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The mode of cyclization of 2-sila-5-hexen-1-yl radicals generated from 6-(bromomethyl)dimethylsilyl$1^{\prime}, 2^{\prime}$-unsaturated uridines was investigated. In contrast to the case of the $2^{\prime}$-unsubstituted 6 -silicontethered substrate (4), which undergoes exclusive 6 -endo-cyclization, reactions of the 2 'substituted ( $\mathrm{Me}, \mathrm{CO}_{2} \mathrm{Me}, \mathrm{OBz}$, and Cl ) derivatives ( $\mathbf{1 4}, \mathbf{2 0}, \mathbf{2 2}$, and $\mathbf{2 4}$ ) uniformly proceeded in preferential or exclusive 5-exo-mode. The Tamao oxidation of the resulting cyclized products was also carried out to synthesize the corresponding $1^{\prime}$ - $C$-hydroxymethyl derivatives.

## Introduction

It is well appreciated that the 5-exo-ring closure of 5 -hexenyl radicals is overwhelmingly preferred to the alternative 6 -endo-cyclization. ${ }^{1} 5$-Hexenyl radicals containing various heteroatoms also follow the same trend ${ }^{2}$ with the exception of simple 2 -sila and 3 -sila counterparts that have been reported to undergo preferential 6-endocyclization. ${ }^{3}$ However, it has also been reported that both 6 -endo and 5-exo pathways are operative in the radical cyclization of allyl alcohols tethered with the (bromomethyl)dimethylsilyl group. ${ }^{4}$

As a part of our continuing studies on the chemistry of $1^{\prime}, 2^{\prime}$-unsaturated uridine, ${ }^{5,6} 1$-( 2 -deoxy-D-erythro-pent-1-enofuranosyl)uracil (1), we became interested in the reaction of a nucleoside 2 -sila- 5 -hexenyl radical (2) with

[^0]the expectation that, if its cyclization can be controlled in favor of 5-exo-mode, the resulting product would act as a precursor to $1^{\prime}$-C-hydroxymethylated nucleosides. Despite the interest generated by the antibacterial and antitumor activities found in the naturally occurring antibiotic angustmycins $\mathrm{C}(\mathbf{3}),{ }^{7}$ no systematic study has been executed so far on the structure-activity relationships of this class of nucleosides. ${ }^{8}$


2 R = TBDMS


## Results and Discussion

Preparation and Radical Reaction of the 6-(Bromomethyl)dimethylsilyl $1^{\prime}, 2^{\prime}$-Unsaturated Uridine. As

[^1]
## SCHEME $1^{a}$


${ }^{a} \mathrm{R}=$ TBDMS.
reported previously, ${ }^{6}$ the 6 -position of $\mathbf{1}$ can be regioselectively lithiated with LDA. However, when $\mathrm{BrCH}_{2}-$ $\mathrm{SiMe}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}$ was reacted with the resulting 6 -lithiated species of $\mathbf{1}$, a large amount of the starting material was recovered, presumably due to susceptibility of the reagent to elimination. The use of LHMDS, which is less basic than LDA, was found to be suitable for the present purpose. ${ }^{9}$ Thus, treatment of a mixture of $\mathbf{1}$ and $\mathrm{BrCH}_{2}-$ $\mathrm{SiMe}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}$ (4 equiv) with LHMDS ( 6 equiv) at below -70 ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 20 min in THF gave the 6 -silicon-tethered derivative (4) in $87 \%$ yield.

When the radical reaction of 4 was carried out in refluxing benzene by adding a mixture of AIBN ( 0.2 equiv) and $\mathrm{Bu}_{3} \mathrm{SnH}$ (2.0 equiv) via a motor-driven syringe over 1 h at $80^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ (final concentration of the substrate: 0.01 M ), only the 6 -endo-cyclized products 5 (58\%) and 6 (32\%) were obtained (Scheme 1). Even at a lower temperature of $-50{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\left(\mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~B} / \mathrm{Bu}_{3} \mathrm{SnH}\right.$ in toluene), no 5-exocyclized product was formed, although a slight increase was observed in the stereoselectivity of the $\alpha$-face attack ( $\mathbf{5} / \mathbf{6}=3.1 / 1$, total yield $55 \%$ ). The regiochemistry of 5 and 6 was apparent from the presence of an anomeric proton resonance (5, $\delta 6.25, J_{1^{\prime}, 2^{\prime}}=3.6 \mathrm{~Hz} ; \mathbf{6}, \delta 5.97, J_{1^{\prime}, 2^{\prime}}=4.0$ $\mathrm{Hz})$ that showed a ${ }^{3} J_{\mathrm{CH}}$ correlation to ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$-resonance of the C6 in the HMBC (Heteronuclear Multiple Bond Connectivity) spectrum. The depicted stereochemistry of 5 was unambiguously determined based on an NOE experiment: $7.8 \%$ NOE correlation between $\mathrm{H}-1^{\prime}$ and H-3'.

Although the preferred 6-endo-cyclization of a simple 2-sila-hexenyl radical has been rationalized in terms of a longer $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{Si}$ bond, ${ }^{10}$ we reasoned that, in the present case, the observed exclusive formation of 5 and $\mathbf{6}$ arises at least in part from stabilization of the anomeric radical $\mathbf{A}$ by the neighboring furanose ring oxygen. If this is the case, it should be possible to alter the cyclization bias in favor of 5-exo by introducing a substituent that stabilizes a $2^{\prime}$-carbon radical.

Cyclization of $\mathbf{2}^{\prime}$-Substituted 6-Silicon-Tethered $\mathbf{1}^{\prime}, \mathbf{2}^{\prime}$-Unsaturated Uridines. Our recent study showed that the 6 -(tributyl)stannylated $1^{\prime}, 2^{\prime}$-unsaturated uridine (7), prepared by LDA lithiation of $\mathbf{1}$ and subsequent reaction with $\mathrm{Bu}_{3} \mathrm{SnCl}$, undergoes an intramolecular

[^2]anionic migration of the stannyl group to yield the $2^{\prime}$ stannyl derivative 8. ${ }^{6}$ This method enabled us to prepare various types of $2^{\prime}$-substituted derivatives. Thus, iodination of 8 by using iodine gave 9 , which was further transformed to the $2^{\prime}$-methyl (10) and the $2^{\prime}$-carbomethoxy (11) derivatives through halogen-lithium exchange reaction. Similarly, by reacting 8 with NCS, the 2'-chloro derivative (12) was obtained. The $2^{\prime}$-benzoyloxy derivative (13) was prepared from $3^{\prime}, 5^{\prime}$-bis- $O$-(tert-butyldi-methylsilyl)-2'-ketouridine according to the published procedure. ${ }^{11}$


The 2'-methyl-6-silicon-tethered derivative (14) was prepared from 10 in $98 \%$ yield based on the aforementioned procedure using LHMDS, and its radical reaction was carried out in refluxing benzene in a manner similar to that for 4. As expected, the 5-exo-cyclized product 15 ( $41 \%$ ) was formed predominantly over the 6 -endo product 16 (8\%). Additional products formed in this reaction were

the glycosidic bond-rearranged product 17 (29\%), the 2'exomethylene derivative 18 ( $1 \%$, stereochemistry not known), and the reduced product 19 ( $4 \%$ ). When carried out at room temperature $\left(\mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~B} / \mathrm{Bu}_{3} \mathrm{SnH} / \mathrm{benzene}\right)$, the amount of 17 ( $36 \%$ ) increased at the expense of 15 ( $26 \%$ ). The depicted structures of $\mathbf{1 5 - 1 7}$ came from the following ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR observations. Compound 15 showed NOE correlations between $\mathrm{H}-2^{\prime} /$ one of the $\mathrm{SiCH}_{2}(11 \%)$ and $2^{\prime}$ $\mathrm{Me} / \mathrm{H}-3^{\prime}(4 \%)$. For 16, these were observed between H-3'/ $\mathrm{H}-1^{\prime}(13 \%), \mathrm{H}-4^{\prime} /$ one of the $6-\mathrm{SiMe}_{2}(6 \%), 2^{\prime}-\mathrm{Me} / \mathrm{H}-1^{\prime}(4 \%)$, and $2^{\prime}-\mathrm{Me} / \mathrm{H}-3^{\prime}(3 \%)$. The regiochemistry of $\mathbf{1 7}$ was apparent from the presence of a coupling between $\mathrm{H}-1^{\prime}$ (double doublet, $J=2.0$ and 6.4 Hz ) and $6-\mathrm{SiCH}_{2}$, while its stereochemistry was confirmed by the presence of NOE enhancement between $\mathrm{H}-1^{\prime} / 2^{\prime}-\mathrm{Me}(5 \%)$ and $\mathrm{H}-1^{\prime} /$ H-4' (5\%).

