{ }^{5+}$ | + $\mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ | 16.6 |
| (bip)2ClRu II) (pyz)Ru(III)Cl(bip) ${ }_{2}^{3+}$ | - | 22.6 |
| $(\mathrm{H} N)_{5} \mathrm{Ru}(\mathrm{II})(\mathrm{py}-\mathrm{py}) \mathrm{Ru}(\mathrm{III})\left(\mathrm{NH}_{3}\right)_{5}{ }^{5+}$ | $\mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ | 27.5 |

ミúvtouevorels: bip=2:2`bipyridyl; phen= :10-phenanthroline; py=pyridine;
py-py $=4: 4^{-}$-bipyridyi;pyz $=$pyrazine.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{L}^{-}=\mathrm{S}\left(\mathrm{CF}_{3}\right) \mathrm{C}: \mathrm{C}\left(\mathrm{CF}_{3}\right) \mathrm{S}^{2-} \\
& \mathrm{L}_{2}=\mathrm{S}\left(\mathrm{CH}_{3}\right) \mathrm{C}: \mathrm{C}\left(\mathrm{CH}_{3}\right) \mathrm{S}^{2-} \\
& \mathrm{L}=\mathrm{CONH}_{2}
\end{aligned}
$$



 $\chi \eta \mu \kappa \kappa \dot{\alpha}$ ч $\alpha ı$ о́ $\mu \varepsilon v \alpha v \alpha \pi \varepsilon \rho ı \pi \lambda \varepsilon ́ \kappa о \nu \nu \tau \eta \nu \kappa \alpha \tau \alpha ́ \sigma \tau \alpha \sigma \eta^{(6,8)}$.



 $\pi \rho о ́ \tau v \pi \alpha$ عvঠıа $\mu \varepsilon ́ \sigma \omega v$ $\sigma \tau \iota \varsigma ~ \alpha \nu \tau \iota \delta \rho \alpha ́ \sigma \varepsilon \iota \varsigma ~ \mu \varepsilon \tau \alpha \varphi о \rho \alpha ́ \varsigma ~ \eta \lambda \varepsilon к \tau \rho о v i \omega v . ~$

















 $\mu \varepsilon \theta \alpha v o ่ \lambda \eta \alpha \pi о \chi \rho \omega \mu \alpha \tau i \zeta \varepsilon \tau \alpha 1 \mu \varepsilon \alpha \kappa \varepsilon \tau о \nu \iota \tau \rho i \lambda 1 \circ$.










$\left[\left(\mathrm{C}_{5} \mathrm{H}_{5}\right) \mathrm{Fe}-\left(\mathrm{C}_{5} \mathrm{H}_{4}-\mathrm{C}_{5} \mathrm{H}_{5}\right) \mathrm{Fe}-\left(\mathrm{C}_{5} \mathrm{H}_{5}\right)\right]^{+}$ (biferrocenium)

кOI

$$
\left[\left(\mathrm{NH}_{3}\right)_{5} \mathrm{Ru}^{\mathrm{II}} \bigcirc \bigcirc-\bigcirc \mathrm{NRu}^{\mathrm{III}}\left(\mathrm{NH}_{3}\right)_{5} 5^{5+}\right.
$$




$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{Fe}-\mathrm{C} \equiv \mathrm{C}-\mathrm{Fc}^{+} \frac{\mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{et}}}{\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{a}}} \mathrm{Fc}^{+}-\mathrm{C} \equiv \mathrm{C}-\mathrm{Fc} \tag{32}
\end{equation*}
$$



$$
\begin{equation*}
\left[\left(\mathrm{NH}_{3}\right)_{5} \mathrm{Ru}^{\mathrm{II}} \text { bpyRu III }\left(\mathrm{NH}_{3}\right)_{5}\right]^{5+} \underset{\text { Eth. }}{\text { Ket. }}\left[\left(\mathrm{NH}_{3}\right)_{5} \mathrm{Ru}^{\text {III }} \text { bpyRu } \mathrm{II}^{\mathrm{II}}\left(\mathrm{NH}_{3}\right)_{5}\right]^{5+} \tag{33}
\end{equation*}
$$

 $\sigma \chi \varepsilon ́ \sigma \varepsilon \omega \varsigma ~ \pi o v ~ \delta i ́ v \varepsilon ı ~ \tau \eta v \varepsilon \xi \dot{\alpha} \rho \tau \eta \sigma \eta \tau \eta \varsigma$ Eop $\alpha \pi o ́ ~ \tau о v ~ \delta ı \alpha \lambda \dot{\tau} \tau \eta \varepsilon \xi i ́ \sigma \omega \sigma \eta$ (34). Н $\gamma \rho \alpha \mu \mu 1-$



 ClRu (L) Ru (Cl) (bpy) ${ }^{3+}$ ótov

$\kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \dot{\alpha} \pi р е \varepsilon ் к \tau \alpha \sigma \eta ~ \eta, ~ \mu \varepsilon \lambda \varepsilon ́ \tau \eta ~ \alpha \varphi о \rho \alpha ́ ~ \tau \eta \nu \varepsilon \pi i \delta \rho \alpha \sigma \eta ~ \tau \eta \varsigma ~ d ~ \sigma \tau \eta \nu ~ \mu \varepsilon \tau \alpha \varphi о \rho \dot{\alpha ~} \eta \lambda \varepsilon к \tau \rho о v i \omega \nu$

 $\varepsilon \xi ً \neq \omega \sigma \eta$

$$
\begin{equation*}
\text { Eop }=\left[x_{i}+e^{2}\left(\frac{1}{2 a_{1}}+\frac{1}{2 a_{2}} \frac{1}{\text { Dop }}-\frac{1}{\text { Ds }}\right)\right]-\frac{e^{2}}{d}\left(\frac{1}{\text { Dop }}-\frac{1}{D s}\right) \tag{34}
\end{equation*}
$$





 $\mu \varepsilon \tau \alpha \varphi о \rho \alpha ́ \varsigma ~ \eta \lambda \varepsilon к \tau \rho о v i ́ o v, ~ т о ~ о \pi о i ́ o ~ \sigma \nu v \delta \varepsilon ́ \varepsilon \tau \alpha ı ~ \mu \varepsilon ~ \tau \eta \nu ~ \varepsilon \lambda \alpha \chi ı \tau о \pi о і ́ \eta \sigma \eta ~ \tau \eta \varsigma ~ \sigma ט v \varepsilon ı \sigma \varphi о-~$





 $\pi \rho \nu v \alpha \pi o ́ ~ \tau \eta v \mu \varepsilon \tau \alpha \varphi о \rho \alpha$ тov $\eta \lambda \varepsilon \kappa \tau \rho o v i o v .{ }^{38}$


$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{K}=\frac{4 \pi \mathrm{Nod}^{3}}{3000} \exp -\left[\frac{\mathrm{Z}_{\mathrm{A}} \mathrm{Z}_{\mathrm{B}} \mathrm{e}^{2}}{\mathrm{dDsRT}}\right] \tag{35}
\end{equation*}
$$

 Avogardo. Av oı $\sigma \chi \varepsilon ́ \sigma \varepsilon ı \zeta ~(34) ~ к \alpha ı ~(35) ~ \sigma u v \delta ı \alpha \sigma \tau о ט ́ v ~ \varepsilon \xi \alpha к о \lambda о v \theta \varepsilon i ~ v \alpha ~ \imath \sigma \chi v ̉ \varepsilon ı ~ o ́ \tau ı ~ \varepsilon v \varepsilon \rho-~$
 $\gamma ⿺ \alpha \tau \eta \nu \mu \varepsilon \tau \alpha \varphi \rho \rho \alpha \dot{\alpha}$ тоט $\eta \lambda \varepsilon \kappa \tau \rho o v i o v^{40}$.
$\Sigma \varepsilon \dot{\varepsilon} v \alpha$ бט́ $\mu \pi \lambda$ око о́ $\pi \omega \varsigma$ то

