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#### Abstract

The temperature dependences of (i) the broad-band decoupled ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ n.m.r. spectrum of 5.6,11.12.17.18-hexahydrotribenzo[a.e.i]cyclododecene (1) and (ii) the ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ n.m.r. spectra of its 2.3.8.9.14.15- (2) and 1.4.7.10.13.16- (3) hexamethyl derivatives have been interpreted in terms of ring inversion between enantiomeric $C_{2}$ conformations. Conformational analysis on these molecules has been carried out with the aid of strain energy calculations on selected conformations of the parent hydrocarbon (1) and its $1.4,7,10,13.16$-hexamethyl derivative (3). Useful correlations between calculated and experimental thermodynamic parameters were found. The temperature dependences of the ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ n.m.r. spectra of the 2.3.8.9-(15) and 1,4.7.10-(16) tetramethyl derivatives of 5,6,11,12-tetrahydrodibenzo[a,e]cyclo-octene (14) have been interpreted in terms of interconversion of chair- and boat-like conformations. Strain energy calculations on selected conformations of the 1.4.7.10-tetramethyl derivative (14) have led to useful correlations between calculated and experimental thermodynamic parameters.


The conformational properties of the hexahydrotribenzocyclododecene (1) were first discussed in a prescient publication in 1945 by Baker, Banks, Lyon, and Mann. ${ }^{2}$ Inspection of molecular models led these authors to consider the four conformations (la-d) shown in Figure 1 as possible forms for the molecule in the crystalline state. A preliminary $X$-ray study indicated that the occurrence of conformations (1a) and (ld), with trigonal symmetry, in the crystal was improbable, without providing any information concerning the relative merits of conformations (1b) and (lc). It is significant that several years before the wide recognition of conformational analysis as a stereochemical discipline, ${ }^{3}$

1 Part 5, D. J. Brickwood, A. M. Hassan, W. D. Ollis, J. S. Stephanatou, and J. F. Stoddart, preceding paper.
${ }^{2}$ W. Baker, R. Banks, D. R. Lyon, and F. G. Mann, J. Chem. Soc., 1945, 27.
${ }^{3}$ D. H. R. Barton, Experientia, 1950, 6, 316; Topics Stereochem., 1971, 6, 1; O. Hassel, Tidsskr. Kjemi Bergvesen og Metallurgi, 1943, 3 [5], 32; Topics Steveochem., 1971, 6, 11.
the ready interconversion of conformations (la)-(ld) was seen to involve only those changes in stereochemistry commonly described nowadays as torsional processes. Hexahydrotribenzocyclododecene (1) is the parent hydrocarbon of a series of twelve-membered ring systems which include the trisalicylide derivatives (4)-(6). The recognition ${ }^{4}$ that tri-3,6-dimethylsalicylide (4), tri-othymotide (5), and tri- - -carvocrotide (6) all exist in solution in diastereoisomeric propeller and helical conformations encouraged us in 1972 to examine the conformational behaviour of the hydrocarbon (1) and its hexamethyl derivatives (2) and (3) in solution.
In 1945, Baker et al. ${ }^{2}$ reported the synthesis of the hexahydrotribenzocyclododecene (1) from $o$-xylylene dibromide with sodium in (i) dioxan and (ii) ether
4 W. D. Ollis and I. O. Sutherland, Chem. Comm., 1966, 402; A. P. Downing, W. D. Ollis, and I. O. Sutherland, ibid., 1967, 171; A. P. Downing, W. D. Ollis, I. O. Sutherland, J. Mason, and S. F. Mason, ibid., 1968, 329; A. P. Downing, W. D. Ollis, and I. O. Sutherland, J. Chem. Soc. (B), 1970, 24.
containing small amounts of ethyl acetate. In our hands, a Wurtz reaction employing the solvent conditions in (ii) gave a low yield of the hydrocarbon (1)
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Figure 1 Reproductions of the photographs of molecular models shown in ref. 2 for four 'strainless phases' (la-d) of hexahydrotribenzocyclododecene (1); (la) with $C_{3 h}$ symmetry, (lb) with $C_{2}$ symmetry, (1c) with $C_{8}$ symmetry, and (1d) with $C_{3 v}$ symmetry
together with small amounts of the acyclic hydrocarbons (7), (10), and (13). This reaction has been the subject of several investigations ${ }^{5-8}$ and the yield of the tribenzocyclododecene ( 1 ) has been improved ${ }^{5,6,8}$ (i) by varying the relative concentrations of the reactants ${ }^{5,8}$ and (ii) by incorporating tetraphenylethylene as catalyst. ${ }^{\mathbf{5 , 6}}$ Tetra-hydrodibenzocyclo-octene (14) ${ }^{\mathbf{2 , 5 - 1 4}}$ was obtained as the major product in $45 \%$ yield along with $16 \%$ of the tribenzocyclododecene (1) and small amounts of $o$ ditolylethane (7) when we carried out the Wurtz reaction in tetrahydrofuran in the presence of tetraphenylethylene (cf. ref. 6).

The $2,3,8,9,14,15$-hexamethyl derivative (2) of (1) and the $2,3,8,9$-tetramethyl derivative (15) of (14) were obtained together with the acyclic hydrocarbons (8) and (11) by a tetraphenylethylene-catalysed Wurtz reaction on the dibromide (21) in tetrahydrofuran. The dibromide (21) was synthesized by a route involving

[^0](i) a Diels-Alder cycloaddition ${ }^{15}$ between 2,3-dimethyl-buta-1,3-diene and diethyl acetylenedicarboxylate to give diethyl 4,5-dimethylcyclohexa-1,4-diene-1,2-dicarboxylate (17) together with small amounts of the aromatic oxidation product (18), (ii) oxidation of (17) with 2 -chloro-2-nitropropane ${ }^{16}$ in methanolic sodium methoxide to the known ${ }^{16}$ dimethyl diester (19), (iii) reduction of (19) with lithium aluminium hydride to the diol (20), and finally (iv) treatment of (20) with phosphorus tribromide.

The $1,4,7,10,13,16$-hexamethyl derivative (3) of (1) and the $1,4,7,10$-tetramethyl derivative (16) of (14) were obtained together with the acyclic hydrocarbons (9) and (12) and 1,2,3,4-tetramethylbenzene (26) by a Wurtz reaction on the dibromide (25) in ether-ethyl


(4) $R^{1}=R^{2}=M e$
(5) $R^{1}=\mathrm{Me}, \mathrm{R}^{2}=\mathrm{CHMe}_{2}$
(6) $R^{1}=\mathrm{CHMe}_{2}, \mathrm{R}^{2}=\mathrm{Me}$
acetate. The synthesis of the dibromide (25) was based on known procedures ${ }^{17,18}$ involving (i) a Diels-Alder condensation ${ }^{\mathbf{1 7}}$ between 2,5-dimethylfuran and maleic

[^1]anhydride to give the adduct (22), (ii) acid-catalysed dehydration of (22) to yield 3,6-dimethylphthalic

(7) $R^{1}=R^{2}=R^{3}=R^{4}=H$
(8) $R^{1}=R^{4}=H, R^{2}=R^{3}=M e$
( 9 ) $R^{1}=R^{4}=M e, R^{2}=R^{3}=M e$

(10) $R^{1}=R^{2}=R^{3}=R^{4}=R^{5}=R^{6}=H$
(11) $R^{1}=R^{4}=R^{5}=M e, R^{2}=R^{3}=R^{6}=H$
(12) $R^{1}=R^{4}=R^{5}=H, R^{2}=R^{3}=R^{6}=M e$

(13)

(14) $R^{1}=R^{2}=H$
(15) $R^{1}=H, R^{2}=M e$
(16) $R^{1}=M e, R^{2}=H$
anhydride (23), (iii) reduction ${ }^{18}$ of (23) with lithium aluminium hydride to the diol (24), and finally (iv) treatment ${ }^{18}$ of (24) with phosphorus tribromide.

In this paper, results of studies on the conformational

19 N. L. Allinger, M. T. Tribble, M. A. Miller, and D. H. Wertz, J. Amer. Chem. Soc., 1971, 98, 1637; for a recent review, see N. L. Allinger, Adv. Phys. Org. Chem., 1976, 13, 1.
behaviour of the twelve-membered ring hydrocarbon (1) and its $1,4,7,10,13,16$-hexamethyl derivative (3) in solution by dynamic ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ and ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ n.m.r. spectroscopy are compared with the conclusions reached on the basis of strain energy calculations. ${ }^{11,19}$ In this way, the influence on the conformational behaviour of aromatic methyl substituents in the ortho-positions with respect to the twelve-membered ring can be assessed. In the 2,3,8,-9,14,15-hexamethyl derivative (2) the methyl substituents occupy simultaneously meta- and para-positions on the benzene rings relative to the twelve-membered ring. Since it has hydrogen atoms in all six orthopositions, and since it contains good ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ n.m.r. probes in the form of the aromatic protons and methyl protons,

(17)

(18) $R^{1}=H, R^{2}=\mathrm{Me}, X=\mathrm{CO}_{2} \mathrm{Et}$

(19) $R^{1}=H, R^{2}=\mathrm{Me}, X=\mathrm{CO}_{2} \mathrm{Me}$
(20) $\mathrm{R}^{1}=\mathrm{H}, \mathrm{R}^{2}=\mathrm{Me}, X=\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{OH}$
(21) $R^{1}=H, R^{2}=\mathrm{Me}, X=\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Br}$
(24) $R^{1}=\mathrm{Me}, \mathrm{R}^{2}=\mathrm{H}, X=\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{OH}$
(25) $R^{1}=\mathrm{Me}, \mathrm{R}^{2}=\mathrm{H}, \mathrm{X}=\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Br}$

(23)

(26)
the hydrocarbon (2) may be considered as an ideal model for the parent hydrocarbon (1). This means that a comparison is possible between the results obtained in solution by dynamic ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ n.m.r. spectroscopy with the parent hydrocarbon (1) and by dynamic ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ n.m.r. spectroscopy with the $2,3,8,9,14,15$-hexamethyl derivative (2). Part of this investigation has been the subject of a preliminary communication ${ }^{20}$ and has also been discussed briefly in a recent review ${ }^{\mathbf{1 1}}$ on the conformational behaviour of some medium-sized ring systems. Finally, the availability from the syntheses of (2) and (3) of the $2,3,8,9$ - (15) and $1,4,7,10-(16)$ tetramethyl derivatives of tetrahydrodibenzocyclo-octene (14) has prompted us to examine the conformational properties of these ' $6,8,6$ ' systems in solution and compare our results with those in the literature ${ }^{\mathbf{1 0 - 1 4}}$ for (14). In particular, the 2,3,8,9-tetramethyl derivative (15), with its four ortho-hydrogen atoms on the benzene rings and its good ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ n.m.r. probes in the form of the aromatic protons and methyl protons, may be regarded as a suitable model for the parent hydrocarbon (14).
${ }^{20}$ D. J. Brickwood, W. D. Ollis, and J. F. Stoddart, J.C.S. Chem. Comm., 1973, 638.

## EXPERIMENTAL

Apart from ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ n.m.r. spectroscopy, the general methods are described in Part 3. ${ }^{21}$ Broad-band decoupled ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ n.m.r. spectra were recorded on a JEOL SP 100 spectrometer with dichlorodideuteriomethane as 'lock' and tetramethylsilane as internal standard.

Reaction between Sodium and o-Xylylene Dibromide (with T. J. Grant). ${ }^{2}$-Sodium wire ( $\mathbf{3 5 . 4} \mathrm{g}$ ) was added to a solution of $o$-xylylene dibromide $(93.4 \mathrm{~g})$ in dry ether $(600 \mathrm{ml})$ and the mixture was heated under reflux for 24 h . Additions of ethyl acetate ( 2 ml ) were made initially, and at the end of 5 , 15 , and 20 h . After the reaction was complete, the resulting amorphous solid was removed by filtration. Evaporation of the filtrate gave an oily residue which was separated into four fractions by fractional distillation. Fraction 1 had b.p. $50-56^{\circ}$ at 20 mmHg , fraction 2 b.p. $80-140^{\circ}$ at 0.1 mmHg , fraction $3 \mathrm{~b} . \mathrm{p}$. $140-210^{\circ}$ at 0.1 mmHg , and fraction 4 b.p. $210-260$ at 0.1 mmHg . Fraction 1 crystallised from ethanol as needles of o-ditolylethane (7) ( 0.11 g , $1 \%$ ), m.p. $65^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{lit.}^{2} 65-66^{\circ}\right), M^{+} 210, \tau\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) 2.90(8 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$, aromatic), $7.18\left(4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)$, and $7.72(6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}, 2 \times \mathrm{Me})$. Fraction 2 was purified by distillation to give 1,2 -bis-(omethylphenethyl)benzene (10) (0.25 g, $1 \%$ ), b.p. $210^{\circ}$ at 0.5 mmHg [Found: $\mathrm{C}, ~ 92.1 ; \mathrm{H}, 8.25 \%$; $M$ (mass spec.), 314. $\mathrm{C}_{24} \mathrm{H}_{26}$ requires $\left.\mathrm{C}, 91.7 ; \mathrm{H}, 8.3 \% ; M, 314\right]$, $\tau\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) 2.74-2.96(12 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}$, aromatic), $7.15(8 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$, $2 \times \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ ), and $7.74(6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}, 2 \times \mathrm{Me})$. Column chromatography of fraction 3 on silica gel using benzene-light petroleum (b.p. $60-80^{\circ}$ ) ( $1: 1$ ) as eluant yielded $5,6,11,12,-$ 17,18-hexahydrotribenzo $a, e, i]$ cyclododecene (1) ( 0.022 g , $0.1 \%$ ), m.p. $189^{\circ}$ (lit., ${ }^{2} 184.5^{\circ}$ ), $M^{+} 312, \tau\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) 2.60-2.92$ $\left(12 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}\right.$, aromatic) and $6.97\left(12 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}, 3 \times \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)$. Fraction 4 crystallised from ethanol to yield 2, $2^{\prime}$-bis-(omethylphenethyl) $\alpha \alpha^{\prime}$-bibenzyl (13) ( $0.023 \mathrm{~g}, 0.1 \%$ ), m.p. $69^{\circ}$ [Found: C, 90.9; H, 7.95\%; $M$ (mass spec.), 418. $\mathrm{C}_{32} \mathrm{H}_{34}$ requires $\left.\mathrm{C}, 91.9 ; \mathrm{H}, 8.14 \%, M, 418\right]$, $\tau\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right)$ 2.76-2.98 ( $16 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}$, aromatic), $7.12(4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$, bibenzyl $\left.\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}\right), 7.17\left(8 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}\right.$, other $\left.\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)$, and $7.76(6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$, $2 \times \mathrm{Me}$ ).