The above results for the reaction of $\mathbf{1 4}$, except for the formation of minor products (16, 18, and 19), can be rationalized as shown in Scheme 2. The high preference for the $\mathrm{C1}^{\prime}$-attack of the $\alpha$-silyl carbon-radial derived from 14 could be due to the formation of an incipient tertiary C2'-radical B, although steric hindrance of the 2'-methyl

[^3]
## SCHEME $2^{a}$



TABLE 1. Minimized Energies ( $\mathbf{k c a l} / \mathrm{mol}$ ) of Conformers E-H by Calculation
"down-conformer"
of $\mathbf{4}(\mathrm{X}=\mathrm{H}): \mathbf{E}$
of $\mathbf{1 4}(\mathrm{X}=\mathrm{Me}): \mathbf{G}$
group cannot be ruled out. Also, the observed concurrent formation of $\mathbf{1 7}$ may suggest that $\mathbf{B}$ is not sufficiently stable to react exclusively with $\mathrm{Bu}_{3} \mathrm{SnH}$, and thus, it eliminated uracil-1-yl radical $\mathbf{C}$ which cyclizes in a 6 -endo manner to yield a stabilized anomeric radical $\mathbf{D}$.

One may question why cyclization of 14 occurred exclusively from the $\alpha$-face of the furanoid glycal portion leading to 15 and 16, in comparison with that of 4 where the $\beta$-face attack took place to an appreciable extent. As we have no clear explanation for these results, semiempirical molecular orbital calculations ${ }^{12}$ of the representative two conformers of $4(\mathbf{E}$ and $\mathbf{F})$ and $14(\mathbf{G}$ and H) were carried out. Geometries of 4 and 14 were generated from crystallographic coordinates of 1 (see Supporting Information) and optimization was performed with MM2 using CAChe program. The results are summarized in Table 1.

Irrespective of the presence or absence of a substituent at the 2 '-position, the "down-conformer" ( $\mathbf{E}$ or $\mathbf{G}$ ) was found to be more stable than the "up-conformer" ( $\mathbf{F}$ or H). Also, energy difference between the up and down conformers is significantly larger in the case of 14 (ca. $4.4 \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol})$ than the case of $4(\mathrm{ca} .1 .9 \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol})$. These
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## SCHEME $3^{a}$


${ }^{a} \mathrm{R}=$ TBDMS.
data are in good agreement with the observed stereochemical outcome of the cyclizations of 14 as well as 4.

To avoid the reaction pathway leading to glycosidic bond-rearrangement, $\mathbf{B} \rightarrow \mathbf{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{D}$ (Scheme 2), it is necessary to introduce a substituent that stabilizes the intermediary $2^{\prime}$-carbon radical more efficiently. ${ }^{13}$ Since there have been ample precedents that $\alpha, \beta$-unsaturated esters undergo radical addition reaction preferentially at the $\beta$-position, ${ }^{14}$ a carbomethoxy group was selected as a $2^{\prime}$-substituent.

Compound 20 was prepared in $87 \%$ yield from 11 and subjected to radical cyclization (Scheme 3). When examined in refluxing benzene, $\mathbf{2 0}$ gave the expected 5 -exoproduct 21 in $53 \%$ yield together with the recovered 20 ( $13 \%$ ), the reduced product ( $2 \%$ ), and an unknown product. There was no trace of the 6 -endo or rearrangement product. The best result was seen in the reaction carried out at room temperature $\left(\mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~B} / \mathrm{Bu}_{3} \mathrm{SnH} /\right.$ benzene $)$ to give $\mathbf{2 1}$ in $93 \%$ along with the reduced product ( $5 \%$ ). Reactions of the $2^{\prime}$-benzoyloxy (22) and the $2^{\prime}$-chloro (24) substrates, carried out under similar conditions, also resulted in exclusive 5-exo-cyclization to give 23 (75\%) and 25 ( $66 \%$ ), respectively. These results suggest that polar effects ${ }^{15}$ rather than the steric hindrance of the $2^{\prime}$ substituent are an important determinant for directing this reaction in favor of 5-exo-cyclization.

The reaction of $\mathbf{2 4}$ deserves a comment. Although 25 was isolated after 1.5 h , it was also possible to obtain the dechlorinated product 26 (69\%) simply by further continuing the reaction for 4 days. This compensates for the aforementioned failure of $\mathbf{4}$ to give the corresponding 5 -exo-cyclized product.

Oxidative Cleavage of the 5-Exo-Cyclized Products. Silicon-tethered molecules are widely used for intramolecular reactions because the tether can be readily removed after the reaction and it offers the scope for facile transformation into other functionalities. ${ }^{16}$ The most widely used transformation is the oxidative cleavage of the $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{Si}$ bond, the Tamao oxidation, ${ }^{17}$ that allows the silicon atom to be converted to a hydroxyl group. There have been several examples of intramolecular radical

[^5]
## SCHEME 4


reaction of silicon-tethered nucleosides for the synthesis of their $C$-branched sugar derivatives. ${ }^{18}$ In these instances, the silicon-tethers used are uniformly attached to a hydroxyl group of the sugar moiety, therefore the heteroatom needed for the oxidative cleavage of $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{Si}$ bond is already attached to the silicon atom. In contrast to this, the present cyclization products have a silicon atom connected to four carbon-substituents. ${ }^{19}$

During our studies on the synthesis of 6 -substituted uridines, ${ }^{20}$ we experienced that the trimethylsilyl group at the 6 -position can be removed simply by reacting with $\mathrm{NH}_{3} / \mathrm{MeOH}$ (rt, 1 h ), presumably with simultaneous formation of methoxytrimethylsilane. This fact encouraged us to examine the oxidative cleavage of the present cyclized products under these frequently employed basic conditions.

When the 6 -endo-cyclized product 5 was heated in refluxing MeOH containing $\mathrm{KHCO}_{3}$ (5 equiv), KF (5 equiv), and $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{2}$ (4 equiv), the reaction proceeded very sluggishly and required 3 days for completion.

Although the desired product was isolated in $81 \%$ yield as its tri- $O$-acetyl derivative (27), we reexamined this reaction. It was found that the addition of 18-crown-6 (5 equiv) to the reaction medium considerably shortened the reaction time. Thus, refluxing for 22 h followed by acetylation gave 27 in $96 \%$ yield (Scheme 4). Similarly, 28 was isolated in $66 \%$ yield from 6.

The oxidative cleavage of the 5-exo-cyclized products $\left(\mathbf{2 1}, \mathbf{2 3}, \mathbf{2 5}\right.$, and 26) ${ }^{21}$ was next examined. Upon treatment under the above-mentioned reaction conditions, the $2^{\prime}$ carbomethoxy derivative 21 was not converted to the expected $1^{\prime}$-hydroxymethyl derivative 29 but instead to a product assumed to be $\mathbf{3 0}$. This product was unstable, giving a more polar compound (31?) during silica gel column chromatography. This result suggested that a more electron-withdrawing alkoxy substituent was necessary to increase the Lewis acidity of the silicon atom, rendering the formation of penta- and hexacoordinated silicon intermediates feasible. ${ }^{17)}$ When the reaction of 21 was carried out in $\mathrm{CF}_{3} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{OH}$ at rt for 15 h , and it was followed by acetylation, the desired 32 was isolated in $87 \%$ yield. Similarly, 33 was obtained in $91 \%$ yield from 23. In the case of the $2^{\prime}$-chloro derivative 25 , the corresponding $1^{\prime}$-hydroxymethyl compound $\mathbf{3 4}$ was isolated in $93 \%$ yield without acetylation.

[^6]
$29 \mathrm{X}=\mathrm{CO}_{2} \mathrm{Me}, \mathrm{R}=\mathrm{H}$
$32 \mathrm{X}=\mathrm{CO}_{2} \mathrm{Me}, \mathrm{R}=\mathrm{Ac}$
$33 X=O B z, R=A c$
$34 \mathrm{X}=\mathrm{Cl}, \mathrm{R}=\mathrm{H}$
$35 \mathrm{X}=\mathrm{R}=\mathrm{H}$
In contrast to these successful examples, the $2^{\prime}$ unsubstituted 5-exo-cyclized product $\mathbf{2 6}$ gave a considerable amount of uracil under the above oxidation conditions. This may be attributable to the lack of an electronwithdrawing substituent at the $2^{\prime}$-position of $\mathbf{2 6}$, thus rendering the formation of sugar-cation comparatively facile. Compound 35 was, therefore, prepared in $77 \%$ yield by the tin-radical mediated dechlorination of $\mathbf{3 4}$.