 тov $\eta \lambda \varepsilon \kappa \tau \rho o v i o v . ~ H ~ \alpha v \alpha ́ \mu \varepsilon ı \xi \eta ~ \tau o v ~ \tau \rho о \chi ı к о и ́ ~ d ~ \pi ~ \tau o v ~ \delta ı \sigma \theta \varepsilon v o v ́ s ~ p o v \theta \eta v i o v ~ \mu \varepsilon ~ \pi^{*} \mu$ o$^{-}$
 $\pi \lambda \varepsilon \cup \rho \dot{\alpha}$ тоט $\mathrm{Ru}^{\mathrm{II}}, \alpha v \xi \dot{\alpha} v o v \tau \alpha \varsigma ~ \tau \eta \nu \alpha \lambda \lambda \eta \lambda \varepsilon \pi \iota \kappa \alpha ́ \lambda \cup \psi \eta$. О $\pi \omega \sigma \delta \dot{\eta} \pi о \tau \varepsilon$, $\tau \alpha \iota v i \varepsilon \varsigma$ IT $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha-$




$$
\begin{aligned}
& {\left[\left(\mathrm{NH}_{3}\right)_{5} \mathrm{Ru} \bigcirc \bigcirc \mathrm{CH}_{2}-\mathrm{CH}_{2}-\bigcirc \mathrm{NRu}^{\mathrm{III}}\left(\mathrm{NH}_{3}\right)_{5}\right]^{5+(42)}} \\
& {\left[(\mathrm{bpy})_{2} \mathrm{ClRu}^{\mathrm{II}}\left(\mathrm{Ph}_{2} \mathrm{PCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{PPh}_{2}\right) \mathrm{Ru}^{\mathrm{III}} \mathrm{Cl}(\text { bpy })_{2}\right]^{3+(43)}}
\end{aligned}
$$





$$
\begin{equation*}
\left[\mathrm{Ru}^{\mathrm{III}}\left(\mathrm{NH}_{3}\right)_{5} \mathrm{Py}, \mathrm{Fe}^{\mathrm{II}}(\mathrm{CN})_{6}\right] \xrightarrow{\mathrm{hv}}\left[\mathrm{Ru}^{\mathrm{II}}\left(\mathrm{NH}_{3}\right)_{5} \mathrm{Py}-\mathrm{Fe}^{\mathrm{III}}(\mathrm{CN})_{6}\right] \tag{36}
\end{equation*}
$$





 $\delta \rho \alpha ́ \sigma \varepsilon ⿺ \varsigma ~ \varepsilon \xi \omega \tau \varepsilon \rho \iota \kappa \eta ் \varsigma ~ \sigma \varphi \alpha i \rho \alpha \varsigma$.


 $\sigma \cup v \tau \alpha \dot{\xi} \varepsilon \omega \varsigma^{(44)} \pi . \chi$. $\tau 0 \cup$ тט́tov:

$$
(\text { bpy })_{2} \mathrm{ClRu}^{\mathrm{II}}(\mathrm{~L}) \mathrm{Ru}^{\mathrm{III}} \mathrm{Cl}(\text { bpy })_{2}^{3+}
$$

## 







## miNAKAE VI

 $23^{\circ} \mathrm{C}^{(22)}$.




$$
\begin{equation*}
\left[\mathrm{Ru}(\mathrm{bpy})_{2}(\mathrm{Py}) \mathrm{Cl}\right]^{2+}+1 \mathrm{e} \rightarrow\left[\mathrm{Ru}(\mathrm{bpy})_{2}(\mathrm{Py}) \mathrm{Cl}\right]^{1+} \tag{37}
\end{equation*}
$$

## 

 $\tau \eta \nu \kappa \alpha \tau \alpha v o ́ \eta \sigma \eta \tau \omega v \alpha \nu \tau \iota \delta \rho \alpha ́ \sigma \varepsilon \omega v \mu \varepsilon \tau \alpha \varphi о \rho \alpha ́ \varsigma ~ \eta \lambda \varepsilon \kappa \tau \rho о v i ́ \omega v$ вivaı $\mu \varepsilon \gamma \dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta$. Av $\alpha \dot{\alpha} \tau \alpha$ $\delta \varepsilon$ -
 $\nu \alpha \quad \gamma \iota \alpha$ тıऽ $\sigma \tau \alpha \theta \varepsilon \rho \varepsilon ́ \varsigma ~ \tau \alpha \chi \cup ́ \tau \eta \tau \alpha \varsigma$.














 $\tau \eta \varsigma ~ \tau \alpha ı v i \alpha \varsigma ~ I V ~ \eta ं ~ \varphi \omega \tau o ́ \lambda v \sigma \eta ~ \mu \varepsilon ~ \varphi \omega \varsigma ~ \mu \varepsilon \gamma \alpha \lambda ט ́ \tau \varepsilon \rho \eta \varsigma ~ \varepsilon v \varepsilon ́ \rho \gamma \varepsilon ı \alpha \varsigma ~ \pi о ט ~ \alpha к о \lambda о и \theta \varepsilon i \tau \alpha ı ~ \alpha \pi o ́ ~$










$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{V}}+\mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{III}} \rightarrow \mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{IV}}+\mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{IV}} \tag{39}
\end{equation*}
$$


 $\kappa \eta$ Raman $\sigma u v \tau o v i \sigma \mu o v ́ ~ \sigma \varepsilon ~ \sigma u v \delta v \alpha \sigma \mu o ́ ~ \mu \varepsilon ~ \eta \lambda \varepsilon к \tau р о v ı к \eta ं ~ \varphi \alpha \sigma \mu \alpha \tau о \sigma к о \pi i \alpha, ~ \gamma ı \alpha ~ v \alpha ~ \varepsilon v-~$



## Summary

Mixed-valence complexes and their successful use in the study of electron transfer reactions

This article is a study of the chemistry of mixed-valence complexes with weak interaction between the ionic centres. We describe the chemistry of complexes in which two metal ions can exchange electrons with little loss of energy and examples are given for the successful use of them in the study of electron transfer reactions. Theories of electron transfer have been concerned with predicting the magnitude of the Fränck-Condon barrier, but direct comparisons between theory and experimental data have been possible only to a limited extent. Mixed valence compounds where there is weak electronic coupling between sites, provide perhaps the clearest experimental insight into electron transfer in solution. Also they may provide a nearly complete microscopic description of electron transfer in most chemical systems.

Key words: Mixed-valence complexes, Intervalence band, electronic delocalization, electronic coupling, intramolecular electron transfer, optical electron transfer, thermal electron transfer.
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# SYNTHESIS AND STUDY OF UNSYMMETRICAL PLANAR HALG (N-ALKYLDITHIOCARBAMATO)PHOSPHINE OR ARSINEMETAL (II) COMPLEXES OF NICKEL TRIAD ELEMENTS 
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## Summary

A new series of four-coordinate square-planar dithiocarbamato complexes of nickel triad elements has been synthesised and studied. A possible mechanism for the formation of the unsymmetrical $\left|\mathrm{NiX}(\mathrm{RHdtc})\left(\mathrm{PPh}_{3}\right)\right|$ complexes $(\mathrm{X}=\mathrm{Cl}, \mathrm{Br})$ has also been proposed. The structures of the new compounds are discussed in relation to their spectroscopic and magnetic data. Some structural conclusions are also drawn for the $\left|\mathrm{M}(\mathrm{RHdtc})_{2}\left(\mathrm{AsPh}_{3}\right)\right|$ complexes ( $\mathrm{M}=\mathrm{Pd}$. Pt) on the basis of spectral studies. Furthermore, it was confirmed that the chemical behaviour of these complexes towards iodine is similar to that of the corresponding phosphine adducts.

Keywords: Sulphur chelates. Dithiocarbamates. Adducts.

## Abbreviations

RHdtc ${ }^{-}=\mathrm{N}$-alkyldithiocarbamate anion $\mathrm{DMSO}=$ dimethylsulfoxide THF $=$ tetrahydrofuran

## Introduction

In previous papers the results of the reactions of various tertiary phosphines and aromatic nitrogenous bases (L) with the square-planar $\mid \mathrm{M}(\text { RHdtc })_{2} \mid$ complexes ( $\mathrm{M}=\mathrm{Pd}, \mathrm{Pt} ; \mathrm{R}=\mathrm{Bu}^{\mathrm{t}}, \mathrm{Bz}$ ) have been reported. ${ }^{1,2}$ The salient feature of these reactions was the formation of unsymmetrical four-coordinate square-planar $\left|\mathrm{M}(\mathrm{RHdtc})_{2} \mathrm{~L}\right|$ complexes which exhibit unidentate/bidentate mode of bonding of the dithiocarbamate groups and are converted into the novel N -alkyliminodithiocarbonato complexes (dithiocarbimato complexes) when treated with excess tertiary phospine ${ }^{3}$. It has also been demonstrated that the reactions with iodine of bis ( N -alkyldithiocarbamato) phosphineplatinum (II) and palladium (II) complexes afford in high yields the corresponding $|\mathrm{MI}(\mathrm{RHdtc}) \mathrm{L}|$ complexes. The mechanism of these reactions has been fully investigated by CNDO/2 quantum chemical calculations based on the
location of the LUMOs of unidentate and bidentate N -alkyldithiocarbamato ligands, which are the main factor controlling the nucleophilic substitution reactions under consideration. ${ }^{3}$

Continuing our interest on the chemistry of planar $\mathrm{d}^{8}$ complexes with sulphurcontaining ligands in the presence of Lewis bases, we report in this paper the results concerning the synthesis and study of a new series of $\mid \mathrm{MX}$ (RHdtc)L $\mid$ comple: $\left(\mathrm{M}=\mathrm{Ni}, \mathrm{Pd}, \mathrm{Pt} ; \mathrm{X}=\mathrm{Cl}, \mathrm{Br}, \mathrm{I} ; \mathrm{L}=\mathrm{PPh}_{3}, \mathrm{AsPh}_{3}\right)$. These compounds are thought to be good candidates for the study of deprotonation reactions of N -alkyldithiocarbamato complexes in an attempt to expand further the pure chemistry of Nalkyliminodithiocarbonato ligands. ${ }^{4.5}$

## Results and Discussion

Reaction of the $\left|\mathrm{M}(\mathrm{BzHdtc})_{2}\right|$ complexes $(\mathrm{M}=\mathrm{Pt}$ or Pd$)$ with $\mathrm{AsPh}_{3}$ (1:1 molar ratio) in toluene gave immediate yellow solutions from which compounds of stoicheiometry $\left|\mathrm{M}(\mathrm{BzHdtc})_{2}\left(\mathrm{AsPh}_{3}\right)\right|$ were readily isolated by concentration and precipitation with light petroleum. These complexes are diamagnetic (sharp ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR signals) and non-conducting in dichloromethane.

