Published in final edited form as:

J Am Chem Soc. 2015 November 18; 137(45): 14446–14455. doi:10.1021/jacs.5b09524.

Solid-State and Solution Structures of Glycinimine-Derived Lithium Enolates

Kyoung Joo Jin and David B. Collum*

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

Abstract

A combination of crystallographic, spectroscopic, and computational studies was applied to study the structures of lithium enolates derived from glycinimines of benzophenone and (+)-camphor. The solvents examined included toluene and toluene containing various concentrations of tetrahydrofuran, *N,N,N',N'*-tetramethylethylenediamine (TMEDA), (*R,R*)-*N,N,N',N'*-tetramethylcyclohexanediamine [(*R,R*)-TMEDA], and (*S,S*)-*N,N,N',N'*-tetramethylcyclohexanediamine [(*S,S*)-TMEDA]. Crystal structures show chelated monomers, symmetric disolvated dimers, S_4 -symmetric tetramers, and both S_6 - and D_{3d} -symmetric hexamers. ^6Li NMR spectroscopic studies in conjunction with the method of continuous variations show how these species distribute in solution. Density functional theory computations offer insights into experimentally elusive details.

TOC Graphic

Introduction

Glycinimines have been used as synthons in the preparation of amino acid derivatives from glycine (eq 1).^{1–4} Benzophenone-based imine **1** has received considerable attention in the context of phase-transfer-catalyzed alkylations.² Alkylations of the corresponding lithium enolates of camphor-derivative **3** have been examined, although the yields and selectivities are variable.^{3,4} Lithiated glycinimines captured our imagination as possible targets for studies of the effects of aggregation and solvation on reactivity and stereoselectivity.⁵

* Author Information: David B. Collum, dbc6@cornell.edu.

Supporting Information: Crystallographic, spectroscopic, and computational data and authors for reference 20. This material is available free of charge via the Internet at <http://pubs.acs.org>.

Notes

The authors declare no competing financial interests.

(1)

Herein we describe X-ray crystallographic, NMR spectroscopic, and density functional theory (DFT) computational studies of glycine enolates **1–3** (R = Me, Et, *tert*-Bu) solvated by several mono- and bidentate ligands. These studies reveal diverse structural motifs, including those of monomer **4**, symmetric and unsymmetric (spirocyclic) dimers **5** and **6**, S_4 -symmetric tetramer **7**, S_6 -symmetric hexamer **8**, and D_{3d} -symmetric hexamer **9** (Chart 1). The spectroscopic studies reveal solvent-dependent aggregate distributions in solution.⁶

Results

Substrates

Glycinimines **10–12** were prepared by condensing glycine esters with benzophenone or thiocamphor via literature protocols.^{3a,h} Enolates **1–3** were prepared in situ from glycinimines **10–12** with the solvent(s) of choice from recrystallized lithium hexamethyldisilazide ($[\text{}^6\text{Li}]\text{LiHMDS}$) or $[\text{}^6\text{Li}, \text{}^{15}\text{N}]\text{LiHMDS}$.⁷ Slow aggregate equilibration demanded aging at 25 °C for 60 min before spectroscopic analysis. Although we focus on the methyl esters **1a** and **3a**, crystallinity or superior spectroscopic behaviors occasionally bring the ethyl and *tert*-butyl esters as well as the alanine derivative **2a** into play. The supporting information archives key experimental data and results that are not mentioned herein. We begin with a survey of crystal structures.

X-ray crystal structure: monomer **4c**

The addition of 1.10 equiv of LiHMDS (0.11 M in toluene) to a solution of glycinimine **10c** generated a 0.10 M solution of enolate **1c** in toluene with 0.50 M *N,N,N',N'*-tetramethylethylenediamine (TMEDA) at –78 °C. After the solution was warmed to 25 °C, pale yellow crystals formed overnight, and their composition as TMEDA-chelated monomer

4 was confirmed with X-ray diffraction (Figure 1). Enolate **1c** crystallizes in the monoclinic P2(1)/n space group. Monomer **4c** displays a chelating TMEDA ligand and an N,O-chelate of the substrate that is common to all crystallographically determined glycinimine enolates.

X-ray crystal structure: symmetric dimers **5b**

The crystallization of enolate **1b** (0.20 M) from pentane containing TMEDA (4.45 M) at $-20\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$ afforded dimer **5b** bearing two η^1 -coordinated TMEDA ligands disposed antarafacially to each other (Figure 2) in the triclinic space group P1. Monodentate TMEDA ligands have been detected crystallographically, spectroscopically, and kinetically.^{8,9} Enolate **1b** was crystallized from a 0.10 M enolate solution in neat tetrahydrofuran (THF) at $25\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$ to afford THF-solvated dimer **5b** (Figure 3), which is structurally similar to the TMEDA-solvated **5b**.

X-ray crystal structure: tetramer **7a**

A 0.10 M solution of benzophenone-derived enolate **2a** in 6.40 M Et₂O/toluene deposited pale yellow crystals after standing at $25\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$ for 3 days. X-ray diffraction analysis (Figure 4) shows tetramer **7a** in the monoclinic space group C2/c. The alternating N,O-chelated enolates correspond to an S₄-symmetric cubic core (**7**).

X-ray crystal structure: hexamer **8b**

A 0.10 M solution of benzophenone-derived enolate **1b** in toluene was prepared at $-78\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$. The solution was warmed to $25\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$ and yielded pale yellow crystals overnight. X-ray diffraction analysis (Figure 5) shows that complex **8b** crystallizes in the monoclinic space group P2(1)/n as a hexamer. The alternating N,O-chelated enolates on a hexagonal drum afford an S₆-symmetric core. Apparent ethoxy–lithium contacts may be stabilizing.

X-ray crystal structure: hexamer **9a**

A 0.10 M solution of camphor-derived enolate **3a** in 1:2 tetramethylsilane¹⁰/pentane afforded colorless crystals after standing at $-20\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$ for 2 days. X-ray diffraction analysis (Figure 6) shows hexamer **9a** in the monoclinic space group P2(1). The N,O-chelated enolates correspond to a D_{3d}-symmetric cubic core.

