Published in final edited form as:

J Org Chem. 2008 October 3; 73(19): 7743–7747. doi:10.1021/jo801532d.

Solution Structures of Lithium Enolates, Phenolates, Carboxylates, and Alkoxides in the Presence of *N,N,N',N'*-Tetramethylethylenediamine: A Prevalence of Cyclic Dimers

Jocelyn M. Gruver, Lara R. Liou, Anne J. McNeil, Antonio Ramirez, and David B. Collum*

Contribution from the Department of Chemistry and Chemical Biology, Baker Laboratory, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York 14853-1301

Abstract

The method of continuous variation was used to characterize lithium enolates, phenolates, carboxylates, and alkoxides solvated by *N,N,N',N'*-tetramethylethylenediamine (TMEDA). The method relies on characterizing an ensemble of homo- and heteroaggregates using ⁶Li NMR spectroscopy. A combination of aggregate counts and symmetries, nearly statistical distributions, and quantitative parametric fits revealed that cyclic dimers are the dominant form. Non-statistical distributions favoring heteroaggregated dimers were observed when hindered enolates and lithium carboxylates were mixed with unhindered enolates. Nonstatistical distributions favoring homoaggregates observed when hindered (tertiary) alkoxides were paired with other O-lithiated forms were traced to the formation of higher aggregates (hexamers) of the tertiary alkoxides. Highly hindered lithium phenolates appear to form TMEDA-solvated monomers.

Introduction

Ketone enolates are highly reactive intermediates used for a range of functionalizations in organic synthesis.¹ It is no surprise, therefore, that they have also commandeered the attention of structural and mechanistic chemists.^{2,3} The Achilles heel of most mechanistic studies is characterizing their structures in solution.^{4–7} The problem stems from a combination of the oppressive symmetry of the possible aggregates and the absence of observable O-Li scalar coupling.⁸ Progress has been made by accruing data from a broad range of indirect analytical methods,² but these methods are often specific to the substrate-solvent combination.

We recently used the method of continuous variation⁹ (the method of Job¹⁰) to show that lithium enolates of β-amino esters are hexameric.¹¹ The generality of the method was confirmed by showing that simple enolates **1–3** are cyclic dimers (**4**) in *N,N,N',N'*-tetramethylethylenediamine (TMEDA), cubic tetramers (**5**) in THF, and cubic tetramers (**6**) in 1,2-dimethoxyethane (DME).³

We have now significantly expanded the range of characterized TMEDA-solvated O-lithiated species.¹² All species in Chart 1 form cyclic dimers of general structure **4**.^{6,13,14} Standard lithium alkoxides constitute the primary exception, affording higher oligomers. The protocols used to determine structure were refined.

Results and Discussion

Method of Continuous Variation

The general strategy for characterizing enolates and related O-lithiated species using the method of continuous variation finds its origins in studies of Chabanel,¹⁵ Gagne,¹⁶ Günther,¹⁷ Reich,⁴ⁱ and others.^{18,19} An ensemble of homo- and heteroaggregated enolates (eq 1) is monitored as a function of the mole fractions of enolate subunits (**A** and **B**) using ⁶Li NMR spectroscopy.²⁰ The number of aggregates and their symmetries reflect the aggregation state, *n*. As we show herein, the preponderant form of TMEDA-solvated enolates is a disolvated dimer of general structure **4**, representing the simplest possible ensemble (eq 2). A high

tendency toward statistical distributions and parametric fits distinguish the all-dimer **A₂-AB-B₂** model from **A₂-AB-B** and **A₂-AB-B₄** models (see supporting information).

$$\mathbf{A}_n + \mathbf{B}_n \mathbf{A}_n + \mathbf{A}_{n-1} \mathbf{B}_1 + \mathbf{A}_{n-2} \mathbf{B}_2 + \mathbf{A}_{n-3} \mathbf{B}_3 + \dots \mathbf{B}_n \quad (1)$$