## Conclusion

The mode of cyclization (5-exo versus 6-endo) of radicals derived from 6-(bromomethyl)dimethylsilyl-1', $2^{\prime}$-unsaturated uridines was studied by changing the substituent at the 2 -position. Compound 4 having no $2^{\prime}$-substituent underwent exclusive 6 -endo-cyclization consistent with the reported precedent. ${ }^{10)}$ Although introduction of the $2^{\prime}$-methyl group to 4 changed the cyclization bias in favor of the 5 -exo-mode, the intermediate 2 -carbon radical is not sufficiently stable. As a result, a considerable extent of glycosidic bond-rearrangement took place in this particular reaction.

Cyclization reactions of other $2^{\prime}$-substituted $\left(\mathrm{CO}_{2} \mathrm{Me}\right.$, OBz , and Cl ) derivatives occurred exclusively in 5 -exomode.
Oxidative cleavage of these cyclized products was also carried out to disclose a new entry to $1^{\prime}$-hydroxymethylbranched nucleosides. In the oxidation of 5 -exo-cyclized products, employing $\mathrm{CF}_{3} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{OH}$ as reaction solvent was critical for an efficient transformation.

## Experimental Section

6-(Bromomethyl)dimethylsilyl-1-[3,5-bis-O-(tert-butyl-dimethylsilyl)-2-deoxy-D-erythro-pent-1-enofuranosyl]uracil (4). To a THF ( 60 mL ) solution of $\mathbf{1}(2.0 \mathrm{~g}, 4.4 \mathrm{mmol})$ and $\mathrm{BrCH}_{2} \mathrm{SiMe}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}(2.4 \mathrm{~mL}, 17.6 \mathrm{mmol})$ was added LHMDS ( 1.54 M THF solution, $17.1 \mathrm{~mL}, 26.4 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) at below $-70^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ under positive pressure of dry Ar. After stirring for 20 min , the reaction mixture was diluted with saturated aqueous $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$. Extraction with EtOAc followed by column chromatography (hexane/EtOAc $=4 / 1$ ) gave $4(2.33 \mathrm{~g}, 87 \%)$ as a foam: UV $(\mathrm{MeOH}) \lambda_{\max } 267 \mathrm{~nm}(\epsilon 10100), \lambda_{\min } 237 \mathrm{~nm}(\epsilon 4000) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 0.08,0.09,0.10$, and $0.12(12 \mathrm{H}$, each as s), 0.49 and $0.50(6 \mathrm{H}$, each as s), 0.90 and 0.91 ( 18 H , each as s), 2.69 and $2.81(2 \mathrm{H}$, each as d, $J=13.0 \mathrm{~Hz}), 3.61(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, J=10.4$ and $8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}), 3.81(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, J=10.4$ and 6.0 Hz$), 4.42(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{ddd}, J$ $=8.4,6.0$, and 2.0 Hz$), 4.98(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, J=2.8$ and 2.0 Hz$), 5.20$ $(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=2.8 \mathrm{~Hz}), 5.94(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=2.0 \mathrm{~Hz}), 8.34(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{br}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta-5.5,-5.3,-4.7,-4.6,-3.1$ and $-3.0,15.0$, $17.9,18.2,25.7,61.6,75.3,89.0,101.4,112.2,149.6,149.7$, 156.9, 161.8; FAB-MS m/z 605 and 607 (M ${ }^{+}+\mathrm{H}$ ). Anal. Calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{24} \mathrm{H}_{45} \mathrm{BrN}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5} \mathrm{Si}_{3} \cdot \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}: \mathrm{C}, 46.21 ; \mathrm{H}, 7.59 ; \mathrm{N}, 4.49$. Found: C, 46.46; H, 7.68; N, 4.74.

Radical Cyclization of 4: Formation of the 6-EndoCyclized Products 5 and 6. To a refluxing benzene (16.5 $\mathrm{mL})$ solution of $4(200 \mathrm{mg}, 0.33 \mathrm{mmol})$ was added a mixture of AIBN ( $10.8 \mathrm{mg}, 0.066 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) and $\mathrm{Bu}_{3} \mathrm{SnH}(0.18 \mathrm{~mL}, 0.66$ mmol ) in benzene ( 16.5 mL ) over 1 h via a motor-driven syringe under positive pressure of dry Ar. The reaction mixture was further refluxed for 20 min and then evaporated. Column chromatography (hexane/EtOAc $=4 / 1$ ) of the residue gave a mixture of $\mathbf{5}$ and $\mathbf{6}(157 \mathrm{mg}, 90 \%, \mathbf{5} / \mathbf{6}=1.8 / 1.0$ calculated by integrating $\mathrm{H}-1^{\prime}$ ). Separation of these products was carried out by HPLC (hexane/EtOAc $=3 / 2$ ) to give analytically pure $5\left(t_{\mathrm{R}}\right.$ $=9.6 \mathrm{~min}$, solid) and $6\left(t_{\mathrm{R}}=11.5 \mathrm{~min}\right.$, foam $)$.

Physical data of 5: $\mathrm{mp} 67-75^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; UV (MeOH) $\lambda_{\text {max }} 271 \mathrm{~nm}$ $(\epsilon 10400), \lambda_{\min } 235 \mathrm{~nm}(\epsilon 1700) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 0.08,0.10$, and $0.11(12 \mathrm{H}$, each as s), 0.30 and $0.41(6 \mathrm{H}$, each as s), 0.68 $(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, J=9.2$ and 15.6 Hz$), 0.92$ and $0.93(18 \mathrm{H}$, each as s), $1.26(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, J=15.6$ and 5.6 Hz$), 2.52-2.66(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.62-$ $3.68(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.83(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, J=10.6$ and 2.0 Hz$), 4.72(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}$, $J=7.4$ and 5.8 Hz$), 5.83(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=2.0 \mathrm{~Hz}), 6.25(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=$ $3.6 \mathrm{~Hz}), 8.10(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{br}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta-5.6,-5.4,-5.0$, $-4.8,-2.3,-1.5,2.0,18.0,18.3,25.7,25.9,40.3,62.1,71.0$, 81.4, 81.9, 109.3, 151.4, 158.3, 161.6; FAB-MS $m / z 527\left(\mathrm{M}^{+}+\right.$ H). Anal. Calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{24} \mathrm{H}_{46} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5} \mathrm{Si}_{3} \cdot 1 / 4 \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}: \mathrm{C}, 54.25$; H, 8.82; N, 5.27. Found: C, 54.42; H, 9.11; N, 5.28.

Physical data of 6: UV (MeOH) $\lambda_{\max } 270 \mathrm{~nm}(\epsilon 9800), \lambda_{\text {min }}$ $234 \mathrm{~nm}(\epsilon 1500) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 0.06,0.07$, and $0.08(12 \mathrm{H}$, each as s), 0.30 and $0.35(6 \mathrm{H}$, each as s), $0.69(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, J=$ 14.8 and 5.0 Hz$), 0.89(18 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.19(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, J=14.8$ and $12.8 \mathrm{~Hz}), 2.18-2.23(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.79-3.84(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 4.04(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}$, $J=2.0 \mathrm{~Hz}), 5.77(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=2.4 \mathrm{~Hz}), 5.97(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=4.0 \mathrm{~Hz})$, $8.16(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{br}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta-5.5,-5.3,-4.7,-4.6,-2.6$, $-2.5,7.9,17.9,18.5,25.7,26.0,44.0,62.6,80.5,82.5,85.4$, 108.9, 151.8, 157.6, 161.5; FAB-MS $m / z 527$ (M ${ }^{+}+\mathrm{H}$ ). Anal. Calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{24} \mathrm{H}_{46} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5} \mathrm{Si}_{3}$ : C, $54.71 ; \mathrm{H}, 8.80 ; \mathrm{N}, 5.32$. Found: C, 54.44; H, 8.93; N, 5.26.

