- Main, P., Fiske, S. J., Hull, S. E., Lessinger, L., Germain, G., Declercq, J.-P. & Woolfson, M. M. (1980). MULTAN80. A System of Computer Programs for the Automatic Solution of Crystal Structures from X-ray Diffraction Data. Univs. of York, England, and Louvain, Belgium.
- Tkachev, V. V., Atovmyan, L. O. & Shchepinov, S. A. (1976). Zh. Strukt. Khim. 17, 945-947.
- Walker, N. & Stuart, D. (1983). Acta Cryst. A39, 158-166.
- Yadav, J. S., Bohra, R., Mehrotra, R. K., Rai, A. K. & Srivastava, G. (1983). Acta Cryst. C45, 308-311.

Acta Cryst. (1992). C48, 2088-2090

Ethyl (2*R*,3*R*,S*R*)-3-(Ethoxycarbonyloxy)-2-[1-(*p*-tolylsulfinyl)cyclopropyl]-1-pyrrolidinecarboxylate

PAUL D. ROBINSON

Department of Geology, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, IL 62901, USA

Duy H. Hua,† Xiangyue Wu, Shou Wu Miao and Muriel Meled

Department of Chemistry, Kansas State University, Manhattan, KS 66506, USA

(Received 14 April 1992; accepted 29 July 1992)

Abstract

The title compound, derived in four steps beginning with the cyclopropanation reaction of the anion of the α sulfinyl ketimine (4*R*,S*S*)-4-(*tert*-butyldimethylsilyloxy)-3,4-dihydro-5-[(*p*-tolylsulfinyl)methyl]-2*H*-pyrrole with 2-chloroethyl trifluoromethanesulfonate, contains a shorter than expected bond [C(7)—C(8) 1.48 (1) Å] and a larger than expected angle [S(1)—C(6)—C(2) 123.2 (6)°] in the cyclopropane framework.

Comment

The title compound (I) was synthesized using α -sulfinyl ketimine chemistry (Hua, Bharathi, Panangadan & Tsujimoto, 1991) as part of our investigations into the asymmetric total synthesis of the anti-tumor agent indicine *N*oxide (Kovach, Ames, Powis, Moertel, Hahn & Cregan, 1979). When (4*R*,SS)-4-(*tert*-butyldimethylsilyloxy)-3,4dihydro-5-[(*p*-tolylsulfinyl)methyl]-2*H*-pyrrole (II) was treated with 1.3 equivalents of lithium diisopropylamide (LDA) in THF at 195 K followed by 2-chloroethyl trifluoromethanesulfonate, 5-cyclopropyldihydropyrrole (III)

† Fellow of the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation, 1989-1993.

was isolated unexpectedly [yield 55%, based on 26% recovery of (II)]. Subsequent stereoselective reduction of (III) with zinc cyanoborohydride followed by desilylation with tetra-*n*-butylammonium fluoride and then ethoxycarbonylation with 3 equivalents of LDA and 2.5 equivalents of ethyl cyanoformate gave the title compound (I); $[\alpha]_D^{22^{\circ}C}$ = +34.4° (*c* 0.5, CHCl₃), m.p. 369–374 K (recrystallized from CH₂Cl₂-hexane).



The C(7)—C(8) bond in the cyclopropyl ring of (1) is shorter [1.48(1) Å] than both the normal distance for cyclopropane (1.51 Å) (Vollhardt, 1987) and the C(6)—C(7) and C(6)—C(8) bonds. In addition, the bond angle S(1)—C(6)—C(2) [123.2(6)°] is substantially larger than the corresponding angle (115°) in cyclopropane.



Fig. 1. Molecular configuration and atom-numbering scheme with thermal ellipsoids at the 30% probability level. H atoms are shown as unlabeled circles of arbitrary radius.



Fig. 2. Stereoscopic illustration of the molecular packing. The origin is at the lower-right-front, a is into the plane of the paper, b is vertical, and c is horizontal.