Optimizing the resolution of the ⁶Li resonances of the various aggregates is of paramount importance. Resolution is most readily achieved by pairing **A_n** and **B_n** with distinctly different ⁶Li chemical shifts (Table 1.)³ A second issue is that the actual mole fractions of the **A** and **B** subunits can deviate from the intended mole fractions because of experimental error, non-quantitative enolization, selective formation of mixed aggregates with base,^{7,21} or formation of by-products. (Metalations using [⁶Li, ¹⁵N]LDA²² and [⁶Li, ¹⁵N]LiHMDS²³ reveal that only LDA forms detectable mixed aggregates in TMEDA/toluene.²¹) Although such deviations do not impair the qualitative analysis of aggregate numbers and their symmetries, they can distort the quantitative parametric fits. Consequently, the mole fractions were measured by simply integrating the ⁶Li resonances. Usually, the intended and measured mole fractions are comparable, but we believe the latter are more accurate.³ One last concern pertains to deviations from statistical behavior. The parametric fits reveal that deviations from statistical behavior are usually quite small. When large deviations occur, however, the parametric fits do not readily distinguish the all-dimer **A₂-AB-B₂** model from the **A₂-AB-B** and **A₂-AB-B₄** models; the models become quite similar if the relative **AB** concentration becomes either very high or very low. Additional experiments exclude the latter two models (vide infra).

Statistical Dimer Distributions

All O-lithiated species in Chart 1 were found to be dimeric in TMEDA/toluene solution. Typical results are illustrated emblematically using enolates **1** and **7**. The homo- and heteroaggregated dimers were easily observed using ⁶Li NMR spectroscopy (Figure 1). The plot of relative aggregate integrations (*I*)²⁴ versus mole fraction (*X*) in Figure 2 shows a nearly statistical distribution of aggregates. Inferior fits to models based on ternary ensembles **A₂-AB-B** and **A₂-AB-B₄** (evidenced by large residual deviations; supporting information) support the dimer assignment.²⁵

Nonstatistical Dimer Distributions

A non-statistical tendency toward heteroaggregation was observed when hindered enolates (**12** and **13**) were paired with their less-congested counterparts (see Figure 3). We suspected that steric interactions destabilized the congested homoaggregated dimer. Indeed, pairing hindered enolates **12** and **13** afforded a statistical distribution that fits the **A₂-AB-B₂** model.

Similar preferences for heteroaggregates (approaching quantitative formation of the heterodimer in some cases) resulted when lithium carboxylates **15** or **16** were paired with lithium enolates. Once again, statistical behavior returned when carboxylates **15** and **16** were paired. Although TMEDA-solvated lithium carboxylates could be represented by dimer **32**, crystallographic guidance is surprisingly absent. A lithium carbamate reported by Snaith and coworkers was found to have a ring-expanded structure (**33**).²⁶

We admit being surprised that lithium carboxylates form homo- and heteroaggregates of well-defined structure. We expected complex aggregates displaying marginal physical properties (gelling or insolubility).²⁷ As salt effects on yields, selectivities, and reactivities continue to be reported,^{21,28} we are encouraged by the potential importance of carboxylates in both synthetic and mechanistic organolithium chemistry.²⁹ There are certainly many more lithium carboxylates than lithium halides!

Higher Oligomers

Hindered lithium alkoxides (**34–36**) displayed a strong bias toward *homoaggregates* resulting from higher oligomers, which we believe to be hexamers. For example, tertiary alkoxides **34–36** in 0.24 M TMEDA/toluene each displayed a single ⁶Li resonance at –90 °C (δ 0.48, 0.71, and 0.31 ppm, respectively). Pairing tertiary alkoxides with relatively uncongested O-lithiated species afforded very low concentrations of putative heterodimers (Figure 4). It is telling that hindered alkoxides even resisted heteroaggregation with *hindered enolates*.³⁰

We suspected that the reticence of alkoxides **34–36** to heteroaggregate with other O-lithiated species stemmed from a reluctance to form heterodimers of any form. Indeed, pairing *t*-BuOLi (**34**) with hindered alkoxides **35** or **36**³¹ afforded remarkable spectral complexity (Figure 5) exceeding even that anticipated for an ensemble of tetramers (**A₄–A₃B–A₂B₂–AB₃–B₄**).³ It seems probable, therefore, that the hindered alkoxides are hexameric (possibly only partially solvated),^{32–34} as indicated by x-ray crystallography^{35,36} and colligative measurements for *t*-BuOLi in benzene.³⁷ The large number of hexamer stoichiometries (seven) and the existence of positional isomers within hexagonal drums resulted in 38 magnetically inequivalent ⁶Li resonances.³ The spectra appeared as though a structural assignment might be possible. Not surprisingly, however, severe overlap of resonances (as evidenced by shoulders on peaks in Figure 5) caused us to abort efforts to tease out additional insights.