Solution structures: general protocols

The enolates were characterized in solution with a series of techniques centering on ⁶Li NMR spectroscopy. Standard ⁶Li spectra were recorded as a function of enolate and donor ligand concentrations to assess relative aggregation and solvation states. ¹⁵N-labeled glycinimine enolates confirmed the presence of chelation. [⁶Li, ¹⁵N]LiHMDS was used to exclude mixed aggregation in the presence of donor ligands.¹¹ However, enolates **1a** or **3a** with excess [⁶Li, ¹⁵N]LiHMDS in neat toluene afford—in addition to the homoaggregates discussed below—two ⁶Li doublets consistent with substructure **13** likely derive from ladder **14**.^{12,13}

Although the crystal structures are helpful, a critical arbiter of solution structure stems from the method of continuous variations (MCV).^{14,15} In short, MCV overcomes the problems of high homoaggregate symmetry, A_n and B_n , by generating an ensemble of homo- and heteroaggregates (eq 2). The number of heteroaggregates, their dependence on subunit mole fraction (X_A or X_B), and their spectroscopically detected symmetries provide the aggregation state, n . In higher aggregates, especially hexamers, positional isomerism and the stereochemistry of chelation cause inordinate complexity.^{15c} Warming the sample to elicit chelate exchange and intra-aggregate lithium–lithium site exchange¹⁶ symmetrizes the heteroaggregates, which causes each A_xB_y stoichiometry to appear as a single ${}^6\text{Li}$ resonance.¹⁴ A graph of concentration versus mole fraction affords a Job plot¹⁷ (exemplified by Figure 9) in which a parametric fit reveals minimal deviations from statistical distributions.

The presence or absence of solvation can be inferred from solvent-dependent chemical shifts. A particularly useful trick is to add increments of pyridine, which shifts resonances corresponding to solvated ${}^6\text{Li}$ nuclei markedly downfield and leaves unsolvated resonances unchanged.¹⁸

Some comments about structural variations are warranted. MCV analyses rely on binary combinations of methyl, ethyl, and *tert*-butyl ester enolates with distinctly different chemical shifts to form A_n – B_n ensembles with optimal resolution. In many instances, different esters afford alternative views of similar structures; we typically focus on the ester offering optimal resolution. In some instances, however, variations are merely historical owing to the chronology of the exploration. When it is clarifying, an explanation is given for the choice of substrate.

Solution Structures: toluene

After aging at 25 °C in toluene, benzophenone-derived enolate **1a** affords two homoaggregates (Figure 7) shown to be a hexamer and a tetramer. The downfield resonance at 1.88 ppm increases with concentration, which indicates that it is the larger of the two. Each resonance of [${}^6\text{Li}$, ${}^{15}\text{N}$]**1a** was a doublet ($J = 3.0$ Hz), which confirms that both are chelated and that chelate exchanges are slow. The consequences of rapid chelate exchange on resonance counts, multiplicities, and coupling constants are discussed below. The major and minor resonances coalesce to a single resonance above -10 °C.

To apply MCV, we turned to camphor-derived enolate **3a**, which displays a single resonance at high concentrations with a minor shoulder (corresponding to the lower aggregate) emerging on dilution. Under conditions in which the two higher homoaggregates dominate, mixtures of **1a** and **3a** in toluene generate complex spectra at low temperatures. This complexity arises from positional isomerism^{15c} within the heteroaggregates. Warming to 35 °C, however, imparts rapid intra-aggregate lithium–lithium site exchanges¹⁶ and chelated exchanges that reveal clean ensembles with seven resonances consistent with hexamers (Figure 8). (Interaggregate exchange at much higher temperatures would average all resonances to a single resonance and, in the case of labelled species, cause loss of ^6Li - ^{15}N coupling.) Monitoring the ensemble as a function of mole fraction affords the Job plot in Figure 9.

Two hexameric topologies were detected crystallographically: S_6 -symmetric hexamer **8b** was observed for enolate **1b** (Figure 5) and D_{3d} -symmetric hexamer **9a** derived from enolate **3a** (Figure 6). Therefore, we are forced to rely on crystallographic analogy and computations (below) to complete the assignments (*vide infra*). We note, however, that S_6 -topology in **8a** derived from chiral enolate **3a** should afford a doubling of the ^6Li resonance; the lithiums around the top and bottom hexagons are not magnetically equivalent.¹⁵ No such doubling was observed. Thus, the solution structure of the hexamer derived from enolate **3a** appears to be the D_{3d} form **9a** found crystallographically (Figure 6).

The observable minor aggregates of enolates **1a** and **3a** were assigned as tetramers. The absence of a downfield shift with added pyridine confirms that these aggregates are unsolvated. They are also demonstrably lower aggregates than hexamers (*vide supra*) and larger than observable dimers (*vide infra*). A plot of n -mer versus hexamer at various enolate concentrations afforded a value of n consistent with tetramer (Figure 10). Efforts to use MCV failed, however, owing to poor resolution.

DFT computations at the B3LYP/6–31G(d) level of theory with single-point calculations at the MP2 level of theory^{20,21} were brought to bear on the problem. The numbers are reported in kilocalories per mole per lithium.^{20,21} The hexamers are considerably more stable than the tetramers (eq 3), which conflicts with the nearly thermoneutral relationship observed experimentally. “ S_6 -symmetric hexamer **8a** and D_{3d} tetramer **9a** are equivalent within computational error (eq 4).²²” S_4 -symmetric tetramer **7a** is slightly less stable than the D_{2d} form, **15a** (eq 5). Compared with both the hexamer and tetramers, the unsolvated dimer (not

shown) is much higher in energy, which suggests that the unsolvated dimer is an improbable form.

