# **Bishomocubane Chemistry. 14. Molecular Mechanics Calculations**  on Bishomocubyl Systems<sup>1,2</sup>

# Wendell L. Dilling

#### Department *of* Chemistry, Central Michigan University, Mount Pleasant, Michigan *48859*

Received March **9, 1993.** 

Molecular mechanics calculations have been performed on several bishomocubane derivatives in order to better understand their reactivities and properties. Strain energies of the five bishomocubane hydrocarbons,  $(CH<sub>2</sub>(CH<sub>2</sub>)<sub>2</sub>$ , calculated by the MM2(87) method increase in the order 1,4 < 1,3 < 1,3' *C* 1,2 < 1,l. The values are 73.34, 76.63, 90.14, 93.12, and 112.57 kcal/mol, respectively. The order of the 1,4 and 1,3 isomers is reversed from that of previous calculations using the Allinger 1971 and Engler 1973 force fields. Approximately the same order was found for the corresponding compounds that contained only the cyclobutane portions of these bishomocubanes. The same order was calculated for the gem-dimethyl derivatives of 1,4- and 1,3-bishomocubane in contrast to the order found in previous calculations using the Allinger 1971-1972 force field. Calculated strain energies of the gem-dimethyldibromo- **andgem-diphenylmethoxybromo-1,3-** and -1,4-bishomocubane ethylene ketals **also** increase in the order 1,4 < 1,3. **Perchloro-l,4-bishomocubane** has alower calculated strain energy than does **perchloro-l,3-bishomocubane,** 187.17 *us* 195.70 kcal/mol. Enthalpies of formation were calculated for endo-dicyclopentadiene, two substituted derivatives, and the related 1,3- or 1,4-bishomocubanes. Geometries were calculated for 1,3-bishomocubanone, methylene-l,3 bishomocubane, several hydroxy derivatives, **and** related hydrocarbons. These results add to our understanding of several reactions and properties of these compounds.

### **Introduction**

Molecular mechanics calculations have been used extensively to predict enthalpies of formation, strain energies, and geometries of organic compounds including some in the bishomocubane series.<sup>1-24</sup> The seeming inconsistency of some of these calculations and the general interest in

- **(3)** Engler, E. M.; Andoee, J. D.; Schleyer, P. v. R. *J.* Am. Chem. SOC. **1973,95,8005-8025.**
- **(4)** Osawa, E.; Schleyer, P. **v.** R.; Chang, L. W. K.; Kane, V. V.
- **(5)** Osawa, E.; Aigami, K.; Inamoto, Y. *J.* Org. Chem. **1977,42,2621-**  Tetrahedron Lett. **1974,4189-4192. 2626.**
- **(6)** Osawa, E.; Aigami, K.; Inamoto, Y. Tetrahedron **1978,34,509-515. (7)** bsawa, E.; Aigami, K.; Inamoto, Y. *J.* Chem. SOC., Perkin *Trans.*  **2 1979, 181-191.**
- (8) Barborak, J. C.;Khoury,D.; Maier, W. F.;Schleyer, P. **v.** R.; Smith,
- E. C.; Smith, W. F., Jr.; Wyrick, C. *J. Org. Chem.* 1979, 44, 4761–4766.<br>
(9) Godleski, S. A.; Schleyer, P. v. R.; Osawa, E.; Wipke, W. T. *Progr.*<br> *Phys. Org. Chem.* 1981, 13, 63–117.
- *Phys. Org. Chem.* 1981, 13, 63–117.<br>(10) Allinger, N. L.; Eaton, P. E. Tetrahedron Lett. 1983, 24, 3697–
- **3700. (11)** Osawa, E.; Muaso, H. Angew. Chem. **1983,95,1;** Angew. Chem.,
- *Znt.* Ed. Engl. **1983,22,1-12. (12)** Zlotogorski, C.; Blum, J.; Osawa, E.; Schwarz, H.; Hohne, G. *J.*
- Org. Chem. **1984,49,971-976. (13) Eaton,P.E.;Or,Y.S.;Branca,S.** *J.;Shankar,B.K.R.Tetrahedron*
- **(14)** Stober, R.; Muaso, H.; Osawa, E. Tetrahedron **1986, 42, 1757- 1986,42,1621-1631. 1761.**
- **(15)** Reddy, V. P.; Jemmis, E. D. Tetrahedron Lett. **1986,27, 3771- 3774.**
- **(16)** Jemmis, E. D.; Leela, G.Proc. Indian Acad. Sci., Chem. Sci. **1987, 99,281-282.**
- **(17)** Dorigo, A. E.; Houk, K. N. *J.* Org. Chem. **1988,53, 1650-1664. (18)** Allinger,N.L.;Yuh,Y. H.;Lii, J.-H. *J.* Am. Chem. SOC. **1989,111, 8551-8566.**