© 1992 International Union of Crystallography

REGULAR STRUCTURAL PAPERS

Experimental		C(5)	0.1592 (8)	0.864	9 (3) 0.507 (1)	0.060 (3)
Crystal data		C(6)	0.3089 (9)	0.909	8(3) 0.133(1) 5(3) 0.055(1)	0.054 (2)
		C(7)	0.430(1)	0.930	5(3) -0.007(1)	0.079(3)
$C_{20}H_{27}NO_6S$	Mo $K\alpha$ radiation	C(9)	0.0288 (8)	0.888	3 (3) 0.103 (1)	0.053 (3)
$M_r = 409.50$	$\lambda = 0.71069 \text{ A}$	C(10)	-0.087 (1)	0.896	8 (3) 0.198 (1)	0.069 (3)
Orthorhombic	Cell parameters from 24	C(11)	-0.189(1)	0.861	1 (4) 0.215 (1)	0.080 (4)
$P2_{1}2_{1}2_{1}$	reflections	C(12)	-0.176 (1)	0.816	4 (3) 0.137 (1)	0.069 (3)
a = 9.622 (2) Å	$\theta = 8.1 - 11.2^{\circ}$	C(13)	-0.062 (1)	0.809	2 (3) 0.039 (1)	0.066 (3)
h = 27.282(7) Å	$\mu = 1.77 \text{ cm}^{-1}$	C(14)	0.0397(9)	0.844	1(3) 0.020(1) 1(4) 0.156(1)	0.063 (3)
c = 8 107 (2) Å	T = 296 K	C(15)	-0.288(1) 0 259(1)	0.777	1(4) 0.130(1) 1(3) 0.312(1)	0.104(2) 0.055(3)
$U = 0.107 (2) \text{ A}^{3}$		C(17)	0.175 (2)	0.723	4(3) 0.345(1)	0.128 (4)
V = 2128.1 (8) A	$0.51 \times 0.28 \times 0.06 \text{ mm}$	C(18)	0.042 (2)	0.703	7 (4) 0.378 (2)	0.172 (8)
Z = 4		C(19)	0.546(1)	0.936	5 (4) 0.558 (2)	0.081 (4)
$D_x = 1.278 \text{ Mg m}^{-3}$	Coloriess	C(20)	0.753 (1)	0.954	7 (5) 0.710 (2)	0.167 (7)
		C(21)	0.841 (1)	0.924	0 (8) 0.741 (3)	0.230 (8)
Data collection			Table 2.	Geometri	c parameters (Å, °)
Rigaku AFC-5S diffractome-	No equivalent reflections	S(1)-O(3))	1 487 (6)	C(2)_C(6)	1 53 (1)
ter	measured	S(1) - C(6))	1.783 (9)	C(3) - C(4)	1.51(1)
ω scans	$\theta_{\rm max} = 25^{\circ}$	S(1) - C(9)		1.783 (8)	C(4) - C(5)	1.52 (1)
Absorption correction:	$h = 0 \rightarrow 11$	O(1)C(1	6)	1.220 (9)	C(6)—C(7)	1.51 (1)
none	$k = 0 \rightarrow 32$	O(2)-C(1	6)	1.342 (9)	C(6)C(8)	1.51 (1)
2197 measured reflections	$l = 0 \rightarrow 9$	O(2) - C(1)	7)	1.45(1)	C(7) - C(8)	1.48 (1)
2177 incustred reflections	3 standard reflections	O(4) = C(3)		1.441 (9)	C(9) = C(10)	1.38(1)
1160 sharmed reflections	monitored every 100	O(4) = C(1)	<i>9)</i> 9)	1.32(1) 1.20(1)	C(9) = C(14) C(10) = C(11)	1.38(1)
1109 observed reflections	reflections	O(6) - C(1)	9)	1.32(1)	C(11) - C(12)	1.38(1)
$[I>2\sigma(I)]$	reflections	O(6)-C(2	0)	1.53 (1)	C(12) - C(13)	1.37 (1)
	intensity variation: +1.1%	N(1)—C(2) N(1)—C(5)		1.459 (8)	C(12)-C(15)	1.53 (1)
				1.463 (9)	C(13)—C(14)	1.37 (1)
Refinement		N(1)C(1	6)	1.335 (9)	C(17) - C(18)	1.42 (2)
Refinement on F	$\Delta \rho_{\rm max}$ = 0.23 e Å ⁻³	C(2) = C(3))	1.536 (9)	C(20) = C(21)	1.22 (2)
Final $R = 0.056$	$\Delta \rho_{\rm min} = -0.21 \ {\rm e} \ {\rm \AA}^{-3}$	O(3) - S(1)	-C(6)	109.6 (4)	C(7) = C(6) = C(8)	58.8 (6)
wR = 0.053	Extinction correction:	C(3) = S(1) = C(9) C(6) = S(1) = C(9)		100.8(4) 101.9(3)	C(0) = C(7) = C(8) C(6) = C(8) = C(7)	60.6 (5)
S = 1.58	Zachariasen type 2 Gaus-	C(16) - O(2) - C(17)		117.4 (7)	S(1) - C(9) - C(10)	118.6 (6)
1160 reflections	sian isotropic	C(3)—O(4)—C(19)		116.0 (8)	S(1) - C(9) - C(14)	122.2 (7)
	Extinction coefficient: none	C(19)-O(6)-C(20)		114 (1)	C(10)-C(9)-C(14)	118.7 (8)
255 parameters	Atomio souttoring fosters	C(2) - N(1) - C(5)		113.4 (6)	C(9) - C(10) - C(11)	120.8 (7)
H-atom parameters not re-	Atomic scattering factors	C(2) - N(1) - C(16)		120.8 (7)	C(10) - C(11) - C(12)	120.6 (9)
fined	from International Tables	N(1) = C(2)	-C(10)	123.3 (7)	C(11) = C(12) = C(13) C(11) = C(12) = C(15)	121 (1)
$w = 4F_o^2/\sigma^2(F_o^2)$	for X-ray Crystallogra-	N(1) - C(2))—C(6)	115.7 (6)	C(13) - C(12) - C(15)	121.6 (8)
$(\Delta/\sigma)_{\rm max} = 0.0003$	phy (1974, Vol. IV, Table	C(3)-C(2))—C(6)	114.7 (6)	C(12)-C(13)-C(14)	122.4 (8)