Like the analogous $\left|\mathrm{M}(\mathrm{RHdtc})_{2}\left(\mathrm{PR}_{3}\right)\right|$ complexes, ${ }^{1,2}$ these $1: 1$ adducts apparently undergo nucleophilic substitution reactions leading to the formation of the corresponding iodo-complexes by replacement of the unidentate N -benzyldithiocarbamato ligand by I-. Possibly, in this reaction dithiocarbamate radicals are formed through an homolytic rupture of M-S bonds which, in succesion, are dimerized into alkylthiuramdisulfides. ${ }^{6}$ This seems likely, because it is well known that the alkylthiuramdisulfides and the corresponding free dithiocarbamate radicals are in equilibrium in solution ${ }^{7}$.

Unfortunately, this method cannot be used to prepare the analogous $\left|\mathrm{NiX}(\mathrm{RHdtc})\left(\mathrm{PR}_{3}^{\prime}\right)\right|$ because of the inability to isolate the corresponding $\mid \mathrm{Ni}(\mathrm{RH}-$ $\mathrm{dtc})_{2}\left(\mathrm{PR}_{3}^{\prime}\right) \mid$ complexes. Presumably, this is a reflection of the high lability of Ni-S compared to $\mathrm{Pt}-\mathrm{S}$ bonds and the fact that dithiocarbamates form stronger bonds to platinum than to nickel ${ }^{8}$. Furthermore, the reactions of halide-bridged dimers $\mid\left[\mathrm{MX}_{2^{-}}\right.$ $\left.\left(\mathrm{PR}_{3}^{\prime}\right)\right]_{2} \mid$ with various alkali-metals dithioacid salts in 1:2 molar ratio in acetone were very inefficient and produced only low yields of the required products even on prolonged refluxing ${ }^{9-12}$. However, an excellent method of synthesising a wide range of these complexes may be represented by the following ligand-exchange reaction:

$$
\left|\mathrm{NiX}_{2}\left(\mathrm{PPh}_{3}\right)_{2}\right|+\left|\mathrm{Ni}(\mathrm{RHdtc})_{2}\right| \rightarrow 2\left|\mathrm{NiX}\left(\mathrm{RHAtc}^{2}\right)\left(\mathrm{PPh}_{3}\right)\right|
$$

where $\mathrm{R}=\mathrm{Me}, \mathrm{Et}, \mathrm{Pr}^{\mathrm{i}}, \mathrm{Bu}^{t}, \mathrm{Ph}, \mathrm{p}-\mathrm{ClPh}, \mathrm{p}-\mathrm{MePh}$ and $\mathrm{p}-\mathrm{MeOPh}$.
It can be suggested that this reaction is as given by the Scheme 1 below, namely dissociation of tetrahedral $\left|\mathrm{NiX}_{2}\left(\mathrm{PPh}_{3}\right)_{2}\right|$ to give compounds of type (I) with local symmetry belonging to $\mathrm{C}_{2 \mathrm{v}}$ point group, ${ }^{13,14}$ followed by the nucleophilic attack of planar $\left|\mathrm{Ni}(\mathrm{RHdtc})_{2}\right|$ complexes by free tertiary phosphine to generate four-coordinate adducts $\left[\mathrm{Ni}(\mathrm{RHdtc})_{2}\left(\mathrm{PPh}_{3}\right)\right]$ with unidentate/bidentate dithio-ligand coordination. Analogous $\mathrm{Pt}(\mathrm{II})$ and $\mathrm{Pd}(\mathrm{II})$ adducts were isolated and their structures were established on the basis of spectroscopic and X-ray crystal structure determination
methods ${ }^{1,2.15}$. Furthermore, the instability of $\mathrm{Ni}(\mathrm{II})$ adducts accounts for the dithiolate dissociation, since the nucleophilic reactivity of phosphine toward M (II) is greater than that of the dithiocarbamate anion ${ }^{16}$. The RHdtc $^{-}$nucleophile reacts further with the intermediate reactive species (I) affording the desired complex (III) and $\mathrm{X}^{-}$ which, in succesion, is cuptured by the electrophile species (II) to give also the unsymmetrical $\left|\mathrm{NiX}(\mathrm{RHdtc})\left(\mathrm{PPh}_{3}\right)\right|$ complexes.


(II)



SCHEME 1
These new Ni (II) complexes were remarkably stable in air either in solution or in solid state. They were soluble in most of the common organic solvents, such as benzene, chloroform, methylene chloride and THF, but were insoluble in diethyl ether, carbon tetrachloride and water.

All the compounds were characterised by elemental analyses (Table I), spectroscopic methods (IR, ${ }^{I}$ H NMR, UV-Vis), magnetic measurements, and in several instances the monomeric nature of the products was established by mass spectroscopy and/or osmometric molecular-weight measurements in chloroform.

TABLE I. Analytical Data for Some $\mathrm{Ni}(\mathrm{II}), \mathrm{Pd}(\mathrm{II})$ and $\mathrm{Pt}(\mathrm{II})$ Dithio-compounds.

| Compound | m.p. ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ) | \%C | \%N | \%H | \% ${ }^{*}$ | M.W. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \| NiCl (EtHdtc) $\left(\mathrm{PPh}_{3}\right) \mid$ | $160-162^{\mathrm{d}^{* *}}$ | 52.68 | 2.89 | 4.43 | 12.15 | 450 |
|  |  | (52.91)*** | (2.93) | (4.41) | (12.32) | (476.3) |
| $\left\|\mathrm{NiBr}(\mathrm{MeHdtc})\left(\mathrm{PPh}_{3}\right)\right\|$ | $121-123^{\text {d }}$ | 47.41 | 2.70 | 3.68 | 11.17 | 489 |
|  |  | (47.36) | (2.76) | (3.74) | (11.58) | (506.7) |
| $\mid \mathrm{NiBr}\left(\mathrm{Pr}^{\mathrm{i}} \mathrm{Hdtc}\right)\left(\mathrm{PPh}_{3}{ }^{\text {j }} \mid\right.$ | 107-109 ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 48.57 | 2.59 | 4.38 | 11.20 | 501 |
|  |  | (49.37) | (2.61) | (4.30) | (10.97) | (534.7) |
| $\left\|\mathrm{NiBr}\left(\mathrm{Bu}{ }^{\text {t }} \mathrm{Hdtc}\right)\left(\mathrm{PPh}_{3}\right)\right\|$ | $132.134^{\text {d }}$ | 50.20 | 2.61 | 4.53 | 10.15 | 512 |
|  |  | (50.29) | (2.55) | (4.58) | (10.69) | (548.7) |
| $\left\|\mathrm{NiBr}(\mathrm{PhHdtc})\left(\mathrm{PPh}_{3}\right)\right\|$ | $113-115^{\text {d }}$ | 52.61 | 2.38 | 3.67 | 10.40 | 550 |
|  |  | (52.74) | (2.46) | (3.69) | (10.32) | (568.7) |
| $\left\|\mathrm{NiBr}(\mathrm{p}-\mathrm{ClPhHdtc})\left(\mathrm{PPh}_{3}\right)\right\|$ | $165-167^{\text {d }}$ | 49.68 | 2.27 | 3.36 | 9.81 | 580 |
|  |  | (49.72) | (2.32) | (3.31) | (9.73) | (603.3) |
| $\left\|\mathrm{NiBr}(\mathrm{p}-\mathrm{MePhHdtc})\left(\mathrm{PPh}_{3}\right)\right\|$ | 171-173 ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 53.60 | 2.38 | 3.91 | 10.17 | 565 |
|  |  | (53.54) | (2.40) | (3.94) | (10.07) | (582.7) |
| $\left\|\mathrm{NiBr}(\mathrm{p}-\mathrm{MeOPhHdtc})\left(\mathrm{PPh}_{3}\right)\right\|$ | $148.150^{\text {d }}$ | 52.01 | 2.41 | 3.83 | 9.63 | 573 |
|  |  | (52.11) | (2.33) | (3.84) | (9.80) | (598.7) |
| $\left\|\mathrm{Pd}(\mathrm{BzHdtc})_{2}\left(\mathrm{AsPh}_{3}\right)\right\|$ | 171-173 ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 52.47 | 3.63 | 4.03 | 13.72 | 750 |
|  |  | (52.58) | (3.61) | (4.02) | (13.60) | (776.5) |
| $\left\|\mathrm{PdI}(\mathrm{BzHdtc})\left(\mathrm{Asph}_{3}\right)\right\|$ | $156-158{ }^{\text {d }}$ | 43.27 | 1.93 | 3.15 | 14.12 | 695 |
|  |  | (43.30) | (1.94) | (3.21) | (14.66) | (721.1) |
| $\left\|\mathrm{Pt}(\mathrm{BzHdtc})_{2}\left(\mathrm{AsPh}_{3}\right)\right\|$ | .193-195 ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 47.05 | 3.18 | 3.52 | 22.85 | 859 |
|  |  | (47.16) | (3.23) | (3.61) | (22.53) | (865.9) |
| $\left\|\mathrm{PtI}(\mathrm{BzHdtc})\left(\mathrm{AsPh}_{3}\right)\right\|$ | 126-128 ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 38.49 | 1.75 | $2.90$ | 23.91 | 792 $(810.5)$ |
|  |  | (38.53) | (1.73) | (2.86) | (24.07) | (810.5) |