We thought that hindered phenolates such as **37** might afford a monomer, but we obtained insoluble material shown to contain approximately one equiv of TMEDA by quenching an isolated sample. The corresponding disubstituted phenolate **38** is soluble and forms no detectable mixed aggregates with dimeric enolate **1** or highly oligomeric alkoxide **36**, suggesting phenolates **37** and **38** are indeed TMEDA-chelated monomers. Similar studies of primary and secondary alkoxides were thwarted by insolubility and spectral complexity, possibly attributable to higher oligomers.³⁸

37; R = *t*-Bu

38; R = H

Conclusion

Addition of TMEDA to lithium enolates, phenolates, and carboxylates affords exclusively cyclic dimers in most instances. We are encouraged by both the success and generality of the method of continuous variation in characterizing species that have traditionally proven opaque to NMR spectroscopy. Although highly functionalized lithium enolates commonly used to effect diastereo- and enantioselective carbon-carbon bond formation may present new challenges and offer a few surprises, the protocol should prove durable. More important, these results satisfy a necessary prerequisite for understanding lithium enolate structure-reactivity relationships.

Experimental Section

Reagents and Solvents

TMEDA was recrystallized as the hydrochloride salt³⁹ and subsequently distilled from solutions containing sodium benzophenone ketyl. Hydrocarbon solvents were distilled from blue solutions containing sodium benzophenone ketyl with approximately 1 percent tetraglyme to dissolve the ketyl. We prepared and recrystallized [⁶Li]LiHMDS, [⁶Li, ¹⁵N]LiHMDS, [⁶Li]LDA, and [⁶Li, ¹⁵N]LDA as described previously.^{22,23} Air- and moisture-sensitive materials were manipulated under argon using standard glove box, vacuum line, and syringe techniques.

Spectroscopic Analysis

Individual stock solutions of the substrates and base were prepared at room temperature. An NMR tube was flame dried on a Schlenk line and allowed to come to room temperature while under vacuum. It was then placed under argon and into a -78 °C dry ice/acetone bath. The appropriate amounts of the base followed by the substrates were added via syringe allowing about 30 seconds between additions. The tube was sealed under partial vacuum and immediately vortexed for approximately 10 seconds before being replaced into a -78 °C bath. Hindered enolates **12** and **13** required warming to 0 °C for approximately one hour to complete the enolization. Each NMR tube had 0.10 M total substrate concentration and 0.12 M lithium amide base in 0.24 M TMEDA/toluene.

^6Li NMR spectra were typically recorded at $-90\text{ }^\circ\text{C}$ on a 400 or 500 MHz spectrometer with a delay between scans set to $>5 \times T_1$ to ensure accurate integrations. In a few instances, adjusting the probe temperature was necessary to optimize resolution and line widths, although the origins of these temperature dependencies were not obvious. Chemical shifts are reported relative to a 0.30 M $^6\text{LiCl/MeOH}$ standard.

NMR resonances were integrated using standard software. After weighted Fourier transform with 64,000 points and phasing, line broadening was set between 0 and 0.2, and a baseline correction was applied if appropriate. Deconvolution was performed in the absolute intensity mode, with application of a drift correction using default parameters for contributions from Lorentzian and Gaussian line shapes. For poorly resolved spectra, the resonances were indicated using the “mark” and “use mark” commands. The math underlying the parametric fits has been described in detail.^{3,11}

Supplementary Material

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.

Acknowledgments

We thank the National Institutes of Health for direct support of this work and Merck, Pfizer, Boehringer-Ingelheim, R. W. Johnson, Aventis, Schering-Plough, and DuPont Pharmaceuticals (Bristol-Myers Squibb) for indirect support. We also thank Emily Jayne and Allyson Pickard for help in preparing several substrates.