Data collection: MSC/AFC Diffractometer Control Software (Molecular Structure Corporation, 1985). Cell refinement: MSC/AFC Diffractometer Control Software. Data reduction: TEXSAN PROCESS (Molecular Structure Corporation, 1988). Program(s) used to solve structure: MITHRIL (Gilmore, 1984) and DIRDIF (Beurskens, 1984). Program(s) used to refine structure: TEXSAN LS. Molecular graphics: TEXSAN ORTEP (Johnson, 1965). Software used to prepare material for publication: TEXSAN FINISH.

2.3.1)

Uen

Table 1. Fractional atomic coordinates and equivalent isotropic thermal parameters $(Å^2)$

$U_{\text{eq}} = \frac{1}{3} \sum_{i} \sum_{j} U_{ij} a_i^* a_j^* \mathbf{a}_i . \mathbf{a}_j.$ x

			-	
S(1)	0.1489 (2)	0.93719 (8)	0.0718 (3)	0.067 (1)
O(1)	0.3395 (7)	0.7922 (2)	0.2042 (7)	0.075 (2)
O(2)	0.1728 (7)	0.7747 (2)	0.3920 (7)	0.079 (2)
O(3)	0.1107 (6)	0.9766 (2)	0.1903 (7)	0.083 (2)
O(4)	0.4211 (6)	0.9169 (2)	0.5737 (7)	0.060 (2)
O(5)	0.5869 (7)	0.9582 (3)	0.440(1)	0.107 (3)
O(6)	0.6147 (7)	0.9275 (3)	0.696 (1)	0.112 (3)
N(1)	0.2417 (6)	0.8513 (2)	0.3627 (7)	0.045 (2)
C(2)	0.3354 (8)	0.8900 (2)	0.308 (1)	0.047 (2)
C(3)	0.3228 (9)	0.9285 (2)	0.445 (1)	0.052 (2)
C(4)	0.182 (1)	0.9200 (3)	0.521 (1)	0.059 (3)

A scan rate of 3° min ⁻¹ in ω was used. Weak reflections
$[I < 10\sigma(I)]$ were rescanned (maximum of two rescans) and the
counts accumulated to improve accuracy. During the final stages
of refinement, the methylene H atoms bound to $C(7)$ and $C(8)$
were included in difference map positions while the remaining
H atoms were placed at assumed positions (C-H = 0.95 Å,
$U = 1.2 \times U_{eq}$ of the associated C atom) and fixed. The rota-
tional orientation of the methyl groups was determined from a
difference Fourier synthesis. The proper enantiomer was chosen
on the basis of the known configuration of the substrate and was
confirmed by a slightly superior refinement when compared to
the antipode.

108.9 (6)

105.2 (6)

105.3 (6)

104.4 (6)

103.4 (6)

123.2 (6)

110.4 (5)

114.0 (6)

114.9(7)

117.9 (7)

O(4) - C(3) - C(2)

O(4) - C(3) - C(4)O(2) - C(3) - C(4)

C(3)-C(4)-C(5)

N(1) - C(5) - C(4)

S(1)-C(6)-C(2)

S(1) - C(6) - C(7)

S(1)-C(6)-C(8)

C(2) - C(6) - C(7)

C(2)-C(6)-C(8)

Financial support from the National Cancer Institute (CA 51794) is acknowledged. We thank Dr Cal Y. Meyers for his help in the preparation of the manuscript.