${ }^{*} \mathrm{M}=\mathrm{Ni} . \mathrm{Pd} . \mathrm{Pt} .{ }^{* *} \mathrm{~d}=$ decomposition. ${ }^{* * *}$ Values in parentheses are the calculated values.

The IR spectra (Table II) of the $\mid \mathrm{MX}$ (RHdtc)L $\mid$ complexes show one broad band in the $3100-3300 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$ region due to the $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{H}$ stretching frequency ${ }^{17}$. The bidentate bonding mode of the dithio-ligand is established by the position of the band in the $1400-1550 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$ region. This region is associated primarily with the «thioureide" vibration and is attributed to the vibration of the $\mathrm{S}_{2} \mathrm{C} \cdots \mathrm{OH}$ NR bond. An increase in the double-bond character of the $\mathrm{C} \cdot \cdots \mathrm{N}$ bond results in higher frequencies for this vibration ${ }^{18}$. The position of this band is affected by the nature of the metal atom. As a rule, a slight shifting is observed toward lower frequencies from $\mathrm{Pt}(\mathrm{II})$ to $\mathrm{Ni}(\mathrm{II})$ complexes. This is justified by the fact that the charge transfer from the ligand to the metal atom (RHdtc $\rightarrow \mathrm{M}$ ) decreases from platinum to nickel according to their electron accepting ability. The stretching frequency of the $\mathrm{C} \cdots \mathrm{N}$ bond is also affected by the electron releasing ability of the amine group. The basicity of the amines is partly a measure of the inductive effect of their alkyl groups; ${ }^{19}$ thus it follows that the effect of alkyl groups on the electronic structure of the dithiocarbamate complexes is inductive in accordance with the views of Cotton et al ${ }^{20}$. This is, however, contrary to the suggestions of Coucouvanis and Selbin et $\mathrm{a}^{21,22}$ who support the idea that the effect of alkyl groups on the electronic structure of dithiocarbamate complexes is mainly a resonance effect. The band in the region between 950 and $1050 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$ is attributed to the stretching vibration of the $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{S}$ bonds. Though it should be expected, a direct
relationship between the $v(C \cdots N)$ and $v(C \cdots S)$ frequencies is not observed for these complexes ${ }^{22}$. This is because the bands which are attributed to the stretching vibration of $\mathrm{C} \cdots \mathrm{S}$ bonds are due only partly to the vibration of these bonds. However, in the case of $\left|\mathrm{M}(\mathrm{BzHdtc})_{2}\left(\mathrm{AsPh}_{3}\right)\right|$ complexes, the Ugo-Bonati criterion that distinguishes unidentate from bidentate binding by the number of bands in the 950-1050 $\mathrm{cm}^{-1}$ region was shown to be valid and is further supported from the observed splittings of the $v(N-H)$ and $v(C \cdots N)$ bands ${ }^{18,23,24}$. Hence, it can be deduced for these complexes that one of the dithio-ligands acts as a bidentate ligand and the other one as a unidentate. Finally, the M-S stretching frequencies were observed in the 300-400 $\mathrm{cm}^{-1}$ region indicating the coordination of the gem-disulfide ligands.

TABLE II. Relevant IR Frequencies ( $\mathrm{cm}^{-1}$ ) for some $\mathrm{Ni}(\mathrm{II}), \mathrm{Pd}(\mathrm{II})$ and $\mathrm{Pt}(\mathrm{II})$ Dithiocompounds with their Assignments ( KBr discs).

| Compound | $v(\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{H})$ | $v(\mathrm{C} \cdots \mathrm{N})$ | $v(\mathrm{C} \cdots \mathrm{S})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| $\left\|\mathrm{NiCl}(\mathrm{EtHdtc})\left(\mathrm{PPh}_{3}\right)\right\|$ | $3290 \mathrm{~m}, \mathrm{br} *$ | $1520 \mathrm{vs}, \mathrm{br}$ | 960 s |
| $\left\|\mathrm{NiBr}(\mathrm{MeHdtc})\left(\mathrm{PPh}_{3}\right)\right\|$ | $3280 \mathrm{~m}, \mathrm{br}$ | $1510 \mathrm{vs}, \mathrm{br}$ | 972 s |
| $\left\|\mathrm{NiBr}\left(\mathrm{Pr}^{\mathrm{i}} \mathrm{Hdtc}\right)\left(\mathrm{PPh}_{3}\right)\right\|$ | $3200 \mathrm{~m}, \mathrm{br}$ | $1515 \mathrm{vs}, \mathrm{br}$ | 980 s |
| $\mid \mathrm{NiBr}\left(\mathrm{Bu}^{\mathrm{t} H d t c}\right)\left(\mathrm{PPh}_{3} \mid\right.$ | $3230 \mathrm{~m}, \mathrm{br}$ | $1518 \mathrm{vs}, \mathrm{br}$ | 968 s |
| $\left\|\mathrm{NiBr}(\mathrm{PhHdtc})\left(\mathrm{PPh}_{3}\right)\right\|$ | $3195 \mathrm{~m}, \mathrm{br}$ | $1390 \mathrm{vs}, \mathrm{br}$ | 982 s |
| $\left\|\mathrm{Nibr}(\mathrm{p}-\mathrm{ClPhHdtc})\left(\mathrm{PPh}_{3}\right)\right\|$ | $3185 \mathrm{~m}, \mathrm{br}$ | $1388 \mathrm{vs}, \mathrm{br}$ | 1000 m |
| $\left\|\mathrm{NiBr}(\mathrm{p}-\mathrm{MePhHdtc})\left(\mathrm{PPh}_{3}\right)\right\|$ | $3180 \mathrm{~m}, \mathrm{br}$ | $1400 \mathrm{vs}, \mathrm{br}$ | 1005 s |
| $\mid \mathrm{NiBr}(\mathrm{p}-\mathrm{MeOPhHdtc})\left(\mathrm{PPh}_{3}\right)$ | $3185 \mathrm{~m}, \mathrm{br}$ | $1415 \mathrm{vs}, \mathrm{br}$ | 990 m |
| $\mid \operatorname{Pd}(\mathrm{BzHdtc})_{2}\left(\mathrm{AsPh}_{3}\right)$ | 3265 m | $1520 \mathrm{vs}, \mathrm{br}$ | 1008 m |
|  | $3145 \mathrm{~m}, \mathrm{br}$ | 1480 s | 978 w |
| $\left\|\operatorname{PdI}(\mathrm{BzHdtc})\left(\mathrm{AsPh}_{3}\right)\right\|$ | $3180 \mathrm{~m}, \mathrm{br}$ | $1515 \mathrm{vs}, \mathrm{br}$ | 995 m |
| $\left\|\operatorname{Pt}(\mathrm{BzHdtc})_{2}\left(\mathrm{AsPh}_{3}\right)\right\|$ | 3260 m | $1528 \mathrm{vs}, \mathrm{br}$ | 1003 m |
|  | $3140 \mathrm{~m}, \mathrm{br}$ | 1485 s | 982 w |
| $\left\|\operatorname{PtI}(\mathrm{BzHdtc})\left(\mathrm{AsPh}_{3}\right)\right\|$ | $3160 \mathrm{~m}, \mathrm{br}$ | $1525 \mathrm{vs}, \mathrm{br}$ | 998 m |

*vs $=$ very strong. $s=$ strong. $\mathrm{m}=$ medium, $\mathrm{w}=$ weak. $\mathrm{br}=$ broad.
The IR data, the diamagnetic nature of the complexes under investigation and their stoicheiometry allowed us to suggest a square-planar configuration. This structure was further supported by the ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR data (Table III) of the new compounds. Thus, although the ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectra of the bis( N -benzyldithiocarbamato) complexes show one sharp peak for the $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{CH}_{2}$ protons ${ }^{2}$, their corresponding arsine adducts exhibit two broad signals at the $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{CH}_{2}$ proton region, a fact which is consistent with the coexistence of one unidentate and one bidentate dithio-ligand. The line broadening of the $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{CH}_{2}$ proton signals of the $1: 1$ adducts could be explained on the basis of their fluxional behaviour ${ }^{1}$. Such dynamic processes for analogous compounds which interconvert the two kinds of the dithio-ligands have already been observed and studied by low temperature ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectroscopy ${ }^{25}$.