The reaction was also carried out in dry tetrahydrofuran with tetraphenylethylene as catalyst. ${ }^{6}$ Column chromatography on silica gel using benzene-light petroleum (b.p. $60-80^{\circ}$ ) (15:1) as eluant gave 5,6,11,12-tetrahydrodibenzo $[a, e]$ cyclo-octene (14) (45\%), m.p. 109-111 ${ }^{\circ}$ (lit., ${ }^{6}$ $110-112^{\circ}$ ) in addition to o-ditolylethane (7) (2\%) and $5,6,11,12,17,18$-hexahydrotribenzo $[a, e, i]$ cyclododecene (16\%).

Diethyl 4,5-Dimethylcyclohexa-1,4-diene-1,2-dicarboxylate (17). ${ }^{15}-2,3$-Dimethylbuta-1,3-diene ( 820 mg ) and diethyl acetylenedicarboxylate ( 1.7 g ) were heated in an autoclave at $120{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 6 h . T.l.c. indicated that two products were formed. They were separated by column chromatography on silica gel using light petroleum (b.p. 60-80 $)$-ethyl acetate ( $8: 1$ ) as eluant. Fraction 1 corresponded to the diene (17) (2.05 g, 81\%), $M^{+} 252, \tau\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) 5.78(4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{q}$, $\left.J 7.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \times \mathrm{CO}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{3}\right), 7.10(4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$, methylene protons), $8.35(6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}, 2 \times \mathrm{Me})$, and $8.71(6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{t}, J 7.8 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $2 \times \mathrm{CO}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{3}$ ). Fraction 2 was characterised as diethyl 4,5-dimethylbenzene-1,2-dicarboxylate (18) (190 mg, $8 \%), M^{+} 250, \tau\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) 2.55(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$, aromatic), $5.69(4 \mathrm{H}$, $\left.\mathrm{q}, J 7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \times \mathrm{CO}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{3}\right), 7.72(6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}, 2 \times \mathrm{Me})$, and $8.68\left(6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{t}, J 7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \times \mathrm{CO}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{3}\right)$.

The same products were obtained when 2,3-dimethylbuta-1,3-diene $(820 \mathrm{mg})$ and diethyl acetylenedicarboxylate $(1.7 \mathrm{~g})$ were heated under reflux in ethanol $(15 \mathrm{ml})$ for 24 h .

Dimethyl 4,5-Dimethylbenzene-1,2-dicarboxylate (19). ${ }^{16}$ The diene diester (17) ( 8.0 g ) was added to m-sodium methoxide ( 500 ml ) containing 2 -chloro-2-nitropropane $(40 \mathrm{ml})$ and the mixture was refluxed in nitrogen for 1 h . The solution was acidified with hydrochloric acid and then excess of acid was destroyed by addition of ethereal diazomethane. Extraction with ether yielded the crude product as an oil. Crystallisation from methanol gave the diester (19) ( $7.2 \mathrm{~g}, 92 \%$ ), m.p. $54-55^{\circ}$ (lit., ${ }^{16} 56^{\circ}$ ).

1,2-Bishydroxymethyl-4,5-dimethylbenzene (20).—The diester (19) ( 1.3 g ) was refluxed for 6 h with lithium aluminium hydride ( 650 mg ) in dry ether ( 40 ml ). The excess of hydride was destroyed by addition of moist ether followed by water. The mixture was filtered and the residual solid was washed thoroughly with dilute hydrochloric acid and then with water. The combined filtrates were extracted with ether, and the ethereal layer was dried $\left(\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}\right)$ and evaporated. The crude product was recrystallised from light petroleum (b.p. $60-80^{\circ}$ ) to give the $\operatorname{diol}(20)(760 \mathrm{mg}$, $88 \%$ ), m.p. 95-98 ${ }^{\circ}$ [Found: C, 72.5; H, 8.8\%; $M$ (mass spec.), 166. $\mathrm{C}_{10} \mathrm{H}_{14} \mathrm{O}_{2}$ requires $\left.\mathrm{C}, 72.3 ; \mathrm{H}, 8.5 \% ; M, 166\right]$, $\tau\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) 2.94\left(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}\right.$, aromatic), $5.41\left(4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}, 2 \times \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{OH}\right)$, $6.58(2 \mathrm{H}$, br s, $2 \times \mathrm{OH})$, and $7.87(6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}, 2 \times \mathrm{Me})$.

1,2-Bisbromomethyl-4,5-dimethylbenzene (21).-Phosphorus tribromide ( 4.2 ml ) in dry ether ( 56 ml ) was added dropwise with stirring to the diol (20) (3.5 g) dissolved in dry benzene ( 40 ml ) and dry ether ( 40 ml ). The mixture was stirred for 2 h and then poured into water ( 160 ml ). The organic layer was washed with $10 \%$ sodium hydrogen carbonate solution $(2 \times 25 \mathrm{ml})$ and then with water $(2 \times 40$ $\mathrm{ml})$, then dried $\left(\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}\right)$ and evaporated. Recrystallisation of the residue from ethanol gave the dibromide (21) ( $5.6 \mathrm{~g}, 92 \%$ ), m.p. $113-116^{\circ}$ (decomp.) [Found: C, 41.1; $\mathrm{H}, 4.3$; $\mathrm{Br}, 54.5 \% ; ~ M$ (mass spec.), 290. $\mathrm{C}_{10} \mathrm{H}_{12} \mathrm{Br}_{2}$ requires $\mathrm{C}, 41.1 ; \mathrm{H}, 4.1 ; \mathrm{Br}, 54.8 \% ; M, 290]$, $\tau\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right)$ $2.89\left(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}\right.$, aromatic), $5.40\left(4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}, 2 \times \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Br}\right)$, and 7.79 $(6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}, 2 \times \mathrm{Me})$.

Reaction between Sodium and the Dibromide (21).- A solution of the dibromide (21) (4.5 g) in dry tetrahydrofuran $(20 \mathrm{ml})$ was added with stirring during 10 h to sodium ( 1.5 g ) and tetraphenylethylene $(260 \mathrm{mg})$ in dry tetrahydrofuran $(30 \mathrm{ml})$ cooled to $-80^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ in acetone-solid $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$. After the reaction was complete moist ether was added followed by water. Separation of the organic layer was followed by further extraction with chloroform; the material from the organic solutions was subjected to column chromatography on silica gel using benzene-light petroleum (b.p. 60-80 ${ }^{\circ}$ ) ( $1: 30$ ) as eluant to give four components. Component 1 was recrystallised from ether-ethanol to afford bis-(2,4,5trimethylphenyl)ethane (8) ( $96 \mathrm{mg}, 5 \%$ ), m.p. $136-137^{\circ}$ [Found: $M$ (mass spec.), $266.2034 . \quad \mathrm{C}_{20} \mathrm{H}_{28}$ requires $M$, $266.2035], \tau\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) 3.03$ and $3.06(4 \mathrm{H}$, two equal intensity singlets, aromatic), $7.24\left(4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)$, and 7.72 and $7.78(18 \mathrm{H}, 2 \times \mathrm{s}, 6 \times \mathrm{Me})$. Component 2 was recrystallised from chloroform-ethanol to give 2,3,8,9-tetramethyl-5,6,11,12-tetrahydrodibenzo [a,e]cyclo-octene (15) $(225 \mathrm{mg}$, $11 \%$ ), m.p. 246-248 ${ }^{\circ}$, [Found: $M$ (mass spec.), 264.1872. $\mathrm{C}_{20} \mathrm{H}_{24}$ requires $\left.M, 264.1879\right], \tau\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}-\mathrm{CS}_{2}\right), 3.31(4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$, aromatic), $7.09\left(8 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}, 2 \times \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)$, and $7.91(12 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$, $4 \times \mathrm{Me}$ ). Component 3 was characterised after recrystallisation from ether-ethanol as 1,2-dimethyl-4,5-bis-(2,4,5trimethylphenethyl)benzene (11) ( $136 \mathrm{mg}, 6 \%$ ), m.p. $139-$ $140.5^{\circ}$ [Found: $M$ (mass spec.), $398.2966 . \quad \mathrm{C}_{30} \mathrm{H}_{38}$ requires
${ }^{21}$ Part 3, W. D. Ollis and J. F. Staddart, J.C.S. Perkin I, 1976, 926.
$M, 398.2973], \tau\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) 3.01,3.06$, and $3.09(6 \mathrm{H}, 3$ equal intensity singlets, aromatic), $7.22\left(8 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}, 2 \times \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)$, and $7.74,7.77$, and $7.81(24 \mathrm{H}, 3 \times \mathrm{s}, 8 \times \mathrm{Me})$. Component 4 was recrystallised from chloroform-ethanol to afford needles of 2,3,8,9,14,15-hexamethyl-5,6,11,12,17,18-hexahydrotribenzo $[\mathrm{a}, \mathrm{e}, \mathrm{i}]$ cyclododecene (2) ( $242 \mathrm{mg}, 11 \%$ ), m.p. $>310^{\circ}$ [Found: $M$ (mass spec.), $396.2801 . \mathrm{C}_{30} \mathrm{H}_{36}$ requires $M, 396.2817]$, $\tau\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) 2.93$ ( $6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$, aromatic), 7.07 ( 12 H , s, $3 \times \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ ), and $7.76(18 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}, 6 \times \mathrm{Me})$.

Diels-Alder Adduct (22) of 2,5-Dimethylfuran and Maleic Anhydride. ${ }^{17-2,5-D i m e t h y l f u r a n ~(~} 500 \mathrm{ml}$ ) was added dropwise with vigorous stirring during 1 h to maleic anhydride $(44 \mathrm{~g})$ in dry ether ( 100 ml ). Stirring was continued for 16 h and then the crystalline product was collected. The filtrate was cooled in an ice-bath for 2 h to yield additional product. The yellow crystalline adduct (22) ( $54.5 \mathrm{~g}, 66 \%$ ) had m.p. $70-72^{\circ}$ (lit., $\left.{ }^{17} 59-63^{\circ}\right), M^{+} 194, \tau\left[\left(\mathrm{CD}_{3}\right)_{2} \mathrm{CO}\right] 3.59(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$, olefinic), $6.65(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$, methine), and $8.35(6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}, 2 \times \mathrm{Me})$.

3,6-Dimethylphthalic Anhydride (23). ${ }^{17}$-The Diels-Alder adduct (22) ( 54 g ) was added in portions to a rapidly stirred solution of $90 \%$ sulphuric acid ( 600 ml ) maintained between 0 and $-6{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Stirring was continued for 1 h at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and then the temperature was allowed to rise to $+10^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The mixture was then poured on to ice ( 1.5 kg ) and the precipitate was collected, washed with ice-water, and dissolved in water ( 800 ml ) containing sodium hydroxide ( 40 g ). Upon addition of glacial acetic acid ( 150 ml ) a small quantity of 2,5-dimethylbenzoic acid (m.p. 132-134 ${ }^{\circ}$; lit., ${ }^{17}$ $132-134^{\circ}$ ) was obtained. Crude 3,6-dimethylphthalic anhydride was isolated from the filtrate by adding 5 N hydrochloric acid until the solution was acidic. Recrystallisation from benzene gave the pure anhydride (23) ( $34.5 \mathrm{~g}, 71 \%$ ), m.p. $140-141^{\circ}$ (lit., ${ }^{17} 142-143^{\circ}$ ), $M^{+} 176$, $\tau\left[\left(\mathrm{CD}_{3}\right)_{2} \mathrm{CO}\right] 2.30(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$, aromatic) and $7.40(6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}, 2 \times \mathrm{Me})$.

1,2-Bishydroxymethyl-3,6-dimethylbenzene (24). ${ }^{18}-3,6-\mathrm{Di}-$ methylphthalic anhydride (23) ( 30 g ) was extracted (Soxhlet) into refluxing dry ether ( 900 ml ) containing lithium aluminium hydride ( 15 g ). Heating under reflux was continued for 28 h and then excess of hydride was destroyed by addition of moist ether followed by water. The mixture was filtered and the residual solid was washed thoroughly with dilute hydrochloric acid and then with water. The combined filtrates were extracted with ether; the ethereal layer was dried $\left(\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}\right)$ and evaporated. The crude product was recrystallised from light petroleum (b.p. 60$80^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ) to give needles of the diol (24) (25.2 g, $87 \%$ ), m.p. $69-70^{\circ}$ (lit., ${ }^{18} 70^{\circ}$ ), $M^{+} 166, \tau\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) 2.95(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$, aromatic), $5.35\left(4 \mathrm{H}\right.$, br s, $\left.2 \times \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{OH}\right), 6.10(2 \mathrm{H}$, br s, $2 \times \mathrm{OH})$, and $7.68(6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}, 2 \times \mathrm{Me})$.

1,2-Bisbromomethyl-3,6-dimethylbenzene (25). ${ }^{18}$ —Phosphorus tribromide ( 30 ml ) in dry ether ( 400 ml ) was added dropwise with stirring to the diol (24) (25 g) dissolved in benzene ( 250 ml ) and dry ether ( 250 ml ). The mixture was stirred for 16 h , and then poured into water (ll). The organic layer was washed with $10 \%$ sodium hydrogen carbonate solution ( $2 \times 150 \mathrm{ml}$ ) and then with water $(2 \times 150 \mathrm{ml})$, dried $\left(\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}\right)$, and evaporated to yield a crystalline residue. Recrystallisation from ethanol gave the dibromide (25) ( $36 \mathrm{~g}, 94 \%$ ), m.p. $101-102^{\circ}$ (lit., ${ }^{18}$ $\left.100^{\circ}\right), M^{+} 290, \tau\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) 2.90(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$, aromatic), $5.30(4 \mathrm{H}$, $\left.\mathrm{s}, 2 \times \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Br}\right)$, and $7.65(6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}, 2 \times \mathrm{Me})$.

