reflections monitored every 7000 s; 7866 reflections (including standards) measured. Data corrected for Larentz, polarization, and crystal decay (based on values of standards; 11% decay; maximum rescale factor on $F_o = 1.222$). After 2502 systematically absent or zero *F,* data were rejected and 144 symmetry equivalent reflections $(R_{\text{merge}} = 0.045)$ were averaged, a data set of 4968 reflections was obtained.

After several recrystallizations from methanol some small colorless plate shaped crystals were obtained (by W.J.C.). The largest available crystal of dimensions only $0.045 \times 0.095 \times 0.175$ mm was used to collect the above weak data set [after excluding standards, only 1687 (22%) of the above 7614 data were considered observed using the criteria $I \geq 2\sigma(I)$. Weaknesses in the data led to both $P2₁/c$ and $P2₁/n$ as possible space groups. The latter was shown to be correct. The crystal packing which consists of layers of molecules 1 and 2 parallel to the ab face in which the *^x*and *z* (but not *y)* coordinates of the two molecules are related by $x_2 \approx \frac{1}{2} + x_1$ and $z_2 \approx z_1$ leads to the pseudoabsence *h0l*, $l =$ 2n, and helps explain some of the weakness of other sections of the data set.

The structure was solved by the use of direct methods (after several attempts and only after renormalization of several parity groups) to locate two fragments and some spurious peaks. In the early stages of refinement only heavily damped least squares gave meaningful results. All missing atoms were then located, and H atoms in the Ad groups were placed in calculated positions with fixed temperature factors. Hydrogen atoms in the $CH₃$ groups and the $C(nI)$ -H atoms (representing 12% of the electron density) were not included. Refinement of anisotropic temperature factors was not possible (too few reflections available) and least-squares refinements minimizing $\sum w \Delta F^2$ then converged (maximum Δ/σ $= 0.12$) to the residuals $\bar{R} = 0.1212$ (w $R = 0.1207$) for 1103 reflections with $F > 3\sigma(F)$. Weights in the final cycles were given by $w = [a^2(F) + 0.00166F^2]^{-1}$ and a final ΔF map contained no peaks > 0.46 e **A-3.** Final positional parameters, bond lengths/bond angles, and structure factors have been deposited as supplementary material.

Acknowledgment. The authors are grateful to the Natural Science and Engineering Research Council of Canada for financial support of this research and for a scholarship for K.M.B.

Registry No. la, 117959-04-3; **lb,** 96760-14-4; IC, 117959-09-8; **Id,** 117959-10-1; **le,** 117959-11-2; **If,** 117959-12-3; **lg,** 81671-43-4; **li,** 97551-01-4; **2b,** 117959-16-7; **2f,** 117959-31-6; **2g,** 117959-31-6; **2g** (2,3-dimethylbutadiene cycloadduct), 117959-39-4; **2g** (anthracene cycloadduct), 117959-40-7; **2h,** 81671-50-3; **3a,** 117959- 05-4; **3b**, 117959-06-5; **3c**, 109242-61-7; **3g**, 4110-02-5; **4a** (isomer l), 117959-14-5; **4a** (isomer 2), 117982-86-2; **4b** (isomer l), 117959-189; **4b** (isomer 2), 117959-19-0; **4c** (isomer l), 117959-23-6; **4c** (isomer 2), 117959-24-7; **4d** (isomer l), 117959-25-8; **4d** (isomer 2), 117959-26-9; **4e** (isomer l), 117959-29-2; **4e** (isomer 2), 117959-30-5; **4f** (isomer l), 117959-33-8; **4f** (isomer 2), 117959-34-9; **4g,** 117959-38-3; **4i,** 117959-41-8; **5a,** 117959-13-4; **5c,** 117959-22-5; **5e** (isomer l), 118099-30-2; **5e** (isomer 2), 117959-27-0; **5g,** 117982-89-5; **6b,** 117959-17-8; **6f,** 117959-32-7; **7b** (isomer l), 117959-20-3; **7b** (isomer 2), 117959-21-4; **7f** (isomer l), 117959-35-0; **7f** (isomer 2), 117959-36-1; **7g,** 117959-38-3; **7h,** 117959-42-9; **7i,** 10ez, 117959-28-1; **lOe,,** 118015-89-7; **lld** (isomer l), 117982-87-3; 11d (isomer 2), 117982-88-4; ClCOAd, 2094-72-6; (Me₃Si)₂(t-Bu)Si(CH₂)₄OCOAd, 117959-07-6; ClCO(t-Bu), 3282-30-2; ClCOMeS, 938-18-1; ClCOCEt₃, 35354-15-5; ClCO(BCO), 21891-38-3; **methyltris(trimethylsilyl)silane,** 2003-86-3; tert-bu**tyltris(trimethyhilyl)silane,** 104475-59-4; tert-butyltrichlorosilane, 18171-74-9; **phenyltris(trimethylsilyl)silane,** 4235-65-8; tris(trimethylsily1)silyl bromide, 5089-31-6; 2,3-dimethylbutadiene, 513-81-5; anthracene, 120-12-7. 117959-41-8; **9b**, 96760-17-7; **10b**, 117959-15-6; 10e₁, 118015-90-0;