## Preparation of Compounds 7 - $\mathbf{1 0}$ and 12. See ref 6.

1-[3,5-Bis-O-(tert-butyldimethylsilyl)-2-C-carbomethoxy-D-erythro-pent-1-enofuranosyl]uracil (11). Under positive pressure of dry Ar, BuLi ( 1.6 M in hexane, $1.47 \mathrm{~mL}, 2.35 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was added dropwise to a mixture of $9(136 \mathrm{mg}, 0.234 \mathrm{mmol})$ and $\mathrm{ClCO}_{2} \mathrm{Me}(181 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 2.34 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) in THF ( 5 mL ). After stirring for 20 min , the reaction was quenched by adding saturated aqueous $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$. Extraction with EtOAc followed by column chromatography (hexane/EtOAc = 6/1) gave 11 ( 73.3 $\mathrm{mg}, 61 \%$ ) as a solid: $\mathrm{mp} 150-153{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; $\mathrm{UV}(\mathrm{MeOH}) \lambda_{\text {max }} 245$ $\mathrm{nm}(\epsilon 17100), \lambda_{\min } 224 \mathrm{~nm}(\epsilon 14800) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 0.09$, 012 , and $0.15(12 \mathrm{H}$, each as s), $0.89(18 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 3.68(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, J$ $=11.0$ and 6.8 Hz$), 3.71(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 3.83(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, J=11.0$ and $5.2 \mathrm{~Hz}), 4.51(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{ddd}, J=6.8,5.2$, and 2.0 Hz$), 5.18(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}$, $J=2.0 \mathrm{~Hz}), 5.79(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, J=8.2$ and 2.0 Hz$), 7.23(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J$ $=8.2 \mathrm{~Hz}), 8.33(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{br}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta-5.5,-5.4,-4.8$, $-4.7,18.0,18.3,25.7,25.8,51.3,61.7,74.3,90.3,102.5,104.3$, 142.5, 147.6, 156.6, 162.5, 163.1; FAB-MS $m / z 513\left(\mathrm{M}^{+}+\mathrm{H}\right)$. Anal. Calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{23} \mathrm{H}_{40} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{7} \mathrm{Si}_{2}$ : C, 53.88 ; H, 7.86; $\mathrm{N}, 5.46$. Found: C, 53.83; H, 7.90; N, 5.43.

1-[2-O-Benzoyl-3,5-bis-O-(tert-butyldimethylsilyl)-d-erythro-pent-1-enofuranosyl]uracil (13). This compound was prepared as a foam in $71 \%$ yield from $3^{\prime}, 5^{\prime}$-bis- $O$-(tert-butyldimethylsilyl)- 2 '-ketouridine by the published procedure: ${ }^{18 \mathrm{c}} \mathrm{UV}(\mathrm{MeOH}) \lambda_{\text {max }} 231 \mathrm{~nm}(\epsilon 17700), \lambda_{\text {min }} 212 \mathrm{~nm}(\epsilon 12500)$, $\lambda_{\text {shoulder }} 270 \mathrm{~nm}(\epsilon 9500) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 0.00,0.07$, and $0.10(12 \mathrm{H}$, each as s), 0.84 and $0.93(18 \mathrm{H}$, each as s), $3.81(1 \mathrm{H}$, dd, $J=11.0$ and 6.0 Hz ), $3.89(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, J=11.0$ and 5.6 Hz ), $4.56(1 \mathrm{H}$, ddd, $J=6.0,5.6$, and 3.0 Hz$), 5.27(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=3.0$ $\mathrm{Hz}), 5.77(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, J=8.0$ and 2.4 Hz$), 7.40(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=8.0$ $\mathrm{Hz}), 7.45-7.49(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 7.58-7.63(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 8.04-8.07(2 \mathrm{H}$, $\mathrm{m}), 8.22(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{br}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta-5.4,-5.3,-4.7,-4.6$, $17.9,18.4,25.6,25.9,62.4,74.1,87.3,103.0,123.4,128.3,128.6$, 130.2, 133.9, 137.0, 141.6, 147.2, 162.3, 163.5; FAB-MS m/z $575\left(\mathrm{M}^{+}+\mathrm{H}\right)$. Anal. Calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{28} \mathrm{H}_{42} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{7} \mathrm{Si}_{2}: \mathrm{C}, 58.51$; H 7.37; N, 4.87. Found: C, 58.57; H, 7.46; N, 4.78.

6-(Bromomethyl)dimethylsilyl-1-[3,5-bis-O-(tert-butyl-dimethylsilyl)-2-deoxy-2-C-methyl-d-erythro-pent-1-enofuranosyl]uracil (14). This compound was obtained as a foam in $98 \%$ yield from $10(100 \mathrm{mg}, 0.213 \mathrm{mmol})$ by the procedure described for the preparation of 4: $\mathrm{UV}(\mathrm{MeOH}) \lambda_{\text {max }} 265 \mathrm{~nm}$ ( $\epsilon 10100$ ), $\lambda_{\text {min }} 236 \mathrm{~nm}(\epsilon 4400) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 0.08$ and $0.13(12 \mathrm{H}$, each as s), 0.46 and $0.48(6 \mathrm{H}$, each as s), $0.91(18 \mathrm{H}$, s), $1.62(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 2.69$ and $2.77(2 \mathrm{H}$, each as d, $J=13.2 \mathrm{~Hz})$, $3.58(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, J=10.5$ an 8.0 Hz$), 3.77(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, J=10.5$ and $6.2 \mathrm{~Hz}), 4.28(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{ddd}, J=8.0,6.2$, and 1.6 Hz$), 4.72(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}$, $J=1.6 \mathrm{~Hz}), 5.96(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=2.4 \mathrm{~Hz}), 8.26(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{br}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta-5.4,-5.3,-4.8,-4.4,-3.3,3.2,9.5,14.7,17.9$, 18.5, 25.7, 26.0, 62.0, 78.4, 86.7, 109.3, 112.4, 143.1, 149.5, 157.5, 162.0; FAB-MS $m / z 619$ and 621 ( $\mathrm{M}^{+}+\mathrm{H}$ ). Anal. Calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{25} \mathrm{H}_{47} \mathrm{BrN}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5} \mathrm{Si}_{3}: \mathrm{C}, 48.45 ; \mathrm{H}, 7.64 ; \mathrm{N}, 4.52$. Found: C, 48.84; H, 7.80; N, 4.50.

Radical Cyclization of 14: Formation of 15-19. The reaction was carried out by using $14(75 \mathrm{mg}, 0.122 \mathrm{mmol})$ by the procedure described for the case of 4. HPLC separation (hexane/EtOAc $=2 / 1$ ) of the reaction mixture gave $\mathbf{1 5}\left(t_{\mathrm{R}} 12.0\right.$ $\mathrm{min}, 27 \mathrm{mg}, 41 \%$, foam), $\mathbf{1 6}\left(t_{\mathrm{R}} 10.9 \mathrm{~min}, 4.9 \mathrm{mg}, 8 \%\right.$, foam), a mixture of $\mathbf{1 7}$ and $\mathbf{1 9}\left[t_{\mathrm{R}} 9.8 \mathrm{~min}, 21.8 \mathrm{mg}, \mathbf{1 7}(29 \%)\right.$ and $\mathbf{1 9}$ ( $4 \%$ ): the yields were calculated from ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR integration] and $18\left(t_{\mathrm{R}} 14.0 \mathrm{~min}, 0.7 \mathrm{mg}, 1 \%\right.$, foam).

Physical data of 15: UV (MeOH) $\lambda_{\text {max }} 252 \mathrm{~nm}(\epsilon 14600), \lambda_{\text {min }}$ $225 \mathrm{~nm}(\epsilon 5600) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 0.02,0.03$, and $0.08(12 \mathrm{H}$, each as s), 0.40 and $0.42(6 \mathrm{H}$, each as s), 0.88 and $0.89(18 \mathrm{H}$, each as s), $1.05(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}), 1.55(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=15.6 \mathrm{~Hz})$, $2.47(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, J=8.2$ and 7.2 Hz$), 3.80-3.91(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 4.42$ $(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, J=8.2$ and 7.0 Hz$), 5.72(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=2.4 \mathrm{~Hz}), 8.16$ $(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{br}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta-5.2,-5.0,-4.2,-3.9,-3.3,-2.7$, $11.0,17.7,18.5,25.7,26.0,29.3,55.7,64.4,77.5,86.9,105.7$, 106.4, 150.2, 161.5, 163.8; FAB-MS $m / z 541\left(\mathrm{M}^{+}+\mathrm{H}\right)$. Anal. Calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{25} \mathrm{H}_{48} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5} \mathrm{Si}_{3}$ : C, $55.51 ; \mathrm{H}, 8.94 ; \mathrm{N}, 5.18$. Found: C, 55.82; H, 9.15; N, 5.17.