TABLE III. ${ }^{2} \mathrm{H}$ NMR Data for Various $\mathrm{Ni}(\mathrm{II}), \mathrm{Pd}(\mathrm{II})$ and $\mathrm{Pt}(\mathrm{II})$ Dithio-compounds in DMSO-d ${ }_{6}$.

| $\left\|\mathrm{NiCl}(\mathrm{EtHdtc})\left(\mathrm{PPh}_{3}\right)\right\|$ | $9.01\left(\mathrm{t}, 3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}_{3},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J} \mathrm{HH}=7.0 \mathrm{~Hz}\right)^{*} ; 6.5-7.02\left(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 2.69\left(\mathrm{~m}, 15 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{5}\right)$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| \| $\mathrm{NiBr}(\mathrm{MeHdtc})\left(\mathrm{PPh}_{3}\right)$ \| | $7.21\left(\mathrm{~d}, 3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}_{3}, \mathrm{~J} \mathrm{HH}=5.0 \mathrm{~Hz}\right) ; 2.65\left(\mathrm{~m}, 15 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{5}\right)$ |
| $\left\|\mathrm{NiBr}\left(\mathrm{Pr}^{\mathrm{i}} \mathrm{Hdtc}\right)\left(\mathrm{PPh}_{3}\right)\right\|$ | $8.75\left(\mathrm{~d}, 6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}_{3},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}_{\mathrm{HH}}=5.0 \mathrm{~Hz}\right) ; 4.87(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}) ; 2.64\left(\mathrm{~m}, 15 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{5}\right)$ |
| $\left\|\mathrm{NiBr}\left(\mathrm{Bu}{ }^{\text {H }} \mathrm{Hdtc}\right)\left(\mathrm{PPh}_{3}\right)\right\|$ | $8.53\left(\mathrm{~s}, 9 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{C}-\mathrm{CH}_{3}\right) ; 2.42\left(\mathrm{~m}, 15 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{5}\right)$ |
| $\mid \mathrm{NiBr}\left(\mathrm{p}-\mathrm{MeOPhHdtc)}\left(\mathrm{PPh}_{3}\right) \mid\right.$ | $6.25\left(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}_{3}\right) ; 2.60\left(\mathrm{mu}, 19 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{5}\right)$ |
| $\left\|\mathrm{Pd}(\mathrm{BzHdtc})_{2}\left(\mathrm{AssPh}_{3}\right)\right\|$ | $5.41\left(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{N}-\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 2.51\left(\mathrm{~m}, 25 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{5}\right)$ |
|  | 5.26(s, $2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{N}-\mathrm{CH}_{2}$ ) |
| $\left\|\mathrm{Pdl}(\mathrm{BzHdtc})\left(\mathrm{AsPh}_{3}\right)\right\|$ | $5.26\left(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{N}-\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 2.58\left(\mathrm{~m}, 20 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{5}\right)$ |
| $\left\|\mathrm{Pt}(\mathrm{BzHdtc})_{2}\left(\mathrm{AsPh}_{3}\right)\right\|$ | $5.32\left(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{N}-\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 2.44\left(\mathrm{~m}, 25 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{5}\right)$ $5.25\left(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{N}-\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)$ |
| $\left\|\mathrm{Ptl}(\mathrm{BzHdtc})\left(\mathrm{AsPh}_{3}\right)\right\|$ | 5.24(s, $\left.2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{N}-\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 2.54\left(\mathrm{~m}, 20 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{5}\right)$ |

* $\mathrm{s}=$ singlet, $\mathrm{d}=$ doublet, $\mathrm{t}=$ triplet, $\mathrm{m}=$ multiplet, $\mathrm{mu}=$ multiplet unresolved.

The electronic spectra (Table-IV) of the complexes are also consistent with the proposed square-planar configuration. All the complexes show three absorption bands (band I, II and III) which are attributed to the chromophore group $\mathrm{NCS}_{2}{ }^{26}$ The assignments of these bands as intraligand transitions are in accordance with the results of CNDO/2 quantum chemical calculations ${ }^{27}$. The most intense band I is due to an intraligand $\pi^{*} \leftarrow \pi$ transition of the $\mathrm{N} \cdots \mathrm{C} \cdots \mathrm{S}$ group ${ }^{28,29}$. The position of this band is slightly affected by the nature of the central atom. Usually, the frequencies follow the order $\mathrm{Ni}<\mathrm{Pd} \leqq \mathrm{Pt}$ according to the electronegativities of the elements. The position of band I is also affected by the electron releasing ability of the amine group, and as this ability increases a shift toward higher frequencies is observed. Consequently, the following is the spectrochemical series of the dithiocarbamato ligands used:

$$
\begin{gathered}
\mathrm{Bu}^{\mathrm{t}} \mathrm{Hdtc} \geqq \mathrm{EtHdtc} \geqq \mathrm{Pr}^{\mathrm{i}} \mathrm{Hdtc} \geqq \text { MeHdtc }>\text { p-MeOPhHdtc }> \\
\text { p-MePhHdtc }>\text { PhHdtc }>\text { p-ClPhHdtc }
\end{gathered}
$$

A similar order was suggested by Eley et $\mathrm{al}^{30}$ for the dithiocarbamato ligands. This is also the sequence of the increasing ligand field strength of the ligands used. The molecular extinction coefficient of band I is slightly affected by the nature of the dithiocarbamato ligand and the nature of the metal atom. As a rule, it is observed that the molecular extinction coefficient of this band decreases as the charge transfer from the ligand to metal atom increases. This is possibly due to the decrease in the difference of polarity between ground and excited states. Band II, which appears as a shoulder, is also due to a $\pi^{*} \leftarrow \pi$ transition of the $S \cdots C \cdots S$ group and is associated with the inequivalence of the $\mathrm{C} \cdots \mathrm{S}$ bonds of the ligands ${ }^{31}$. In the spectra of the arsine adducts, however, band II shows a characteristic maximum. This may be attributed to the fact that in these cases the bonding mode of the dithiocarbamato ligands is different, in agreement with their IR and ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectra. Band III was assigned by several authors to an $\pi^{*} \leftarrow \mathrm{n}$ electronic transition located on the sulphur atom, ${ }^{32,33}$ while others assigned it to a charge transfer from the ligand to the metal ${ }^{34}$. However, the frequency of this band is slightly increased as the electron
releasing ability of amine group increases. This observation can be justified if we ascribe the band to an $\pi^{*} \leftarrow \mathrm{n}$ transition, because it is known that an increase in the electron density of a chromophore group results in a blue shift of the $\pi^{*} \leftarrow n$ band ${ }^{35}$. Finally, bands IV, V and VI are due to charge transfer (CT) transitions. These bands are analogous to the CT bands observed in square-planar complexes of $\mathrm{D}_{4 \mathrm{~h}}$ symmetry and are assigned to ${ }^{1} \mathrm{~A}_{2 \mathrm{~g}} \leftarrow{ }^{1} \mathrm{~A}_{1 \mathrm{~g}} ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{~B}_{2 \mathrm{~g}} \leftarrow{ }^{1} \mathrm{~A}_{1 \mathrm{~g}}$ and ${ }^{1} \mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{g}} \leftarrow{ }^{1} \mathrm{~A}_{1 \mathrm{~g}}$ transitions, respectively ${ }^{36,37}$.