these compounds $1,24-31$  prompted a further investigation of these calculations and an extension to other derivatives.

## **Results and Discussion**

The enthalpies of formation and strain energies of the five bishomocubanes **1-51132** as calculated by the MM2(87) program<sup>19,33,34</sup> are given in Figure 1. As expected, all five of these isomers have lower strain energies than that of homocubane **(1** 1) or cubane **(12)** (Figure l), mainly because of smaller deviations from the normal tetrahedral bond angles for the bishomocubanes. **Our** calculated strain energies for **2, 11,** and **12** agree exactly with values calculated recently by other workers.<sup>20,21</sup>

**(19) Osawa,E.;Barbiric,D.A.;Lee,O.S.;Kitano,Y.;Padma,S.;Mehta,**  G. *J.* Chem. SOC., Perkin Trans. **2 1989,1161-1165.** 

- **(20)** Sauers, R. R.; Krogh-Jespersen, K. Tetrahedron Lett. **1989,30, 527-530.**
- <sup>~</sup>**(21)** Ogino, T.; Awano, K.; Fukazawa, Y. *J.* Chem. *SOC.,* Perkin Trans. **2 1990,1735-1738; 1991,437.**
- **(22)** bsawa, E.; Rudzinski, J. M.; Xun, Y-M. Struct. Chem. **1990.1,**  .. **333-344.**
- **(23)Marchand,A.P.;Vidyaeagar,V.;Wataon,W.H.;Nagl,A.;Kashyap,**
- R. P. *J. Org. Chem.* 1991, 56, 282–286.<br>(24) Higuchi, H.; Ueda, I. In *Carbocyclic Cage Compounds: Chemistry*<br>*and Applications*, Osawa, E.; Yonemitsu, O., Eds.; VCH Publishers: New York, **1992;** pp **217-247.**
- **(25)** Griffin, G. W.; Marchand, A. P. Chem. Reu. **1989,89,997-1010. (26)** Marchand, A. P. Chem. Rev. **1989,89, 1011-1033.**
- **(27)** Klunder, A. J. H.; Zwanenburg, B. Chem. Rev. **1989, 89, 1035- 1050.**

**(28)** Marchand, A. P. In Carbocyclic Cage Compounds: Chemistry and Applications, Osawa, E.; Yonemitau, O.,Eds.; VCH Publishers: New York, **1992;** pp **1-59.** 

- **(29)** Naemura, K. In Carbocyclic Cage Compounds: Chemistry and Applications, Osawa, E.; Yonemitau, O., Eds.; VCH Publishers: New York, **1992;** pp **61-90.**
- **(30)** Mehta, **G.;** Padma, S. In Carbocyclic Cage Compounds: Chemistry and Applications, Osawa, E., Yonemitsu, O., Eds.; VCH Publishers: New
- York, **1992;** pp **183-215. (31)** Miyashi, T.; Yamashita, Y.; Mukai, T. In Carbocyclic Cage Compounds: Chemistry and Applications, Osawa, E., Yonemitau, O., Eds.; VCH Publishers: New York, **1992;** pp **365-382.**
- **(32)** Dilling, W. L.; Reineke, C. E.; Plepys, R. A. *J.* Org. Chem. **1969,**
- **34, 2605-2615; 1972, 37, 3753. (33)** AUinger, N. L. *J.* Am. Chem. SOC. **1977,99,8127-8134.**
- **(34)** Burkert, U.; Allinger, N. L. Molecular Mechanics; Monograph **177;** American Chemical Society: Washington, DC, **1982.**