(3)

(4)

(5)

Solution Structures: THF

In 1.0–4.0 M THF/toluene, the incremental addition of THF to enolate **1a** converts the hexamer–tetramer mixture to a single new aggregate as indicated by the Li-6 NMR spectra (Figure 11) shown to be a solvated dimer by MCV (below). Incremental addition of pyridine to **1a** in 1.0 M THF/toluene causes a marked downfield shift that confirms the solvated form of the dimer. The spectrum of $[^6\text{Li}, ^{15}\text{N}]\mathbf{1a}$ fails to show clear ^6Li – ^{15}N coupling at temperatures as low as -115°C , which is consistent with a loss of chelation, but some broadening of the ^6Li resonance suggests that a dynamic process is involved. Indeed, the ^6Li resonance of the *ethoxy*-substituted enolate $[^6\text{Li}, ^{15}\text{N}]\mathbf{1b}$ appears as a triplet owing to ^6Li – ^{15}N coupling ($J = 1.5 \text{ Hz}$). The lone triplet suggests rapid intra-aggregate chelate

exchange with the concomitant appearance of coupling by *both* Li–N dative interactions (eq 6) statistically averaged to half the normal 3 Hz coupling.¹⁶

(6)

The spectrum of alanine-derived enolate **2a** in THF/toluene solutions is different than that of **1a** (*vide infra*). Most important, distinctly different chemical shifts for **1a** and **2a** allow for an MCV analysis. Thus, varying the mole fraction of enolates **1a** and **2a** affords an ensemble of resonances consistent with dimeric homoaggregates and a single heteroaggregate (Figure 12). The resulting Job plot is illustrated in Figure 13. Heterodimer **16** should appear as two distinct ⁶Li resonances, but the rapid chelate exchange akin to that in eq 6 precludes this result.

A critical consequence of the time-averaging is our inability to distinguish symmetric dimer **5a** from unsymmetric dimer **6a**. DFT computations weigh in by showing that they are of nearly equal stability (eq 7). The role of type **6** dimers comes to light with chelating ligands (*vide infra*).

(7)

Solutions of **1a** in 8.0 M THF show dimers along with a minor upfield shoulder below -80°C that is suspected to be a monomer. The more substituted alanine-derived enolate **2a** shows the putative monomer resonance slightly downfield, but it is better resolved and the dominant form in neat THF. Reducing the enolate concentration and lowering the temperature also favored monomer relative to dimer.²³ Monitoring the dimer–monomer equilibrium versus absolute concentration affords further supports the monomer assignment (Figure 14). Unfortunately, exchange occurs too quickly to observe ^6Li – ^{15}N coupling at -90°C .

Conventional thinking that presumes tetrahedral lithium suggests the monomer to be solvate **4a** ($S = \text{THF}$), but five-coordinate monomer **17** seems reasonable to us in light of well-documented high-coordinate lithium.²⁴ Nonetheless, **17** is not computationally viable (expels a THF ligand), possibly owing to crowding by the phenyl moiety. The computations show a modest preference for the dimeric form (eq 8).

(8)

Camphor-derived enolates **3** exhibit markedly different behaviors. The unsolvated hexamer **9a** derived from enolate **3a** is observable even in neat THF solution and at elevated temperatures, affording only low concentrations of a THF-solvated form of unknown structure. The ^6Li NMR spectrum of ethyl ester-derived enolate **3b** in THF is intractable; the

tert-butyl ester-derived enolate **3c** is more tractable but still complex. The steric inhibition of solvation is likely at play.²⁵

Solution Structures: TMEDA

Despite having a crystal structure of **5b** bearing an η^1 -TMEDA (Figure 2), we could not detect symmetric type **5** dimers in significant concentrations. By contrast, unsymmetrical dimer **6a**, which lacks crystallographic analogy within our study, is quite prevalent. The spectroscopic properties arising from the symmetry of **6** are definitive (Figure 15).²⁶

Results for enolates **1a** and **1b** are analogous; maximal resolution is observed with ethyl ester derived enolate **1b** (Figure 16). Dimer **6b** displays two distinct ^6Li resonances. The downfield resonance at 2.94 ppm splits into a triplet ($J_{\text{Li-N}} = 3.0$ Hz) for $[^6\text{Li}, ^{15}\text{N}]\textbf{1b}$, whereas the upfield peak at 0.72 ppm is a singlet. The ^6Li resonances have 1:1 ratios under all conditions. High concentrations of TMEDA cause the disappearance of **6b** and the growth of putative monomer **4b**.

As depicted in Figure 15, the spirocyclic structure of **6** renders the internal lithium nucleus stereogenic with concomitant formation of *diastereomers* of camphor-derived enolates **3a–c** (eq 9). $[^6\text{Li}]\textbf{3b}$ at low TMEDA concentrations in toluene gave the clearest resolution of dimer **6** as an approximate 3:1 mixture of diastereomers (Figure 17a). The two upfield resonances, each corresponding to a diastereomer, resolve for enolates **3a–c**, whereas the downfield resonances corresponding to the stereogenic centers offer only glimpses of doubling in the form of distortions. The 1:1 ratio was shown to be constant by integrating the pairs of upfield resonances and the broad downfield resonance. The downfield resonances of enolates $[^6\text{Li}, ^{15}\text{N}]\textbf{3a}$ and $[^6\text{Li}, ^{15}\text{N}]\textbf{3b}$ appear as broadened (superimposed) triplets, whereas neither splitting nor broadening was observed for the two upfield resonances.

(9)

Solutions of enolate $[^6\text{Li}, ^{15}\text{N}]\textbf{3b}$ observed at high TMEDA concentration afford a new species consistent with monomer **4b**. In contrast to the benzophenone-based enolates in which coupling is not observable, camphor-derived monomer **4b** appears as a doublet ($J_{\text{Li-N}} = 4.2$ Hz). Thus, the assignment as a monomer is reasonably secure, although we cannot rigorously exclude a higher symmetric oligomer such as dimer **5**.

Solution Structures: *N,N,N',N'*-tetramethylcyclohexanediamine (TMCD)A

In analogy with TMEDA, TMCD^{27,28} influences the aggregation of enolates **1–3**. The chirality is clarifying but offers one confounding result. Benzophenone derivative **1a** in (*R,R*)-TMCD_A/toluene shows a number of ⁶Li resonances consistent with dimers **6** in which the stereogenic center at lithium causes the formation of diastereomers (eq 10). The upfield resonances resolve, whereas the downfield resonances do not. There was added complexity, however. The integrations of the upfield resonances do not match those of downfield peaks, and this outcome suggests an aggregate of unknown structure hiding underneath. The ethyl ester enolate **1b** provides improved resolution, although the amount of dimer **6b** is not as significant owing to the appearance of monomer at relatively low TMCD_A concentrations.

The confounding result is that we observe *three* pairs of ⁶Li resonances of **6b** with matching integration values in the presence of 0.040 M (*S,S*)-TMCD_A. The downfield ⁶Li resonances of [⁶Li, ¹⁵N]**1b** appear as overlapping multiplets, and the upfield resonances are partially resolved. The putative monomer appears at 1.80 ppm with ⁶Li–¹⁵N coupling (2.9 Hz) as expected. The remaining benzophenone derivatives **1c** and **2a** show strong tendencies to form monomers.