TABLE IV. Electronic Spectra of some $\mathrm{Ni}(\mathrm{II}), \mathrm{Pd}(\mathrm{II})$ and $\mathrm{Pt}(\mathrm{II})$ Dithio-compounds in THF.

| Compound | Band 1 | Band II | Band III | Band IV | Band V | Band VI |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\left\|\mathrm{NiCl}(\mathrm{EtH} \mathrm{dtc})\left(\mathrm{PPh}_{3}\right)\right\|$, $\quad \therefore$ | $36.9{ }^{*}(4.06)^{* *}$ | 31.1sh***(3.88) | 26.2(3.38) | 23.7 (2.30) | 21.25h (1.83) | 20.0 (1.52) |
| $\left\|\mathrm{NiBr}(\mathrm{MeHdtc})\left(\mathrm{PPh}_{3}\right)\right\|$ | 36.5 (4.11) | 31.0sh (3.56) | 26.1 (3.15) | 23.5 (2.15) | 20.5sh (2.02) | 19.2 (1.45) |
| $\left\|\mathrm{NiBr}\left(\mathrm{Pr}^{\mathbf{1}} \mathbf{H d t c}\right)\left(\mathrm{PPh}_{3}\right)\right\|$ | 36.8 (4.08) | 31.2sh' (3.67) | 26.1 (3,22) | 23.3sh (2.17) | 21.6 (1.98) | 19.2 (1.58) |
| $\left\|\mathrm{NiBr}\left(\mathrm{Bu}^{\mathbf{t}} \mathrm{Hdtc}\right)\left(\mathrm{PPh}_{3}\right)\right\|$ | 36.9 (4.04) | 31.1sh (3.43) | 26.3 (3.09) | 23.4sh (2.05) | 21.1sh (1.75) | 19.2 (1.38) |
| $\left\|\mathrm{NiBr}(\mathrm{PhHdtc})\left(\mathrm{PPh}_{3}\right)\right\|$ | 36.1 (4.23) | 30.6sh (3.75) | 25.5 (3.27) | 23.9 (2.30) | 21.8 (1.81) | 19.2 (1.46) |
| \| $\mathrm{NiBr}(\mathrm{p}-\mathrm{ClPhHdtc})\left(\mathrm{PPh}_{3}\right)$ ) | 35.8(4.30) | 30.3sh (3.30) | 25.2 (3.01) | 23.4 (2.22) | 21.1 (1.77) | 19.2 (1.50) |
| $\left\|\mathrm{NiBr}(\mathrm{p}-\mathrm{MePhHdtc})\left(\mathrm{PPh}_{3}\right)\right\|$ | 36.2 (4.17) | 30.4sh (3.41) | 25.6 (3.30) | 23.3 (2.14) | 20.8sh (1.33) | $19.0{ }^{\circ}(1.37)$ |
| \| $\mathrm{NiBr}\left(\mathrm{p}-\mathrm{MeOPhHdtc}\right.$ ) $\left(\mathrm{PPh}_{3}\right) \mid$ | 36.4 (4.15) | 30.3sh (3.58) | 25.9 (3.46) | 23.8 (1.98) | 21.3sh (1.56) | 19.1 (1.35) |
| $\left\|\mathrm{Pd}(\mathrm{BzHdtc})_{2}\left(\mathrm{AsPh}_{3}\right)\right\|$ | 37.1 (4.43) | 33.3 (3.96) | 28.8 (3.98) | 23.5 (1.23) |  |  |
| $\left.\mid \mathrm{PdI}(\mathrm{BzHdtc})(\mathrm{AsPh})_{1}\right) \mid$ | 37.0 (4.36) | , 30.5sh (3.89) | 28.4 (3.24) | 23.2sh (1.95) |  |  |
| $\left\|\mathrm{Pr}(\mathrm{BzHdtc})_{2}\left(\mathrm{AsPh}_{3}\right)\right\|$ | 38.8 (4.63) | 33.6 (4.55) | 28.6 (3.82) | 23.9 (2.20) |  |  |
|  | - 37.9 (4.50) | 31.4sh (3.88) | 27.1 (3.60) | 23.4 (2.12) |  |  |

${ }^{*} \mathrm{v} / \mathrm{kK}{ }^{* *}$ loge $_{\mathrm{mol}}{ }^{* * *} \mathrm{sh}=$ shoulder
The molecular ions of the studied compounds were not detected in the mass spectra. The absence of molecular ions can be attributed either to pyrolytic decomposition, in the direct inlet, under the high temperature which was used ( $200-280^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ), or to electron impact. The fragments corresponding to higher $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{e}$ values can be regarded as direct fragments of the molecular ions while those at lower $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{e}$ values

may be regarded as daughter fragments of the phosphine and N -alkyldithiocarbamato ligands. In most cases the base peak of the spectra corresponds to the $\mathrm{PPh}_{3}{ }^{+\cdot}$ or $\mathrm{AsPh}_{3}{ }^{+\cdot}$ ions. A possible fragmentation mechanism of the molecular ions of $\left|\mathrm{MI}(\mathrm{RHdtc})\left(\mathrm{AsPh}_{3}\right)\right|$ complexes is represented by Scheme 2.

## Experimental

Physical Measurements
IR spectra were recorded in the $4000-250 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$ region on a Perkin-Elmer 467 spectrophotometer using KBr pellets or Nujol mulls. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectra were recorded on a Varian A $60 \mathrm{~A}(60 \mathrm{M} / \mathrm{c})$ instrument in DMSO or $\mathrm{CS}_{2}$ solutions using TMS as an internal standard. Electronic spectra were obtained on a Cary 17DX spectrophotometer using freshly prepared $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ and THF solutions. Mass spectra were measured on a RMU-6L Hitachi Perkin-Elmer mass spectrometer with ionisation source of T-2p type operating at 70 eV . Magnetic susceptibility measurements in solid state were done by the Faraday technique using $\mathrm{Hg}\left|\mathrm{Co}(\mathrm{SCN})_{4}\right|$ as the calibrant. Molecular weights were determined using a Perkin-Elmer molecular weight apparatus Model 115 in $\mathrm{CHCl}_{3}$ solutions. Melting points were determined with a Büchi apparatus and are uncorrected. The elemental analysis of carbon, nitrogen and hydrogen was performed on a Perkin-Elmer 240B Elemental Analyser. Nickel, palladium and platinum were determined according to published methods ${ }^{38}$.

## Preparation of the Complexes

Bromo (N-alkyldithiocarbamato) triphenylphosphinenickel (II) - A solution of 1 mmol of the appropriate $\left|\mathrm{Ni}(\mathrm{RHdtc})_{2}\right|$ complex in 50 ml of diethyl ether was treated with $0.74 \mathrm{~g}(1 \mathrm{mmol})$ of $\left|\mathrm{NiBr}_{2}\left(\mathrm{PPh}_{3}\right)_{2}\right|$ under nitrogen atmosphere. The reaction mixture was left for 2 hrs at room temperature under continuous magnetic stirring and then the resulted red-violet solid was filtered off, washed with diethyl ether and dried under vacuum. Recrystallisation was carried out by dissolving the solid in benzene and reprecipitating with n-hexane $(80-90 \%$ yield). In a similar manner chloro ( N ethyldithiocarbamato) triphenylphosphinenickel (II) was prepared ( $70-80 \%$ yield).

Bis(N-benzyldithiocarbamato) triphenylarsinepalladium (II) - A suspension of the complex $\left|\mathrm{Pd}(\mathrm{BzHdtc})_{2}\right|$ in a small amount of toluene was treated with triphenylarsine ( $1: 1$ mole ratio). A clear solution was obtained which, on addition of light petroleum (b. p. $50-60^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ), precipitated the pale yellow product which was filtered off, washed with diethyl ether and dried under vacuum. The complex was recrystallised from chloroform ( $60-70 \%$ yield). A similar method was also employed for the preparation of bis(N-benzyldithiocarbamato) triphenylarsineplatinum (II) (7080\% yield).

Iodo ( $N$-benzyldithiocarbamato) triphenylarsinepalladium (II) - The complex $\left|\mathrm{Pd}(\mathrm{BzHdtc})_{2}\left(\mathrm{AsPh}_{3}\right)\right|(1 \mathrm{mmol})$ was suspended in toluene and treated with iodine ( 0.5 mmol ) dissolved in the same solvent. In the resulting clear solution light petroleum was added and an orange solid was precipitated which was filtered off, washed with diethyl ether and dried under vacuum. The complex was recrystallised from acetone $(50-60 \%$ yield). The same synthetic route was also followed for the
prepparation of iodo ( $N$-benzyldithiocarbamato) triphenylarsineplatinum (II) (60-70\% yield).

## Пері́גŋчך
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## Introduction

Angiotensin II, a linear octapeptide hormone with amino acid sequence Asp-Arg-Tyr-Ile (or Val)-His-Pro-Phe, is a peptide of much current interest in particular to its hypertensive action. Furthermore dimers and cyclic analogues of peptides appear to have in many cases increased or selective potency ${ }^{1-3}$. In this paper I report the synthesis and biological activities of two new angiotensin derivatives with adipic acid (Scheme).