[^2]Reaction between Sodium and the Dibromide (25).-Sodium wire ( 5.35 g ) was added to a solution of the dibromide (25) $(14 \mathrm{~g})$ in dry ether ( 100 ml ) and the mixture was heated under reflux for 24 h . Additions of ethyl acetate ( 2 ml ) were made initially and at the end of 5,10 , and 20 h . After the reaction was complete, the inorganic material was removed by filtration. Evaporation of the filtrate gave an oily residue which was separated by fractional distillation at 5 mmHg . Fraction $1(0.89 \mathrm{~g})$ had b.p. $64-88^{\circ}$ and fraction $2(1.7 \mathrm{~g})$ b.p. $90-220^{\circ}$. Fraction 1 was redistilled at 4.5 mmHg to give $1,2,3,4$-tetramethylbenzene (26) ( $370 \mathrm{mg}, 6 \%$ ), b.p. $78-80^{\circ}$ at 4.5 mmHg (lit., ${ }^{17} 78.5-80.5^{\circ}$ at 10 mmHg ). Fraction 2 was subjected to column chromatography on silica gel using benzene-light petroleum (b.p. $60-80^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ) ( $1: 19$ ) as eluant to give four crystalline components. Component 1 was recrystallised from light petroleum (b.p. $40-60^{\circ}$ ) to give bis-(2,3,6-trimethylphenyl)ethane (9) ( $110 \mathrm{mg}, 9 \%$ ), m.p. 97- $100^{\circ}$ [Found: $M$ (mass spec.), 266.203 8. $\mathrm{C}_{20} \mathrm{H}_{26}$ requires $\left.M, 266.2034\right]$, $\tau\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right)$ $3.09\left(4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}\right.$, aromatic), $7.17\left(4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)$, and 7.66 , 7.72 , and $7.75(18 \mathrm{H}, 3$ equal intensity singlets, $6 \times \mathrm{Me})$. Component 2 was recrystallised from light petroleum (b.p. $60-80{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ) to give $1,4,7,10$-tetramethyl- $5,6,11,12$-tetrahydrodibenzo $[\mathrm{a}, \mathrm{e}]$ cyclo-octene (16) ( $45 \mathrm{mg}, 4 \%$ ), m.p. $128-130^{\circ}$ [Found: $M$ (mass spec.), 264.187 7. $\mathrm{C}_{20} \mathrm{H}_{24}$ requires $M$, 264.1879 ], $\tau\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) 3.29(4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$, aromatic), $6.91(8 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$, $2 \times \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ ), and $7.76(12 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}, 4 \times \mathrm{Me})$. Component 3 was recrystallised from light petroleum (b.p. $60-80{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ) to give 1,2-dimethyl-3,6-bis-(2,3,6-trimethylphenylethyl)benzene (12) ( $63 \mathrm{mg}, 3 \%$ ), m.p. $166-168^{\circ}$ [Found: $M$ (mass spec.), $398.2961 . \mathrm{C}_{30} \mathrm{H}_{38}$ requires $\left.M, 398.2973\right] \tau\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right)$ $3.20-3.24$ ( $6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}$, aromatic), $7.16\left(8 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}, 2 \times \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}\right.$ ), and $7.73,7.78,7.83$, and $7.88(24 \mathrm{H}, 4$ equal intensity singlets, $8 \times \mathrm{Me}$ ). Component 4 was recrystallised from benzene-light petroleum (b.p. $60-80{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ) to give $1,4,7,10,-$ 13,16-hexamethyl-5,6,11,12,17,18-hexahydrotribenzo[a,e,i]cyclododecene (3) ( $4 \mathrm{mg},<1 \%$ ), m.p. $>290^{\circ}$ [Found: $M$ (mass spec.), $396.2807 . \quad \mathrm{C}_{30} \mathrm{H}_{36}$ requires $\left.M, 396.2817\right]$, $\tau\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) 2.95-3.05(6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}$, aromatic), $6.70-7.10(12 \mathrm{H}$, $\mathrm{m}, 3 \times \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ ), and $7.42,7.50$, and $7.54(18 \mathrm{H}, 3$ equal intensity signals, $6 \times \mathrm{Me}$ ).

Determination of Rates of Conformational Changes by Dynamic ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ and ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ N.m.r. Spectroscopy.-The methods used are fully described in Parts 1-4. ${ }^{10,21-23}$ The computer programs (coded in FORTRAN IV) used to generate the theoretical line-shapes are now described for the general methods I-III.

Method I. A program (I) * for exchange of nuclei between two equally or unequally populated sites, A and B, with no mutual coupling. The aromatic protons of eightmembered ring compounds (15) and (16) both gave two singlet signals of unequal intensities at low temperatures and so spectral line-shapes were simulated using this program. Calculated and observed spectra are shown in Figures 2 and 3 for compounds (15) and (16), respectively. The methyl protons of compounds (15) and (16) both gave two singlets at low temperatures as well. In the case of compound (16), spectral line-shapes were also simulated using this program. Calculated and observed spectra are shown in Figure 3.

Method II. A program (IV) $\dagger$ for exchange of nuclei
${ }^{22}$ Part 2, R. P. Gellatly, W. D. Ollis, and I. O. Sutherland, J.C.S. Perkin I, 1976, 913.
${ }^{23}$ Part 4, D. J. Brickwood, W. D. Ollis, and J. F. Stoddart, J.C.S. Perkin I, 1978, 1385.
between three equally or unequally populated sites, A, B, and C , with no mutual coupling. The modified form of the Bloch equations introduced by McConnell ${ }^{24}$ can be extended ${ }^{25}$ to cases involving exchange between more than two sites with no mutual coupling. For a $j$ site problem, the general equation (1) may be written for the complex magnetic moment $G_{j}$ of the $j$ th site. The assumption is made that all spectra were recorded under steady-state conditions so that all the time derivatives of the complex magnetic moments may be set to zero. ${ }^{24,26}$

$$
\begin{equation*}
\alpha_{j} G_{j}-\Sigma_{1 \neq j}\left(k_{1 j} G_{1}-k_{j 1} G_{j}\right)=-i \gamma \mathrm{H}_{1} M_{\mathbf{0}} P_{j} \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{equation*}
\alpha_{j}=T_{2 j}^{-1}-i\left(\omega_{j}-\omega\right) \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

$\omega$ is the observing frequency * and is therefore that of the rotational frequency $\ddagger$ of the applied field $\mathrm{H}_{1}, \omega_{j}$ is the Larmor frequency $\ddagger$ corresponding to the $j$ th site, $T_{2 j}$ is the

SITE computer program. Values for site frequencies, $\omega_{j}$, populations, $p_{j}$, and relaxation times, $T_{2 j}$ were obtained initially from chemical shifts, relative intensities, and halfheight peak widths for the singlet signals $\mathrm{A}, \mathrm{B}$, and C in the low temperature spectra. The absorption intensity at frequency $\omega$ is proportional to the imaginary part of $G_{\mathrm{A}}+$ $G_{\mathrm{B}}+G_{\mathrm{C}}$. The solutions to equations (3)-(5) for a range of values for $\omega$ which cover the appropriate region of the spectrum give line-shapes for selected input values of the rate constants, $k_{\mathrm{AB}}$ etc. All three twelve-membered ring compounds (1)-(3) exhibited low temperature spectra consistent with a conformation which renders constitutionally identical atoms and groups in these compounds diastereotopic. Thus, the methyl protons of compound (3) give rise to three singlet signals at room temperature and below. The spectral line-shapes associated with the high temperature spectra were simulated (see Figure 4) using this
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Figure 2 Observed (full line) and computed (broken line) spectra of the aromatic protons of 2,3,8,9-tetramethyl-5,6,11,12-tetrahydrodibenzo $[a, e]$ cyclo-octene (15): (a) at $-52{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, k_{\mathrm{AB}} 215 \mathrm{~s}^{-1}, p_{\mathrm{A}} 0.6, p_{\mathrm{B}} 0.4$; (b) at $-57{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, k_{\mathrm{AB}} 126 \mathrm{~s}^{-1}, p_{\mathrm{A}} 0.6, p_{\mathrm{B}} 0.4$; (c) at -62 ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, k_{\mathrm{AB}} 68 \mathrm{~s}^{-1}, p_{\mathrm{A}} 0.6, p_{\mathrm{B}} 0.4$; (d) at $-67{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, k_{\mathrm{AB}} 34 \mathrm{~s}^{-1}, p_{\mathrm{A}} 0.6, p_{\mathrm{B}} 0.4$; (e) at $-71^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, k_{\mathrm{AB}} 15 \mathrm{~s}^{-1}, p_{\mathrm{A}} 0.6, p_{\mathrm{B}} 0.4$
transverse relaxation time of nuclei in the $j$ th site, $p_{j}$ is the population of site $j$ expressed as a mole fraction, $M_{0}$ is the nuclear magnetic moment per unit volume, $\gamma$ is the gyromagnetic ratio for the nucleus under investigation and $k_{1 j}$ etc. is the rate constant for exchange from site 1 to site $j$ etc. For an exchange process between three sites A, B, and C with no mutual coupling, the complex simultaneous equations (3)-(5) can be derived from the general equation (1) as follows:

$$
\begin{align*}
G_{\mathrm{A}}\left(\alpha_{\mathrm{A}}+k_{\mathrm{AB}}+k_{\mathrm{AC}}\right)+G_{\mathrm{B}}\left(-k_{\mathrm{BA}}\right) & +G_{\mathrm{C}}\left(-k_{\mathrm{CA}}\right) \\
& =-\gamma i \mathrm{H}_{\mathbf{1}} M_{\mathbf{0}} p_{\mathrm{A}}  \tag{3}\\
G_{\mathrm{A}}\left(-k_{\mathrm{AB}}\right)+G_{\mathrm{B}}\left(\alpha_{\mathrm{B}}+k_{\mathrm{BA}}+k_{\mathrm{BC}}\right)+ & G_{\mathrm{C}}\left(-k_{\mathrm{CB}}\right) \\
& =-i \gamma \mathrm{H}_{\mathbf{1}} M_{\mathbf{0}} p_{\mathrm{B}}  \tag{4}\\
G_{\mathrm{A}}\left(-k_{\mathrm{AC}}\right)+G_{\mathrm{B}}\left(-k_{\mathrm{BC}}\right)+G_{\mathrm{C}}\left(\alpha_{\mathrm{C}}+\right. & \left.k_{\mathrm{CA}}+k_{\mathrm{CB}}\right) \\
& =-i \gamma \mathrm{H}_{\mathbf{1}} M_{\mathbf{0}} p_{\mathrm{C}} \tag{5}
\end{align*}
$$

These equations were solved for the complex magnetic moments $G_{\mathrm{A}}, G_{\mathrm{B}}$, and $G_{\mathrm{C}}$ by use of a MASTER THREE

* Angular frequency units (radians $\mathrm{s}^{-1}$ ) are used for all frequencies in these equations.
$\dagger$ We thank Professor I. O. Sutherland for a copy of his program.
${ }^{24}$ H. M. McConnell, J. Chem. Phys., 1958, 28, 430.
program. Compound (2) exhibited low temperature spectral dependence for its aromatic protons whilst the quaternary aromatic carbons and bismethylene carbons of compound (1) each gave rise to three singlets at low temperatures in its broad-band decoupled ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ n.m.r. spectrum (see Figure 5). In all cases, spectral line shapes were simulated using this program. Calculated and observed spectra are shown in Figures 6-8.
Method III. A program (V) $\dagger$ for exchange of nuclei between four equally or unequally populated sites A, B, C, and D with no mutual coupling. This computer program (MASTER FOUR SITE) was written to solve the four complex simultaneous equations which can be derived from the general equation (1) in an analogous manner to that described in method II. The problem has already been discussed by us at some length in our publications ${ }^{4}$ on the conformational behaviour of the trisalicylide derivatives (4)-(6). This program was used to simulate the spectral
${ }^{25}$ C. S. Johnson, Adv. Magnetic Resonance, 1965, 1, 33.
${ }^{26}$ L. W. Reeves, Adv. Phys. Org. Chem., 1965, 3. 187; A. Allerhand, H. S. Gutowsky, J. Jonas, and R. A. Meinzer, J. Amer. Chem. Soc., 1966, 88, 3185.
line-shapes of the methyl protons of compound (3) in order to examine the possibility that a small amount of a second conformation in a diastereoisomeric mixture was populating a fourth site. Calculated spectra are shown in Figure 4 beside the observed spectra and the spectra calculated using Method II assuming only three-site occupancy.

Strain Energy Calculations.-These were carried out on


Figure 3 Observed (full line) and computed (broken line) spectra of (i) the aromatic protons and (ii) the methyl protons of 1,4,7,10-tetramethyl-5,6,11,12-tetrahydrodibenzo[a,e]cyclooctene (16): (a) at $-29{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, k_{\mathrm{AB}} 129 \mathrm{~s}^{-1}$ for (i) $k_{\mathrm{AB}} 124 \mathrm{~s}^{-1}$ for (ii), $p_{\mathrm{A}} 0.12, p_{\mathrm{B}} 0.88$; (b) at $-40{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, k_{\mathrm{AB}} 20 \mathrm{~s}^{-1}$ for (i) and (ii), $p_{\mathrm{A}} 0.12, p_{\mathrm{B}} 0.88$; (c) at $-51{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, k_{\mathrm{AB}} 2.0 \mathrm{~s}^{-1}$ for (i), $k_{\mathrm{AB}} 2.2 \mathrm{~s}^{-1}$ for (ii), $p_{\mathrm{A}} 0.12, p_{\mathrm{B}} 0.88$; (d) at $-61{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, k_{\mathrm{AB}} 0.36 \mathrm{~s}^{-1}$ for (i), $k_{\mathrm{AB}}$ $0.35 \mathrm{~s}^{-1}$ for (ii), $p_{\mathrm{A}} 0.12, p_{\mathrm{B}} 0.88$
compounds (1), (3), and (16) using a program * (coded in FORTRAN) based upon the procedure reported by Allinger et al. ${ }^{19}$ Details of the force field employed have been given in a recent review. ${ }^{11}$

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The temperature-dependent n.m.r. spectra and the conformational properties of the twelve-membered ring compounds (1)-(3) are presented first, and the discussion of the corresponding results for the ' $6,8,6$ ' systems (15) and (16) follows.