(10)

The camphor derivatives **3** do not afford detectable monomer. Solvation of enolate **3a** by (*R,R*)-TMCD_A affords unsymmetric type **6** dimers more readily than that by TMEDA. The unsolvated hexamer persists in various degrees throughout a series of TMCD_A concentrations ranging from 0.048 to 1.80 M. Labeling studies of **3a** show what appears to be superimposed triplets along with unaffected singlets in the upfield region. (*S,S*)-TMCD_A affords unsymmetric dimer with distinctly different chemical shifts (as expected). The resolution is maximized by using the ethoxy derivative (Figure 17b,c) wherein [⁶Li, ¹⁵N]**3b** shows two pairs of ⁶Li resonances manifesting two triplet–singlet pairs in the presence of (*S,S*)-TMCD_A.

Discussion

Lithium enolates of **1–3** derived from glycinimines are synthetically useful for preparing non-natural substituted amino acids.^{1–4} A clear understanding of organolithium solvation and aggregation is a *mandatory* prerequisite for elucidating the mechanistic basis of stereocontrol: the solvent-dependent structure determinations described herein represent the first steps toward understanding how structure influences mechanism and reactivity. The crystallographic studies revealed an unusually diverse array of aggregate types (Chart 1). Spectroscopic studies showed a high but imperfect correlation between solid-state and

solution structures. Computational studies provided a few experimentally elusive details and theory–experiment correlations.

Hexamers

Ligand-free hexamers characterized crystallographically and shown by MCV to persist in toluene solutions have several curious structural features. The most surprising is that the benzophenone-derived enolate (see Figure 5) and camphor-derived enolate (see Figure 6) prefer fundamentally different S_6 - and D_{3d} -symmetric core structures (**8** and **9**), respectively. The stereochemistry of the hexamers in solution is elusive, but tacit evidence suggests the chiral camphor-derived hexamer is D_{3d} -symmetric **9**. The ethoxy–lithium interactions (**18**) could be attributable to steric relief but are also likely to be stabilizing. We suspect that the approximate 120° Li–O–Li bond angle of the hexagonal prism may support the multidentate contact, whereas the more acute angles on lower aggregates do not.

Tetramers

The tetramers were the most elusive of the structural forms. A crystallographically characterized S_4 isomer (Figure 4) was observed, but computations of enolate **1a** indicates a preference of D_{2d} isomer **15** (eq 5). Both forms of chelating organolithiums are precedented.^{29,30} Computations also showed a distinct preference for hexamers over tetramers. Tetramers were detected in solution, but the assignment relied on inference: they were confirmed with concentration dependencies. All attempts to apply MCV analysis failed to identify pairing partners that would afford well-resolved ensembles.

Dimers

The dimeric enolates underscored the divergence of solution and solid-state structures: symmetric dimers of type **5** were observed (twice) crystallographically (Figures 2 and 3) but in many instances could not be unassailably identified in solution. By contrast, unsymmetric type **6** dimers were readily detected and characterized in solution owing to their highly characteristic resonance counts and ^6Li – ^{15}N coupling patterns, but none crystallized. Both **5** and **6** are computationally viable (eq 7) and have ample analogy in the structural organolithium literature.²³

The stereogenic center of the **6** type dimer (see Figure 15) offered interesting spectroscopic properties in that introducing additional stereogenic centers by using camphor-derived enolates **3**, (*R,R*)-TMCDA, or (*S,S*)-TMCDA resulted in peak doublings consistent with mixtures of diastereomers (eqs 9 and 10).

Monomers

A monomer of enolate **4c** chelated by TMEDA was characterized crystallographically (Figure 1). Toluene solutions containing THF, TMEDA, and TMCDA all afforded putative monomers at high ligand concentrations. Rapid exchanges, however, caused a loss of the expected ^6Li – ^{15}N coupling in most circumstances, although we did see coupling in one case. We are comfortable assigning TMEDA- and TMCDA-solvated monomers as four-coordinated chelates in solution. We suspected that the THF solvates might favor five-coordinate forms **17** owing to well-precedented high-coordinate lithium. Computational studies clearly do not support this notion, however.

Conclusion

Glycinimine-derived enolates provide unexpectedly rich structural diversity when solvated by several standard solvents. The various aggregates necessarily influence the rates of alkylation. It is less clear, however, whether the different species influence the stereochemistries of functionalizations. Aggregate-dependent mechanisms and stereochemistries depend on whether the aggregates react with electrophiles without intervening deaggregations or whether they all funnel through common, possibly monomer-based, intermediates. We have some evidence that the aggregates can react directly, but these studies are preliminary, ongoing, and challenging.

Experimental Section

Reagents and Solvents

Glycinimines were prepared from the corresponding commercially available glycinate esters, ^{15}N -labelled glycinate esters, benzophenone, camphor, and thiocamphor via literature protocols.^{3a,h} Toluene, hexanes, TMEDA, THF, (*R,R*)-*trans*-TMCDA,²⁷ and (*S,S*)-*trans*-TMCDA²⁷ were distilled from sodium benzophenone ketyl. Toluene and hexanes were distilled from blue solutions containing sodium benzophenone ketyl with approximately 1% tetraglyme to dissolve the ketyl. $[\text{}^6\text{Li}]\text{LiHMDS}$ and $[\text{}^6\text{Li},^{15}\text{N}]\text{LiHMDS}$ were prepared and

recrystallized as described previously.⁷ Air- and moisture-sensitive materials were manipulated under argon using standard glove box, vacuum line, and syringe techniques.

NMR Spectroscopy

Individual stock solutions of substrates and base were prepared at room temperature. An NMR tube under vacuum was flame-dried on a Schlenk line and allowed to return to room temperature. It was then backfilled with argon and placed in a $-78\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$ dry ice/acetone bath. The appropriate amounts of $[\text{}^6\text{Li}]\text{LiHMDS}$ and glycinimine were added sequentially via syringe. The tube was sealed under partial vacuum, aged at $25\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$ for 60 min to equilibrate the aggregates, stored in a $-86\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$ freezer until used to record the spectra, and shaken before placement into the spectrometer. Each NMR sample contained 0.10 M total enolate and 0.11 M LiHMDS unless stated otherwise.