Physical data of 16: UV (MeOH) $\lambda_{\text {max }} 272 \mathrm{~nm}(\epsilon 10000), \lambda_{\text {min }}$ $236 \mathrm{~nm}(\epsilon 1800) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 0.08,0.10,0.11$, and 0.12 $(12 \mathrm{H}$, each as s), $0.26(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=16.0 \mathrm{~Hz}), 0.30$ and $0.39(6 \mathrm{H}$, each as s), 0.93 and $0.94(18 \mathrm{H}$, each as s), $1.08(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.51$ $(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=16.0 \mathrm{~Hz}), 3.55(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{ddd}, J=7.2,2.4$, and 2.0 Hz ), $3.67(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, J=11.6$ and 2.4 Hz$), 3.82(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, J=11.6$ and $2.0 \mathrm{~Hz}), 4.27(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}), 5.84(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=2.0 \mathrm{~Hz})$, $5.94(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 7.99(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{br}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta-5.6,-5.4,-4.5$, $-4.3,-1.3,0.5,10.3,18.0,18.2,23.7,25.7,25.8,44.8,62.1$, 76.5, 81.3, 86.1, 109.3, 151.6, 158.3, 161.6; FAB-MS m/z 541 $\left(\mathrm{M}^{+}+\mathrm{H}\right)$. Anal. Calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{25} \mathrm{H}_{48} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5} \mathrm{Si}_{3}: \mathrm{C}, 55.51 ; \mathrm{H}, 8.94$; N, 5.18. Found: C, 55.39 ; H, 9.19 ; N, 4.97.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR and ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR data of 17: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta-0.01$, $0.11,0.20,0.27$, and $0.40(18 \mathrm{H}$, each as s), 0.85 and $0.90(18 \mathrm{H}$, each as s), $1.02(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, J=2.0$ and 15.6 Hz$), 1.44(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, J$ $=15.6$ and 6.4 Hz$), 1.49(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 3.27(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, J=10.2$ and $7.0 \mathrm{~Hz}), 3.49(1 \mathrm{H}$, dd, $J=10.2$ and 5.6 Hz$), 3.79(1 \mathrm{H}$, ddd, $J$ $=7.0,5.6$, and 1.2 Hz$), 4.36(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, J=6.4$ and 2.0 Hz$), 4.71$ $(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=1.2 \mathrm{~Hz}), 5.75(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=2.4 \mathrm{~Hz}), 8.18(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{br}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta-5.6,-5.5,-5.4,-5.3,0.0,0.2,8.7,16.7,17.9$, $18.5,25.8,26.0,63.3,71.3,77.4,80.5,87.6,109.2,151.4,161.0$, 161.4.

Physical data of 18: UV (MeOH) $\lambda_{\text {max }} 263 \mathrm{~nm}(\epsilon 10300), \lambda_{\text {min }}$ $232 \mathrm{~nm}(\epsilon 3500) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta-0.01,0.01,0.14$, and $0.18(12 \mathrm{H}$, each as s), 0.45 and $0.46(6 \mathrm{H}$, each as s), 0.86 and $0.94(18 \mathrm{H}$, each as s), 1.37 and $1.62(2 \mathrm{H}$, each as d, $J=15.4$ Hz ), $3.58(1 \mathrm{H}$, ddd, $J=8.2,6.0$, and 2.4 Hz ), $3.76(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, J$ $=11.6$ and 6.0 Hz$), 3.89(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, J=11.6$ and 2.4 Hz$), 4.97$ ( 1 H , ddd, $J=8.2,2.4$, and 2.2 Hz ) $5.09(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=2.2 \mathrm{~Hz}$ ), $5.23(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=2.4 \mathrm{~Hz}), 5.76(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=2.4 \mathrm{~Hz}), 7.75(1 \mathrm{H}$, br); ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta-5.4,-5.3,-4.5,-4.2,-3.5,-2.5$, 17.9, 18.3, 25.8, 26.0, 27.4, 62.9, 72.1, 83.4, 100.6, 105.8, 107.8, 149.0, 155.4, 160.6, 163.5; FAB-MS m/z 539 ( $\mathrm{M}^{+}+\mathrm{H}$ ). Anal. Calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{25} \mathrm{H}_{46} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5} \mathrm{Si}_{3}$ : C, 55.72; H, 8.60; N, 5.20. Found: C, 55.69; H, 8.55; N, 4.96 .
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR and ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR data of 19: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 0.08$, 0.11 , and $0.12(12 \mathrm{H}$, each as s), $0.32(9 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 0.89$ and 0.91
( 18 H , each as s), $1.60(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 3.61(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, J=10.6$ and 8.4 $\mathrm{Hz}), 3.78(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, J=10.6$ and 6.0 Hz$), 4.27(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{ddd}, J=$ $8.2,6.0$, and 2.0 Hz ), $4.72(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 5.91(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=2.4 \mathrm{~Hz})$, $8.13(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{br}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta-5.4,-5.3,-4.3,-1.0,9.6$, 17.9, 18.5, 25.6, 26.0, $62.1,78.4,86.6,108.8,110.9,143.4,149.8$, 161.3, 162.2 .

6-(Bromomethyl)dimethylsilyl-1-[3,5-bis-O-(tert-butyl-dimethylsilyl)-2-C-carbomethoxy-2-deoxy-D-erythro-pent-1enofuranosyl]uracil (20). This compound was obtained as a solid ( $\mathrm{mp} 117-120^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ) in $87 \%$ yield from $11(361 \mathrm{mg}, 0.703$ $\mathrm{mmol})$ by the procedure described for the preparation of 4: UV $(\mathrm{MeOH}) \lambda_{\max } 262 \mathrm{~nm}(\epsilon 13200), \lambda_{\text {min }} 221 \mathrm{~nm}(\epsilon 9000) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 0.09,0.14$, and $0.18(12 \mathrm{H}$, each as s$), 0.45$ and 0.46 $(6 \mathrm{H}$, each as s), 0.90 and $0.91(18 \mathrm{H}$, each as s), $2.66(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s})$, $3.62(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, J=10.5$ and 8.5 Hz$), 3.84(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, J=10.5$ and $6.0 \mathrm{~Hz}), 4.52(1 \mathrm{H}$, ddd, $J=8.5,6.0$, and 1.4 Hz$), 5.15(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}$, $J=1.4 \mathrm{~Hz}), 6.00(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=2.4 \mathrm{~Hz}), 8.13(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{br}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta-5.4,-4.9,-3.5,14.4,17.9,18.4,25.6,25.9,51.5$, $60.9,74.2,90.3,107.5,112.4,149.2,156.0,157.1,161.6,163.0$; FAB-MS $m / z 663$ and $665\left(\mathrm{M}^{+}+\mathrm{H}\right)$. Anal. Calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{26} \mathrm{H}_{47}$ $\mathrm{BrN}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{7} \mathrm{Si}_{3}$ : C, 47.04; H, 7.14; N, 4.22. Found: C, 47.07 ; H, 7.39; N, 4.19.

Radical Cyclization of 20: Formation of 21. To a mixture of 20 ( $50 \mathrm{mg}, 0.076 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) and $\mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~B}$ ( 1 M THF solution, $30 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.0304 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) in benzene ( 6.7 mL ) was added a benzene $(7.6 \mathrm{~mL})$ solution of $\mathrm{Bu}_{3} \mathrm{SnH}(31 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.114 \mathrm{mmol})$ via a motordriven syringe over 1 h at rt, during which time the same amount of $\mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~B}$ was added three times every 15 min . After addition of $\mathrm{Bu}_{3} \mathrm{SnH}$, the reaction mixture was stirred for further 0.5 h . Evaporation of the solvent followed by HPLC separation (hexane/EtOAc = 2/1) gave $21\left(t_{\mathrm{R}} 12.4 \mathrm{~min}, 41 \mathrm{mg}\right.$, $93 \%$, solid) and the reduced product ( $t_{\mathrm{R}} 9.2 \mathrm{~min}, 2.4 \mathrm{mg}, 5 \%$, foam). Physical data of 21: mp $194-195^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; UV (MeOH) $\lambda_{\text {max }}$ $267 \mathrm{~nm}(\epsilon 10200), \lambda_{\min } 233 \mathrm{~nm}(\epsilon 1700) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta$ $-0.03,0.01,0.11$, and $0.14(12 \mathrm{H}$, each as s), 0.43 and $0.44(6 \mathrm{H}$, each as s), 0.85 and $0.88(18 \mathrm{H}$, each as s), 1.69 and $1.77(2 \mathrm{H}$, each as d, $J=15.2 \mathrm{~Hz}), 3.39(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}), 3.65(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s})$, $3.71(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, J=11.6$ and 7.2 Hz$), 3.79(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, J=11.6$ and $2.4 \mathrm{~Hz}), 3.83(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dt}, J=7.2$ and 2.4 Hz$), 4.92(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{t}, J=7.2$ $\mathrm{Hz}), 5.75(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=2.4 \mathrm{~Hz}), 7.91(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{br}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right)$ $\delta-5.4,-5.3,-4.8,-4.5,-3.6,-2.6,18.0,18.4,25.8,25.9$, $30.0,51.5,63.5,64.5,73.6,86.2,102.2,106.1,150.1,160.7$, 163.0, 169.5; FAB-MS m/z $585\left(\mathrm{M}^{+}+\mathrm{H}\right), 623\left(\mathrm{M}^{+}+\mathrm{K}\right)$. Anal. Calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{26} \mathrm{H}_{48} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{7} \mathrm{Si}_{3}: \mathrm{C}, 53.39$; $\mathrm{H}, 8.27$; N, 4.79. Found: C, 53.39 ; H, 8.66; N, 4.73 .