## HOOC- $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4} \mathrm{CO}$-Asp-Arg-Val-Tyr-Ile-His-Pro-Phe-COOH



SCHEME. Structures of adipoyl angiotensin and dimer with amino terminal groups of the two angiotensin molecules coupled to the carboxyl groups.

## Methods

$\left|\mathrm{Asp}^{1}, \mathrm{Val}^{5}\right|$ angiotensin II was synthesized by the solid phase method as previously reported ${ }^{4}$. Adipic acid was purchased from Aldrich Chemical Co. Di-(pnitrophenyl) adipate was synthesized as follows, $0.73 \mathrm{~g}(0.05 \mathrm{~mole})$ of adipic acid and 1.39 g ( 0.1 mole ) of p -nitrophenole were dissolved in the minimum volume of dimethylformamide at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. To that solution 2.06 g of dicyclohexylcarbodiimide ( $50 \%$ solution in dichloromethane) were added in portions. The reaction mixture was
stirred for 18 hrs at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, filtered and washed with acetone thoroughly. The solution was evaporated to dryness and the product, di-(p-nitrophenyl) adipate was precipitated from ethanol with a yield of $60 \%$. The ester was over 90 pure as judged by thin layer chromatography in the systems: n-butanol, acetic acid, water (4:1:5) $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}$ 0.1 , chlorofrom: methanol: acetic acid ( $85: 10: 5$ ) $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}} 0.45$ and by proton nuclear magnetic resonanse spectrum on a T 60 MHz varian spectrometer. Bromocresol blue reagent was used to visualize free adipic acid and $50 \%$ ammonium hydroxide to visualize the diester.

Di-(p-nitrophenyl) adipate was further used for coupling with $\mid$ Asp $^{1}$, $\mathrm{Val}^{5} \mid$ angiotensin II to form the dimer and the monomer adipoyl-angiotensin. The products were assayed for their contracting activity on rabbit aortic strips with a Grass Model 70 polygraph.

## Results

For the coupling of angiotensin II with di-(p-nitrophenyl) adipate, 3 mg ( 0.003 mMole) of $\mid \mathrm{Asp}^{1}$, $\mathrm{Val}^{5} \mid$ angiotensin in $20 \mu \mathrm{l}$ water, $200 \mu \mathrm{l}$ dimethylformamide and $100 \mu \mathrm{l}$ pyridine were stirred overnight at $37^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and then 2 mg ( $100 \%$ excess) di-(p.nitrophenyl) adipate were added in portions. The reaction mixture after being stirred at room temperature for 48 hrs was evaporated to dryness, redissolved in $80 \%$ acetic acid and chromatographed on a Biogel P4, column (1.2 23 cm ). The fractions corresponding to the dimer and monomer respectively were collected, evaporated to dryness and rechromatographed separately on the same Biogel P4 colum. The dimer and monomer were further characterized by SDS gel electrophoresis $13 \%$ in polyacrylamide ${ }^{5}$ and by paper electrophoresis at pH 3.5 (pyridine acetate buffer) and 9.4 (sodium borate buffer). Amino acid analysis of the products on a Durum 500 Analyzer proved the integrity of the amino acids. Fig. 1 gives the dose-responce curves in rabbit aortic strip for the dimer, monomer and free angiotensin respectively. The $E D_{50}$, values ( $E_{50}$, effective dose, which produces $50 \%$ of maximum responce) are $1.8 \chi 10^{-8} \mathrm{M}$ for the dimer, $5 \chi 10^{-8}$ for free angiotensin and $2 \chi 10^{-7}$ for the monomer.

## Discussion

Two kinds of monomers were formed during the coupling reaction. Both are adipoyl angiotensins with the second carboxyl group of the adipic either free or as pnitrophenylester. The mixture of the two monomers which was eluted at the same fractions at the first Biogel P4 column was treated with dilute sodium hydroxide, so that only one kind of monomer had to be characterized. It should be noted that SDS electrophoresis was mainly used to verify the dimer from either free or adipoyl angiotensin, whereas paper electrophoresis at pH 's reported above was ased to characterize adipoyl angiotensin' fraction eluted from the second Biogel P4 colum.

Since the coupling amount of di (p-nitrophenyl) adipate is $100 \%$ excess, no free angiotensin was detected even in trace amounts as it was proven by paper electrophoresis of adipoyl angiotensin sample.


FIG: Dose responce curves in rabbit aortic strip for the dimer $(-)$, free angiotensin $(\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O})$ and adipoyl angiotensin $(\mathbf{\Lambda}-\mathbf{4})$. The values are the average of three experiments.

The dimer and monomer were assayed for their contracting activity as described previously ${ }^{4}$. The data of Fig. 1 show that elongation of the peptide chain of angiotensin (formation of head to head dimer) does not alter significantly the biological activity. Dimeric forms of peptides have also been reported for different enkephalins ${ }^{3}$. It was found that dimeric enkephalins show increased affinity and selectivity for the $\delta$ receptor.

Derivatization of angiotensin II at the N -terminal aminogroup with low molecular weight residues such as acetyl, propionyl e.t.c. has been reported ${ }^{6}$. Other high molecular weight derivatives such as poly-D, L-alanine-angiotensin have also been reported ${ }^{7}$ and their biological activity was found to be $50 \%$ of the action of pure angiotensin.

## Summary

Two biological active derivatives of angiotensin II, the dimer with amino terminal groups of two angiotensin molecules coupled to the carboxyl groups of adipic acid and the monomer adipoyl-angiotensin II have been synthesized.

Key words: angiotensin II, di-(p-nitrophenyl) adipate, biological acivity, structure-activity relationship.

## Пері́ $\eta \boldsymbol{\eta} \boldsymbol{\eta}$

 тo $\alpha \delta ı \pi \iota \kappa o ́ ~ o \xi v ́$.
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[^1]:    * This paper is a reprinting of DEMO 68/4 (July 1964, reprinted June 1968); Atomindex 11, No. 5, 1488 (1969); For papers I, II, and III of this series see refs. 4-6 respectively; See also the introduction to the reprinting of the series DEMO. 68/1-68/4 in this Journal as papers I-IV respectively: G.A. Gregoriou, Chimika Chronika, New Series, 8, 215 (1979).

[^2]:    * This. ${ }^{3}$ and the preceding papers ${ }^{4-6}$ of this series were written from 1962 to 1964 , at the Demokritos Nuclear Research Center and the Brookhaven National Laboratory where the author held a 1962-63 researehtefpointment, and parts of them were presented in seminars. ${ }^{2}$. Their starting point has been a unified mextamis introduced in 1958. ${ }^{1}$
    ** The modet employed (unified model) and the interactions involved, thus, the "thinking" associated with this, niodel, were the important feature and not the reference to it as an intermediate.

[^3]:    * The term "symmetrical" intermediate will be used to denote an intermediate I in which the Z group is bound to $\mathrm{C}_{\beta}$ and $\mathrm{C}_{a}$ to such a relative extent as to render optimum the contribution of the forms VII$X$ as governed by the $R$ groups. Thus, for a compound for which $R_{1}, R_{2}=R_{3}, R_{4}$, the term "symmetrical" intermediate refers to a structure in which the Z group is equidistant from $\mathrm{C}_{\beta}$ and $\mathrm{C}_{a}$ and thus in this case it also denotes geometrical summetry. This is not so, however, when the R groups are
    
    different. In this latter case, the "symmetrical" structure will not be geometrically sysmmetrical, the Z group being closer and more extensively bound to the carbon atom bearing the poorer electron donor groups. The term "unsymmetrical" will refer to a structure in which the Z group is bound to $\mathrm{C}_{\beta}$ and $\mathrm{C}_{a}$ to any relative extent different from that in the "symmetrical" structure and of course to structures also in which the group is bound to one only of the two carbon atoms.

[^4]:    * A molecular orbital treatment could be used to examine the argument.

[^5]:    * An important difference between this type of $Z$ group and the case of $Z$ being a hydrogen or a saturated hydrocarbon residue is that-the former $Z$ group can get bound to $C_{a}$ without a serious rupture of its bond to $C_{\beta}$. This feature may affect considerably the difference in the behavior, in the nonclassical sense, between the two types.

[^6]:    * According to the unified theory, the rupture of the $C_{a}-X$ bond and "ionization" in general, are the result of extensive bonding (referring to covalent bonding) with the medium.

[^7]:    * This expression is a term borrowed from the usual approach and it is inaccurate according to the theory, because the various features (e.g. lack of covalency, need for nucleophilic contribution, planarity etc.) of carbonium ions and of their reactions considered equivalent by the usual approach turn out not to be so according to the theory. Thus, in going from one reaction to another, one of these features may become more pronounced while another one may diminish according to the theory.