The Temperature-dependent N.m.r. Spectra and the Conformational Properties of $5,6,11,12,17,18-H e x a h y d r o-$ tribenzo[a,e,i]cyclododecene (1) and its 2,3,8,9,14,15- (2)

* See footnote on p. 1403.
and 1,4,7,10,13,16- (3) Hexamethyl Derivatives.-The ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ n.m.r. spectrum of the hexahydrotribenzocyclododecene (1) at room temperature in carbon disulphide containing a small amount of deuteriochloroform showed (see Table 1) a multiplet for the aromatic protons


## Table 1

Temperature-dependent ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ n.m.r. spectral parameters ( 25.14 MHz ) for compound (1) and ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ n.m.r. spectral parameters ( 100 MHz ) for compounds (1)-(3)

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Com- } \\ & \text { pound } \end{aligned}$ | Solvent | Temp. <br> $\left({ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)$ | Group | $\delta\left({ }^{13} \mathrm{C}\right)$ or $\tau^{\text {a }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (1) | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{CD}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}-\mathrm{CS}_{2} \\ & (2: 1) \end{aligned}$ | -104 | $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{4}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \delta 140.0 \text { (A), } 139.7 \text { (B), } \\ & 139.3 \text { (C), } 130.2 \text {, } \\ & 126.7 \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  |  | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \delta 38.2 \text { (A), } 36.8 \text { (B), } \\ & 36.0 \text { (C) } \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  | +20 | $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{4}$ | $\delta 139.9(\mathrm{ABC}), 130.4$ |
|  |  |  | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ | $\delta 37.4(\mathrm{ABC})$ |
| (1) | $\mathrm{CS}_{2}{ }^{\text {b }}$ | -90 | $\stackrel{\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{CH}_{4} \mathrm{C} \mathrm{H}_{2}}{ }$ | $\begin{aligned} & \tau 2.92(\mathrm{br}, \mathrm{~s}) \\ & \tau 6.64-7.64(\mathrm{~m}) \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  | $+21$ | $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{4}$ | ¢ $2.74-3.00$ (m) |
|  |  |  | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ | $\tau 7.07$ (s) |
| (2) | $\underset{(1: 1)}{\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}-\mathrm{CS}_{2}}$ | -90 | $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{2}$ | ${ }_{(\mathrm{BC})^{c}}$ |
|  |  |  | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ | $\tau 6.60-7.80$ (m) |
|  |  |  | $\mathrm{CH}_{3}$ | ${ }_{\text {c }} 7.74$ (br,s) ${ }_{\text {c }} \mathbf{3 . 0 3}$ (s) $(\mathrm{ABC})$ |
|  |  | $+20$ |  | ¢ $3.03(\mathrm{~s})(\mathrm{ABC})$ $\tau 7.15$ (s) |
|  |  |  | $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ | $\begin{gathered} \tau 7.15(\mathrm{~s}) \\ \tau 7.80(\mathrm{~s}) \end{gathered}$ |
| (3) | $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ | $+20$ | $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{2}$ | $\tau 2.95-3.05$ (m) |
|  |  |  | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ | $\tau 6.70-7.10$ (m) |
|  |  |  | $\mathrm{CH}_{3}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \tau 7.42(\mathrm{~s})(\mathrm{A}), 7.50(\mathrm{~s}) \\ & \text { (B), } 7.54 \text { (s) (C) } \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  | $+80$ | $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{2}$ | $\tau 3.04$ (s) |
|  |  |  | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ | $\tau 6.91$ (br,s) |
|  |  |  | $\mathrm{CH}_{3}$ | $\tau 7.50$ (s) (ABC) |

${ }^{4}$ Sites are designated A, B, and C for the three-site systems. Sites that represent three time-averaged signals are designated ABC . ${ }^{b}$ Contains a few drops of $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$. ©The chemical shifts of the $B$ and $C$ protons are coincident.
and a singlet for the $\mathrm{CH}_{2}-\mathrm{CH}_{2}$ protons which became a broad unsymmetrical multiplet at $-80^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ indicating the presence of a conformation devoid of three-fold symmetry. Molecular models suggest that compounds (1)(3) could adopt (see Figure 9) two conformations in the ground state, one with $C_{2}$ symmetry (27a) and the other with $D_{3}$ symmetry (28a). These two conformations (denoted by $C_{2}$ and $D_{3}$ ) are topologically analogous to the helical $\left(C_{1}\right)$ and propeller $\left(C_{3}\right)$ conformations of the trisalicylides. ${ }^{4}$ Since the $C_{2}$ conformation (27a) has only one $C_{2}$ axis of symmetry it follows that the $\mathrm{CH}_{2}$ groups of the two homotopic $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ groups are diastereotopic while the $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ group which is bisected by the $C_{2}$ axis contains homotopic $\mathrm{CH}_{2}$ groups. Thus, this conformation (27a; $\mathrm{R}^{1}=\mathrm{R}^{2}=\mathrm{H}$ ) should give rise to two superimposable ABCD systems and one $\mathrm{AA}^{\prime} \mathrm{BB}^{\prime}$ system (i.e. an unsymmetrical multiplet) for the $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ protons in the low temperature ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ n.m.r. spectrum of (1). The $D_{3}$ conformation ( $28 \mathrm{a} ; \mathrm{R}^{1}=\mathrm{R}^{2}=\mathrm{H}$ ) has three $C_{2}$ axes and one $C_{3}$ axis of symmetry which render all the $\mathrm{CH}_{2}$ groups of the $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ groups homotopic. This conformation (28a; $\mathrm{R}^{1}=\mathrm{R}^{2}=\mathrm{H}$ ) should therefore give rise to three coincident $\mathrm{AA}^{\prime} \mathrm{BB}^{\prime}$ systems (i.e. a symmetrical multiplet) for the $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ protons in the ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$
n.m.r. spectrum of (1) at low temperatures. One of two conclusions can be drawn from the fact that an unsymmetrical multiplet is observed for the $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ protons at $-80{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ : either (i) compound (1) exists in solution entirely in the $C_{2}$ conformation (27a; $\mathrm{R}^{\mathbf{1}}=$ $\mathrm{R}^{2}=\mathrm{H}$ ), or (ii) it exists as a mixture of the $C_{2}$ and $D_{3}$
ring and (ii) good ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ n.m.r. probes are potentially present in the form of the methyl protons and aromatic protons. At $+20{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, the ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ n.m.r. spectrum of compound (2) in deuteriochloroform-carbon disulphide ( $\mathbf{1}: \mathbf{1}$ ) consisted of three singlets for the aromatic, $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$, and arylmethyl protons (see Table 1). Interest was centred
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Figure 4 Observed (full line) and computed spectra of the methyl protons of 1,4,7,10,13,16-hexamethyl-5,6,11,12,17,18-hexahydrotribenzo $[a, e, i]$ cyclododecene ( 3 ) using (i) program IV for exchange of protons among three equally populated sites, $\mathrm{A}, \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{and} \mathrm{C}(---)$ and (ii) program $V$ for exchange of protons among three equally populated sites, $\mathrm{A}, \mathrm{B}$, and C , and a fourth site D ( $p_{\mathrm{D}} 0.8$ ) coincident with C (-.-- -) (in both cases the input values for all the rate constants, $k_{\mathrm{AB}}$ etc. were the same and so they will be referred to collectively as $k$ ) : (a) at $+73^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, k 106 \mathrm{~s}^{-1}$ for (i), $k 63 \mathrm{~s}^{-1}$ for (ii); (b) at $+56^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, k 16.9 \mathrm{~s}^{-1}$ for (i), $k 13 \mathrm{~s}^{-1}$ for (ii); (c) at $+45{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, $k 6.3 \mathrm{~s}^{-1}$ for (i), $k 4.8 \mathrm{~s}^{-1}$ for (ii); (d) at $+38{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, k 3.7 \mathrm{~s}^{-1}$ for (i), $k 2.9 \mathrm{~s}^{-1}$ for (ii); (e) at $+8{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, k 0.01 \mathrm{~s}^{-1}$ for (i), $k 0.07 \mathrm{~s}^{-1}$ for (ii)
conformations, (27a; $\mathrm{R}^{\mathbf{1}}=\mathrm{R}^{\mathbf{2}}=\mathrm{H}$ ) and (28a; $\mathrm{R}^{\mathbf{1}}=$ $\mathrm{R}^{2}=\mathrm{H}$ ).

In order to obtain a better understanding of the conformational behaviour of the hexahydrotribenzocyclododecene (1), the $2,3,8,9,14,15$-hexamethyl derivative (2) was studied as a suitable model. This compound (2) was chosen for two reasons: (i) the methyl groups are sufficiently remote from the twelve-membered ring not to influence the conformatioan behaviour of the
around the signal for the aromatic protons because they responded to temperature changes over a shorter range than did the signals for the $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ and aryl-methyl protons. As the temperature was lowered to $-90{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ the singlet for the aromatic protons separated into two singlets with relative intensities 1:2 (see Figure 6). Over this temperature range, the signal for the arylmethyl protons broadened and the $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ signal became a broad unsymmetrical multiplet as in the low
temperature ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ n.m.r. spectra for compound (1). The most obvious interpretation of the low temperature ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$


Figure 5 The broad-band decoupled ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ n.m.r. spectra of 5,6,11,12,17,18-hexahydrotribenzo $[a, e, i]$ cyclododecene (1) at (a) $+20^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and (b) $-104{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ in $\mathrm{CD}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}-\mathrm{CS}_{2}(2: 1)$; see Table 1 for chemical shift data
n.m.r. spectrum of (2) is to assign the two singlets in the aromatic region to the three pairs of diastereotopic


Figure 6 Observed (full line) and computed (broken line) spectra of the aromatic protons of $2,3,8,9,14,15$-hexamethyl$\mathbf{5 , 6 , 1 1 , 1 2 , 1 7 , 1 8 - h e x a h y d r o t r i b e n z o [ a , e , i ] c y c l o d o d e c e n e ~}$ using program IV for exchange of protons between three equally populated sites, $\mathrm{A}, \mathrm{B}$, and C (the input values for all the rate constants, $k_{\mathrm{AB}}$ etc. were the same and so they will be referred to collectively as $k$ ): (a) at $-62{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, k 94.1 \mathrm{~s}^{-1}$; (b) at $-72{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, k 32.2 \mathrm{~s}^{-1}$; (c) at $-76{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, k 17.4 \mathrm{~s}^{-1}$; (d) at $-81^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, $k 10.6 \mathrm{~s}^{-1}$; (e) at $-90^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, k 7.5 \mathrm{~s}^{-1}$
aromatic protons in the $C_{2}$ conformation (27a; $\mathrm{R}^{\mathbf{1}}=\mathrm{H}$, $\mathrm{R}^{2}=\mathrm{Me}$ ). This interpretation recognises that the chemical shifts of two of the three pairs of diastereotopic aromatic protons are apparently coincident. For this
reason, the aromatic protons give rise to two singlets with relative intensities $1: 2$ rather than to three singlets of equal intensity.


Figure 7 Observed (full line) and computed (broken line) spectra of the quaternary aromatic carbons of $5,6,11,12,17,18$ hexahydrotribenzo[a,e,i]cyclododecene (1) using program IV for exchange of broad-band decoupled carbons between three equally populated sites, A, B, and C (the input values for all the rate constants, $k_{\mathrm{AB}}$ etc. were the same and so they will be referred to collectively as $k$ ): (a) at $-82{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, k 19.3 \mathrm{~s}^{-1}$; (b) at -88 ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, k 9.3 \mathrm{~s}^{-1}$; (c) at $-92{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, k 5.0 \mathrm{~s}^{-1}$; (d) at $-104{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, k 0.52 \mathrm{~s}^{-1}$


Figure 8 Observed (full line) and computed (broken line) spectra of the dimethylene carbons of $5,6,11,12,17,18$-hexahydrotribenzo[a,e,i]cyclododecene (1) using program IV for exchange of broad-band decoupled carbons between three equally populated sites, $A, B$, and $C$ (the input values for all the rate constants, $k_{\text {AB }}$ etc. were the same and so they will be referred to collectively as $k$ ): (a) $-82{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, k 110 \mathrm{~s}^{-1}$; (b) at $-88{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, k 4.3 \mathrm{~s}^{-1}$; (c) at $-92{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, k 1.9 \mathrm{~s}^{-1}$; (d) at $-104^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, $k$

Although the conformational interconversion and inversion processes involving the $C_{2}\left(27 \mathrm{a} ; \mathrm{R}^{\mathbf{1}}=\mathrm{H}\right.$, $\left.\mathrm{R}^{2}=\mathrm{Me}\right)$ and $D_{3}\left(28 \mathrm{a} ; \quad \mathrm{R}^{1}=\mathrm{H}, \mathrm{R}^{2}=\mathrm{Me}\right)$ conformations and their enantiomers (denoted by $C_{2}{ }^{*}$ and $D_{3}{ }^{*}$ ) can be discussed in terms of the equilibria $D_{3} \rightleftharpoons$ $C_{2} \rightleftharpoons C_{2}{ }^{*} \rightleftharpoons D_{3}{ }^{*}$, the site exchange between sites $\mathrm{A}, \mathrm{B}$, and C involving the three pairs of diastereotopic aromatic protons ( $\mathrm{R}^{1}=\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{A}}, \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{B}}$, or $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{C}}$ ) of the $C_{2}$ and $C_{2}{ }^{*}$ conformations ( 27 a and $\mathrm{b} ; \mathrm{R}^{1}=\mathrm{H}, \mathrm{R}^{2}=\mathrm{Me}$ ) can only be fully understood by reference to Figures 10 and

$\tau_{2}$ conformation (27a)