*0* 1993 American Chemical Society

**0022-3263/93/1958-5338\$Q4.QQ/Q** 

Abstract published in Aduance ACS Abstracts, September **1,1993. (1)** Part **13:** Dilling, W. L. In Carbocyclic Cage Compounds: Chemistry and Applications, Osawa, E.; Yonemitsu, O., Eds.; VCH Publishers: New York, **1992;** pp **249-291.** 

**<sup>(2)</sup>** Resulta presented, in part, at the 205th National Meeting of the American Chemical Society, Denver, CO, March 28-April **2, 1993**  (Abstract: Dilling, W. L. Book of Abstracts, ORGN 39), the 33rd National Organic Chemistry Symposium, American Chemical Society, Boseman, organic chemical Southern American Customs, A-80), MT, June 13-17, 1993 (Abstract: Dilling, W. L. Book of Abstracts, A-60), and the 206th National Meeting of the American Chemical Society, Chicago, IL, Aug 22-27, 1993 (Abstract: Dilling, W. L. Book of Abstracts, ORGN -~ ~~ **37).** 

calculated by MM2(87).

the MM2 calculations.



Figure **1.** Enthalpies of formation and strain energies (SE)

In carbocyclic systems, four-membered rings are significantly more strained than five- or six-membered rings. Thus, we originally reasoned that one could predict the order of strain energies in the bishomocubanes **1-5** by considering only the four-membered ring portions of these molecules. 1,4-Bishomocubane **(1)** contains two fourmembered rings that are not fused to each other and should be the least strained of the five bishomocubanes. 1,3- Bishomocubane **(2)** contains two four-membered rings fused to each other and should be the next most strained. Both 1,3'- **(3)** and 1,2-bishomocubane **(4)** contain three four-membered rings fused to each other, linearly fused in 3 and fused about a single carbon atom in **4.** The latter appeared to us to be the more strained. 1,l-Bishomocubane **(5)** contains four four-membered rings fused to each other and was predicted to be the most strained of the five isomers. Thus, the predicted order of increasing strain energy was  $1 < 2 < 3 < 4 < 5$ , the order actually found by



Figure **2.** MM2-calculated structures of tricyclic hydrocarbons **8** and **9.** 

be used because **1** has two four-membered rings. If this is done, compounds **1** and **2** are not in the same order **as**  2 **X 6** (55.02 kcal/mol) and **7.** However, again the noncage series has hydrogen-hydrogen interaction differences, two more cis vicinal interactions in  $2 \times 6$  than in 7, that are not present in the bishomocubane series.

The above discussion does not take into account the other non-four-membered ring related interactions present in these molecules. The MM2 calculation does take into account all significant aspects of strain in these molecules, not just that attributable to the arrangement of the fourmembered rings.

Godleski and co-workers<sup>9</sup> reported enthalpies of formation of the bishomocubanes **1** and **2** calculated by the Allinger 1971 and Engler 1973 force fields. The values for the 1,4 isomer **1** were higher than for the 1,3 isomer **2**  (49.86 and 48.34 kcal/mol, respectively, for the Engler force field; 55.03 and 52.19 kcal/mol, respectively, for the Allinger force field). Osawa and co-workers<sup>7</sup> calculated enthalpies of formation and strain energies for the gem-dimethyl derivatives, **13** and **14,** by using the Allinger 1971-1972 force field. They **also** found higher values for the 1,4 isomer **13** (39.35 and 82.03 kcal/mol, respectively) than for the 1,3 isomer **14** (37.63 and 80.31 kcal/mol, respectively). These relative values are reversed from the results of the present calculations, which employed the MM2(87) program (Figure 1). We find both 1,3-bishomocubanes, 2 and **14,** to have higher enthalpies of formation and strain energies than the corresponding 1,4-bishomocubanes, **1**  and **13,** respectively. The differences in these earlier workers' and our results apparently were caused by the different parameters used in the various programs. Earlier, Schleyer and co-workers reported a higher calculated strain energy for 1,1,4-trishomocubane (one methylene bridge and one ethano bridge) than for  $1,1,3$ -trishomocubane.<sup>36</sup> Calculated strain energies of the other trishomocubanes paralleled our results on the bishomocubanes.3s