[^8]:    * It should be pointed out that the fact that a path may be more difficult than others does not necessarily mean that this path will not contribute to the reaction process. It only means that its contribution will be smaller. Furthermore, the ease of operation of paths should be a function of the extent of contribution with which they are burdened. Thus, even though a path may be easier than another one, as the contribution by way of this easier path increases along the reaction coordinate, further increments by way of the easier path may be expected to become energetically ever more difficult until the equivalent transmission of nucleophilic forces through the more difficult path, which however is not loaded with the burden of nucleophilic contribution to which the easy path is, may even be favored. This follows also from the argument that the resistance of a system to the development of a sharp gradient should rise sharply with the gradient (or the resistance to the development of charge should rise sharply with the increase in the charge).
    ** This should be so provided that paths can operate. If in some cases geometric or steric conditions inhibit their operation, the possibility of deviations may have to be considered and among them the possibility of a not quite smooth transition from the picture of non-bridged to that of symmetrically bridged intermediates. One such problem could perhaps be introduced by steric interference in the simultaneous operation of bridging, e.g., for extensive bridging and special systems, and solvent attack on $\mathrm{C}_{a}$.

[^9]:    * The position of this minimum should be determined by the position of the maximum and the minimum of the contributing curves and by their shapes, e.g., the deeper and sharper the dip in the comcave curve, the larger the probability that the superposition of the concave on the convex one could result in a minimum. The maximum of the convex curve (this maximum corresponds to the transition state of the hypothetical process making use of a direct path only) is expected to appear at about the half-way point (we are still referring to a symmetrical substrate). The minimum of the concave curve could most reasonably bee expected to appear at the same point, since the operation of paths other than the main one should be enhanced as the energy requirements of the mair path are enhanced (e.g., at the transition state). Consequently, these other paths should tend to reach their maximum contribution at around the point of maximum energy requirements for the main path, tmless inhibiting and other factors, e.g., geometric factors, favor appearance of the minimum at another point, in which case some shift of this minimum may occur. In the present system one cannot easily recognize such a factor. Thus, the minimum for the overall curve can be expected to appear most likely for a "symmetrical" structure.

[^10]:    * Geometric and other considerations may introduce difficulties under some conditions.
    ** Other ways of looking at the rearrangement between the two intermediates give a similar answer.
    *** It should be kept in mind that the postulate of intermediates ${ }^{5,12}$ is being applied in the above discussion to the conversion of one "unsymmetrical" intermediate to the other one, and thus the contributions and changes referred to are those along the reaction coordinate from one to the other intermediate, although the overall process enters into the picture also; namely they refer to "increments" of contributions from and beyond those already operating in the first intermediate (although other paths are entering also as mentioned). This has an important bearing because the extent of contribution (referring actually to the paths leading to bridging, i.e., to the extent of bridging) already present in the first intermediate becomes a factor playing an important role concerning the question of formation or importance of the symmetrical intermediate (this subject requires special discussion).

[^11]:    * Somewhat analogous considerations to those discussed in this paper could apply to the fate of such intermediates but there should be differences also. Because some factors are unknown and because uncertainties are involved, the subject of the detailed structure and fate (with respect to bridging etc.) of these intermediates cannot be discussed now usefully.

[^12]:    * The unified intermediate complex suggested in $1958^{1}$ was such a structure capable of involving variable extent of bonding between $Z$ and $\mathrm{C}_{\alpha}$. The terms "fractionally non-classical" or "partially nonclassical" couid be used to describe such "unsymmetrically" or partially bridged structures. This suggestion follows from the fact that the concept of non-classical intermediates is strongly associated with that of a single symmetrically bridged species, and from the fact that the thinking and the conclusions are so strictly inierrelated with the symmetrical intermediate that another term should be used for the suggested fractionally bridged species. This also follows from the argument that the properties of an intermediate should deviate from those associated with non-classical behavior to a variable extent, this deviation increasing along with a decrease in the extent of bridging in the intermediate. One could not very well term each one of two species non-classical if one of them behaved only to a small extent, compared to the other one, as non-classical. Another reason for this suggestion is that since variable degrees of bridging are suggested (and since bridging and hyperconjugation - which by the way is to be a variable reaching high values also - are to be interrelated and not really separable) the question could arise as to where one would draw the line between the term classical and non-classical, a problem bypassed by the use of the term "partially non-classical", or "fractionally" bridged intermediate complex as compared to "symmetrically" bridged intermediate complex.

[^13]:    * The term "unsymmetrical", as defined in this paper, covers both partially bridged and classical structures.

[^14]:    * The nature of electrophilic interactions with aromatic rings is to be examined in a discussion of "aromatic substitution in the light of the unified theory". The type of such interactions is to vary continually between the two types referred to as $\pi$ - and $\sigma$-.
    ** Lack of such obstacles may be a major factor contributing toward lack of symmetry, by allowing easily the simultaneous operation of both bridging and the direct path (vide supra).

[^15]:    * Even though the fact that similar proportions of the same products were formed from the two types of starting materials was used as evidence for a symmetrical system, small differences between them rather than being overlooked could be used to question the conclusion of symmetry.

[^16]:    * This claim is analogous to the one made on the basis of this approach (ref. 5, p. 249) about the question of duality of mechanisms in the $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{N}} 1-\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{N}} 2$ sense in borderiine solvolyses. There too, duality is not the explanation accepted by the theory. Duality is allowed as a rule when the two intermediates (of the dual mechanism) resemble closely each other structurally, but then one can think of them as a statistical deviation from one mechanism. However, this claim about the question of duality cannot be supported equaly well in the non-classical intermediate case, because here the competition between bridging and the direct path (solvent attack) could even introduce some problem on steric grounds (vide supra), which was not easily the case in the case of the $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{N}} 1-\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{N}} 2$ question. If this could occur in some cases, the possibility of duality could become real.

[^17]:    * The difference between the unified and the classical approach on this subject can be put as follows: As derived from the unified theory, intermediates do not differ qualitatively from transition states with respect to the extent of bond formations and bond ruptures. Thus, just as transition states are considered to be formed by partial bond formations and bond ruptures, so are intermediates considered to be formed, and are treated as being formed from their preceding starting materials or intermediates by partial bond formations and bond ruptures. This contrasts with what has generally been the picture in the usual approach.

[^18]:    * As part of this effort, an experimetal program on this subject, and in particular on the phenonium (aronium actually) and the norbornyl carbonium ion intermediates will soon get under way in this laboratory, in an effort to test the present predictions. NOTE ADDED IN THIS REPRINTING: The program referred to above has since materialized in part, and some of its results have been published [S. Loukas, M. Velkou, and G. Gregoriou, Chem. Commun., $1199^{(1969) ; ~ i b i a ., ~} 251$ (1970); S. Loukas, F. Varveri, M. Velkou and G. Gregoriou, Tetrahedron Letters, 1803 (1971)] or have been reported [G. Gregoriou, S. Loukas, and M. Velkou, paper presented at the Conference on Carbonium Ions, Cleveland, Ohio U.S.A., October 1968; G. Greogoriou, S. loukas, and M. Velkou, paper presented at The International Symposium on Isotope Effects, York, England, July, 1969; G. Gregoriou, Ph. Avouris, S. Loukas, A. Mavridis, F. Varveri, and M. Velkou, paper presented at the International Conference of the Mechanism of Reactions in Solution, Kent, England, July 1970; G. Gregoriou, F. Varveri, and M. Velkou, paper presented at the 160th Meeting of the American Chemical Society, Chicago, Séptember. 1970; G. Gregoriou and F. Varveri, Bull. Chem. Soc. Belges, 91, 424 (1982), 6th IUPAC Conference on Physical Organic Chemistry, Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium, July, 1982].

[^19]:    * According to the picture provided by this unified approach, the proper argument would be the opposite one, namely: "because the intermediate is a species which has already progressed far toward product formation, or because it exhibits much covalent bonding to its envirronment (mainly incoming and leaving group), in other terms, because it is not a carbonium ion and because it does not carry a large charge, it is unstable and it quickly reacts further". As seen, the difference is not only one of the argument used but of the essence also. Thus the less an intermediate formed by the usual chemical means resembles the picture of a carbonium ion, the more reactive it should be, and not when it resembles it more. In fact the more it resembles a carbonium ion (that is the less its covalent bonding to the environment) the less reactive it should be.

[^20]:    * Several efforts between 1958 and 1963 to make this work ${ }^{1-6}$ public (conferences or publications) have not been very successful. As a result the author has written this work in the form of reports, and has concentrated instead his effort an the experimental aspects of the subject - an extremely slow process as compared to the number of subjects and the need for speed on this matter. The result may be that several of the not yet verified predictions may also be verified before this work even gets off the ground.

[^21]:    ＊$\Sigma v \nu \tau \varepsilon \tau \mu \eta \mu \varepsilon ́ v a$ m．v（mixed valence）．