$\mathrm{O}_{3}$ conformation (28a)
Figure 9 The ground-state $C_{2}(27 a)$ and $D_{3}(28 a)$ conformations of compounds (1)-(3). For (1), $\mathrm{R}^{1}=\mathrm{R}^{2}=\mathrm{H}$; for (2), $\mathrm{R}^{1}=$ $\mathrm{H}, \mathrm{R}^{2}=\mathrm{Me}$; for (3), $\mathrm{R}^{1}=\mathrm{Me}, \mathrm{R}^{2}=\mathrm{H}$. The enantiomeric ground-state conformations are denoted by $C_{2}{ }^{*}(27 \mathrm{~b})$ and $D_{3}{ }^{*}$ (28b) in the text
11. The designations $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{A}}, \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{B}}$, and $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{C}}$ of the three pairs of diastereotopic aromatic protons of the $C_{2}$ conformations (27a and b) in Figure 10 do not reflect the relative chemical shifts of these protons. Individual assignments are, of course, quite arbitrary.] Despite the fact that the $D_{3}$ and $D_{3}^{*}$ conformations ( 28 a and $\mathrm{b} ; \mathrm{R}^{\mathbf{1}}=\mathrm{H}$, $\mathrm{R}^{2}=\mathrm{Me}$ ) are not detectable by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ n.m.r. spectroscopy at low temperatures they must be considered as possible intermediates in the site exchange processes involving the $C_{2}$ and $C_{2}{ }^{*}$ conformations ( 27 a and $\mathrm{b} ; \mathrm{R}^{\mathbf{1}}=\mathrm{H}$, $\mathrm{R}^{2}=\mathrm{Me}$ ). Formally, the site occupied by the homotopic aromatic protons ( $\mathrm{R}^{\mathbf{1}}=\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{D}}$ ) of the $D_{3}$ conformations ( 28 a and b ; $\mathrm{R}^{\mathbf{1}}=\mathrm{H}, \mathrm{R}^{2}=\mathrm{Me}$ ) is designated as site D in Figures 10 and 11 even although its occupancy has not been detected experimentally. In Figure 10, each formula represents a ground state conformation on
the conformational itinerary. The conformations are drawn such that the mean plane of the twelve-membered ring lies in the plane of the paper and the methylene groups are indicated as being oriented above ( ) or below ( $(\bigcirc)$ the mean plane. Formally at least, $D_{3}$ conformations ( 28 a and $\mathrm{b} ; \mathrm{R}^{\mathbf{1}}=\mathrm{H}, \mathrm{R}^{2}=\mathrm{Me}$ ) can be interconverted with $C_{2}$ conformations ( 27 a and $\mathrm{b} ; \mathrm{R}^{\mathbf{1}}=$ $\mathrm{H}, \mathrm{R}^{2}=\mathrm{Me}$ ), and $C_{2} \rightleftharpoons C_{2}{ }^{*}$ ring inversions can occur by processes which involve simultaneous torsion about the two carbon-carbon bonds (e.g. 4a,5 and 6,6a) linking a particular dimethylene group (e.g. 4,5) to two aromatic rings (e.g. those defined by $1,2,3,4,4 \mathrm{a}, 18 \mathrm{a}$ and $6 \mathrm{a}, 7,8,-$ $9,10,10 a)$. These processes, when executed with molecular models, are reminiscent of pedalling motions. Pedalling of any one of the three homotopic dimethylene bridges ( 1,2 , or 3 ) of the $D_{3}$ conformation ( $28 \mathrm{a} ; \mathrm{R}^{\mathbf{1}}=\mathrm{H}$, $\mathrm{R}^{2}=\mathrm{Me}$ ) leads to a $C_{2}$ conformation ( $27 \mathrm{a} ; \mathrm{R}^{\mathbf{1}}=\mathrm{H}$, $\mathrm{R}^{\mathbf{2}}=\mathrm{Me}$ ). However, since the sites of the three pairs of diastereotopic protons designated $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{A}}, \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{B}}$, and $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{C}}$ are different with respect to the six designated aromatic protons (H-1,4,7,10,13,16) according as to whether the $C_{2}$ axis bisects dimethylene bridge 1,2 , or 3 , it is convenient to identify the $C_{2}$ conformations (27a; $\mathrm{R}^{\mathbf{1}}=\mathrm{H}$ $\mathrm{R}^{2}=\mathrm{Me}$ ) as $C_{2}-1, C_{2}-2$, and $C_{2}-3$, respectively. Pedalling of either of the two homotopic dimethylene bridges (2 or 3 for $C_{2}-1,1$ or 3 for $C_{2}-2$, and 1 or 2 for $C_{2}-3$ ) of $C_{2}-1, C_{2}-2$, or $C_{2}-3$ effects $C_{2} \rightleftharpoons C_{2}$ * ring inversion such that $C_{2}-1$ is inverted to give either $C_{2}{ }^{*-3}$ or $C_{2}{ }^{*-2}$, $C_{2}-2$ to give either $C_{2}{ }^{*-3}$ or $C_{2}{ }^{*}-1$, and $C_{2}-3$ to give either $C_{2}{ }^{*}-2$ or $C_{2}{ }^{*}-1$. Pedalling of any of the three dimethylene bridges, 1,2 , or 3 bisected by the $C_{2}$ axis in $C_{2}{ }^{*-1}, C_{2}{ }^{*-2}$, and $C_{2}{ }^{*-3}$, respectively, leads to the $D_{3}{ }^{*}$ conformation ( $28 \mathrm{~b} ; \mathrm{R}^{1}=\mathrm{H}, \mathrm{R}^{2}=\mathrm{Me}$ ). The complete site exchange scheme for $H_{A}, H_{B}, H_{C}$, and $H_{D}$ is summarised by the cubic array diagram in Figure 11. The designation of sites within the square brackets reading from left to right correspond to $\mathrm{H}-1,4,7,10,13,16$. Since the $D_{3}$ conformations (28a and $\mathrm{b} ; \mathrm{R}^{\mathbf{1}}=\mathrm{H}, \mathrm{R}^{\mathbf{2}}=\mathrm{Me}$ ) are undetected intermediates in the low temperature ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ n.m.r. spectra, further discussion of the conformational behaviour of compound (2) can be restricted to a consideration of the $C_{2}$ conformations (27a and b; $\mathrm{R}^{\mathbf{1}}=$ $\mathrm{H}, \mathrm{R}^{2}=\mathrm{Me}$ ). Figures 10 and 11 show that the $C_{2} \rightleftharpoons$ $C_{\mathbf{2}}{ }^{*}$ inversion process is associated with a first-order rate constant $k$ which in turn may be related to the rate constants for the aromatic protons' site exchanges $\left[\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{A}} \rightarrow \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{B}}, \quad \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{A}} \rightarrow \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{C}}, \quad \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{B}} \rightarrow \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{A}}, \quad \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{B}} \rightarrow \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{C}}\right.$. $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{C}} \rightarrow \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{A}}, \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{C}} \rightarrow \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{B}}$. Thus, the rate constants for $C_{2} \rightleftharpoons C_{2}{ }^{*}$ ring inversion at different temperatures were determined (see Figure 6) by comparing experimental ${ }^{\text {J }} \mathrm{H}$ n.m.r. spectra for the aromatic protons with theoretical spectra generated by the line-shape procedure described in method II (see Experimental section). Values for the free energy of activation for the $C_{2} \rightleftharpoons C_{2}{ }^{*}$ ring inversion process were determined at the various temperatures. Table 2 records the average value ( $10.1 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}^{-1}$ ) for $\Delta G^{\ddagger}\left(C_{2} \rightleftharpoons C_{2}{ }^{*}\right)$ in compound (2).

During our investigations on the conformational
behaviour of compound (2), an FT ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ n.m.r. spectrometer became available to us. Consequently, we decided to investigate the temperature dependence of the broad-band decoupled ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ n.m.r. spectrum of the parent compound (1) in order to establish that (i) the $2,3,8,9,14$,-15-hexamethyl derivative (2) is indeed a good model for
pound (1) also adopts predominantly $C_{2}$ conformations ( 27 a and $\mathrm{b} ; \mathrm{R}^{1}=\mathrm{R}^{2}=\mathrm{H}$ ) in solution. Of course, small contributions ( $<\mathbf{2} \%$ ) from the $D_{3}$ conformations (28a and $\mathrm{b} ; \mathrm{R}^{1}=\mathrm{R}^{2}=\mathrm{H}$ ) would not necessarily be detected by variable temperature broad-band decoupled ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ n.m.r. spectroscopy. As before, the site


Figure 10 Conformational itinerary and site-exchange scheme for different nuclei and groups of nuclei involving the $C_{2}$ ( 27 a ), $C_{2} *$ (27b), $D_{3}(28 \mathrm{a})$, and $D_{3}{ }^{*}$ (28b) conformations of compounds (1)-(3). For (1), $\mathrm{R}^{1}=\mathrm{R}^{2}=\mathrm{H}$; for (2), $\mathrm{R}^{1}=\mathrm{H}, \mathrm{R}^{2}=\mathrm{Me}$; for (3), $\mathrm{R}^{1}=\mathrm{Me}, \mathrm{R}^{2}=\mathrm{H} . \equiv$ a methylene group above the mean plane of the ring. $\bigcirc \equiv$ a methylene group below the mean plane of the ring
(1) and (ii) line-shape analysis of broad-band decoupled ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ n.m.r. spectra constitutes a reliable means of obtaining activation parameters for conformational changes in medium-sized ring compounds. At $+20{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, the broadband decoupled ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ n.m.r. spectrum of compound (1) in dichlorodideuteriomethane-carbon disulphide ( $2: 1$ ) consisted of three singlets for the aromatic carbon atoms and one for the $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ carbons (see Table 1 and Figure 5). As the temperature was lowered to $-104{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, the singlet for the $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ carbon atoms ( $\mathrm{C}-5,6,11,12,17,18$ ) separated into three singlets of approximately equal intensities. The low-field singlet for the quaternary aromatic carbons (C-4a,6a,10a,12a,16a,18a) also separated into three singlets of approximately equal intensities at $-104{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Over this temperature range the signals for the other two sets of aromatic carbons remained as singlets. Taken together, these observations indicate that com-
exchanges between sites $\mathrm{A}, \mathrm{B}$, and C involving (i) the three pairs of diastereotopic quaternary aromatic carbons and (ii) the three pairs of diastereotopic $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ carbons of the $C_{2}$ and $C_{2}{ }^{*}$ conformations (27a and b ; $\mathrm{R}^{1}=\mathrm{R}^{2}=\mathrm{H}$ ) can only be fully appreciated by reference to Figures 10 and 11. The situation is analogous to that already discussed for the three pairs of diastereotopic aromatic protons in compound (2). Rate constants for $C_{2} \rightleftharpoons C_{2}{ }^{*}$ ring inversion at various temperatures were determined by comparing the experimental broad-band decoupled ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ n.m.r. spectra for (i) the quaternary aromatic carbons (see Figure 7) and (ii) the $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ carbons (see Figure 8) with theoretical spectra generated by the line-shape procedure described in method II (see Experimental section). Values for the free energy of activation for the $C_{2} \rightleftharpoons C_{2}$ * ring inversion process were determined at the various temperatures. The average
value for $\Delta G^{\ddagger}\left(C_{2} \rightleftharpoons C_{2}{ }^{*}\right)$ was found (Table 2) to be (i) $9.9 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}^{-1}$ derived from the quaternary aromatic carbons and (ii) $10.1 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}^{-1}$ derived from the $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$

Table 2
Thermodynamic parameters associated with $C_{2} \rightleftharpoons C_{2}{ }^{*}$ ring inversion in compounds (1)-(3)

| Compound | $\mathrm{R}^{1}$ | $\mathrm{R}^{2}$ | Solvent | N.m.r. probe ${ }^{\text {a,b }}$ | $\underset{\substack{\ddagger \\ \mathrm{mol}^{\ddagger} / \mathrm{kcal}}}{ }$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (1) | H | H | $\mathrm{CD}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}-\mathrm{CS}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{C}-4 \mathrm{a}, 6 \mathrm{a}, 10 \mathrm{a}, 12 \mathrm{a}$ | $9.9 \pm 0.2^{\circ}$ |
|  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{C}-5,6,11,12,17 \\ & 18 \end{aligned}$ | $10.1 \pm 0.1{ }^{\text {d }}$ |
| (2) | H | Me | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}-\mathrm{CS}_{2} \\ (1: 1) \end{gathered}$ | H-1,4, 7, 10, 13, 16 | $10.1 \pm 0.3{ }^{\text {e }}$ |
| (3) | Me | H | $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{Me}-1,4,7,10,13 \\ & \quad 16 \end{aligned}$ | $17.4 \pm 0.3{ }^{f}$ |

${ }^{a}$ Details of ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ and ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ chemical shifts are given in Table 1. ${ }^{6}$ The site exchanges involving sites $\mathrm{A}, \mathrm{B}$, and C are described in Figures 10 and 11. Line-shape analysis was carried out using program IV described in method II. © Value from ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$, n.m.r. line-shape analysis (see Figure 7). ${ }^{d}$ Value from ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}^{\prime}$ n.m.r. line-shape analysis (see Figure 8). ©Value from ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ n.m.r. line-shape analysis (see Figure 6). s Value from ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ n.m.r. line-shape analysis (see Figure 4).
carbon atoms. Not only is the agreement between these two values for the same conformational process in compound (1) obtained from use of two different ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ n.m.r. probes satisfying, but the close correspondence with the average value ( $10.1 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}^{-1}$ ) for $\Delta G^{\ddagger}\left(C_{2} \rightleftharpoons C_{2}{ }^{*}\right)$ from from ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ n.m.r. line shape analysis of compound (2) is encouraging. Clearly, the $2,3,8,9,14,15$-hexamethyl derivative (2) is a good model for the tribenzocyclododecene (1). Finally, application of dynamic ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ n.m.r. spectroscopy obviously leads to results which agree with those


Figure 11 Cubic array diagram showing the site exchanges for different nuclei and groups of nuclei involving $C_{2}(27 \mathrm{a}), C_{2}{ }^{*}$ (27b), $D_{3}$ (28a), and $D_{3}{ }^{*}(28 \mathrm{~b})$ conformations of compounds (1)-(3). The sites indicated in square brackets read from left to right starting with the lowest and proceeding to the highest numbered nucleus or groups of nuclei in formulae (1)-(3)
obtained by dynamic ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ n.m.r. spectroscopy ( $c f$. ref. 27). This observation is reassuring.

[^3]In order (i) to assess the relative importance of the $D_{3}$ conformations (28a and $b ; \mathrm{R}^{1}=\mathrm{R}^{2}=\mathrm{H}$ ) which are not


IS ( $\mathrm{O}_{3}=\mathrm{C}_{2}$ ) conformation (29)


TS ( $\left.\mathcal{C}_{2} C_{2}^{\star}\right)$ conformation (30)
Figure 12 The transition state conformations TS ( $C_{2} \rightleftharpoons$ $\left.C_{2}{ }^{*}\right)(29)$ and $\operatorname{TS}\left(D_{3} \rightleftharpoons C_{2}\right)(30)$ for ring inversion and interconversion in compounds (1)-(3). For (1), $\mathrm{R}^{1}=\mathrm{R}^{2}=\mathrm{H}$; for (2), $\mathrm{R}^{1}=\mathrm{H}, \mathrm{R}^{2}=\mathrm{Me}$; for (3), $\mathrm{R}^{1}=\mathrm{Me}, \mathrm{R}^{2}=\mathrm{H}$. The portions of the molecules indicated by thickened bonds are coplanar in each case (see footnote $g$ in Table 3)
detectable experimentally and (ii) to investigate the nature of the transition state geometry in the $C_{2} \rightleftharpoons$ $C_{2}{ }^{*}$ ring inversion process, strain energy calculations on selected conformations of the tribenzocyclododecene (1) were carried out using a molecular mechanics program (see Experimental section) based on the procedure developed by Allinger et al. ${ }^{19}$ The results for the groundstate conformations (Figure 9) of the $C_{2}\left(27 \mathrm{a} ; \mathrm{R}^{1}=\right.$ $\left.\mathrm{R}^{2}=\mathrm{H}\right)$ and $D_{3}\left(28 \mathrm{a} ; \mathrm{R}^{1}=\mathrm{R}^{2}=\mathrm{H}\right)$ type and for the trial transition states (Figure 12) TS ( $C_{2} \rightleftharpoons C_{2}{ }^{*}$ ) (29; $\mathrm{R}^{1}=\mathrm{R}^{2}=\mathrm{H}$ ) to $C_{2} \rightleftharpoons C_{2}{ }^{*}$ ring inversion and TS $\left(D_{3} \rightleftharpoons C_{2}\right)\left(30 ; \mathrm{R}^{1}=\mathrm{R}^{2}=\mathrm{H}\right)$ to $D_{3} \rightleftharpoons \mathrm{C}_{2}$ ring interconversion are given in Table 3. $\dagger$ In order for a ground-state conformation to reach a transition-state, pedalling of a dimethylene bridge is required until a conformation is attained in which the dimethylene bridge becomes coplanar with one of the aromatic rings (see footnote $g$ in Table 3). The data for the individual interactions in each conformation show (Table 3) that the major contributions towards the total strain energies of both transition states arise mainly from angle strain and non-bonded interactions. The angle strain is associated almost entirely with the twelve-membered ring CCC angles and the transannular non-bonded interactions are associated with the carbon and hydrogen atoms of the dimethylene groups. Both transition-state