The results of acetolyses of secondary sulfonate ester derivatives **15** and **26-29** of the bishomocubanes **1-5,**  summarized in Figure  $3,32,37,38$  are in general agreement with expectations based on the calculated strain energies of **1-5.** The most strained ester **15** gave products, rationalized by a series of 1,2-alkyl shifts of carbocations (Figure 3), representing all five bishomocubyl systems. $37$ All of the other esters 26-29 gave products with lower or nearly the same strain energies as the starting ester.<sup>32,37,38</sup> The relative rates of these acetolyses (25 "C, Figure 3) **also**  agree in general with expectations that the fastest rates

gen-hydrogen distance in **9** is 2.673 **A** (three such interactions by symmetry). These types of hydrogenhydrogen interactions are absent in **3** and **4** and may

membered ring.<sup>35</sup> In comparing the strain energy orders of **1-5** and 6-10 possibly twice the strain energy of cyclobutane **(6)** should

account for the reversed order. Interestingly, the strain energies of 6-10 are all  $\sim$ 26-27 kcal/mol per four-

To test whether the hydrocarbons analogous to **1-5** with the non-four-membered ring portions removed follow the same strain order, we calculated the strain energies of compounds **6-10** (Figure 1). The order is nearly the same; only the tricycloalkanes **8** and **9** are interchanged. The calculated strain energies of these two compounds differ only slightly compared with the range of strain energies for the entire series of compounds **6-10.** The calculated minimum energy structures of **8** and **9** are shown in Figure 2. One possible reason for the reversal in relative strain energies of **8** and **9** may be the 2.279 **A** interaction of the two endo hydrogen atoms of **8** (two such interactions by symmetry). The closest nongeminal, nonvicinal, hydro-

**(35) Gaeteiger,** J.; **Dammer, 0.** *Tetrahedron* **1978,34, 2939-2945.** 

**<sup>(36)</sup> Kent, G. J.; Godleski, S. A.; Osawa, E.; Schleyer, P. v. R.** *J. Org.*  **(37) Dauben, W. G.; Wen, D. L.** *J. Am. Chem. SOC.* **1971,93,7244-**  *Chem.* **1977,42,3852-3859; 1979,44, 3739.** 

**<sup>7249.</sup>** 

**<sup>(38)</sup> Brown, S. F. Senior Thesis, Princeton University, 1967.** 





**Figure 3. Rearrangements of bishomocubyl** cations **on** acetolyses of **sulfonate esters.** 

would occur for those esters in which the most strain can be relieved in the transition state.

Ring expansion reactions of homocubylcarbinyl systems **30** and **37** (Figures 4 and 6) gave l,3-bishomocubyl producta **31, 32,** and **38** rather than the 1,4 isomers **33** and **39,**  respectively.39\*40 MM2 calculations on **30,32,33** (Figure 4), and **37-39** (Figure *6)* gave the same order of strain energies **as** noted above for the hydrocarbons **11,2,** and **1 (and'14** and **13).** Thus, the less stable (by MM2) 1,3 isomers are formed rather than the more stable 1,4 isomers. The earlier explanation of a probable higher steric strain for the 1,4 isomer **33** compared to that of the 1,3 isomer **327** is probably incorrect. Calculations on the specific compounds, **33** and **32** (Figure 4), show the reversed order of strain energies.

