Chemical Communications

Number 1 1985

Aconcaguine: An Isoquinoline-derived Alkaloid from Berberis actinacantha

Inge Weiss,* Alan J. Freyer,* Maurice Shamma,* and Alejandro Urzúab

^a Department of Chemistry, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pennsylvania 16802, U.S.A.

^b Departamento de Quimíca, Universidad de Santiago de Chile, Santiago 2, Chile

Chilean *Berberis actinacantha* Mart. ex Schult. (Berberidaceae) has yielded the novel alkaloid (+)-aconcaguine (2) which is probably derived from intradiol oxidative cleavage of ring A of magnoflorinemethine (1).

We have obtained from Chilean *Berberis actinacantha* Mart. ex Schult. (Berberidaceae), which had previously supplied chiloenamine (3),¹ the novel yellow amorphous base (\pm) aconcaguine (2). The molecular composition of aconcaguine, $C_{20}H_{23}NO_6$, makes it structurally isomeric with (3). Furthermore, the i.r. spectrum of (2) in the carbonyl region, $v_{max.}$ (CHCl₃) 1715 and 1745 cm⁻¹, was essentially superimposable on that of chiloenamine (3) while the complex u.v. spectrum indicated a highly conjugated system, and was also very similar to that for chiloenamine (3).†

The 360 MHz n.m.r. spectrum of aconcaguine in $CDCl_3$ is outlined around structure (2). The two pairs of aromatic doublets at δ 7.30 and 8.08, and at δ 7.41 and 7.51, pointed to a tetrasubstituted naphthalene skeleton. The dimethylamino moiety could be inferred from the 6-proton singlet at δ 2.18. Two *O*-methyl singlets were also in evidence, one due to a methyl ester at δ 3.56, and the other at lower field (δ 4.05) due to an aromatic OMe group.

The positions of the substituents around the naphthalene nucleus were confirmed by a detailed n.m.r. nuclear Overhauser enhancement (n.O.e.) difference study.² In particular, the two side chains must be proximate since irradiation of the methylene multiplet at δ 2.53 resulted in a 1.9% enhancement of the singlet at δ 3.12 due to the methylene protons adjacent to the ester carbonyl group.[†]

The ${}^{13}C$ n.m.r. spectrum of aconcaguine (2) was also obtained, and the carbon multiplicities were determined by the gated spin echo (GASPE) technique.³ Signals appearing above an arbitrary line arise from quaternary and methylene carbon atoms and are shown in structure (2A) with the chemical shift values underlined. On the other hand, signals

[†] Aconcaguine (2): λ_{max} (MeOH) 215, 267, 322, 335, and 384 nm (log ε 4.45, 4.42, 3.66, 3.64, and 3.68); *m/z* 373 (*M* ⁺; 6%), 342 (0.5), 315 (0.1), 301 (0.5), 300 (0.1), 242 (0.5), 227 (1), 213 (0.8), and 58 (100); n.O.e. values δ 2.53→3.12 (1.9%), 3.12→7.30 (6.1%), 7.30→8.08 (14.6%), 8.08→7.30 (14.1%), 8.08→7.51 (18.4%), 7.51→8.08 (19.4%), 4.05→7.41 (24.7%), and 7.41→4.05 (13.6%). 5 mg of (2) were obtained from 25 kg of dried twigs of *B. actinacantha* collected on Cerro Lo Curro, in Santiago, Chile. The quaternary aporphine (+)-magnoflorine is also abundantly present in the plant.





that are found below the arbitrary line are due to methine and methyl carbon atoms and are indicated with a bar over them. Chemical shifts with identical superscripts are interchangeable.

An important feature of the mass spectrum of aconcaguine (2) is that the molecular ion, m/z 373 (6%), is appreciably stronger than in chiloenamine (3), since loss of the CH₂NMe₂ moiety from the molecular ion of aconcaguine is not as favoured a process.

Aconcaguine (2) should be compared with the abovementioned chiloenamine (3),¹ with the well known taspine (4),⁴ and with the recently described santiagonamine (5),⁵ all of which are found among members of the Berberidaceae. These four alkaloids appear to be derived biogenetically from 1,2,10,11-tetraoxygenated aporphines. More specifically, aconcaguine (2) is probably the product of catechol dioxygenase intradiol cleavage of ring A of magnoflorinemethine (1), followed by lactonization.⁶

This research was supported by a grant from the National Science Foundation.

Received, 22nd August 1984; Com. 1208

References

- 1 M. Shamma, H.-Y. Lan, A. J. Freyer, J. E. Leet, A. Urzúa, and V. Fajardo, J. Chem. Soc., Chem. Commun., 1983, 799.
- 2 L. D. Hall and J. K. M. Sanders, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 1980, 102, 5703.
- 3 D. J. Cookson and B. E. Smith, Org. Magn. Reson., 1981 16, 111.
- 4 H. Guinaudeau, M. Leboeuf and A. Cavé, J. Nat. Prod., 1983, 46, 761.
- 5 E. Valencia, A. Patra, A. J. Freyer, M. Shamma and V. Fajardo, *Tetrahedron Lett.*, 1984, **25**, 3163.
- 6 M. Nozaki, Top. Curr. Chem., 1979, 78, 145.