[^4]conformations show considerable relaxation of nonbonded interactional strain at the expense of increased angle strain. In the case of the ground-state conformations, the $D_{3}$ conformation (28a; $\mathrm{R}^{1}=\mathrm{R}^{2}=\mathrm{H}$ ) experiences (i) larger non-bonded transannular interactions involving the dimethylene groups and (ii) more angle strain in the twelve-membered ring than does the $C_{2}$ conformation (27a; $\mathrm{R}^{1}=\mathrm{R}^{2}=\mathrm{H}$ ). These results are consistent with indications from space-filling molecular models of closer packing in the $C_{2}$ conformation (27a; $\mathrm{R}^{\mathbf{1}}=\mathrm{R}^{2}=$ H ) than in the $D_{3}$ conformation (28a; $\mathrm{R}^{\mathbf{1}}=\mathrm{R}^{2}=\mathrm{H}$ ) of the two sets of three transannularly-interacting hydrogens above and below the mean planes of the twelvemembered rings in both these conformations. The calculated strain energy difference ( $\Delta E_{\mathrm{T}} 3.6 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}^{-1}$ ) between the $C_{2}\left(27 ; \mathrm{R}^{1}=\mathrm{R}^{2}=\mathrm{H}\right)$ and $D_{3}\left(28 ; \mathrm{R}^{1}=\right.$ $\mathrm{R}^{2}=\mathrm{H}$ ) conformations (Table 3) is consistent with the
the basis of symmetry considerations alone. This conclusion can be reached either by (i) noting that the symmetry number is reduced from 2 to 1 on going from the ground state to transition state conformations or (ii) appreciating that a dimethylene group can be pedalled in two energetically equivalent ways during $C_{2} \rightleftharpoons C_{2}{ }^{*}$ ring inversion. If the difference $\left(\Delta E_{\mathrm{T}}=9.24 \mathrm{kcal}\right.$ $\left.\mathrm{mol}^{-1}\right)$ in the strain energies between the $C_{2}\left(27 \mathrm{a} ; \mathrm{R}^{\mathbf{1}}=\right.$ $\left.\mathrm{R}^{2}=\mathrm{H}\right)$ and the $\mathrm{TS}\left(C_{2} \rightleftharpoons C_{2}{ }^{*}\right)\left(29 ; \mathrm{R}^{1}=\mathrm{R}^{2}=\mathrm{H}\right)$ conformations is equated with $\Delta H^{\ddagger}$ then the entropy difference of $R \ln 2$ means that a free energy of activation $\left(\Delta G^{\ddagger}\right)$ of $8.8 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}^{-1}$ can be calculated for $C_{2} \rightleftharpoons C_{2}{ }^{*}$ ring inversion. The relatively close correspondence between this value and the experimentally determined values (Table 2) of 9.9 and $10.1 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}^{-1}$ suggests that the selected TS $\left(C_{2} \rightleftharpoons C_{2}{ }^{*}\right)\left(29 ; \mathrm{R}^{1}=\mathrm{R}^{2}=\mathrm{H}\right)$ conformation corresponds closely to the actual transition

Table 3
Calculated strain energies $\left(E_{\mathrm{T}} / \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}^{-1}\right)$ of various conformations of $5,6,11,12,17,18$-hexahydrotribenzo[a,e,i]-

| Conformation | $E_{r}{ }^{a-c}$ | $E{ }_{\theta}{ }^{\text {a-c }}$ | $E_{\phi}{ }^{\text {a-d }}$ | $E_{\delta}{ }^{\text {are, }}$ | $E_{n b}{ }^{a-c, f}$ | $E_{T}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $C_{2} \equiv C_{2}{ }^{*}\left(27 ; \mathrm{R}^{1}=\mathrm{R}^{2}=\mathrm{H}\right)$ | 0.11 | 2.07 | 0.28 | 0.13 | -0.23 | 2.36 |
| $D_{3} \equiv D_{3}{ }^{*}\left(28 ; \mathrm{R}^{1}=\mathrm{R}^{2}=\mathrm{H}\right)$ | 0.25 | 4.61 | 0.12 | 0.10 | 0.88 | 5.96 |
| $\mathrm{TS}\left(C_{2} \rightleftharpoons C_{2}{ }^{*}\right)\left(29 ; \mathrm{R}^{1}=\mathrm{R}^{2}=\mathrm{H}\right)^{\text {¢ }}$ | 0.40 | 7.69 | 0.88 | 0.62 | 2.01 | 11.60 |
| $\mathrm{TS}\left(D_{3} \rightleftharpoons C_{2}\right)\left(30 ; \mathrm{R}^{1}=\mathrm{R}^{2}=\mathrm{H}\right)$ g | 0.64 | 9.72 | 1.83 | 0.46 | 6.46 | 19.11 |

${ }^{a}$ The following energy terms (J. F Stoddart, ' Organic Chemistry, Series One, Structure Determination in Organic Chemistry, ed. W. D. Ollis, Butterworths, London, 1973, p. l) have been used: $E_{r}$ (bond length strain), $E_{\theta}$ (angle strain), $E_{\phi}$ (torsional strain) $E_{\delta}$ (out-of-plane strain in aromatic rings), $E_{n b}$ (non-bonded interactional strain); total strain energy $E_{\mathrm{T}}=E_{\mathrm{r}}+E_{\theta}+E_{\phi}+E_{\delta}+E_{n b}$, ${ }^{i}$ Calculations based upon the following force constants. Bond length strain: aromatic $k_{\text {CC }} 1102, k_{\mathrm{CH}} 729$; aliphatic $k_{\mathrm{CC}} 663$. $k_{\mathrm{CH}} 655 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}{ }^{-1} \AA^{-2}$. Angle strain : aromatic $k_{\mathrm{CCC}} 144, k_{\mathrm{CCH}} 108$; aliphatic $k_{\mathrm{CCO}} 115, k_{\mathrm{CCH}} 94, k_{\mathrm{HCH}} 74 \mathrm{kcal}_{\mathrm{ct}} \mathrm{mol}^{-1} \mathrm{radian}^{-2}$; all angle strain reduced by a factor of $0.7 .{ }^{c}$ Calculations based upon the following equilibrium bond lengths and bond angles: aromatic C-C 1.395, C-H 1.09; aliphatic C-C 1.54 , Ar-C $1.50, \mathrm{C}-\mathrm{H} 1.09 \AA$. Aromatic $\mathrm{CCC} 120^{\circ}, \mathrm{CCH} 120^{\circ}$; aliphatic $\mathrm{CCC} 111.5^{\circ} \mathrm{CCH}$ $109.5^{\circ}, \mathrm{HCH} 106^{\circ}$. ${ }^{\text {d }}$ The torsional strain associated with $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{C}$ bonds was treated as a three-fold barrier of height $3.0 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}^{-1}$. Aromatic $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{C}$ bond twisting was calculated according to Boyd et al. (see footnote e). ${ }^{e}$ Out-of-plane strain associated with aromatic rings was calculated according to Boyd et al. (R. H. Boyd, J. Chem. Phys., 1968, 49, 2574; C. Shieh, D. McNally, and R. H. Boyd, Tetrahedron, 1969, 29, 3653). f Non-bonded interactions based upon the Hill equation as summarised in E. L. Eliel, N. L. Allinger, S. J. Angyal, and G. A. Morrison, 'Conformational Analysis,' Wiley-Interscience, New York, 1965, ch. 7. g Transition-state geometries are defined by holding a $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ unit in the plane of one of the aromatic rings. For the TS ( $\left.C_{2} \rightleftharpoons C_{2}{ }^{*}\right)\left(29 ; \mathrm{R}^{1}=\mathrm{R}^{2}=\right.$ H) conformation, atoms, $5,4 \mathrm{a}, 4,3,2,1,18 \mathrm{a}, 18,17$, and 16 were 'held ' coplanar. For the $\operatorname{TS}\left(D_{3} \rightleftharpoons C_{2}\right)\left(30 ; \mathrm{R}^{1}=\mathrm{R}^{2}=\mathrm{H}\right)$ conformation, atoms $12,12 \mathrm{a}, 13,14,15,16,16 \mathrm{a}, 17,18$, and 18 a were 'held' coplanar. See Figure 12.
failure to observe any $D_{3}$ conformational signal in the low temperature broad-band decoupled ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ n.m.r. spectra of the tribenzocyclododecene (1). Entropy differences arising from the different symmetries of the two conformations also favour the $C_{2}$ conformation (27a; $\mathrm{R}^{\mathbf{1}}=$ $\mathrm{R}^{2}=\mathrm{H}$ ). This conformation has a symmetry number of 2 and consequently will be higher in entropy by $R \ln 3$ cal $\mathrm{deg}^{-1} \mathrm{~mol}^{-1}$ than the $D_{3}$ conformation (28a; $\mathrm{R}^{1}=$ $\mathrm{R}^{2}=\mathrm{H}$ ) which has a symmetry number of 6 . If $\Delta E_{\mathrm{T}}$ is equated with $\Delta H$, then the entropy difference of $R \ln 3$ means that the free energy difference $(\Delta G)$ between the two conformations at room temperature is $4.2 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}^{-1}$. This value for $\Delta G$ corresponds with $c a .0 .1 \%$ of the $D_{3}$ conformations (28a and $\mathrm{b} ; \mathrm{R}^{\mathbf{1}}=\mathrm{R}^{\mathbf{2}}=\mathrm{H}$ ) in equilibrium with the $C_{2}$ conformations (27a and $\mathrm{b} ; \mathrm{R}^{1}=\mathrm{R}^{2}=\mathrm{H}$ ) in solution. Thus, it is not surprising that the $D_{3}$ conformations (28a and $b ; \mathrm{R}^{1}=\mathrm{R}^{2}=\mathrm{H}$ ) of the tribenzocyclododecene (1) are not detected by dynamic ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ n.m.r. spectroscopy. Compared with the $C_{2}$ conformations (27a and $\mathrm{b} ; \mathrm{R}^{1}=\mathrm{R}^{2}=\mathrm{H}$ ), the transition state conformation $\operatorname{TS}\left(C_{2} \rightleftharpoons C_{2}{ }^{*}\right) \quad\left(29 ; \quad \mathrm{R}^{1}=\mathrm{R}^{2}=\mathrm{H}\right)$ is favoured on entropy grounds by $R \ln 2 \mathrm{cal} \mathrm{deg}^{-1} \mathrm{~mol}^{-1}$ on
state for $C_{2} \rightleftharpoons C_{2}{ }^{*}$ ring inversion. This investigation demonstrates that use of molecular mechanics based on strain energy calculations is a reliable complementary procedure with medium-sized ring hydrocarbons for (i) assessing the relative importance of experimentally inaccessible ground-state conformations and (ii) defining the geometry of transition-state conformations.

It was also of interest to ascertain the effect on the conformational behaviour in solution of the twelvemembered ring of introducing six methyl substituents into the ortho-positions of the aromatic rings of the hexahydrotribenzocyclodecene (1). Accordingly, we have investigated the temperature dependence of the ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ n.m.r. spectrum of the $1,4,7,10,13,16$-hexamethyl derivative (3). At $+20^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, the spectrum in deuteriochloroform consisted of multiplets for the aromatic and $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ protons, and three singlets for the aryl-methyl protons (see Table 1). Interest was centred on the signal for the aryl-methyl protons since the three singlets observed at room temperature coalesced to give one singlet as the temperature was raised (see Figure 4) to $+80^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Over this temperature range, the multiplets for the aromatic
and $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ protons both coalesced to give singlets However, close inspection of the three singlets for the aryl-methyl substituents at $+20^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ indicates that the two singlets located at lower field are slightly broader than the high-field singlet. Two interpretations of this observation may be considered: either (i) the three pairs of diastereotopic methyl protons $\left(\mathrm{R}^{\mathbf{1}} \equiv \mathrm{Me}_{\mathrm{A}}\right.$, $\mathrm{Me}_{\mathrm{B}}$, or $\mathrm{Me}_{\mathrm{C}}$ ) of the $C_{2}$ and $C_{2}{ }^{*}$ conformations (27a and $\mathrm{b} ; \mathrm{R}^{\mathbf{1}}=\mathrm{Me}, \quad \mathrm{R}^{2}=\mathrm{H}$ ) are exhibiting non-identical relaxation times, or (ii) there is a small amount ( $<5 \%$ ) of the $D_{3}$ and $D_{3}{ }^{*}$ conformations ( 28 a and $\mathrm{b} ; \mathrm{R}^{\mathbf{1}}=\mathrm{Me}$, $\mathrm{R}^{2}=\mathrm{H}$ ) whose homotopic methyl protons ( $\mathrm{R}^{1} \equiv \mathrm{Me}_{\mathrm{D}}$ ) are giving rise to a signal coincident with that of $\mathrm{Me}_{\mathrm{C}}$ in the $C_{2}$ conformations ( 27 a and $\mathrm{b} ; \mathrm{R}^{\mathbf{1}}=\mathrm{Me}, \mathrm{R}^{2}=\mathrm{H}$ ) and exchanging with $\mathrm{Me}_{\mathrm{A}}$ and $\mathrm{Me}_{\mathrm{B}}$.

Strain energy calculations have been performed on the
interconversion. However, in view of the results of the strain energy calculations, the values employed for these rate constants were the same as those established simultaneously for $C_{2} \rightleftharpoons C_{2}{ }^{*}$ ring inversion (see below). Good matches were obtained (see Figure 4) between theoretical and experimental spectra provided the contribution from the $D_{3}$ conformations ( 28 a and $\mathrm{b} ; \mathrm{R}^{1}=$ $\mathrm{Me}, \mathrm{R}^{2}=\mathrm{H}$ ) was not allowed to exceed $0.8 \%$. Rate constants for the $C_{2} \rightleftharpoons C_{2}{ }^{*}$ ring inversion process at various temperatures were determined and the average value for $\Delta G^{\ddagger}\left(C_{2} \rightleftharpoons C_{2}{ }^{*}\right)$ was found to be 17.5 kcal $\mathrm{mol}^{-1}$. However, after this detailed consideration, interpretation (ii) discussed in the preceding paragraph was effectively ruled out by the observation that there were no significant changes in the room temperature line-shape for the aryl-methyl protons down to $-40{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$.