^6Li NMR spectra were typically recorded at temperatures between -70 and $-80\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$ on a 500 or 600 MHz spectrometer with the delay between scans set to $>5 \times T_1$ to ensure accurate integrations. Chemical shifts were reported relative to a 0.30 M $^6\text{LiCl}/\text{MeOH}$ standard at the reported probe temperature. The resonances were integrated by using the standard software accompanying the spectrometers. After weighted Fourier transform with 64,000 points and phasing, line broadening was set between 0 and 0.3, and a baseline correction was applied when appropriate. Deconvolution of the ensemble in the experiments for MCV determination of structure was performed in the absolute intensity mode, with the application of a drift correction using default parameters for contributions from Lorentzian and Gaussian line shapes. The mathematics underlying the parametric fits have been described in detail.^{15a}

Supplementary Material

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.

Acknowledgments

We thank the National Institutes of Health (GM077167).

References and Footnotes

1. Abellán T, Chinchilla R, Galindo N, Guillena G, Nájera C, Sansano JM. *Eur J Org Chem.* 2000:2689.
2. (a) O'Donnell MJ. *Acc Chem Res.* 2004; 37:506. [PubMed: 15311949] (b) O'Donnell MJ, Wu S, Huffman JC. *Tetrahedron.* 1994; 50:4507. (c) O'Donnell MJ, Wu S. *Tetrahedron: Asymm.* 1992; 3:591. (d) Lygo B, Andrews B. *Acc Chem Res.* 2004; 37:518. [PubMed: 15311950] (e) Ooi T, Maruoka K. *Angew Chem Int Ed.* 2007; 46:4222. (f) Maruoka K. *Org Process Res Dev.* 2008; 12:679. (g) Maruoka K, Ooi T. *Chem Rev.* 2003; 103:3013. [PubMed: 12914490]
3. (a) McIntosh JM, Mishra P. *Can J Chem.* 1986; 64:726. (b) McIntosh JM, Leavitt RK. *Tet Lett.* 1986; 27:3839. (c) McIntosh JM, Cassidy KC. *Can J Chem.* 1988:3116. (d) McIntosh JM, Leavitt RK, Mishra P, Cassidy KC, Drake JE, Chadha R. *J Org Chem.* 1988; 53:1947. (e) Sánchez-Obregón R, Fallis AG, Szabo AG. *Can J Chem.* 1992; 70:1531. (f) Laue KW, Mück-Lichtenfeld C, Haufe G. *Tetrahedron.* 1999; 55:10413. (g) Kroeger S, Haufe G. *Libigs Annalen/Recueil.* 1997; 6:1201. (h) O'Donnell MJ, Polt RL. *J Org Chem.* 1982; 47:2663–2666.

4. (a) Kanemasa S, Tatsukawa A, Wada E. *J Org Chem.* 1991; 56:2875.(b) Yamamoto H, Kanemasa S, Wada E. *Chem Soc Jpn.* 1991; 64:2739.(c) Tatsukawa A, Dan M, Ohbatake M, Kawatake K, Fukata T, Wada E, Kanemasa S, Katei S. *J Org Chem.* 1993; 58:4221.(d) Pyne SG, Safaei GJ, Schafer K, Javidan A, Skelton BW, White AH. *Aust J Chem.* 1998; 51:137.(e) Changyou Z, Daimo C, Yaozhong J. *Syn Comm.* 1987; 17:1377.(f) Tatsukawa A, Kawatake K, Kanemasa S, Rudzinski JM. *J Chem Soc Perkin Trans 2.* 1994:2525.(g) Kanemasa S, Tatsukawa A, Wada E, Tsuge O. *Chem Lett.* 1989; 18:1301.
5. (a) Green, JR. *Science of Synthesis.* Vol. 8a. Georg Thieme Verlag; New York: 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.(d) Caine, D. *Comprehensive Organic Synthesis.* Trost, BM.; Fleming, I., editors. Vol. 1. Pergamon; New York: 1989. p. 1.Martin, S. F. *Ibid.*, Vol. 1, pg. 475.(e) Plaquevent, J-C.; Cahard, D.; Guillen, F.; Green, JR. *Science of Synthesis.* Vol. 26. Georg Thieme Verlag; New York: 2005. p. 463-511.(f) Katritzky, Alan R.; Taylor, Richard JK., editors. *Comprehensive Organic Functional Group Transformations II.* Elsevier; Oxford, U.K.: 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] (j) Wu G, Huang M. *Chem Rev.* 2006; 106:2596. [PubMed: 16836294]
6. (a) Seebach D. *Angew Chem, Int Ed Engl.* 1988; 27:1624.(b) Reich HJ. *Chem Rev.* 2013; 113:7130. [PubMed: 23941648] (c) Braun M. *Helv Chim Acta.* 2015; 98:1.(d) Setzer WN, Schleyer PvR. *Adv Organomet Chem.* 1985; 24:353.(e) Williard, PG. *Comprehensive Organic Synthesis.* Trost, BM.; Fleming, I., editors. Vol. 1. Pergamon; New York: 1991. Chapter 1.1(f) Reich HJ. *J Org Chem.* 2012; 77:5471. [PubMed: 22594379] (g) Kim Y-J, Streitwieser A. *Org Lett.* 2002; 4:573. [PubMed: 11843594] (h) Jackman LM, Lange BC. *Tetrahedron.* 1977; 33:2737.(i) Li D, Keresztes I, Hopson R, Williard PG. *Acc Chem Res.* 2009; 42:270. [PubMed: 19105594] (j) Zune C, Jerome R. *Prog Polymer Sci.* 1999; 24:631.(k) Baskaran D. *Prog Polym Sci.* 2003; 28:521.
7. Romesberg FE, Bernstein MP, Gilchrist JH, Harrison AT, Fuller DJ, Collum DB. *J Am Chem Soc.* 1993; 115:3475.
8. (a) Bauer W, Klusener PAA, Harder S, Kanters JA, Duisenberg AJM, Brandsma L, Schleyer PvR. *Organometallics.* 1988; 7:552.(b) Köster H, Thoennes D, Weiss E. *J Organomet Chem.* 1978; 160:1. (c) Tecle' B, Ilsley WH, Oliver JP. *Organometallics.* 1982; 1:875.(d) Harder S, Boersma J, Brandsma L, Kanters JA. *J Organomet Chem.* 1988; 339:7.(e) Sekiguchi A, Tanaka M. *J Am Chem Soc.* 2003; 125:12684. [PubMed: 14558797] (f) Linnert M, Bruhn C, Ruffer T, Schmidt H, Steinborn D. *Organometallics.* 2004; 23:3668.(g) Fraenkel G, Stier M. *Prepr Am Chem Soc, Div Pet Chem.* 1985; 30:586.(h) Ball SC, Cragg-Hine I, Davidson MG, Davies RP, Lopez-Solera MI, Raithby PR, Reed D, Snaith R, Vogl EM. *J Chem Soc, Chem Commun.* 1995:2147.(i) Wehman E, Jastrzebski JTBH, Ernsting J-M, Grove JM, van Koten G. *J Organomet Chem.* 1988; 353:145.(j) Becker J, Grimme S, Fröhlich R, Hoppe D. *Angew Chem, Int Ed.* 2007; 46:1645.(k) Bernstein MP, Romesberg FE, Fuller DJ, Harrison AT, Williard PG, Liu QY, Collum DB. *J Am Chem Soc.* 1992; 114:5100.
9. Collum DB. *Acc Chem Res.* 1992; 25:448.
10. (a) Hexamethyldisiloxane is reputed to be less polar than standard hydrocarbons for crystallizing lipophilic compounds (ref 10b). For organolithium reagents, the more robust tetramethylsilane appears to act similarly as evidenced by the insolubility of LiHMDS (ref 10c).(b) Pfeifer, J. Hexamethyldisiloxane. In: Paquette, LA., editor. *Encyclopedia of Reagents for Organic Synthesis.* Wiley; New York: 2004. (c) Lucht BL, Collum DB. *J Am Chem Soc.* 1996; 118:2217.
11. (a) Collum DB. *Acc Chem Res.* 1993; 26:227.(b) Lucht BL, Collum DB. *Acc Chem Res.* 1999; 32:1035.
12. Mulvey RE. *Chem Soc Rev.* 1991; 20:167.
13. Bruneau AM, Collum DB. *J Am Chem Soc.* 2014; 136:2885. [PubMed: 24471766]
14. Renny JS, Tomasevich LL, Tallmadge EH, Collum DB. *Angew Chem, Int Ed.* 2013; 52:11998.
15. (a) Liou LR, McNeil AJ, Ramírez A, Toombes GES, Gruver JM, Collum DB. *J Am Chem Soc.* 2008; 130:4859. [PubMed: 18336025] (b) De Vries TS, Goswami A, Liou LR, Gruver JM, Jayne E, Collum DB. *J Am Chem Soc.* 2009; 131:13142. [PubMed: 19702308] (c) Liou LR, McNeil AJ, Toombes GES, Collum DB. *J Am Chem Soc.* 2008; 130:17334. [PubMed: 19090750]