Supplementary Material Available: Tables of fractional coordinates and bond distances and angles for **7b** (5 pages); a listing of structure factors (4 pages). Ordering information is given on any current masthead page.

Crystal Structures of Four Sterically Crowded 1,3-Disilacyclobutanes

Kim M. Baines, A. G. Brook,' Paul D. Lickiss, and Jeffery F. Sawyer

Lash Miller Chemical Laboratories, University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada M5S 1A 1

Received June 15, 1988

The crystal structures of the four 1,3-disilacyclobutanes $(R_1R_2SiCR_3R_4)_2$ [1, R₁ = Me, R₂ = OSiMe₃, R₃
= 1-Ad, R₄ = SiMe₂t-Bu; 2, R₁ = R₂ = Me, R₃ = 1-Ad, R₄ = SiMe(t-Bu)(OSiMe₃) (*R,R:S,S*); 3, R - $N_{12} = 1 - N_{13} = 1 - N_{14}$, $N_4 = 31N_{14} = 31N_{14$ **adamantylcarbonyl)tert-butylbis(trimethylsilyl)silane** are reported in the previous paper are herein described 1,3-disilacyclobutane rings. Despite the differences in the nature of the R_2 and R_4 substituents, the individual bond lengths and bond angles in the two independent molecules of **1** and in **2-4** do not deviate significantly from average values obtained from the dimensions of all the molecules, although the $\langle Si-C \rangle$ distance [1.962 Å] is significantly longer than a standard Si-C single bond length and is ca. 0.04 Å longer than values observed in other disilacyclobutanes. Additional evidence of steric crowding in these molecules can be seen in the lengthening of the C(ring)-Ad bond lengths to 1.624 **A** (average). The significant increases in the already elongated $C(ring)-R_4$ bond lengths seem to be consistent with approximate cone angles calculated for the $R₄$ silicon substituents. Similarly, angle deformations result in differences in the maximum and minimum bond angles at each ring atom and in the tert-butyl groups of up to 13'. Finally, in the disiloxane moieties the Si-&Si bond angles vary from 137' to 166' and there is **an** obvious correlation between the Si-0 bond length and the included Si-0-Si angle.