The explanation of more relief of strain in the homocubyl system by cleaving one of the **a** bonds **(34** and **40,** Figures 4 and 6, respectively) than by cleaving the **b** bonds9 may be correct. The calculated enthalpies of formation and strain energies of the hydrocarbons **43** and **44** resulting from cleavage of the **a** and **b** bonds, respectively, of homocubane **(11)** are shown in Figure 6. The values calculated by the Allinger 1971-1972 force field (46.07 and 74.57 kcal/mol, respectively, for 43 and 56.23 and 84.73 kcal/mol, respectively, for **44')** were in the same order **as**  calculated by the MM2(87) program, although the differences were much smaller from the latter calculation. The difference in the bond strain energies of **11** (Figure 6) is only  $\sim$ 1 kcal/mol.<sup>7</sup>

The symmetrical hydrocarbon **44 has** a closer calculated nonbonded hydrogen-hydrogen interaction, 2.082 A, than does **43,** 2.217 **A** (Figure 7). These repuleions are not present in **a** homocubyl system undergoing bond cleavage. Thue, **43** and **44** may not be good models of the bondcleaved systems. The diketones **45** and **46** (Figure 6) do not have these close hydrogen interactions, but the relative strain energies are in the same order. The calculated difference in strain energies is much larger between the diketones than between the hydrocarbons.

Arecent report of *similar* **reactions** of homocubylcarbinyl and cubyldicarbinyl systems indicated that mixtures of 1,3- and 1,4-bishomocubyl products were formed, with

**<sup>(39)</sup> Klunder, A. J. H.; Zwanenburg, B.** *Tetrahedron* **1973,29, 161- 166.** 

**<sup>(40)</sup> Mak,** T. C. **W.;** Yip, **Y.** C.; **Luh,** T.-Y. *Tetrahedron* **1986,42,1981- 1988.** 



**Figure 4.** Enthalpies of formation and strain energies of homocubylcarbinol 30 and possible ring-expansion products.



**Figure 5.** Enthalpies of formation and strain energies of homocubylcarbinol<sup>37</sup> and possible ring-expansion products.

larger **amounts** of the 1,4 isomer being formed from more highly stabilized cations related to **40.24** A consistent explanation for **all** the above results involves kinetic control in reactions of the less stable homocubylcarbinyl cations to give the less stable 1,3-bishomocubyl isomers by cleaving the more strained **a** bonds and thermodynamic control in reactions of the more stable cations to give the more stable 1,4 isomers by cleaving the **b** bond.



**Figure 6.** Enthalpies of formation and strain energies of model secohomocubanes and bond strain energies of homocubane **(11).** 



**Figure** 7. MM2-calculated structures of secohomocubanes **43**  and **44.** 

Perchloro-endo-dicyclopentadiene **(47)** gave perchloro-1,4-bishomocubane **(48)** (mirex) on treatment with AlCls.41 If a cationic rearrangement via **60-52** is responsible for this transformation,<sup>41</sup> the possibility exists for the for-.mation of **perchlore1,3-bishomocubane (49) as** well (Figure **8). MM2** calculations on **47-49** explain the preferential formation of **48.** The very high calculated **strain** energies of **47-49** compared to the values for the corresponding hydrocarbons is interesting in light of the high stability of the chlorocarbons.

**An** attempt to prepare the **1,3** perchlorocarbon **49** by reaction of the diketone 54 with  $\text{PCl}_5$  gave the 1,4 isomer **4842** (Figure 9). A likely mechanism for this reaction via cations **65** and **56** would explain this transformation.32 The rearrangement of the 1,3-bishomocubyl system to the 1,4 isomer is entirely reasonable in light of the **MM2**  calculations.

The calculated enthalpy change for the conversion of the perchlorodiene **47** to the cage isomer **48** (Figure **8)** is exothermic by 47.10 kcal/mol. This exothermicity is in qualitative agreement with the ease of this process.41 In contrast, the calculated enthalpy change for the hypothetical analogous conversion of the corresponding hycontrast, the calculated enthalpy change for the hypothetical analogous conversion of the corresponding hydrocarbon  $(57 \rightarrow 1)$  is nearly thermoneutral. At least two fectors may contribute take method and the method is the factors may contribute to the greater exothermicity of the chlorinated system  $(47 \rightarrow 48)$  than that of the hydrocarbon system  $(57 \rightarrow 1)$ . One is the differential effect of chlorine substituents on the enthalpy of formation of alkenes and cyclobutanes. Calculations using Benson's group values<sup>43</sup> indicate greater exothermicities for the conversion of chloroalkenes to chlorocyclobutanes than for the conver-

**<sup>(41)</sup> Mark, V.; Weil, E.** *D. J. Org. Chem.* **1971,36,67&686. (42) Eaton, P. E. Ph.D. Thesis, Harvard University, 1960.** 

**<sup>(43)</sup> Benson,** *S.* **W.** *Thermochemical Kinetics,* **2nd** *ed.;* **John Wdey Q Sone: New York, 1976.** 



**Figure 8.** Enthalpies of formation and **strain** energies of **perchloro-endo-dicyclopentadiene (47)** and possible ring-closure products.