16. (a) Arvidsson PI, Ahlberg P, Hilmersson G. *Chem Eur J*. 1999; 5:1348.(b) Bauer W. *J Am Chem Soc*. 1996; 118:5450.(c) Bauer W, Griesinger C. *J Am Chem Soc*. 1993; 115:10871.(d) DeLong GT, Pannell DK, Clarke MT, Thomas RD. *J Am Chem Soc*. 1993; 115:7013.(e) Thomas RD, Clarke MT, Jensen RM, Young TC. *Organometallics*. 1986; 5:1851.(f) Bates TF, Clarke MT, Thomas RD. *J Am Chem Soc*. 1988; 110:5109.(g) Fraenkel, G.; Hsu, H.; Su, BM. *Lithium: Current Applications in Science, Medicine, and Technology*. Bach, RO., editor. Wiley; New York: 1985. p. 273-289.(h) Heinzer J, Oth JFM, Seebach D. *Helv Chim Acta*. 1985; 68:1848.(i) Fraenkel G, Henrichs M, Hewitt JM, Su BM, Geckle MJ. *J Am Chem Soc*. 1980; 102:3345.(j) Lucht BL, Collum DB. *J Am Chem Soc*. 1996; 118:3529.(k) Knorr R, Menke T, Ferchland K, Mahlstäubl J, Stephenson DS. *J Am Chem Soc*. 2008; 130:14179. [PubMed: 18828636]
17. Job P. *Ann Chim*. 1928; 9:113.
18. (a) Tomasevich LL, Collum DB. *J Org Chem*. 2013; 78:7498. [PubMed: 23806055] (b) Reich HJ, Kulicke KJ. *J Am Chem Soc*. 1996; 118:273.(c) Jackman LM, Chen X. *J Am Chem Soc*. 1997; 119:8681.(d) Jackman LM, Petrei MM, Smith BD. *J Am Chem Soc*. 1991; 113:3451.(e) Jackman LM, DeBrosse CW. *J Am Chem Soc*. 1983; 105:4177.(f) Deana RK, Recklinga AM, Chena H, Daweab LN, Schneiderac CM, Kozak CM. *Dalton Trans*. 2013; 42:3504. [PubMed: 23280340] (g) Boyle TJ, Pedrotty DM, Alam TM, Vick SC, Rodriguez MA. *Inorg Chem*. 2000; 39:5133. [PubMed: 11233212]
19. The measured mole fraction—the mole fraction within only the ensemble of interest—rather intended mole fraction of the enolates added to the samples—eliminates the distorting effects of impurities.
20. Frisch, MJ., et al. *GaussianVersion 3.09*. Gaussian, Inc; Wallingford, CT: 2009. revision A.1
21. For leading references to theoretical studies of O-lithiated species, see:(a) Khartabi HK, Gros PC, Fort Y, Ruiz-Lopez MF. *J Org Chem*. 2006; 73:9393.(b) Streitwieser A. *J Mol Model*. 2006; 12:673. [PubMed: 16341718] (c) Pratt LM, Streitwieser A. *J Org Chem*. 2003; 68:2830. [PubMed: 12662059] (d) Pratt LM, Nguyen SC, Thanh BT. *J Org Chem*. 2008; 73:6086. [PubMed: 18646860]
22. Because of technical problems owing to their size, the hexamer comparison in eq 4 is not MP2 corrected.
23. Reich HJ. *Chem Rev*. 2013; 113:7130. [PubMed: 23941648]
24. (a) Lucht BL, Collum DB. *J Am Chem Soc*. 1995; 117:9863.(b) Scheschkewitz D. *Angew Chem, Int Ed Engl*. 2004; 43:2965. [PubMed: 15170317] (c) Niecke E, Nieger M, Schmidt O, Gudat D, Schoeller WW. *J Am Chem Soc*. 1999; 121:519.(d) Becker G, Eschbach B, Mundt O, Reti M, Niecke E, Issberner K, Nieger M, Thelen V, Noth H, Waldhor R, Schmidt MZ. *Anorg Allg Chem*. 1998; 624:469.(e) Becker G, Schwarz W, Seidler N, Westerhausen MZ. *Anorg Allg Chem*. 1992; 612:72.(f) Wang H, Wang H, Li H-W, Xie Z. *Organometallics*. 2004; 23:875.(g) Xu X, Zhang Z, Yao Y, Zhang Y, Shen Q. *Inorg Chem*. 2007; 46:9379. [PubMed: 17880064] (h) Thiele K, Goris H, Imhof W, Seide WZ. *Anorg Allg Chem*. 2002; 628:107.(i) Ramirez A, Lobkovsky E, Collum DB. *J Am Chem Soc*. 2003; 125:15376. [PubMed: 14664582] (j) Buchalski P, Grabowska I, Kaminska E, Suwinska K. *Organometallics*. 2008; 27:2346.
25. (a) Zhao P, Collum DB. *J Am Chem Soc*. 2003; 125:14411. and references cited therein. [PubMed: 14624589] For an early suggestion that steric effects are major determinants of solvation, see:(b) Settle FA, Haggerty M, Eastham JF. *J Am Chem Soc*. 1964; 86:2076.(c) Bernstein MP, Collum DB. *J Am Chem Soc*. 1993; 115:8008.
26. (a) Reich HJ, Goldenberg WS, Gudmundsson B, Sanders AW, Kulicke KJ, Simon K, Guzei IA. *J Am Chem Soc*. 2001; 123:8067. [PubMed: 11506563] (b) Steiner A, Stalke D. *Angew Chem, Int Ed Engl*. 1995; 34:1752.(c) Belzner J, Schar D, Dehnert U, Noltemeyer M. *Organometallics*. 1997; 16:285.(d) Jantzi KL, Puckett CL, Guzei IA, Reich HJ. *J Org Chem*. 2005; 70:7520. [PubMed: 16149779] (e) Vos M, de Kanter FJJ, Schakel M, van Eikema Hommes NJR, Klumpp GW. *J Am Chem Soc*. 1987; 109:2187.(f) Hilmersson G, Davidsson O. *J Org Chem*. 1995; 60:7660.(g) Hilmersson G, Arvidsson PI, Davidsson Ö, Håkansson M. *Organometallics*. 1997; 16:3352.(h) Hilmersson G. *Chem Eur J*. 2000; 6:3069. [PubMed: 10993268] (i) Kahne D, Gut S, DePue R, Mohamadi F, Wanat RA, Collum DB, Clardy J, Van Duyne G. *J Am Chem Soc*. 1984; 106:4865. (j) Reich HJ, Sikorski WH, Thompson JL, Sanders AW, Jones AC. *Org Lett*. 2006; 8:4003. [PubMed: 16928059] (j) Larranaga O, de Cozar A, Bickelhaupt FM, Zangi R, Cossio FP. *Chem Eur J*. 2013; 19:13761. [PubMed: 23964002]