Introduction

The photolysis of **tris(trimethylsily1)acylsilanes** is a well-established route to highly substituted silenes.'

$$
(Me_3Si)_{3}SiCR \xrightarrow{h\nu} Me_3Si = C
$$
\n
$$
Me_3Si = C
$$
\n
$$
Me_3Si
$$
\n
$$
Re_3Si = C
$$

This mild route has been used to prepare stable silenes (R = 1-adamantyl, CEt₃, mesityl, 1-methylcyclohexyl)² and has enabled us to investigate the physical properties and

^{(1) (}a) Brook, A. G.; Harris, J. **W.; Lennon,** J.; El **Sheikh,** M. *J. Am. Chem. SOC. 1979,101, 83.* **(b) Brook, A. G.; Kallury. R. K.** M. **R.:** Poon. **Y. C.** *Organometallics 1982, 1, 987.*

Figure 1. ORTEP views of the two independent molecules in 1,3-disilacyclobutane 1 and of 1,3-disilacyclobutanes **2,3,** and **4** showing the crystallographic numbering of principal atoms in each structure. Thermal ellipsoids are drawn at the **50%** probability level.

chemistry of these compounds with relative ease.^{2,3} It was of interest to prepare silenes with substituents other than trimethylsilyl groups at the unsaturated silicon atom, and thus, the photolysis of bis(trimethylsily1)alkyl- and bis- **(trimethylsily1)arylacylsilanes** was inve~tigated.~ **As** expected these acylsilanes rearranged under photolytic conditions to the expected silenes. However, the initially formed silenes underwent further rearrangement to give differently substituted silenes which, in the absence of trapping reagents, dimerized in the usual head-to-tail

manner to give 1,3-disilacyclobutanes (Scheme I). Details of this rearrangement are discussed in the preceding paper⁵ while in this paper we report details of the crystal structure determinations of 1,3-disilacyclobutanes **1-4** and a detailed comparison of their structures. These 1,3-disilacyclobutanes are of interest not only as a result of this unprecedented rearrangement but also due to recent interest shown in small-ring silacarbocycle chemistry.6

 $\frac{1}{1}$: R_i = Me; R₂=OSiMe₃; R₃=l-Ad; R₄=SiMe₂⁺-Bu

- 12 R_I=Me; R₂=OS+Me3; R₃=1-Ad; R4=SiMe₂1-Bu
20 R_I=R₂=Me; R₃=1-Ad; R₄=SiMe<u>1</u>-Bu(OSiMe₃) (R,R : S,S)
- 3:R_I=R₂=Me; R₃=I-Ad; R₄=SiMePh(OSiMe₃)(R,R:S,S) $\frac{3}{2}$
- 3: R_I=R₂=Me ; R₃=I-Ad ; R₄=SiMePh(OSiMe₃) (R,R : S,S)
4. R_I=R₂=Me ; R₃=I-Ad ; R₄=SiMePh(OSiMe₃) (R,S : S,R)

(5) See preceding paper.

^{(2) (}a) Brook, A. G.; Nyburg, S. C.; Abdesaken, F.; Gutekunst, B.; Gutekunst, G.; Kallury, R. K. M. R.; Poon, Y. C.; Chang, Y.-M.; Wong-Ng, W. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1982, 104, 5667. (b) Nyburg, S. C.; Brook, A. G.;

Abdesaken, F.; Gutekunst, G.; Wong-Ng, W. Acta Crystallogr. 1985, C41, 1632. (c) Brook, A. G.; Wessely, H.-J. Organometallics 1985, 4, 1487. (3) (a) Brook, A. G.; Chatterton, W. J.; Sawyer, J. F.; Hughes, D. W.; Chatterton **2128.**

⁽⁴⁾ A preliminary communication has been published: Brook, A. G.; Safa, K. D.; Lickiss, P. D.; Baines, K. M. *J.* Am. Chem. Soc. **1985,** *107,* **4338.**

Table I. Selected Bond Lengths (A) and Bond Angles (des)

- **1** RI: Me, RZzOSrMe3 , R3=l-Ad, R4=SbMezL-Bu

2 R_1 = R₂ = Me ; R_3 = l-Ad; R_4 =SiMe<u>t</u>-Bu(OSiMe₃) (R,R : S,S)

 $\frac{3!}{2!}$ R_I=R₂=Me; R₃=I-Ad; R₄=SiMePh(OSiMe₃) (R,R : S,S)