References and Footnotes

- Green, JR. Science of Synthesis. Vol. Vol. 8a. New York: Georg Thieme Verlag; 2005. p. 427-486. (b) Schetter B, Mahrwald R. Angew. Chem., Int. Ed 2006;45:7506. (c) Arya P, Qin H. Tetrahedron 2000;56:917. Caine, D. Comprehensive Organic Synthesis. Trost, BM.; Fleming, I., editors. Vol. Vol. 1. New York: Pergamon; 1989. p. 1. Martin SF. Ibid Vol. 1:475. Plaquevent, J-C.; Cahard, D.; Guillen, F.; Green, JR. Science of Synthesis. Vol. Vol. 26. New York: Georg Thieme Verlag; 2005. p. 463-511. Katritzky, Alan R.; Taylor, Richard JK., editors. Comprehensive Organic Functional Group Transformations II. Oxford, UK: Elsevier; 1995. p. 834-835. (g) Cativiela C, Diaz-de-Villegas MD. Tetrahedron: Asymmetry 2007;18:569. (h) Dugger RW, Ragan JA, Ripin DHB. Org. Process Res. Dev 2005;9:253. (i) Farina V, Reeves JT, Senanayake CH, Song JJ. Chem. Rev 2006;106:2734. [PubMed: 16836298] Wu G, Huang M. Chem. Rev 2006;106:2596. [PubMed: 16836294]
- Representative examples and leading references to rate studies: (a) Jackman LM, Lange BC. Tetrahedron 1977;33:2737. (b) Jackman LM, Bortiatynski J. Adv. Carbanion Chem 1992;1:45. (c) Jackman LM, Chen X. J. Am. Chem. Soc 1997;119:8681. (d) Wang DZ, Kim Y-J, Streitwieser A. J. Am. Chem. Soc 2000;122:10754. (e) Kim Y-J, Streitwieser A. Org. Lett 2002;4:573. [PubMed: 11843594] (f) Kim Y-J, Wang DZ. Org. Lett 2001;3:2599. [PubMed: 11483070] (g) Zune C, Jerome R. Prog. Polymer Sci 1999;24:631. (g) Baskaran D. Prog. Polym. Sci 2003;28:521. (h) For an extensive bibliography of the structural and mechanistic studies of lithium enolates, see ref³.
- Liou LR, McNeil AJ, Ramirez A, Toombes GES, Gruver JM, Collum DB. J. Am. Chem. Soc 2008;130:4859. [PubMed: 18336025]
- For selected examples of and leading references to structural studies of lithium enolates in solution, see: (a) Yamataka KYamada HTomioka HRappoport ZMarek I The Chemistry of Organolithium Compounds 2004 Vol. 2 New York Wiley 908 (b) Zabicky JRappoport ZMarek I The Chemistry of Organolithium Compounds 2004 Vol. 2 New York Wiley 376 (c) Jackman LM, Bortiatynski J. Adv. Carbanion Chem 1992;1:45. (d) Jackman LM, Lange BC. Tetrahedron 1977;33:2737. (e) Zune C, Jerome R. Prog. Polymer Sci 1999;24:631. (f) Baskaran D. Prog. Polym. Sci 2003;28:521. (g) Pospisil PJ, Wilson SR, Jacobsen EN. J. Am. Chem. Soc 1992;114:7585. (h) Kim Y-J, Streitwieser A. Org. Lett 2002;4:573. [PubMed: 11843594] (i) Biddle MM, Reich HJ. J. Org. Chem 2006;71:4031. [PubMed: 16709041]