Table 4
Calculated strain energies $\left(E_{\mathrm{T}} / \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}^{-1}\right)^{a}$ of various conformations of 1,4,7,10,13,16-hexamethyl-5,6,11,12,17,18-

| Conformation | $E_{r}$ | $E_{\theta}$ | $E_{\phi}$ | $E_{\delta}$ | $E_{n b}$ | $E_{T}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $C_{2} \equiv C_{2}{ }^{*}\left(27 ; \mathrm{R}^{1}=\mathrm{Me}, \mathrm{R}^{2}=\mathrm{H}\right)$ | 0.35 | 2.71 | 0.76 | 0.24 | 0.05 | $4.11{ }^{\text {c }}$ |
| $D_{3} \equiv D_{3}{ }^{*}\left(28 ; \mathrm{R}^{1}=\mathrm{Me}, \mathrm{R}^{2}=\mathrm{H}\right)$ | 0.31 | 2.47 | 1.53 | 0.65 | 0.00 | $4.96{ }^{\text {c }}$ |
| $\mathrm{TS}\left(C_{2} \rightleftharpoons C_{2}{ }^{*}\right)\left(29 ; \mathrm{R}^{1}=\mathrm{Me}, \mathrm{R}^{2}=\mathrm{H}\right)^{\text {b }}$ | 0.87 | 15.29 | 1.43 | 0.76 | 2.44 | 20.79 d |
| $\mathrm{TS}\left(D_{3} \rightleftharpoons C_{2}\right)\left(30 ; \mathrm{R}^{1}=\mathrm{Me}, \mathrm{R}^{2}=\mathrm{H}\right){ }^{\text {b }}$ | 0.96 | 12.99 | 1.87 | 0.98 | 5.05 | 21.85 |

${ }^{a}$ See footnotes $a-f$ in Table 3. ${ }^{b}$ Transition-state geometries are defined by holding a $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ unit in the plane of one of the aromatic rings. For the $\mathrm{TS}\left(C_{2} \rightleftharpoons C_{2}{ }^{*}\right)\left(29 ; \mathrm{R}^{1}=\mathrm{Me}, \mathrm{R}^{2}=\mathrm{H}\right)$ conformation, atoms $5,4 \mathrm{a}, 4,3,2,1,18 \mathrm{a}, 18,17$, and 16 were 'held ' coplanar. For the $\operatorname{TS}\left(D_{3} \rightleftharpoons C_{2}\right)\left(30 ; \mathrm{R}^{1}=\mathrm{Me}, \mathrm{R}^{2}=\mathrm{H}\right)$ conformation, atoms $12,12 \mathrm{a}, 13,14,15,16,16 \mathrm{a}, 17,18$, and 18a were ${ }^{\circ}$ held ' coplanar. See Figure 12. $c$ The $C_{2}$ conformation ( $27 \mathrm{a} ; \mathrm{R}^{1}=\mathrm{Me}, \mathrm{R}^{2}=\mathrm{H}$ ) is also favoured by entropy. On the basis of symmetry considerations alone, the $C_{2}$ conformation ( $27 \mathrm{a} ; \mathrm{R}^{1}=\mathrm{Me}, \mathrm{R}^{2}=\mathrm{H}$ ), which has a symmetry number of 2 , will be $R \ln 3 \mathrm{cal} \mathrm{deg}{ }^{-1} \mathrm{~mol}^{-1}$ higher in entropy than the $D_{3}$ conformation (28a; $\mathrm{R}^{1}=\mathrm{Me}, \mathrm{R}^{2}=\mathrm{H}$ ) which has a symmetry number of 6 . If the difference in strain energies ( $\Delta E_{T} 0.85 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}^{-1}$ ) between the two ground-state conformations is equated with $\Delta H$, then the entropy difference of $R \ln 3$ means that the free energy difference ( $\Delta G_{\text {calc. }}$.) between the two conformations is $c a .1 .5 \mathrm{kcal}^{\text {mol }}{ }^{-1}$. ${ }^{d}$ If the difference in strain energies $\left(\Delta E_{\mathrm{T}^{\ddagger}} 16.68 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}^{-1}\right)$ between the $C_{2}$ conformation ( $27 \mathrm{a} ; \mathrm{R}^{1}=\mathrm{Me}, \mathrm{R}^{2}=\mathrm{H}$ ) and the transition state $\operatorname{TS}\left(C_{2} \rightleftharpoons C_{2}{ }^{*}\right)\left(29 ; \mathrm{R}^{1}=\mathrm{Me}, \mathrm{R}^{2}=\mathrm{H}\right)$ is equated with $\Delta H^{\ddagger}$ then an approximate estimate for $\Delta G^{\ddagger}$ calc. of $16.3 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}^{-1}$ follows from recognising that the transition state is favoured on entropy grounds by $R \ln 2 \mathrm{cal} \mathrm{deg}^{-1} \mathrm{~mol}^{-1}\left(i . e\right.$. the $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{unit}^{\text {can }}$ be pedalled in two energetically equivalent ways during $C_{2} \rightleftharpoons C_{2}{ }^{*}$ ring inversion).
ground-state conformations (27a and b ; $\mathrm{R}^{\mathbf{1}}=\mathrm{Me}$, $\mathrm{R}^{2}=\mathrm{H}$ ) and ( 28 a and $\mathrm{b} ; \mathrm{R}^{1}=\mathrm{Me}, \mathrm{R}^{2}=\mathrm{H}$ ) and on the probable transition states (see Figure 2) $\mathrm{TS}\left(C_{2} \rightleftharpoons C_{2}{ }^{*}\right)$ $\left(29 ; \mathrm{R}^{1}=\mathrm{Me}, \mathrm{R}^{2}=\mathrm{H}\right)$ for $C_{2} \rightleftharpoons C_{2}{ }^{*}$ ring inversion and TS $\left(D_{3} \rightleftharpoons C_{2}\right)\left(30 ; \mathrm{R}^{1}=\mathrm{Me}, \mathrm{R}^{2}=\mathrm{H}\right)$ for $D_{3} \rightleftharpoons$ $C_{2}$ ring interconversion. The results (Table 4) agree with the conclusion that the $C_{2}$ conformation (27a; $\mathrm{R}^{1}=$ $\left.\mathrm{Me}, \quad \mathrm{R}^{2}=\mathrm{H}\right)$ is more stable $\left(\Delta G_{\text {calc. }}=c a .1 .5 \mathrm{kcal}\right.$ $\mathrm{mol}^{-1}$ ) than the $D_{3}$ conformation (28a; $\mathrm{R}^{1}=\mathrm{Me}, \mathrm{R}^{2}=$ H) but suggest that the latter may contribute slightly to the conformational equilibrium. If this is the case, then the fact that the calculated energy barriers $\left.\left.\left[\Delta E_{\mathrm{T}^{\ddagger}\left(D_{3}\right.}{ }^{\longrightarrow} C_{2}\right) 16.89, \Delta E_{\mathrm{T}^{\ddagger}\left(C_{2}\right.}{ }^{[ } D_{3}\right) 17.74 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}^{-1}\right]$ for $D_{3} \rightleftharpoons C_{2}$ ring interconversion are of the same order of magnitude as the $C_{2} \rightleftharpoons C_{2}{ }^{*}$ ring inversion barrier ( $\Delta E_{\mathrm{T}^{\ddagger}} 16.68 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}^{-1}$ ) suggests that an exchange process involving a fourth site might be occurring in the temperature range +20 to $+80{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. This possibility [i.e. interpretation (ii) above] was explored by generating theoretical spectra using line-shape equations based on a four-site exchange process (method III in the Experimental section) amongst $\mathrm{Me}_{\mathrm{A}}, \mathrm{Me}_{\mathrm{B}}, \mathrm{Me}_{\mathrm{C}}$, and $\mathrm{Me}_{\mathrm{D}}$ with the chemical shifts of $\mathrm{Me}_{\mathrm{C}}$ and $\mathrm{Me}_{\mathrm{D}}$ being made coincident. It was found that the line-shapes were insensitive to the magnitude of the rate constants for $D_{3} \rightleftharpoons C_{2}$ ring

By implication, interpretation (i) must provide the answer to the problem. Comparison (see Figure 4) of the experimental ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ n.m.r. spectra for the arylmethyl protons with theoretical spectra generated by line-shape equations based upon a three-site exchange process [method II in the Experimental section] amongst $\mathrm{Me}_{\mathrm{A}}, \mathrm{Me}_{\mathrm{B}}$, and $\mathrm{Me}_{\mathrm{C}}$ gave a value for $\Delta G^{\ddagger}$ of $17.4 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}^{-1}$ for $C_{2} \rightleftharpoons C_{2}{ }^{*}$ ring inversion. There is encouraging agreement between this value and the $\Delta G^{\ddagger}$ calc. value of $16.3 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}^{-1}$ determined from strain energy calculations (see Table 4) assuming that the transition state for $C_{2} \rightleftharpoons C_{2}{ }^{*}$ ring inversion corresponds to $\mathrm{TS}\left(C_{2} \rightleftharpoons C_{2}{ }^{*}\right)\left(29 ; \mathrm{R}^{1}=\mathrm{Me}, \mathrm{R}^{2}=\mathrm{H}\right)$.

A comparison (Table 2) between the $\Delta G^{\ddagger}\left(C_{2} \rightleftharpoons C_{2}{ }^{*}\right)$ values for the hexahydrotribenzocyclododecene (1) and its $2,3,8,9,14,15-(2)$ and $1,4,7,10,13,16-(3)$ hexamethyl derivatives shows that approximately the same barrier is associated with $C_{2} \rightleftharpoons C_{2}{ }^{*}$ ring inversion in compounds (1) and (2) whereas a much higher barrier (plus ca. 7 kcal $\mathrm{mol}^{-1}$ ) is associated with the same ring inversion process in compound (3). This observation leads to the conclusion that the presence of aryl-methyl substituents in the meta-positions with respect to the dimethylene bridges does not contribute towards an increase in the energy barrier associated with $C_{2} \rightleftharpoons C_{2}{ }^{*}$ ring inversion. Thus,
the assumption that the $2,3,8,9,14,15$-hexamethyl derivative (2) is a good model for the parent hydrocarbon (1) is vindicated. In contrast, the presence of aryl-methyl substituents in the ortho-positions with respect to the dimethylene bridges increases significantly the energy barrier associated with $C_{2} \rightleftharpoons C_{2}{ }^{*}$ ring inversion as a result of (i) nonbonded interactions between the methyl groups and adjacent dimethylene bridges, and (ii) nonbonded interactions between juxtaposed methyl groups. By way of comparison, it is interesting that the activation parameters for the conformational changes in the trisalicylides (4)-(6), for which analogous transition states have been proposed, ${ }^{4}$ were found ${ }^{4}$ to correlate in a similarly predictable manner with the varying steric demands of the alkyl substituents occupying the orthopositions. Thus, the free energies of activation for ring inversion and interconversion processes are considerably less for tri-3,6-dimethylsalicylide (4) than they are for tri-o-thymotide (5) or tri-o-carvocrotide (6). However, whereas the hydrocarbons (1)-(3) prefer to adopt the less symmetrical $C_{2}$ conformation (27) in solution, both helical $\left(C_{1}\right)$ and propeller $\left(C_{3}\right)$ conformations are present in solutions of the trisalicylides (4)-(6) with the more symmetrical propeller always preferred.

Finally, in this discussion on the conformational behaviour of twelve-membered ring hydrocarbons, it is worth reflecting upon the pioneering work of Baker et al. ${ }^{2}$ In fact, the $C_{2}$ conformation ( $27 \mathrm{a} ; \mathrm{R}^{\mathbf{1}}=\mathrm{R}^{2}=\mathrm{H}$ ), established by dynamic n.m.r. spectroscopy and strain energy calculations in the present investigation to be the most stable ground-state conformation, corresponds with form (lb) in Figure 1. This is (i) one of four forms [(lad) in Figure 1] proposed as a 'strainless phase' of hexahydrotribenzocyclododecene (1) by Baker et al. ${ }^{2}$ and (ii) one of the two forms [(1b and c) in Figure 1] which satisfies the preliminary $X$-ray crystallographic evi-

dence ${ }^{2}$ (see the introductory section) that (1) lacks trigonal symmetry, at least in the crystal. To our knowledge, the only other related investigations in more recent times are those describing the conformational behaviour of the all-cis-1,5,9-cyclododecatriene (31) ${ }^{28}$ and its $1,5,9$-tribromo-derivative (32). ${ }^{29}$ The crown (33), saddle (34), symmetrical s-trans-(35), and unsymmetrical s-trans-(36) conformations shown in Figure 13 were all considered as possibilities by Untch et al. ${ }^{28,29}$ for compounds (31) and (32) in solution. On the basis of (i) u.v. spectroscopy of (31), (ii) dipole moment measurements on (32), and (iii) the magnitudes of the vicinal coupling constants for the $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ protons of (32), the
${ }^{23}$ K. G. Untch and D. J. Martin, J. Amer. Chem. Soc., 1965, 87, 3518.
presence of crown (33) and saddle (34) conformations in significant amounts was excluded. From examination of molecular models it was deduced that the unsymmetrical s-trans-(35) is less strained than the symmetrical


Crown (33)


Unsymmetrical s-trans (36)


Saddle (34)


Symmetrical s-trans (35)

Figure 13 Possible ground-state conformations [crown (33), saddle (34), symmetrical s-trans (35), and unsymmetrical strans (36)] for cis,cis,cis-cyclododeca-1,5,9-triene (31) and its tribromo-derivative (32) proposed by Untch et al. ${ }^{28,29}$ For (31), $\mathrm{R}=\mathrm{H}$; for (32), $\mathrm{R}=\mathrm{Br}$
s-trans-(36) conformation because intra-annular hydrogen repulsions are less in (36) than in (35). Thus, it was concluded that the unsymmetrical s-trans-conformation (36) is of lower energy and would be the most populated in solution. Since the unsymmetrical s-trans-conformation (36) of compounds (31) and (32) is stereochemically analogous to the $C_{2}$ conformations (27) of compounds (1)-(3), there is close correspondence between the conformational behaviour of the hexahydrotribenzocyclododecenes (1)-(3) and the cis,cis,cis-1,5,9-cyclododecatrienes (31) and (32) in solution.