27. We found that *R,R*- and *S,S*-1,2-cyclohexanediamines are not equivalent purities. Although the source of the differences was not found, we alleviated the problem by resolving *trans*-cyclohexanediamine,^{27b} N-methylating the methyls,^{17b} recrystallizing the resulting TMCDAs as its HCl salt,^{17b} evaluating the optical purity by ¹³C NMR spectroscopy by adding two equiv of (+)-taddol in toluene-*d*₈.^{39c} (a) Larrow JF, Jacobsen EN. *Org Synth*. 1998; 10:96. (c) Seebach D, Beck AK, Heckel A. *Angew Chem, Int Ed*. 2001; 40:92.
28. Representative studies of TMCDAs in organolithium chemistry: (a) Hodgson DM, Stefane B, Miles TJ, Witherington J. *J Org Chem*. 2006; 71:8510. [PubMed: 17064027] (b) Cabello N, Kizirian J-C, Gille S, Alexakis A, Bernardinelli G, Pinchard L, Caille J-C. *Eur J Org Chem*. 2005; 22:4835. (c) Cointeaux L, Alexakis A. *Tetrahedron: Asymmetry*. 2005; 16:925. (d) Mealy MJ, Luderer MR, Bailey WF, Sommer MB. *J Org Chem*. 2004; 69:6042. [PubMed: 15373489] (e) Strohmman C, Gessner VH. *J Am Chem Soc*. 2007; 129:8952. [PubMed: 17595089] (f) Strohmman C, Gessner VH. *J Am Chem Soc*. 2008; 130:11719. [PubMed: 18686951]
29. (a) Niemeyer J, Kehr G, Frohlich R, Erker G. *Dalton Trans*. 2009:3731. [PubMed: 19417938] (b) Williard PG, Tata JR, Schlessinger RH, Adams AD, Iwanowicz EJ. *J Am Chem Soc*. 1988; 110:7901. (c) Jones C, Junk PC, Leary SG, Smithies NA. *J Chem Soc, Dalton Trans*. 2000:3186. (d) Muller G, Brand JZ. *Anorg Allg Chem*. 2005; 631:2820. (e) Rajeswaran M, Begley WJ, Olson LP, Huo S. *Polyhedron*. 2007; 26:3653. (f) Kathirgamanathan P, Surendrakumar S, Antipan-Lara J, Ravichandran S, Chan YF, Arkley V, Ganeshamurugan S, Kumaravel M, Paramswara G, Partheepan A, Reddy VR, Bailey D, Blake AJ. *J Mater Chem*. 2012; 22:6104.
30. (a) Arnett EM, Nichols MA, McPhail AT. *J Am Chem Soc*. 1990; 112:7059. (b) Graalman O, Klingebiel U, Clegg W, Haase M, Sheldrick GM. *Angew Chem, Int Ed*. 1984; 23:891. (c) Williard PG, Salvino JM. *Tetrahedron Lett*. 1985; 26:3931. (d) Jastrzebski JTBH, van Koten G, Christophersen MJN, Stam CH. *J Organomet Chem*. 1985; 292:319. (e) Strauch J, Warren TH, Erker G, Frohlich R, Saarenketo P. *Inorg Chim Acta*. 2000; 300:810. (f) Driess M, Dona N, Merz K. *Chem -Eur J*. 2004; 10:5971. [PubMed: 15487025] (g) Dippel K, Keweloh NK, Jones PG, Klingebiel U, Schmidt DZ. *Naturforsch, B: Chem Sci*. 1987; 42:1253. (h) Davies RP, Wheatley AEH, Rothenberger A. *J Organomet Chem*. 2006; 691:3938. (i) Nichols MA, McPhail AT, Arnett EM. *J Am Chem Soc*. 1991; 113:6222. (j) Davies JE, Davies RP, Dunbar L, Raithby PR, Russell MG, Snaith R, Warren S, Wheatley AEH. *Angew Chem, Int Ed*. 1997; 36:2334. (k) Brehon M, Cope EK, Mair FS, Nolan P, O'Brien JE, Pritchard RG, Wilcock DJ. *J Chem Soc, Dalton Trans*. 1997:3421. (l) Schmidt-Base D, Klingebiel U. *Chem Ber*. 1989; 122:815. (m) Armbruster F, Armbruster N, Klingebiel U, Noltemeyer M, Schmatz SZ. *Naturforsch, B: Chem Sci*. 2006; 61:1261. (n) Apeloig Y, Zharov I, Bravo-Zhivotovskii D, Ovchinnikov Y, Struchkov Y. *J Organomet Chem*. 1995; 499:73. (o) Graser M, Kopacka H, Wurst K, Muller T, Bildstein B. *Inorg Chim Acta*. 2013; 401:38.