1-(Bromomethyl)dimethylsilyl-1-[2-O-benzoyl-3,5-bis-O-(tert-butyldimethylsilyl)-D-erythro-pent-1-enofuranosyl]uracil (22). This compound was obtained as a foam in $80 \%$ yield from $13(100 \mathrm{mg}, 0.174 \mathrm{mmol})$ by the procedure described for the preparation of 4: UV (MeOH) $\lambda_{\max } 232 \mathrm{~nm}$ ( $\epsilon 18200$ ) and $263 \mathrm{~nm}(\epsilon 12800)$, $\lambda_{\text {min }} 218 \mathrm{~nm}(\epsilon 15300)$ and $250 \mathrm{~nm}(\epsilon 11900) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta-0.02,0.09,0.12$ and $0.13(12 \mathrm{H}$, each as s), 0.57 and $0.58(6 \mathrm{H}$, each as s), 0.84 and $0.93(18 \mathrm{H}$, each as s), 2.81 and $2.88(2 \mathrm{H}$, each as d, $J=13.2$ Hz ), $3.82(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, J=10.4$ and 8.0 Hz ), $3.91(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, J=10.4$ and 6.4 Hz$), 4.41(1 \mathrm{H}$, ddd, $J=8.0,6.4$ and 1.6 Hz$), 5.31(1 \mathrm{H}$, $\mathrm{d}, J=1.6 \mathrm{~Hz}), 5.98(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 7.98(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{br}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta$ $-5.4,-4.7,-3.3,-3.2,14.8,17.8,18.5,25.6,25.9,61.7,76.7$, 87.1, 112.7, 127.8, 128.2, 128.7, 130.1, 133.9, 137.7, 148.7, 156.9, 161.4, 163.1; FAB-MS $m / z 725$ and $727\left(\mathrm{M}^{+}+\mathrm{H}\right)$. Anal. Calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{26} \mathrm{H}_{48} \mathrm{BrN}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{7} \mathrm{Si}_{3}$ : C, $51.29 ; \mathrm{H}, 6.80 ; \mathrm{N}, 3.86$. Found: C, 51.41; H, 7.02; N, 3.89.

Radical Cyclization of 22: Formation of 23. This reaction was carried out by using 22 ( $50 \mathrm{mg}, 0.069 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) in a similar manner as described for 20. After addition of $\mathrm{Bu}_{3} \mathrm{SnH}$, the reaction mixture was stirred for 3 h at rt. HPLC separation (hexane/EtOAc $=5 / 1$ ) of the mixture gave $23\left(t_{\mathrm{R}}\right.$ $14.6 \mathrm{~min}, 35 \mathrm{mg}, 75 \%$, foam) and the reduced product ( $t_{\mathrm{R}} 11.3$ $\mathrm{min}, 1.5 \mathrm{mg}, 3 \%$, foam). Physical data of 23: UV ( MeOH ) $\lambda_{\text {max }}$ $232 \mathrm{~nm}(\epsilon 15700)$ and $265 \mathrm{~nm}(\epsilon 10000), \lambda_{\min } 211 \mathrm{~nm}(\epsilon 10100)$ and $249 \mathrm{~nm}(\epsilon 6800)$; ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta-0.04,0.06,0.07$, and $0.08(12 \mathrm{H}$, each as s), 0.39 and $0.43(6 \mathrm{H}$, each as s), 0.84
and $0.90(18 \mathrm{H}$, each as s), 1.78 and $2.22(2 \mathrm{H}$, each as d, $J=$ $15.4 \mathrm{~Hz}), 3.86-4.01(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 4.92(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, J=8.0$ and 6.2 Hz ), $5.46(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=6.2 \mathrm{~Hz}), 5.56(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=2.4 \mathrm{~Hz}), 7.40-$ 7.44 and $7.55-7.59(3 \mathrm{H}$, each as m), $7.65(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{br}), 7.93-7.95$ $(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta-5.2,-5.1,-4.8,-4.2,-4.1,-3.4$, 17.7, 18.5, 25.6, 26.0, 27.6, 64.1, 75.5, 82.6, 89.2, 102.3, 105.4, 128.4, 128.7, 129.6, 133.8, 149.6, 161.2, 163.0, 166.0; FAB-MS $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z} 647\left(\mathrm{M}^{+}+\mathrm{H}\right)$. Anal. Calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{31} \mathrm{H}_{50} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{7} \mathrm{Si}_{3}$ : C, 57.55 ; H, 7.79; N, 4.33. Found: C, 57.49; H, 8.08; N, 4.29.

6-(Bromomethyl)dimethylsilyl-1-[3,5-bis-O-(tert-butyl-dimethylsilyl)-2-chloro-2-deoxy-D-erythro-pent-1-enofuranosyl]uracil (24). This compound was obtained as a powder (mp 127-129 ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ) in $89 \%$ yield from $12(330 \mathrm{mg}, 0.675 \mathrm{mmol})$ by the procedure described for the preparation of 4: UV $(\mathrm{MeOH}) \lambda_{\max } 263 \mathrm{~nm}(\epsilon 10500), \lambda_{\min } 239 \mathrm{~nm}(\epsilon 6000) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 0.09,0.10,0.15$ and $0.17(12 \mathrm{H}$, each as s), 0.50 and $0.51(6 \mathrm{H}$, aech as s), 0.91 and $0.92(18 \mathrm{H}$, each as s), $2.73(2 \mathrm{H}$, s), $3.66(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, J=10.6$ and 8.2 Hz$), 3.84(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, J=10.6$ and 6.2 Hz$), 4.40(1 \mathrm{H}$, ddd, $J=8.2,6.2$, and 2.0 Hz$), 4.85(1 \mathrm{H}$, $\mathrm{d}, J=2.0 \mathrm{~Hz}), 5.98(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=2.4 \mathrm{~Hz}), 8.20(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{br}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta-5.4,-4.7,-4.5,-3.5,-3.4,1.6,14.5,17.6$, 18.4, 25.6, 25.9, 61.4, 76.7, 87.7, 108.8, 112.8, 144.9, 148.9, 156.8, 161.7; FAB-MS $m / z 639$ and 641 ( ${ }^{+}+\mathrm{H}$ ). Anal. Calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{24} \mathrm{H}_{44} \mathrm{BrClN}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5} \mathrm{Si}_{3}$ : C, $45.02 ; \mathrm{H}, 6.93 ; \mathrm{N}, 4.38$. Found: C, 45.33; H, 7.02; N, 4.38.

Radical Cyclization of 24: Formation of 25 and 26. This reaction was carried out by using 24 ( $50 \mathrm{mg}, 0.078 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) in a similar manner as described for 20. After finishing addition of $\mathrm{Bu}_{3} \mathrm{SnH}$, the reaction mixture was stirred for 0.5 h at rt . HPLC separation (hexane/EtOAc $=2 / 1$ ) of the mixture gave $\mathbf{2 5}\left(t_{\mathrm{R}} 11.6 \mathrm{~min}, 28.7 \mathrm{mg}, 66 \%\right.$, foam), $\mathbf{2 6}\left(t_{\mathrm{R}} 14.2 \mathrm{~min}, 2.5\right.$ $\mathrm{mg}, 6 \%$, foam), and the reduced product ( $t_{\mathrm{R}} 8.3 \mathrm{~min}, 3.7 \mathrm{mg}$, $8 \%$, foam). When the reaction mixture was stirred for 4 days, 26 was isolated in $69 \%$ together with 25 (trace amount) and the reduced product ( $7 \%$ ).