**Figure 9.** Rearrangement of **perchloro-1,3-bishomocubanedione (54)** on reaction with **PCh.** 

sion of hydrocarbon alkenes to cyclobutanes. A second factor may be relief of steric compression of chlorine atoms in the diene **47** on conversion to the 1,4-bishomocubane **48.** Of the various types of close Cl\*-Cl interactions in **48**  (Figure 81, the following interatomic distances, calculated by MM2, in **47** show the greatest increase on conversion (Figure 8), the following interatomic distances, calculated<br>by MM2, in 47 show the greatest increase on conversion<br>to 48: Cl<sup>a</sup><sub>\*\*</sub>Clb, 2.914  $\rightarrow$  2.968 Å; Cl<sup>b/</sup><sub>\*\*</sub>Cl<sup>o</sup>′, 3.342  $\rightarrow$  3.511<br> $\frac{3}{2}$  (Clb, Clb, Clb, Cld,  $A \text{ (C1*...Cl}^6, 2.914 → 2.968 \text{ A}; \text{Cl}^2 \text{...Cl}^6, 3.342 → 3.511 \text{ Å} \text{ (C1*...Cl}^6; \text{Cl}^1 \text{...Cl}^1, 3.110 → 3.746 \text{ Å}; \text{Cl}^1 \text{...Cl}^1, 3.058 → 3.357 \text{ Å}; \text{Cl}^1 \text{...Cl}^1, 3.169 → 3.247 \text{ Å}. \text{ Other Cl} \text{...Cl} \text{ inter-} \text{...} \text{...} \text{...} \text{...}$ actions in **47** are also relieved on conversion to **48.** These





**Figure 10.** Enthalpies of formation and strain energies of *endo*dicyclopentadiene **(57),** the ketone **58,** and their photochemical ring-closure products **2** and **59.** 

are significant changes in light of the 1.8 **A** van der Wad's radius of chlorine.<sup>44</sup>

The known photochemical transformation of the diene **57** to the 1,3-bishomocubyl isomer  $2^{45-47}$  is calculated to be endothermic by 3.26 kcal/mol (Figure 10), a lower value than the 9.76 kcal/mol calculated previously using the Allinger 1971-1972 force field.<sup>5</sup> A slightly larger endothermicity, 6.86 kcal/mol, is calculated for the related transformation of the dienone  $58^{49,50}$  (Figure 10). This calculated gas-phase value is somewhat lower than the 16.41 kcal/mol crystal-phase value derived from the experimental enthalpies of formation of the reactant **58**  and product **69.51** Enthalpies of vaporization for **58** and **59** would be required for us to make a direct comparison.

Metal hydride reductions ${}^{32,50,52}$  of and additions of organometallic reagents40 to 1,3-bishomocubanone **59**  (Figure 11) indicate that the reagents attack the bridge carbon atom preferentially from the anti side. Peracid epoxidation of **methylene-l,3-bishomocubane (64)** (Figure 12) also shows a slight preference for anti attack.<sup>53,54</sup> MM2 calculations show that one of the carbon-hydrogen internuclear distances, indicated in Figure 13, in **59** and **64**  is shorter than the other three indicated distances. One

**(44)** Gould, **E.** *S. Mechnism and Structure in Organic Chemistry,*  **Henry Holt** & **Co.: New York, 1959; p 51.** 