Figure 1.
X-ray crystal structure of *N,N,N',N'*-tetramethylethylenediamine (TMEDA)-chelated monomer **4c** derived from enolate **3c**.

Figure 2.
X-ray crystal structure of η^1 -TMEDA-solvated dimer **5b** derived from enolate **1b**.

J Am Chem Soc. Author manuscript; available in PMC 2016 February 23.

Figure 4.
X-ray crystal structure of unsolvated S_4 -symmetric tetramer **7a** derived from enolate **2a**.

Figure 5.
X-ray crystal structure of unsolvated S_6 -symmetric hexamer **8b** derived from enolate **1b**.

Figure 6.
X-ray crystal structure of unsolvated D_{3d} -symmetric hexamer **9a** derived from enolate **3a**.

Figure 7. ^6Li NMR spectra of 0.10 M $[\text{}^6\text{Li}]\mathbf{1a}$ (top) and $[\text{}^6\text{Li}, \text{}^{15}\text{N}]\mathbf{1a}$ (bottom) in toluene at $-70\text{ }^\circ\text{C}$.

Figure 8.

^6Li NMR spectrum of a 1:1 mixture of **1a** and **3a** in toluene at 35 °C and a 0.10 M total enolate concentration showing an ensemble of homo- and heteroaggregates as labeled.

Figure 9.

Job plot showing the relative integrations of hexameric homo- and heteroaggregates versus measured¹⁹ mole fractions of **3a** (χ_{3a}) from mixtures of **1a** and **3a** (0.10 M total enolate concentration) at 35 °C (see Figure 8).

Figure 10.

A plot of $n \times n\text{-mer}$ concentration versus hexamer concentration for **1a** in toluene at -70°C .

The plot was fitted to $y = n(K_{\text{eq}}^{1/6}x^{n/6})$, affording $n = 4.4 \pm 0.2$ and confirming the lower aggregate as a tetramer. The derivation is found in the supporting information.

Figure 11.

^6Li NMR spectra of 0.10 M $[^6\text{Li}]\mathbf{1a}$ in various THF/toluene concentrations showing the symmetric dimer **5a**, tetramer **7a**, and hexamer **8a**. From top to bottom, the spectra were obtained at $-70\text{ }^\circ\text{C}$, $-70\text{ }^\circ\text{C}$, and $-90\text{ }^\circ\text{C}$, respectively. The asterisks denote lithium hexamethyldisilazide.

Figure 12.

^6Li NMR spectra showing the dimer ensemble of **1a** (**A₂**) and **2a** (**B₂**). The total enolate concentration is 0.10 M in 1.00 M THF at -75°C . X_{2a} indicates the measured mole fractions of **2a**.

Figure 13.

Job plot showing the relative integrations of dimeric homo- and heteroaggregates versus X_{2a} for 0.10 M mixtures of **1a** (A_2) and **2a** (B_2) at $-75\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$.

Figure 14.

Plot of $n \times [\text{n-mer}]$ vs. $[\text{dimer}]$ for **2a** in 6.0 M THF at $-90\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$. The best fit gives $n = 1.0 \pm 0.2$, confirming the lower aggregate as a monomer. The plot was fitted to $y = n(K_{\text{eq}}^{1/2} x^{n/2})$, derived in the supporting information.

Figure 15. Generic structure of a type **6** dimer illustrating characteristic splitting patterns and stereochemistry.

Figure 16. ^6Li NMR spectra of $[\text{}^6\text{Li}, \text{}^{15}\text{N}]\mathbf{1b}$ in neat toluene (top) and in 0.34 M TMEDA/toluene (bottom) at $-75\text{ }^\circ\text{C}$. Inset: ^6Li resonance of **6** with additional window functions showing the splitting by two ^{15}N nuclei.

Figure 17.

${}^6\text{Li}$ NMR spectra of $[\text{}^6\text{Li}, \text{}^{15}\text{N}]\mathbf{3b}$ at $-95\text{ }^\circ\text{C}$ in (a) 0.55 M TMEDA; (b) 0.48 M (*R,R*)-*N,N,N',N'*-tetramethylcyclohexanediamine [(*R,R*)-TMEDA]; and (c) 0.48 M (*S,S*)-TMEDA in toluene cosolvent. The downfield resonances of the type **6** dimer in (*S,S*)-TMEDA clearly display the overlapping triplets, whereas TMEDA and (*R,R*)-TMEDA show only the resolution of the upfield resonances.

Chart 1.