 $\Delta \cdot R_1 = R_2 = me$; $R_3 = 1 - Ad$; $R_4 = Sim(OSiMe_g)$ ($R, S : S, R$)
 $\Delta : R_1 = R_2 = Me$; $R_3 = 1 - Ad$; $R_4 = Sim(OSiMe_g)$ ($R, S : S, R$)

Results and Discussion

Compounds **1-4** all contain the 1,3-disilacyclobutane moiety with different **R2** and **R4** substituents at silicon and carbon, respectively (Figure 1). The silyl substituents **(R4)** in compounds **2,3,** and **4** are chiral, and the relative configuration of the two silyl substituents in each compound is indicated above. Both independent molecules in the asymmetric unit of disilacyclobutane **1** and disilacyclobutanes **2** and **3** have approximately twofold symmetry with the twofold axis perpendicular to the center of the $Si₂C₂$ ring, whereas disilacyclobutane **4** has approximately *m* symmetry. The dimensions of the independent molecules of compound **1** are very similar (Table I), and the results of a least-squares fit of the two molecules using the **pro**gram BMFIT⁷ (supplementary material) show that the atoms

(6) (a) Fritz, G. *Angew. Chem.* **1987, 99, 1150. (b) Fritz, G.; Matern, E.** *Carbosilanes Syntheses and Reactions;* **Springer-Verlag: Berlin, 1986.**

Table II. Average Bond Lengths^a and Bond Angles for the **Disilacyclobutane Moieties**

Disitaty closutane molecies					
Bond Lengths (A)					
Si(ring) – C(ring)	1.962	C (ring)-Ad			1.624
$Si(ring)-Me$	1.885	C (ring)– $SiMe2(t-Bu)$			1.982
Si-O	1.636	C (ring)-SiMePh(OSiMe ₃)			1.922
				C (ring)-SiMe(t-Bu)(OSiMe ₃)	1.964
Bond Angles (deg)					
C (ring)–Si– C (ring)		$Si(ring)$ -C- $Si(ring)$ 95.4		84.5	
C (ring)-Si-R ₁ ^b			117.7	$[112.7 - 120.9]$	
C (ring)–Si–R ₂ ^b		114.1		$[111.2 - 117.1]$	
R_1 –Si– R_2		99.0		$[96.3 - 101.9]$	
$Si(ring)$ -C-R ₃ ^b		116.8		$[107.5 - 121.4]$	
$Si(ring)-C-R_4^b$		113.6		$[107.3 - 121.1]$	
$R_2 - C - R_4$		109.4		[108.4–110.3]	

Standard Si-C and Si-0 bond lengths for four-coordinate silicon are 1.872 (1) and 1.610 (4) Å, respectively.⁸ b ^The small fold in each disilacyclobutane ring makes the C(1 or 2)-Si-R₁ angle different from the C(1 or 2)-Si-R₂ angle, likewise, the Si(1 or 2)-C-R₃ angle is different from the $Si(1$ or 2)-C-R₄ angle.

in the two disilacyclobutane rings fit to within 0.036 A. The remaining deviations of atoms are within 0.45 A. In the unit cell, the mean plane through the $Si₂C₂$ ring of molecule 2 makes an angle of 8' with the corresponding mean plane of molecule 1. Compounds **3** and **4** differ only in the relative configurations of the R_4 substituent. Thus, the results of a least-squares fit of molecules **3** and **4** indicate that the two molecules fit one another within 0.49 Å except in the region of $Si(6)$ which is of opposite configuration in the two molecules (supplementary material).