Physical data of 25: UV (MeOH) $\lambda_{\text {max }} 262 \mathrm{~nm}(\epsilon 10100), \lambda_{\text {min }}$ $229 \mathrm{~nm}(\epsilon 1900) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 0.05,0.11$, and $0.15(12 \mathrm{H}$, each as s), 0.43 and $0.44(6 \mathrm{H}$, each as s), 0.88 and $0.90(18 \mathrm{H}$, each as s), 1.70 and $1.78(2 \mathrm{H}$, each as d, $J=15.6 \mathrm{~Hz}), 3.81$ $(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, J=11.2$ and 1.6 Hz$), 3.91(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{ddd}, J=8.3,8.1$, and $1.6 \mathrm{~Hz}), 4.01(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, J=11.2$ and 8.3 Hz$), 4.23(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=$ $8.0 \mathrm{~Hz}), 4.77(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, J=8.1$ and 8.0 Hz$), 5.73(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=2.4$ $\mathrm{Hz}), 8.47(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{br}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta-5.2,-5.1,-4.6,-3.8$, $-3.1,-3.0,17.8,18.5,25.7,26.0,29.0,64.0,73.1,78.5,84.8$, 103.4, 105.9, 149.7, 160.3, 163.4; FAB-MS m/z $561\left(\mathrm{M}^{+}+\mathrm{H}\right)$. Anal. Calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{24} \mathrm{H}_{45} \mathrm{ClN}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5} \mathrm{Si}_{3}$ : C, $51.35 ; \mathrm{H}, 8.08 ; \mathrm{N}, 4.99$. Found: C, 51.59 ; H, 8.31 ; N, 4.99.

Physical data of 26: UV $(\mathrm{MeOH}) \lambda_{\max } 258 \mathrm{~nm}(\epsilon 7400), \lambda_{\text {min }}$ $232 \mathrm{~nm}(\epsilon 2400) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 0.00,0.01,0.08$, and 0.09 $(12 \mathrm{H}$, each as s), 0.38 and $0.44(6 \mathrm{H}$, each as s), 0.87 and 0.90 ( 18 H , each as s), 1.42 and $1.72(2 \mathrm{H}$, each as d, $J=15.2 \mathrm{~Hz}$ ), $2.05(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, J=13.3 \mathrm{~Hz}), 3.51(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, J=13.3$ and 7.7 Hz$)$, $3.67(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, J=12.0$ and 7.6 Hz$), 3.77-3.82(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 4.59$ $(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, J=7.7$, and 6.0 Hz$), 5.74(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=2.4 \mathrm{~Hz}), 8.05$ $(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{br}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta-5.4,-5.2,-4.8,-3.8,-3.5,-2.7$, $17.9,18.4,25.8,25.9,29.2,47.1,63.4,72.4,87.1,103.7,105.9$, 149.7, 161.2, 163.2; FAB-MS $m / z 527\left(\mathrm{M}^{+}+\mathrm{H}\right)$. Anal. Calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{24} \mathrm{H}_{46} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5} \mathrm{Si}_{3}$ : C, $54.25 ; \mathrm{H}, 8.82$; $\mathrm{N}, 5.27$. Found: C, 54.40 ; H, 8.72; N, 5.12.

1-(2-C-Acetoxymethyl-3,5-di-O-acetyl-2-deoxy- $\alpha$-D-ribofuranosyl)uracil (27). A mixture of $5(100 \mathrm{mg}, 0.19 \mathrm{mmol})$, $30 \%$ aqueous $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{2}(73 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.76 \mathrm{mmol})$, 18 -crown-6 ( 251 mg , $0.95 \mathrm{mmol}), \mathrm{KHCO}_{3}(81 \mathrm{mg}, 0.95 \mathrm{mmol})$, and $\mathrm{KF}(55 \mathrm{mg}, 0.95$ $\mathrm{mmol})$ in $\mathrm{MeOH}(3 \mathrm{~mL})$ was stirred at refluxing temperature for 22 h . The reaction mixture was evaporated and dried under reduced pressure. To a pyridine $(3 \mathrm{~mL})$ solution of the resulting residue was added $\mathrm{Ac}_{2} \mathrm{O}(0.45 \mathrm{~mL}, 4.75 \mathrm{mmol})$ and the mixture was stirred at rt overnight. Evaporation of the solvent followed by column chromatography (EtOAc) gave $27(70 \mathrm{mg}, 90 \%)$ as a foam: UV (MeOH) $\lambda_{\text {max }} 261 \mathrm{~nm}(\epsilon 12000), \lambda_{\text {min }} 231 \mathrm{~nm}(\epsilon$ 2600 ); ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 2.02,2.10$, and 2.14 ( 9 H , each as s), $3.23-3.30(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 4.07-4.21(4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 4.58(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dt}, J=4.8$
and 1.0 Hz$), 5.40(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, J=6.0$ and 1.0 Hz$), 5.76(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J$ $=8.2 \mathrm{~Hz}), 6.47(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}), 7.41(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=8.2 \mathrm{~Hz})$, $8.50(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{br}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 20.7,20.8,20.9,45.2,57.6$, $63.5,73.6,84.5,86.8,102.0,139.8,150.5,163.1,169.5,170.4 ;$ FAB-MS $m / z 385\left(M^{+}+H\right)$. Anal. Calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{16} \mathrm{H}_{20} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{9} \cdot 1 /$ $5 \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}: \mathrm{C}, 49.54 ; \mathrm{H}, 5.30 ; \mathrm{N}, 7.22$. Found: C, 49.47; H, 5.16; N, 6.86

1-(2-C-Acetoxymethyl-3,5-di- $O$-acetyl-2-deoxy- $\beta$-d-arabinofuranosyl)uracil (28). This compound was prepared as a foam in $66 \%$ yield from $6(100 \mathrm{mg}, 0.19 \mathrm{mmol})$ by the procedure described for the preparation of 27 . The reaction was continued for 16 h at the refluxing temperature of $\mathrm{MeOH}: \mathrm{UV}$ (MeOH) $\lambda_{\max } 262 \mathrm{~nm}(\epsilon 9400)$, $\lambda_{\text {min }} 230 \mathrm{~nm}(\epsilon 2100)$; ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 2.00,2.13$ and $2.14(9 \mathrm{H}$, each as s), 3.05$3.09(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 4.04(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, J=12.0$ and 3.6 Hz$), 4.15(1 \mathrm{H}$, dd $J=12.0$ and 5.2 Hz$), 4.18(1 \mathrm{H}$, ddd, $J=5.2,4.4$ and 3.2 Hz$)$, $4.40(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, J=12.2$ and 4.4 Hz$), 4.43(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, J=12.2$ and $3.2 \mathrm{~Hz}), 5.10(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, J=5.2$ and 4.8 Hz$), 5.75(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=8.0$ $\mathrm{Hz}), 6.17(1 \mathrm{H} \mathrm{d}, J=6.4 \mathrm{~Hz}), 7.55(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=8.0 \mathrm{~Hz}), 8.77$ $(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{br}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 20.5,20.7,21.0,46.6,59.6,62.6$, $73.6,80.6,85.5,101.9,139.6,150.2,163.1,170.1,170.2,170.3 ;$ FAB-MS m/z $385\left(\mathrm{M}^{+}+\mathrm{H}\right.$ ). Anal. Calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{16} \mathrm{H}_{20} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{9} \cdot 1 /$ $5 \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}: \mathrm{C}, 49.54 ; \mathrm{H}, 5.30 ; \mathrm{N}, 7.22$. Found: C, 49.42; H, $5.18 ; \mathrm{N}$, 6.90 .