**(45) Schenck,** *G. 0.;* **Steinmetz, R.** *Bull. SOC. Chim. Belg.* **1962,** *71,*  **781-800.** . - - - - -.

**(46) Schenck, G.** *0.;* **Steinmetz, R.** *Chem. Ber.* **1963,96, 520-525.** 

**(47) Dilling, W. L.; Braendlin, H. P.; McBee, E. T.** *Tetrahedron* **1967, (48) Stull, D.** R.; **Weetrum,** E. F., **Jr.; Sinke,** G. C. *The Chemical*  **23,1211-1224; 1968,24, OP 3517; 1969,25, OP 2047.** 

*Thermodynamics of Organic Compounds;* **John Wdey** & **Sone: New York, 1969; p 720.** 

**(49)** Cookson,R. C.; **Hudec, J.; Williame,R. 0.** *TetrahedronLett.* **1960, 29-32.** 

**(50) Cookson,** R. **C.; Hudec, J.;** Williams, R. **0.** J. *Chem. SOC. C* **1967, 1382-1385.** 

**(51) Cookson,** R. **C.: Crundwell,** E.: **Hill, R. R.; Hudec, J.** *J. Chem. SOC.*  **1964, 3062-3075.** 

**(52) Dilling, W. L.; Reineke,** C. **E.** *Tetrahedron Lett.* **1967,2547-2563.**  (53) **Dilling, W. L.**; Alford, J. A. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1974**, *96*, 3615-**3623.** 

**(54) Dilling, W. L.; Alford, J. A.** *Tetrahedron Lett.* **1971,761-764.** 



**F'igure** 11. Stereochemistry of hydride reductions of and addition of organometallic reagents to 1,3-bishomocubanone **(59).** 



Figure 12. Enthalpy of formation and strain energy of olefin 64 and stereochemistry of **its** epoxidation and HOAc additions.



Figure 13. MM2-calculated structures of 1,3-bishomocubanone **(59)** and **methylene-1,3-bishomocubane** (64) (relative dietances in parentheses).

explanation for the selectivity exhibited in these reactions is the steric effect of this close hydrogen atom in partially blocking the **syn** side of the bridge carbon atom that is attacked. The lower selectivity in the epoxidation could result from an attack of the peracid near the center of the carbon-catbon double bond while the reactions at the carbonyl group occur on ita carbon atom, nearer the close hydrogen atom. The predominance of the **syn** acetate **68**  over the anti epimer **67** in the addition of acetic acid to 64 under various conditions<sup>53,54</sup> may result from prefer-



Figure 14. Enthalpies of formation and strain energies of 1,3 bishomocubanols 60-61 and 62-63 and their equilibrations.



Figure 15. MM2-calculated structures of anti- (61) and **ayn-**1,3-bishomocubanol (60) (relative distances in parentheses).

ential bridging of the intermediate cation on the anti side, leaving the **syn** side more open to attack by acetate.

Equilibration of the secondary alcohols **60** and **61** gave nearly equal amounts of the two epimers<sup>32</sup> (Figure 14). **MM2** calculations indicate that the **syn** isomer **60** is slightly more strained than the anti isomer **61.** This calculated enthalpy difference (gas phase) translates into a 46.2:53.8 equilibrium mixture in favor of the anti alcohol **61** at **120**   $\rm{C}$  if  $\Delta S$  is negligible.<sup>55</sup> The closer O-H distance in 60 compared to **61,** indicated in Figure **15,** may explain the difference in their calculated stabilities.

Likewise, equilibration of the tertiary alcohols **62** and **63** gave nearly equal amounts of the two isomers<sup>53</sup> (Figure **14).** The calculated enthalpy difference leads to a predicted equilibrium composition of **57.9:42.1** at **25 OC** in favor of the **syn** alcohol **62.** The lowest energy conformation of **63** has the shortest interatomic distance of those shown in Figure **16** and may explain the calculated preference for the **syn** alcohol **62.** The experimental results, although not very precise, do not reflect this preference.