Despite the difference in the nature of the R_2 and R_4 substituents, individual Si(ring)-C(ring), C(ring)-Ad, and Si(ring)-Me bond lengths and the endocyclic C-Si-C and Si-C-Si bond angles in the five molecules do not deviate significantly from average values obtained from the dimensions of all the molecules (Tables I and 11). All of the molecules must be considered to be sterically crowded since the endocyclic Si-C bond lengths are all significantly longer (average $Si(ring)$ -C(ring) distance is 1.962 Å; Table II) than standard values for four-coordinate silicon (standard Si-C bond length = 1.872 (1) \AA ⁸), as are most of the Si-O bond distances (average Si-0 for **1-4** = 1.636 A; standard Si-0 bond length = 1.610 (4) \AA^8). These endocyclic Si-C bond lengths are considerably longer than the analogous bond lengths in other disilacyclobutanes^{9,10} (by ca. 0.04 Å) but are comparable to the Si-C bond lengths of some sterically crowded alkyllithiums^{11a} and organocuprates,¹¹ of the sterically hindered siloxetane 9 (Si-C = 1.963 Å),^{3a} and of **l-mesityl-2,3,4-tri-tert-butyl-l-silacyclobutadiene** (Si-C = 1.928 (3) A, Si-C(sp3), and 1.837 **(3)** A, Si-C(sp2), in the ring and 1.933 (3) Å, C–SiMe $_3$ exo ring). 12 Longer Si–C bond lengths have been observed in the sterically crowded 1,2-disilacyclobutane **1013** (Si-C bond length = **2.00** A) and the disiloxetane 11^{14} (Si-C = 2.028 Å). The lengthening of the Si(ring)-C(ring) bonds in the 1,3-disilacyclobutanes **1-4** is even more extreme in view of the small endocyclic

- 1988, 110, 1315.
- Y.-M.; **Lee,** J.-S.; Picard, J.-P. *J. Am. Chem. SOC.* 1979, *101,* 6750. (13) Brook, **A.** G.; Nyburg, S. C.; Reynolds, W. F.; Poon, Y. C.; Chang,
- 1985,282, 305. (14) Schaefer, A.; Weidenbruch, M.; Pohl, S. *J. Organomet. Chem.*

C-Si-C bond angle values, implying that the Si(ring)-C- (ring) bonds in these compounds must be bent. Additional evidence of strain in these molecules can be seen in the lengthening of the C(ring)-Ad distances to 1.624 Å (cf. normal C-C bond length $=$ ca. 1.54 Å), which is comparable to the lengthened central C-C bonds of sterically hindered ethanes,¹⁵ and in the lengthening of the C(ring)-R₄ distances (Table II). The average C(ring)- R_4 distances to the different R_4 groups vary significantly: $C-R_4 = 1.922$ Å for $-SiMePh(OSiMe₃), 1.964$ Å for $-SiMe(t-Bu)(OSiMe₃),$ and 1.982 Å for $-SiMe₂(t-Bu)$. The increase in these distances is consistent with the increasing size of the groups as indicated by their cone angles θ ¹⁶ The cone angles of silicon ligands have been shown to be equal to the cone angles of the corresponding phosphorus ligands¹⁷ and thus, on the basis of the cone angle values calculated for phosphorus ligands,¹⁶ the cone angles for the $-SiMePh(OSiMe₃)$, $-\text{SiMe}(t\text{-Bu})(\text{OSiMe}_3)$, and $-\text{SiMe}_2(t\text{-Bu})$ groups were estimated to be 126° , 138° , and 139° , respectively.¹⁸ The cone angle for the trimethylsiloxy substituent was assumed to be \leq 118° (115°), which is not unreasonable considering that the cone angles of alkoxy substituents are generally 10-35° smaller than their alkyl counterparts.