5. The rate law provides the stoichiometry of the transition structure relative to the reactant (Edwards JO, Greene EF, Ross JJ. *J. Chem. Educ* 1968;45:381.); knowing the structure of the reactant is essential. For a review describing some recent advances and details of studying organolithium reaction mechanism, see: Collum DB, McNeil AJ, Ramirez A. *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed* 2007;46:3002.
6. The crystallographic literature of lithium enolates⁷ reveals a prevalence of chelated dimmers for TMEDA solvates: (a) Nichols MA, Leposa CM, Hunter AD, Zeller M. *J. Chem. Crystallogr* 2007;37:825. (b) Seebach D, Amstutz R, Laube T, Schweizer WB, Dunitz JD. *JACS* 1985;107:5403. (c) Meyers AI, Seefeld MA, Lefker BA, Blake JF, Williard PG. *J. Am. Chem. Soc* 1998;120:7429. (d) Boche G, Langlotz I, Marsch M, Harms K. *Chem. Ber* 1994;127:2059. (e) Hahn E, Maetzke T, Plattner DA, Seebach D. *Chem. Ber* 1990;123:2059. (f) Henderson KW, Dorigo AE, Williard PG, Bernste PR. *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed* 1996;35:1322. (g) See reference 21c and 28a.
7. (a) Seebach D. *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed. Engl* 1988;27:1624. (b) Setzer WN, Schleyer PvR. *Adv. Organomet. Chem* 1985;24:353. Williard, PG. Chapter 1.1. In: Trost, BM.; Fleming, I., editors. *Comprehensive Organic Synthesis*. Vol. Vol. 1. New York: Pergamon; 1991.
8. The rapid relaxation of the highly quadrupolar ¹⁷O nucleus would preclude observing ⁶Li-¹⁷O coupling.
9. (a) Gil VMS, Oliveira NC. *J. Chem. Educ* 1990;67:473. (b) Huang CY. *Method Enzymol* 1982;87:509. (c) Hirose K. *J. Incl. Phenom* 2001;39:193. (d) Likussar W, Boltz DF. *Anal. Chem* 1971;43:1265.
10. Job P. *Ann. Chim* 1928;9:113.
11. (a) McNeil AJ, Toombes GES, Gruner SM, Lobkovsky E, Collum DB, Chandramouli SV, Vanasse BJ, Ayers TA. *J. Am. Chem. Soc* 2004;126:16559. [PubMed: 15600361] (b) McNeil AJ, Toombes GES, Chandramouli SV, Vanasse BJ, Ayers TA, O'Brien MK, Lobkovsky E, Gruner SM, Marohn JA, Collum DB. *J. Am. Chem. Soc* 2004;126:5938. [PubMed: 15137738] (c) McNeil AJ, Collum DB. *J. Am. Chem. Soc* 2005;127:5655. [PubMed: 15826205]
12. TMEDA is one of the most prevalent ligands in organolithium chemistry: (a) Snieckus V. *Chem. Rev* 1990;90:879. (b) Clayden J. *Organolithiums: Selectivity for Synthesis* 2002 New York Pergamon (c) Langer AW Jr. *Polyamine-Chelated Alkali Metal Compounds* 1974 Washington American Chemical Society (d) For a discussion of the effect of TMEDA on anionic polymerizations of methyl methacrylate, see: Baskaran D, Muller AHE, Sivaram S. *Macromol. Chem. Phys* 2000;201:1901.
13. ⁶Li NMR spectra recorded on mixtures of **1** and **3** in Me₂NET, a non-chelating analog of TMEDA display a distribution of resonances characteristic of an ensemble of tetramers.³
14. Free and bound TMEDA have been observed by ¹³C NMR spectroscopy for a select group of homodimers derived from **1**, **2**, **3**, **13**, **15**, and **28**, suggesting chelation.
15. (a) Goralski P, Chabanel M. *Inorg. Chem* 1987;26:2169. (b) Goralski P, Legoff D, Chabanel M. *J. Organomet. Chem* 1993;456:1.
16. Kissling RM, Gagne MR. *J. Org. Chem* 2001;66:9005. [PubMed: 11749634]
17. Günther H. *J. Brazil. Chem* 1999;10:241.
18. (a) Novak DP, Brown TL. *J. Am. Chem. Soc* 1972;94:3793. (b) Desjardins S, Flinois K, Oulyadi H, Davoust D, Giessner-Prettre C, Parisel O, Maddaluno J. *Organometallics* 2003;22:4090. (c) Weingarten H, Van Wazer JR. *J. Am. Chem. Soc* 1965;87:724.
19. For a more recent example, see: Jacobson MA, Keresztes I, Williard PG. *J. Am. Chem. Soc* 2005;127:4965. [PubMed: 15796563]
20. After surveying a subset of the community, we have chosen to refer to (LiX)_n and (LiX)_m(LiX')_n as a "homoaggregate" and "heteroaggregate", respectively, and reserve the term "mixed aggregate" for (LiX)_m(LiY)_n.
21. (a) Collum DB. *Acc. Chem. Res* 1993;26:227. (b) Williard PG, Hintze MJ. *J. Am. Chem. Soc* 1990;112:8602. (c) Henderson KW, Dorigo AE, Williard PG, Bernstein PR. *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed. Engl* 1996;35:1322. (d) See ref 28e.
22. Kim Y-J, Bernstein MP, Galiano-Roth AS, Romesberg FE, Fuller DJ, Harrison AT, Collum DB, Williard PG. *J. Org. Chem* 1991;56:4435.
23. Romesberg FE, Bernstein MP, Gilchrist JH, Harrison AT, Fuller DJ, Collum DB. *J. Am. Chem. Soc* 1993;115:3475.