The Temperature-dependent ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ N.m.r. Spectra and Conformational Properties of 2,3,8,9- (15) and 1,4,7,10(16) Tetramethyl-5,6,11,12-tetrahydrodibenzo[a,e]cyclo-octene.-The availability of the 1,4,7,10-tetramethyl derivative (16) of tetrahydrodibenzocyclo-octene (14) provided an opportunity to study the effect on the conformational behaviour in solution of the eightmembered ring of introducing four ortho-methyl substituents into the aromatic rings. The low temperature ${ }^{\mathbf{1}} \mathrm{H}$ n.m.r. spectrum of (16) shows two sets of signals which could be easily assigned to two differently populated diastereoisomeric conformations. Each of these two ground-state conformations was associated with sets of signals provided by (i) four homotopic aromatic protons, (ii) four homotopic aromatic methyl substituents, and (iii) a pair of $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ groups. The corresponding changes observable in the ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ n.m.r. spectra of (16) in carbon disulphide are ( $c f$. Table 5) as follows: (i) the
29 S. Castellano and K. G. Untch, J. A mer. Chem. Soc., 1966, 88, 4238.
singlet ( $\tau 3.47 ;+30^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ) broadened at lower temperatures eventually giving at $-61{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, two sharp singlets ( $\tau 3.25$ and 3.50 ; relative intensities $12: 88$ ), (ii) the singlet $\left(\tau_{\mathrm{Me}} 7.87 ;+30^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)$ gave two sharp singlets at $-61^{\circ}\left(\tau_{\mathrm{Me}}\right.$

Table 5
Temperature-dependent ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ n.m.r. spectral parameters ( 100 MHz ) for compounds (15) and (16)

| Compound | Solvent | Temp. $\left({ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)$ | Group | $\tau^{\text {a }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (15) | $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}-\mathrm{CS}_{2}$ | $-71$ | $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{2}$ | $2.98 \text { (s) (A), } 3.34(\mathrm{~s})$ |
| (2:1) |  |  | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}{ }^{\text {b }}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6.95(\mathrm{~s}), 6.97\left(\mathrm{AA}^{\prime}\right), \\ & 7.40\left(\mathrm{BB}^{\prime}\right) \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  |  | $\mathrm{CH}_{3}$ | $7.76 \text { (s) (A), } 7.94 \text { (s) }$ |
|  |  | $+20$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{2} \\ & \mathrm{C} \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{C} \mathrm{H}_{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.31(\mathrm{~s})(\mathrm{AB}) \\ & 7.09(\mathrm{~s})^{b} \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  |  | $\mathrm{CH}_{3}$ | 7.91 (s) (AB) |
| (16) | $\mathrm{CS}_{2}$ | -61 | $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{2}$ | $3.25(\mathrm{~s})(\mathrm{A}), 3.50(\mathrm{~s})$ |
|  |  |  | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}{ }^{\text {b }}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6.97(\mathrm{~s}), 6.76\left(\mathrm{AA}^{\prime}\right), \\ & 6.88\left(\mathrm{BB}^{\prime}\right)^{b} \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  |  | $\mathrm{CH}_{3}$ | $7.70(\mathrm{~s})(\mathrm{A}), 7.88 \text { (s) }$ |
|  |  | $+30$ | $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{2}{ }_{\text {b }}$ | 3.47 (s) (AB) |
|  |  |  | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}{ }^{\text {b }}$ | 7.01 (s) ${ }^{\text {b }}$ ( ${ }^{\text {a }}$ ( ${ }^{\text {a }}$ ) |
|  |  |  | $\mathrm{CH}_{3}$ | 7.87 (s) (AB) |

${ }^{a}$ Sites are designated A and B for the two-site systems. Sites that represent two time-averaged signals are designated AB. ${ }^{b}$ The $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ group gives an $\mathrm{AA}^{\prime} \mathrm{BB}^{\prime}$ system for the chair conformation and a time-averaged singlet for the boat conformation, which coalesce to a single singlet at higher temperatures.
7.70 and 7.88 , relative intensities $12: 88$ ) and (iii) the singlet ( $\tau 7.01$ ) observed at $+30{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for the $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ protons broadened considerably as the temperature was lowered and then sharpened again at $-20{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, giving eventually at $-61{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ a major signal (singlet $\mathrm{A}_{4}, \tau 6.97$; relative intensity $c a .85$ ) and a minor signal (unresolved $\mathrm{AA}^{\prime} \mathrm{BB}^{\prime}$ system, $\tau_{\mathrm{A}} 6.76, \tau_{\mathrm{B}} 6.88$; relative intensity $c a$. 15). The characteristics of the signals associated with (iii) are such that the $\mathrm{A}_{4}$ system must be assigned to the major conformation (molar population 0.88 at $-61{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ in $\mathrm{CS}_{2}$ solution) which is one of a family of flexible Boat * conformations. ${ }^{10,11}$ Similarly, the $\mathrm{AA}^{\prime} \mathrm{BB}^{\prime}$ system must be associated with the minor conformation (molar population 0.12 at $-61{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ in $\mathrm{CS}_{2}$ solution) which corresponds to a rigid Chair* conformation. Line-shape analyses employing a program (see method I in the Experimental section) for two-site exchange processes were carried out (see Figure 3) for (i) and (ii) described above. They each gave a $\Delta G^{\ddagger}$ value of $12.1 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}^{-1}$ for $\mathrm{C} \longrightarrow$ Boat interconversion (see Table 6). Strain energy calculations have been performed on selected conformations of the 1,4,7,10-tetramethyl derivative (16). The results (Table 7) characterise (i) the two ground-state conformations (see Figure 14) as the C conformation (37; $\mathrm{R}^{\mathbf{1}}=\mathrm{Me}, \mathrm{R}^{2}=\mathrm{H}$ ) and a minimum

[^5]energy boat (MEB) conformation (38; $\mathrm{R}^{\mathbf{1}}=\mathrm{Me}, \mathrm{R}^{\mathbf{2}}=$ H ) with torsion angles of $c a .26^{\circ}$ about the 5,6 - and $11,12-$ bonds and (ii) the transition-state conformations (see Figure 15) as the TSI ( $39 ; \mathrm{R}^{1}=\mathrm{Me}, \mathrm{R}^{2}=\mathrm{H}$ ) and TS2 conformations. The MEB conformation ( $38 ; \mathrm{R}^{\mathbf{1}}=\mathrm{Me}$, $\mathrm{R}^{2}=\mathrm{H}$ ) is predicted to be more stable ( $\Delta E_{\mathrm{T}} 1.34 \mathrm{kcal}$ $\mathrm{mol}^{-1}$ ) than the C conformation ( $37 ; \mathrm{R}^{\mathbf{1}}=\mathrm{Me}, \mathrm{R}^{2}=\mathrm{H}$ )


(38)

Figure 14 The ground-state C (37) and MEB (38) conformations of compounds (15) and (16). The notation for the torsional angles is defined in refs. 10 and 11 and refers in turn to the 4a,5-, $5,6-, 6,6 \mathrm{a}-, 10 \mathrm{a}, 11-, 11,12-$, and 12,12a-bonds. The descriptors C and $\mathrm{C}^{*}$ refer to degenerate conformations; the descriptors MEB 1 and MEB $1^{*}$ refer to enantiomeric conformations; further degenerate analogues are the MEB 2 and MEB 2* conformations. See refs. 10 and 11 for a full discussion of the conformational itinerary of these ' $6,8,6$ ' systems
which is in accord with experimental observation (see Table 6) and the strain energy difference ( $\Delta E_{T^{\ddagger}} \quad 13.23$ $\mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}^{-1}$ ) between the $\operatorname{TS1}\left(39 ; \mathrm{R}^{1}=\mathrm{Me}, \mathrm{R}^{2}=\mathrm{H}\right.$ ) and $\mathrm{C}\left(37 ; \mathrm{R}^{\mathbf{1}}=\mathrm{Me}, \mathrm{R}^{\mathbf{2}}=\mathrm{H}\right.$ ) conformations is in satisfying agreement with the observed $\Delta G^{\ddagger}$ value of $12.1 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}^{-1}$ for $\mathrm{C} \longrightarrow$ Boat interconversion. This value is $c a .2 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}^{-1}$ higher than the reported values $\left[\Delta G^{\ddagger}{ }_{\mathrm{C}} \rightarrow\right.$ Boat $=10.2$ (refs. 10—12) 10.0 (ref. 13) kcal $\left.\mathrm{mol}^{-1}\right]$ for tetrahydrodibenzocyclo-octene (14). Clearly, the presence of four ortho-methyl substituents on the aromatic rings serves to destabilise the TSl conformation (39; $\mathrm{R}^{\mathbf{1}}=\mathrm{Me}, \mathrm{R}^{2}=\mathrm{H}$ ) relative to the C conformation (37; $\mathrm{R}^{1}=\mathrm{Me}, \mathrm{R}^{2}=\mathrm{H}$ ) in the $1,4,7,10$-tetramethyl derivative (16).
The availability of the 2,3,8,9-tetramethyl derivative (15) as a suitable model for tetrahydrodibenzocyclo-
octene (14) provided a means of assessing the reported ${ }^{10-13}$ values (see above) for the free energy of
methyl substituents. The ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ n.m.r. spectral data for (15) in deuteriochloroform-carbon disulphide (2:1) at

Table 6
Site exchanges and thermodynamic parameters associated with the Chair $\longrightarrow$ Boat ring interconversion process in compounds (15) and (16)

|  |  |  | Site |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Compound | $\mathrm{R}^{\mathbf{1}}$ | $\mathrm{R}^{2}$ | exchanges * | $p_{\text {A }}$ | $p_{\text {B }}$ | $\Delta G / \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}^{-1}$ | $\Delta G^{t} / \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}^{-1}$ |
| (15) | H | Me | $\mathrm{A} \rightarrow \mathrm{B}$ | 60 | 40 | +0.16 | $10.5 \pm 0.2$ |
| (16) | Me | H | $A \longrightarrow B$ | 12 | 88 | $-0.83$ | $12.1 \pm 0.5^{\text {b }}$ |

${ }^{a}$ Details of the chemical shifts are given in Table 5. For the 2,3,8,9-tetramethyl derivative (15), a full line-shape analysis was carried out (see Figure 2) on the ${ }^{\mathbf{1}} \mathrm{H}$ n.m.r. spectra for the aromatic protons. For the $1,4,7,10$-tetramethyl derivative (16), a full line-shape analysis was carried out (see Figure 3) on the ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ n.m.r. spectra for (i) the aromatic protons and (ii) the methyl protons. ${ }^{b}$ Identical values for $\Delta G^{\ddagger}$ were obtained from line-shape analysis of the ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ n.m.r. spectra for (i) the aromatic protons and (ii) the methyl protons.

Table 7
Calculated strain energies $\left(E_{\mathrm{T}} / \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}^{-1}\right)^{a}$ of various conformations ${ }^{b}$ of $1,4,7,10$-tetramethyl-5,6,11,12-tetrahydrodi-benzo[a,e]cyclo-octene (16)

| Conformation | $E_{r}$ | $E_{\theta}$ | $E_{\phi}$ | $E_{8}$ | $E_{n b}$ | $E_{T}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{C} \equiv \mathrm{C}$ * (37) | 0.05 | 1.18 | 5.95 | 0.13 | 0.00 | 7.31 |
| $\mathrm{B} \equiv \mathrm{B}^{*} \boldsymbol{b}$ | 0.11 | 1.66 | 6.00 | 0.15 | 0.04 | 7.96 |
| TB $\equiv$ ( TB* $\boldsymbol{b}$ | 0.20 | 1.86 | 6.10 | 0.07 | 1.03 | 9.26 |
| MEB (38) | 0.08 | 1.62 | 4.05 | 0.22 | 0.00 | 5.97 |
| TS1 $\equiv$ TS1* $\equiv$ TS2 $\equiv$ TS2* (39) | 0.87 | 16.88 | 0.93 | 1.05 | 0.81 | 20.54 |

${ }^{a}$ See footnotes $a-f$ in Table 3. ${ }^{b}$ These conformations have been defined in Part $1^{10}$ and in a recent review. ${ }^{11}$
activation associated with $\mathrm{C} \longrightarrow$ Boat interconversion in (14). Potentially, good ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ n.m.r. probes are present


Figure 15 The transition-state conformation TS1 (39) for $\mathrm{C} \longrightarrow$ Boat interconversion in compounds (15) and (16) The notation for the torsional angles is defined in refs. 10 and 11 and refers in turn to the 4a,5-, 5,6-, 6,6a-, 10a,11-, 11,12-, and 12,12a-bonds. The descriptors TS1 and TS1* refer to degenerate conformations defined by coplanarity of atoms 11, 12, 12a, 4a, 5, and 6. Further degenerate analogues are the TS2 and TS2* conformations (see refs. 10 and 11) defined by coplanarity of atoms $5,6,6 \mathrm{a}, 10 \mathrm{a}, 11$, and 12
in compound (15) in the form of (i) the four homotopic aromatic protons and (ii) the four homotopic aromatic
(i) $+20^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and (ii) $-70^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ indicate (see Table 5) that the signals for the aromatic protons are the most suitable for line-shape analysis (see Figure 2) employing the two-site exchange program (see method I in the Experimental section) over the temperature range -52 to $-71{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The results of this analysis (Table 6) show that the C (37; $\mathrm{R}^{1}=\mathrm{H}, \mathrm{R}^{2}=\mathrm{Me}$ ) and $\operatorname{MEB}\left(38 ; \mathrm{R}^{1}=\mathrm{H}\right.$, $\mathrm{R}^{\mathbf{2}}=\mathrm{Me}$ ) conformations (see Figure 14) of (15) are populated to the extent of $\mathrm{C}: \mathrm{MEB} \simeq 60: 40 \mathrm{in} \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}-$ $\mathrm{CS}_{2}(2: 1)$ at $-71{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and that the free energy of activation is $10.5 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}^{-1}$ for $\mathrm{C} \longrightarrow$ Boat interconversion in close agreement with the values of 10.2 (refs. $10-12$ ) and 10.0 (ref. 13) reported for tetrahydrodibenzocyclooctene (14). This correspondence in conformational behaviour between (14) and (15), together with strain energy calculations discussed previously ${ }^{10,11}$ for (14), suggest that (i) the 2,3,8,9-tetramethyl derivative (15) is a suitable model for tetrahydrodibenzocyclo-octene (14) and (ii) $\mathrm{C} \longrightarrow$ Boat interconversion in the $2,3,8,9-$ tetramethyl derivative (15) involves a transition-state conformation (see Figure 15) of the TS1 (39; $\mathrm{R}^{1}=\mathrm{H}$, $\mathrm{R}^{2}=\mathrm{Me}$ ) type.
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