An alternative way to relieve steric strain is for there to be angle deformations or for the molecules to fold. Surprisingly, the fold angles for the present molecules are quite small $(2-6^{\circ};$ Table III), much smaller than the values observed in cyclobutanes (35^{°19}), the siloxetane 9 (20.1^{°3a}), and other 1,3 disilacyclobutanes (e.g. 17.9°⁹). As a result of the fold, the C(ring)-Si(ring)-R₁ bond angles differ by several degrees from the C(ring)-Si(ring)- R_2 bond angles, as do the Si(ring)-C(ring)- R_3 and Si(ring)-C(ring)- R_4 bond angles. With different R groups there is obviously much more variation in these angles than the variations in the other ring dimensions (Tables I and 11). At each ring Si or C atom one or two of these bond angles are contracted down due to steric interactions, although no consistent trends are apparent. This does result in differences between the maximum and minimum bond angles at each ring atom of up to 12.8° (the smallest difference is 4.1°). In general, the angle deformations are slightly larger at the carbon atoms. Variation in the C(ring)-Si(ring)-R and $Si(ring)-C(ring)-R$ angles have also been observed in a folded $1,3$ -disilacyclobutane;⁹ however, the corresponding angles observed in a planar 1,3-disilacyclobutane¹⁰ are virtually identical with those observed in the present compounds.

The bond lengths and bond angles within the adamantyl and phenyl groups do not deviate significantly from normal values; however, the bond angles to these groups and other groups are somewhat distorted (supplementary material). For example, the angles at the Si atoms in the **R4** groups, that is, \ddot{C} (ring)-Si-Me, -Ph, -OSiMe₃, and -t-Bu are consistently larger than tetrahedral values, with bond angles of up to 124.7° being observed, and accordingly, the

- (16) Tolman, C. **A.** *Chem. Reo.* 1977, **77,** 313.
-
- (17) Imyanitov, N. S. *Sou. J. Coord. Chem.* 1985, 11, 663.
(18) $\theta(SiR_1R_2R_3) = \frac{1}{3}\theta[P(R_1)_3] + \frac{1}{3}\theta[P(R_2)_3] + \frac{1}{3}\theta[P(R_3)_3]$.
(19) March, J. *Advanced Organic Chemistry; 3rd;* Wiley: New York,
- 1985; **p** 129.

⁽⁷⁾ Yuen, P. S.; Nyburg, S. C. J. Appl. Cryst. 1979, 12, 258.

(8) Klebe, G. J. Organomet. Chem. 1985, 293, 147.

(9) Fritz, G.; Thomas, J.; Peters, K.; Peters, E.-M.; von Schnering, H.-G. Z. Anorg. Allg. Chem. 1984, 514,

Chem. 1983,502, 61.

^{(11) (}a) Eaborn, C.; Hitchcock, P. B.; Smith, J. D.; Sullivan, A. C. J.
Chem. Soc., Chem. Commun. 1983, 827. (b) Eaborn, C.; Hitchcock, P.
B.; Smith, J. D.; Sullivan, A. C. J. Organomet. Chem. 1984, 263, C23.
(12) Fink, M.

⁽¹⁵⁾ Ruechardt, C.; Beckhaus, H.-D. *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed. Engl.* 1980, 19, 429.

^a0 is defined as the angle between the planes Sil-Si2-C1 and Sil-Si2-C2; **A** is the distance of atom C2 from the plane through **Sil-Si2-** c1.

^a Enraf-Nonius CAD4 diffractometer; $\theta/2\theta$ mode; Mo K $\bar{\alpha}$ radiation ($\lambda = 0.71069$ Å); graphite monochromator; *T* = 298 K. ^b For compound 1, refinement below \sim 11% was not possible with the complete data set and there was very poor agreement at low (sin θ)/ λ (R factors > 15%). Accordingly, the 1248 observed data with (sin θ/λ < 0.25 were rejected in subsequent cycles of least squares. Refinement then proceeded routinely to give the indicated R factors. CPrograms: Enraf-Nonius SDP package on PDP 11/23 or SHELX on Gould 9705 computers. Scattering curves stored in programs were taken from ref 23. $^d w = 4F^2[\sigma^2(I) + (pF^2)^2$

remaining angles (i.e. Me-Si-Ph, Me-Si-t-Bu, Me-Si-OSiMe₃, etc.) are smaller. Values as small as 98.9° were observed. This implies that the groups on the central Si atoms of the R_4 moieties are folding back, most probably to relieve steric strain.