24. The relative integration (I_n)³ was previously referred to as aggregate mole fraction (X_n).¹¹ The change was made to avoid using two, distinctly different mole fraction terms and to include provisions for mixtures of aggregates with different aggregation numbers.
25. The mathematics underlying the parametric fits has been described in detail in refs ³ and ¹¹.
26. Ball SC, Cragg-Hine I, Davidson MG, Davies RP, Edwards AJ, Lopez-Solera I, Raithby PR, Snaith R. *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed. Engl* 1995;34:921.
27. Wisian-Neilson P, Islam MS, Ganapathiappan S, Scott DL, Raghuveer KS, Ford RR. *Macromolecules* 1989;22:4382. Kim YH, Webster OW. *J. Am. Chem. Soc* 1990;112:4592.
28. Leading references to salt effects: (a) Tchoubar BLoupy A Chapters 4, 5, and 7. *Salt Effects in Organic and Organometallic Chemistry* 1992 New York VCH (b) Seebach D Proceedings of the Robert A. Welch Foundation Conferences on Chemistry and Biochemistry 1984 New York Wiley 93 (c) Gossage RA, Jastrzebski JTBH, van Koten G. *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed* 2005;44:1448. (d) Seebach D. *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed. Engl* 1988;27:1624. (e) Ramirez A, Sun X, Collum DB. *J. Am. Chem. Soc* 2006;128:10326. [PubMed: 16881665] (f) Also, see ref ^{11a}.
29. Green, JR. *Science of Synthesis*. Vol. Vol. 8a. New York: Georg Thieme Verlag; 2005. p. 427
30. A mixed aryloxide/alkoxide tetramer has been characterized crystallographically: Ko B-T, Lin C-C. *J. Am. Chem. Soc* 2001;123:7973. [PubMed: 11506552]
31. The phenyl moieties on **32** and **33** were necessary to maximize the resolution in the ⁶Li NMR spectrum when paired with *t*-BuOLi (**31**).
32. Collum DB. *Acc. Chem. Res* 1992;25:448.
33. A solvent-free hexameric imidate crystallizes from solutions containing TMEDA: Maetzke T, Seebach D. *Organometallics* 1990;9:3032.
34. For early discussions of steric effects on solvation and aggregation, see: Settle FA, Haggerty M, Eastham JF. *J. Am. Chem. Soc* 1964;86:2076. Lewis HL, Brown TL. *J. Am. Chem. Soc* 1970;92:4664. Brown TL, Gerteis RL, Rafus DA, Ladd JA. *J. Am. Chem. Soc* 1964;86:2135.
35. Unsolvated *t*-BuOLi (**31**) is octameric in the solid state: Allan JF, Nassar R, Specht E, Beatty A, Calin N, Henderson KW. *J. Am. Chem. Soc* 2004;126:484. [PubMed: 14719943]
36. Unsolvated Me₂PhCOLi (**32**) is hexameric in the solid state: Chisholm MH, Drake SR, Naiini AA, Streib WE. *Polyhedron* 1991;10:805.
37. (a) Kamienski CW, Lewis DH. *J. Org. Chem* 1965;30:3498. (b) Golovanov IB, Simonov AP, Priskunov AK, Talalseva TV, Tsareva GV, Kocheshkov. *Dokl. Adka. Nauk. SSSR* 1963;149:835. (c) Simonov AP, Shigorin DN, Talalseva TV, Kocheshkov KA. *Bull. Acad. Sci. USSR Div. Chem. Sci* 1962;6:1056.
38. (a) Arnett EM, Moe KD. *J. Am. Chem. Soc* 1991;113:7288. (b) Arnett EM, Fisher FJ, Nichols MA, Ribeiro AA. *J. Am. Chem. Soc* 1990;112:801. (c) Seebach D, Bauer von W. *Helv. Chim. Acta* 1984;67:1972. (d) Shobatake K, Nakamoto K. *Inorg. Chim. Acta* 1980;4:485. (e) den Besten R, Harder S, Brandsma L. *J. Organomet. Chem* 1990;385:153. (f) Halaska V, Lochmann L. *Collect. Czech. Chem. Commun* 1973;38:1780. (g) Simonov AP, Shigorin DN, Talalseva TV, Kocheshkov KA. *Bull. Acad. Sci. USSR Div. Chem. Sci* 1962;6:1056. (h) Armstrong DR, Davies JE, Davies RP, Raithby PR, Snaith R, Wheatley AEH. *New J. Chem* 1999;35 (i) Lochmann L, Lim D. *J. Organomet. Chem* 1973;50:9. (j) Also, see ref ⁴.
39. (a) Freund M, Michaels H. *Ber. Dtsch. Chem. Ges* 1897;30:1374.8 (b) Chadwick ST, Rennels RA, Rutherford JL, Collum DB. *J. Am. Chem. Soc* 2000;122:8640. (c) Rennels RA, Maliakal AJ, Collum DB. *J. Am. Chem. Soc* 1998;120:421.