Calculated enthalpies of formation and strain energies of *syn-* **69** and **anti-methyl-l,3-bishomocubane 70** are shown in Figure 17. Again, one of the C<sub>\*\*</sub>H distances in the **syn** methyl isomer **69** is shorter than corresponding distances in the anti epimer **70.** Not unexpectedly, the difference in enthalpies of formation between the **syn** and

 $(55)$  See  $\text{ref } 9$  for a discussion of the relevance of  $\Delta S$  in these calculations. **The closely related structures diecuesed here should** minimize **the importance of AS in these calculations.** 



Figure **16.** MM2-calculated structures of methyl-syn- **(62)** and **methyl-anti-1,3-bishomocubanol(63)** (relative distances in pa- rentheses).



Figure **17.** MM2-calculated structures of syn- **(69)** and *anti***methyl-l,3-bishomocubane (70)** (relative distances in parenthe- ses).



Figure **18. Syn** *(8)* and anti (a) protons on 1,3-bishomocubyl derivatives.

anti methyl isomers 69 and **70,** 0.28 kcal/mol, is larger than the corresponding difference in the secondary alcohols 60 and 61,0.12 kcal/mol. Thus, the methyl group has a stronger preference for the anti position than does the hydroxyl group. When both substituents are present, **as**  in 62 and **63,** the preference of the methyl group is greatest, and the most stable isomer is the anti methyl, **syn** hydroxyl isomer 62, by 0.19 kcal/mol.

Proton NMR spectra of several **syn** and anti pairs of 1,3-bishomocubyl derivatives (Figure 18) show that the chemical shifts of protons, H<sup>s</sup>, on the syn side of the methylene bridge are shifted downfield relative to those, H<sup>a</sup>, on the anti side.<sup>56</sup> The chemical shifts of methyl



Figure **19.** MM2-calculated structures of 1,3-bishomocubane **(2)** and gem-dimethyl derivative **14.** 

protons in 73 and 74 differ more,  $\delta_{H} - \delta_{H} = 0.29 - 0.32$ ppm, than do those of the secondary derivatives **71** and 72,  $\delta_{H} - \delta_{H} = 0.23{\text -}0.29$  ppm. Calculated interatomic distances (Figures 15,16,19) of the lowest energy conformations agree with our earlier suggestion that the chemical shift differences may be caused by greater steric compression of the **syn** protons than of the anti protons.66 In **all** examples the **syn** protons are nearer one of the indicated tertiary protons than are the anti protons. The **syn** methyl proton of **14** is nearer to the indicated proton, 2.297 **A,**  than is the **syn** methylene proton of 2,2.727 **A** (Figure 19). This proximity difference may account for the greater shift difference in the methyl derivatives **73** and **74** than in the secondary derivatives **71** and **72.** The same trend is noted in the distances shown in Figures 15 and 16. The relative distances (1.00, 1.17, 1.18, 1.23) estimated with ball and spring models of **2%** were in the same order and nearly the same magnitude **as** those (1.00,1.14,1.20,1.25) calculated with the MM2 program.

#### **Conclusions**

MM2(87) calculations indicate that the bishomocubanes increase in strain energy in the order  $1.4 < 1.3 < 1.3'$ 1,2 < 1,l. This order is approximately the same **as** that calculated for the analogous set of compounds that contain only the four-membered ring portions of these compounds. These results are consistent with the reactivity of several derivatives of the bishomocubanes. The stereochemistry of several addition reactions of 1,3-bishomocubanone and **methylene-l,3-bishomocubane** are consistent with the calculated geometry of these compounds. The calculated stabilities of **syn** and anti isomers of 1,3-bishomocubanols indicate that the isomers with the closer intramolecular interactions between the methylene bridge **syn** substituents and the  $\gamma$  tertiary hydrogen atoms have the higher strain energies. Proton NMR chemical shifts agree qualitatively with calculated geometries that show closer intramolecular interactions of methylene bridge substituents on the **syn** side than on the anti side.

Supplementary Material Available: Figures (stick, **ball**  and stick, and **CPK** space-filling) that show the calculated structures of compounds **1-14,30,32-33,37-39,43-49,57-64,** and **69-70** (10 pages). **This** material **is** contained in libraries on microfiche, immediately follows this article in the microfii version of the **journal,** and can be ordered from the **ACS;** see any current masthead page for ordering information.

**<sup>(56)</sup> Dilling, W. L.** *J. Org. Chem.* **1975,40, 23-2384.**