Notably, the increase in the average C(ring)-Si-R angles for the **R4** substituents in each compound correlates well with the sizes of the R groups. Thus, in compound **2** the \langle CSiO \rangle , \langle CSiMe \rangle , and \langle CSiBu \rangle angles are 106.1, 114.3, and 124.0° ((OSiMe), (OSiBu), and (MeSiBu) are 103.7, 105.4, and 101.3', respectively), while in compounds **3** and **4** the corresponding (CSiO), (CSiMe), and (CSiPh) bond angles are 110.6, 114.6, and 116.9° respectively (with (OSiMe), (OSiPh) and (MeSiPh) of 105.3, 103.5, and 104.8°). However, in compound 1 the \langle CSiBu \rangle [124.3°] is significantly larger than the (CSiMe) average angle [111.6'] but comparable to the corresponding angles in compound **2.** However, there is no difference in the (MeSiMe) and (MeSiBu) angles in compound **1.** In arriving at these angles, it should be noted that angle differences of up to 5.3° between comparable angles in compounds **3** or **4** due to the change in configuration of the

'Parameters with **an** asterisk were refined isotropically. Anisotropically refined atoms are given in the form of the isotropic equivalent thermal parameter defined as $({}^4/3){a^2B(1,1) + b^2B(2,2) + c^2B(3,3) + ab(cos\gamma)B(1,2) + ac(cos\beta)B(1,3) + bc(cos\alpha)B(2,3)}$. *Positional parameters $x, y, z \times 10^4$.

R4 substituent have been averaged while the maximum difference between corresponding angles of compounds **3** and 4 is much smaller [only 2.3°].

In the $\rm R_4$ substituents the average Si–Me bond lengths are 1.883, 1.877, and 1.878 Å in compounds 1, 2, and $\frac{3}{4}$, respectively. All of these values are significantly longer than the average Si-Me bond lengths in the $OSiMe₃$ substituents [1.859 *8,* **(l),** 1.858 *8,* **(2))** 1.849 *8,* **(3),** and 1.839 *A* (4)].

Likewise, the crowding of the tert-butyl groups in **1** and **2** is also reflected in the lengthening of the $Si-C(t-Bu)$ bonds to an average value of 1.965 **8,** and a compression

of the Me-C-Me bond angles (average value 107.4°). The Si-C-Me bond angles were also distorted with the difference between the maximum and minimum Si-C-Me angles ranging up to **13.2'** (supplementary material). Related distortions of other sterically crowded tert-butyl groups have been noted previously.20

The disiloxane moieties of 1,3-disilacyclobutanes **1-4** have bent configurations with the Si-O-Si bond angles

⁽²⁰⁾ For example: (a) Cheng, P.-T.; Nyburg, S. C.; Thankachan, C.; Tidwell, T. T. Angew. Chem., Int. Ed. Engl. 1977, 16, 654. (b) Cheng, P.-T.; Nyburg, S. C. Acta Crystallogr. 1978, B34, 3001.

Figure 2. Relationship between silicon-oxygen bond lengths and included Si-0-Si bond angles in the trimethylsiloxy groups of compounds **1-4.**

varying between 137° and 166°. Organodisiloxanes, in general, usually have either bent configurations with Si-0-Si angles between 140' and 160' or linear configurations, i.e. Si-0-Si angle of 180°.21 In the present compounds there is a correlation between the Si-0 bond lengths and the Si-0-Si bond angle (Figure **2).** Similar correlations have been commented upon elsewhere²¹ and have been treated theoretically.²²

In conclusion, the 1,3-disilacyclobutanes **1-4** are all very similar in structure with relatively planar central $Si₂C₂$ rings in which the Si-C bond lengths are significantly elongated. All four molecules are sterically crowded, and steric strains have been relieved or lessened by a variety of means including lengthening of various Si-0, Si-C, or C-C bonds and significant angle deformations at each Si or C atom or by changes in the SiOSi angles of the siloxy substituents.