Figure 1. ^6Li NMR spectrum of an equimolar mixture (mole fraction: $X_7 = 0.5$) of $[^6\text{Li}]\mathbf{1}$ (**A**) and $[^6\text{Li}]\mathbf{7}$ (**B**) in 0.24 M TMEDA/toluene at $-50\text{ }^\circ\text{C}$.

Figure 2.

Job plot showing the relative integrations versus mole fractions of **7** for 0.10 M mixtures of enolates $[^6\text{Li}]\mathbf{1}$ (**A**) and $[^6\text{Li}]\mathbf{7}$ (**B**) in 0.24 M TMEDA/toluene at $-50\text{ }^\circ\text{C}$.

Figure 3.

Job plot showing the relative integrations versus mole fractions of **13** for 0.10 M mixtures of enolates $[^6\text{Li}]\mathbf{1}$ (**A**) and $[^6\text{Li}]\mathbf{13}$ (**B**) in 0.24 M TMEDA/toluene at $-90\text{ }^\circ\text{C}$.

Figure 4.

Job plot showing the relative integrations versus mole fractions of **1** for 0.10 M mixtures of alkoxide [⁶Li]**34** (**A**) and enolate [⁶Li]**1** (**B**) in 0.24 M TMEDA/toluene at −90 °C.

Figure 5. ^6Li NMR spectrum of a 1:1 mixture of $[\text{}^6\text{Li}]\mathbf{34}$ and $[\text{}^6\text{Li}]\mathbf{36}$ in 0.24 M TMEDA/toluene at $-30\text{ }^\circ\text{C}$.

Table 1

^6Li NMR chemical shifts relative to a 0.30 M [^6Li]LiCl/MeOH standard at $-90\text{ }^\circ\text{C}$ in 0.24 M TMEDA/toluene.

Substrate	$\delta\text{ }^6\text{Li}$	Substrate	$\delta\text{ }^6\text{Li}$
1	0.22	18	-0.33
2	-0.02	19	0.29
3	0.05	20	0.05
7	0.14	21	-0.24
8	-0.05	22	-0.14
9	-0.12	23	-0.26
10	-0.34	24^b	-0.14
11	0.00	25^c	-0.04
12	-0.27	26	0.30
13	-0.42	27	0.03
14	-0.06	28	0.04
15	1.12	29	0.32
16	0.66	30	0.30
17^a	0.33	31	-0.13

^a 3.0 M TMEDA/0.11 M THF/toluene/pentane.

^b $-60\text{ }^\circ\text{C}$.

^c $-70\text{ }^\circ\text{C}$.