1-[1-C-Acetoxymethyl-3,5-bis-O-(tert-butyldimethyl-silyl)-2-C-carbomethoxy-2-deoxy- $\boldsymbol{\beta}$-D-arabinofuranosyl]uracil (32). To a solution of $21(16.7 \mathrm{mg}, 0.029 \mathrm{mmol})$ in $\mathrm{CF}_{3} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{OH}(1.5 \mathrm{~mL})$ were added $\mathrm{KHCO}_{3}(14.5 \mathrm{mg}, 0.145$ mmol ), 18 -crown-6 ( $38 \mathrm{mg}, 0.145 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), KF ( $8.4 \mathrm{mg}, 0.145$ $\mathrm{mmol})$, and $30 \%$ aqueous $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{2}(13.1 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.116 \mathrm{mmol})$ at -20 ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The reaction mixture was stirred for 15 h at rt , evaporated, and partially purified by Florisil column chromatography (hexane/EtOAc $=2 / 1$ ). The resulting crude product was treated overnight with $\mathrm{Ac}_{2} \mathrm{O}(16.4 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.17 \mathrm{mmol})$ in pyridine ( 2 mL ). Florisil column chromatography (hexane/EtOAc $=10 / 1$ ) of the acetylation mixture gave 32 ( $14.8 \mathrm{mg}, 87 \%$ ) as a foam: UV $(\mathrm{MeOH}) \lambda_{\max } 261 \mathrm{~nm}(\epsilon 10600), \lambda_{\min } 230 \mathrm{~nm}(\epsilon 1900) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 0.03,0.07,0.09$, and $0.10(12 \mathrm{H}$, each as s$), 0.87$ and $0.92(18 \mathrm{H}$, each as s), $2.05(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 3.36(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=6.2 \mathrm{~Hz})$, $3.76(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, J=11.2$ and 3.2 Hz$), 3.89(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, J=11.2$ and $4.4 \mathrm{~Hz}), 3.93-3.97(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 4.53(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{t}, J=6.2 \mathrm{~Hz}), 4.71$ and $4.77(2 \mathrm{H}$, each as d, $J=10.4 \mathrm{~Hz}), 5.65(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, J=8.4$ and $2.4 \mathrm{~Hz}), 8.00(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}) 8.36(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{br}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta-5.4,-5.0,-4.9,0.0,17.8,18.3,20.7,25.5,25.9$, $52.4,58.3,60.3,64.8,74.1,85.8,95.1,101.0,141.2,150.0,162.9$, 169.9, 170.0; FAB-MS m/z $587\left(\mathrm{M}^{+}+\mathrm{H}\right), 625\left(\mathrm{M}^{+}+\mathrm{K}\right)$. Anal. Calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{26} \mathrm{H}_{46} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{9} \mathrm{Si}_{2}$ : C, 53.22; H, 7.90; N, 4.77. Found: C, 53.62; H, 8.05; N, 4.72.

1-[1-C-Acetoxymethyl-3,5-bis-O-(tert-butyldimethyl-silyl)-2-O-benzoyl- $\beta$-d-arabinofuranosyl]uracil (33). This compound was prepared in $91 \%$ yield as a foam from 23 (13.8 $\mathrm{mg}, 0.021 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) by the procedure described for the preparation of 32, except that the oxidative cleavage was performed at $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 15 h . Acetylation mixture was purified by Florisil column chromatography (hexane/EtOAc $=5 / 1$ ): UV ( MeOH ) $\lambda_{\text {max }} 233 \mathrm{~nm}(\epsilon 16500)$ and $262 \mathrm{~nm}(\epsilon 10400)$, $\lambda_{\text {min }} 212 \mathrm{~nm}(\epsilon$ 9300) and $249 \mathrm{~nm}(\epsilon 8300) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta-0.06,-0.03$, 0.14 , and $0.23(12 \mathrm{H}$, each as s), 0.80 and $0.94(18 \mathrm{H}$, each as s), $2.06(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 3.59(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, J=7.6 \mathrm{~Hz}), 3.78(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, J=$ 10.4 and 5.8 Hz ), $4.24(1 \mathrm{H}$, ddd, $J=7.6,5.8$, and 1.6 Hz ), 4.33 $(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{t}, J=1.6 \mathrm{~Hz}), 4.74$ and $4.96(2 \mathrm{H}$, each as d, $J=12.0$ $\mathrm{Hz}), 5.61(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=1.6 \mathrm{~Hz}), 5.74(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, J=8.4$ and 2.4
$\mathrm{Hz}), 7.38-7.42(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 7.54-7.57(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 7.78-7.80(2 \mathrm{H}$, m), $7.91(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}), 8.12(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{br})$; ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right)$ $\delta-5.6,-5.5,-5.2,-4.8,17.8,18.2,20.6,25.6,25.7,62.2,63.0$, $76.8,79.9,88.2,97.3,100.7,128.7,129.3,133.7,128.8,141.2$, 149.2, 163.0, 163.9, 170.0; FAB-MS m/z 687 ( $\mathrm{M}^{+}+\mathrm{K}$ ). Anal. Calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{31} \mathrm{H}_{48} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{9} \mathrm{Si}_{2}$ : C, 57.38; H, 7.46; N, 4.32. Found: C, 57.24; H, 7.55; N, 4.30 .

1-[3,5-Bis-O-(tert-butyldimethylsilyl)-2-chloro-2-deoxyl-1-C-hydroxymethyl- $\beta$-D-arabinofuranosyl]uracil (34). This compound was prepared in $93 \%$ yield as a foam from 25 (23.5 $\mathrm{mg}, 0.041 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) by the procedure described for the preparation of 32. After stirring at rt for 3 h , the oxidation mixture was quenched by adding saturated aqueous $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{~S}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$. Extraction with EtOAc followed by HPLC purification (hexane/EtOAc $=1 / 2)$ gave $34\left(t_{\mathrm{R}}=12.3 \mathrm{~min}, 20.2 \mathrm{mg}, 93 \%\right)$ as a foam: UV $(\mathrm{MeOH}) \lambda_{\text {max }} 261 \mathrm{~nm}(\epsilon 12700), \lambda_{\text {min }} 230 \mathrm{~nm}(\epsilon 3300) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 0.10,0.13$, and $0.16(12 \mathrm{H}$, each as s$), 0.91$ and 0.92 ( 18 H , each as s), $3.14(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{br}), 3.82(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, J=10.7$ and 6.6 $\mathrm{Hz}), 3.87(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, J=10.7$ and 4.8 Hz$), 4.07(1 \mathrm{H}$, ddd, $J=$ $6.6,4.8$, and 3.2 Hz$), 4.19(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 4.20(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=3.2 \mathrm{~Hz})$, $4.47(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, J=3.2$ and 2.0 Hz$), 4.57(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=2.0 \mathrm{~Hz})$, $5.67(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, J=8.3$ and 1.8 Hz$), 7.84(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=8.3 \mathrm{~Hz})$, $8.71(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{br}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta-5.4,-5.0,4.7,17.8,18.4$, $25.6,25.9,61.8,63.1,65.7,79.8,86.7,99.9,100.5,142.5,149.8$, 165.0; FAB-MS m/z $559\left(\mathrm{M}^{+}+\mathrm{K}\right)$. Anal. Calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{22} \mathrm{H}_{41^{-}}$ $\mathrm{ClN}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{6} \mathrm{Si}_{2}$ : C, $50.70 ; \mathrm{H}, 7.93 ; \mathrm{N}, 5.37$. Found: C, $50.75 ; \mathrm{H}, 8.17$; N, 5.23 .

1-[3,5-Bis- $O$-(tert-butyldimethylsilyl)-2-deoxyl- $\beta$-D-psicofuranosyl]uracil (35). A mixture of $\mathbf{3 4}(38 \mathrm{mg}, 0.073 \mathrm{mmol})$, $\mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~B}(1 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{THF}$ solution, $146 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.146 \mathrm{mmol})$, and $\mathrm{Bu}_{3} \mathrm{SnH}$ ( $39 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.146 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) in benzene ( 3.0 mL ) was stirred at rt. After 2 h , the same amount of $\mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~B}$ was added to the reaction mixture, and stirring was continued for further 1 h . Evaporation of the solvents followed by HPLC purification (hexane/ $\operatorname{EtOAc}=1 / 2)$ gave $35\left(t_{\mathrm{R}}=9.8 \mathrm{~min}, 27 \mathrm{mg}, 77 \%\right)$ as a foam: $\mathrm{UV}(\mathrm{MeOH}) \lambda_{\max } 263 \mathrm{~nm}(\epsilon 12700), \lambda_{\min } 234 \mathrm{~nm}(\epsilon 7100) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 0.03,0.04,0.09$, and $0.10(12 \mathrm{H}$, each as s), 0.86 and $0.90(18 \mathrm{H}$, each as s), $2.55(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, J=14.8$ and 2.4 Hz ), $2.62(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, J=8.0$ and 5.0 Hz$), 2.69(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, J=14.8$ and 5.6 Hz$), 3.61-3.68(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.92(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, J=11.6$ and $8.0 \mathrm{~Hz}), 3.97(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, J=11.6$ and 5.0 Hz$), 4.15(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, J=$ 5.8 and 4.0 Hz$), 4.34(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dt}, J=5.6$ and 2.4 Hz$), 5.62(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}$, $J=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}), 7.90(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}), 8.31(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{br}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta-5.7,-5.6,-5.0,-4.8,17.5,18.2,25.6,25.7,44.1$, $62.4,65.9,72.5,89.6,99.9,100.2,142.1,150.1,164.4$; FABMS $m / z 487\left(\mathrm{M}^{+}+\mathrm{H}\right)$. Anal. Calcd forC ${ }_{22} \mathrm{H}_{42} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{6} \mathrm{Si}_{2}$ : C, 54.29 ; H, 8.70; N, 5.76. Found: C, 54.44; H, 9.03; N, 5.62.
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