Experimental Section

The preparations (by photolysis of the appropriate acylsilanes) isolation, purifications, and physical properties (melting points and NMR and MS spectra) of the four 1,3-disilacyclobutanes whose crystal structures are herein reported have been described in detail in the preceding paper.5 The correspondence between the compound numbering in the two papers is as follows: 1,3 disilacyclobutane **1** = dimer **9b;** 1,3-disilacyclobutane **2** = dimer **10b;** 1,3-disilacyclobutane **3** $(R, R \text{ or } S, S) = \text{dimer } 10e_1; 1,3-\text{d}$ silacyclobutane **4** $(R, S \text{ or } S, R) = \text{dimer 10e}_2.$

X-ray Crystallography. Crystals of compound **1** were sealed in 0.2-0.3 mm Lindemann capillaries **as** a precautionary measure; all other crystals were glued to thin fibers. Crystal data on all four compounds were obtained on an Enraf-Nonius CAD4 diffractometer by the use of graphite-monochromatized Mo K $\bar{\alpha}$ radiation $(\lambda = 0.71069 \text{ Å})$ at 298 K and are summarized in Table IV which also contains a summary of the intensity measurements and structure refinements undertaken. Lorentz and polarization corrections were applied to all data collected. For compounds **1-3** the intensity data sets were rescaled for the effects of slow systematic declines in the intensities of the standard reflections after each data reduction. No absorption corrections were considered necessary in view of the small size of μ (Mo Ka) for each compound. Averaging of symmetry equivalent reflections and the exclusion of systematically absent or zero F_o data gave the totals of nonzero data indicated in Table IV. All four structures were solved by the use of direct methods to locate the majority of the non-hydrogen atoms in each structure. Least-squares refinements minimizing $\sum w \Delta F^2$ and Fourier calculations then located the remaining atoms. Hydrogen atoms when included were located in ΔF maps or were placed in calculated positions with common temperature factors for each substituent group. Some disorder in the OSi(6)Me₃ group in compound 4 resulted in two alternative arrangements of the methyl positions. No hydrogen atoms were included for this group. Suitable weighting schemes were applied and blocked least-squares refinements eventually converged to the indicated final residuals. **As** noted in Table IV, the low $(\sin \theta)/\lambda$ data for compound 1 were considered unreliable possibly due to the overlap from adjacent reflections (profiles somewhat broad) and have been excluded in the final refinements.

For all four structures neutral atom scattering curves stored in the programs were originally taken from ref 23a. Computing was performed on PDP11/23 and Gould 9705 computers using programs in the SDP package and SHELX.23 The final atomic positional parameters for all four structures are given in Table V.

Acknowledgment. We are indebted to the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada for financial support of this research and for a scholarship for K.M.B.

Registry No. 1, 96760-17-7; **2,** 118243-25-7; **3,** 118015-90-0; **4,** 117959-28-1.

Supplementary Material Available: Tables of anisotropic thermal parameters, hydrogen atom positions, results of best molecular fits, and supplementary bond lengths and bond angles for compounds **1-4** (17 pages); listings of final structure factor amplitudes for compounds **1-4** (129 pages). Ordering information is given on any current masthead page.

⁽²¹⁾ Karle, I. L.; Karle, J. M.; Nielsen, C. J. *Acta Crystallogr.* **1986,** *(242,* 64.

⁽²²⁾ Newton, **M.** D. In *Structure and Bonding in Crystals;* O'Keefe, *M.,* Navrotsky, A., Eds.; Academic Press: New York, 1981; Vol. I, **p** 175.

^{(23) (}a) *International Tables for X-Ray Crystallography;* Kynoch Press: Birmingham (Present distributor D. Reidel, Dordrecht), 1974; Vol. IV. (b) Sheldrick, G. M. **SHELX,** Program for Crystal Structure Determination; University of Cambridge: Cambridge, England, 1976. (c) Frenz, B. A. *Enraf-Nonius Structure Determination Package;* Texas A&M University: College Station, TX, 1981.