119.6 (8)

124.0 (8)

125.0 (8)

111.0 (8)

107 (1)

125 (1)

107 (1)

127 (1)

107 (1)

C(9) - C(14) - C(13)

O(1)-C(16)-O(2)

O(1) - C(16) - N(1)

O(2) - C(16) - N(1)

O(4) - C(19) - O(5)

O(4)-C(19)-O(6)

O(5)-C(19)-O(6)

O(6)-C(20)-C(21)

O(2) - C(17) - C(18)

Lists of structure factors, anisotropic thermal parameters, H-atom coordinates and complete geometry have been deposited with the British Library Document Supply Centre as Supplementary Publication No. SUP 55376 (22 pp.). Copies may be obtained through The Technical Editor, International Union of Crystallography, 5 Abbey Square, Chester CH1 2HU, England. [CIF reference: CR1017]

References

- Beurskens, P. T. (1984). DIRDIF. An automatic procedure for phase extension and refinement of difference structure factors. Tech. Rep. 1984/1. Univ. of Nijmegen, The Netherlands.
- Gilmore, C. J. (1984). J. Appl. Cryst. 17, 42-46.
- Hua, D. H., Bharathi, S. N., Panangadan, J. A. K. & Tsujimoto, A. (1991). J. Org. Chem. 56, 6998-7007.
- Johnson, C. K. (1965). ORTEP. Report ORNL-3794. Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Tennessee, USA.
- Kovach, J. S., Ames, M. M., Powis, G., Moertel, C. G., Hahn, R. G. & Cregan, E. T. (1979). *Cancer Res.* 39, 4540–4544.
- Molecular Structure Corporation (1985). TEXSAN. TEXRAY Structure Analysis Package. MSC, 3200 Research Forest Drive, The Woodlands, TX 77381, USA.
- Molecular Structure Corporation (1988). MSC/AFC Diffractometer Control Software. MSC, 3200 Research Forest Drive, The Woodlands, TX 77381, USA.
- Vollhardt, K. P. C. (1987). Organic Chemistry, p. 119. New York: W. H. Freeman.

Acta Cryst. (1992). C48, 2090-2092

Structure of an 11-Membered Cyclic Silyl Enol Ether from Condensation of Methacrolein and a Pseudoephedrine-Derived *O*-Silyl Ketene *N*,*O*-Acetal

WILLIAM P. SCHAEFER, VIJAYA SUBRAMANIAN AND ANDREW G. MYERS

Division of Chemistry and Chemical Engineering[†] and The Beckman Institute, Mail Code 139-74, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, California 91125, USA

(Received 20 February 1992; accepted 25 June 1992)

Abstract

The title compound, (4S,5S,8R,10Z)-2,2,5,6,8,10hexamethyl-4-phenyl-1,3-dioxa-6-aza-2-silacycloundec-10-en-7-one, crystallizes with two virtually identical molecules in the asymmetric unit, each with the same absolute configuration. Bond distances and angles are normal; the closest approaches across the ring between non-bonded atoms are all greater than

† Contribution No. 8557.

0108-2701/92/112090-03\$06.00

3.35 Å. The amide and enol ether groups are planar to within ± 0.06 Å.

Comment

The pseudoephedrine-derived O-silyl ketene N,Oacetal (1) undergoes facile aldol addition reactions with aldehydes to form 9-membered cyclic siloxane condensation products (Myers, Widdowson & Kukkola, 1992). α,β -Unsaturated aldehydes react differently, forming, in the case of methacrolein, the 11-membered cyclic silyl enol ether (2) (Myers & Subramanian, 1992). The structure of this crystalline material has been established unambiguously by X-ray crystallography.



Fig. 1 shows the two independent molecules: both drawings have the same orientation relative to the least-squares plane of all their atoms, emphasizing their great similarity. Fig. 2 is a packing drawing showing the molecules in the unit cell. Bond distances and angles in the two independent molecules agree well; average values are quoted here, together with the higher or highest e.s.d.'s of the individual bonds. The Si-C and Si-O lengths average 1.842 (6) and 1.636 (3) Å. The angles at silicon differ from 109.5° by an average of 3.1° . There is some evidence of opening of the ring at the internal O atoms, where angles average 125.2 (9)°; the C-O distances, however, are normal [1.443 (5) Å to C1, 1.376 (6) Å to C17]. Other internal angles in the 11-membered ring are close to expected values. The grouping C8 - N(C10) - C11(O3) - C12 is nearly planar in both molecules, with similar deviations from the least-squares plane. In molecule A, the two 'end' atoms, C8 and C12, are 0.057 Å out of the plane and the inner atoms (N, C10, C11 and O3) are -0.011, -0.045, -0.006 and -0.052 Å out of the plane respectively. In molecule B, the comparable distances are +0.047, and -0.017, -0.030, -0.009and -0.037 Å. The non-bonded distances across the ring are all at or greater than van der Waals distances: O1...C10 3.42 and 3.48 Å, O2...C11 3.30 and 3.33 Å, O1...O3 3.66 and 3.67 Å, O2...O3 3.51 and 3.56 Å. Intermolecular contacts are also all at van der Waals distances or greater, the shortest $(O2b \cdots H4b)$ being 2.65 Å. The shortest H \cdots H contact is 2.38 Å compared with an expected value of 2.4 Å.

© 1992 International Union of Crystallography