42. Stereochemical Aspects of Acid-Catalyzed Cyclopropane Ring-Opening Reactions. A Stereospecific Pathway to Crinosterol and Brassicasterol

by Robert W. Lang and Carl Djerassi

Department of Chemistry, Stanford University, Stanford, California 94305

(6.XI.81)

Summary

It is shown that the acid-catalyzed ring-opening of the two diastereoisomeric 23,24-methylenecholesterols 3 and 5 on treatment with gaseous HCl in acetic acid leads stereospecifically to the naturally occurring crinosterol (4) and brassicasterol (6), respectively (Scheme 1). This isomerization can be viewed as a biomimetic model of an *in vivo* methylation process of the type already known in plant sterol metabolism (cf. cycloeucalenol \rightarrow obtusifoliol, $1 \rightarrow 2$). The synthetic application of this method provides a convenient labelling of sterol side chains for tracer experiments. The mechanistic features of the reaction with respect to its particular stereospecificity are discussed.

Introduction. – Are sterols containing a cyclopropane ring moiety metabolic dead ends or do they represent biosynthetic intermediates? This question has become relevant with the recent isolation of many such sterols [1]. Lederer originally postulated [2] that cyclopropanes may serve as intermediates for methyl groups through a biochemical reductive opening, but he rejected this consideration on the basis of negative experimental results. However in vivo C-alkylation by isomerization of a cyclopropane intermediate to a methylated product (with an additional double bond) has been shown experimentally to be operative in plant sterol metabolism [3]. Thus cycloeucalenol (1) seems to play a key role in the biosynthesis of phytosterols since enzymatic opening of the three-membered ring leads to the Δ^8 -isomer obtusifoliol (2) [4]. Therefore we considered the possibility of a similar enzymatic isomerization process occurring among cyclopropane-containing marine sterols [1].



Our studies in the marine sterol field [5] and the recent discovery of various steroidal cyclopropanes (petrosterol [6], calysterol [7], gorgosterol [8], 23-demethylgorgosterol [9], and 22, 23-methylenecholesterol [10]) prompted us to search for a possible biomimetic counterpart of such an enzymatic isomerization process. We recently published the results of our preliminary study in this direction [11]. The unique feature of having the cyclopropane ring in the side chain, which has been encountered only in marine, but not in terrestrial sterols, and which gives rise to much more conformational flexibility than nuclear cyclopropanes (*e.g.* 1) induced us to examine the degree of stereospecificity of any anticipated ring-openings. We now report the details of the acid-catalyzed ring-opening of the diastereoisomeric 23, 24-methylenecholesterols 3 and 5 (Scheme 1) which follows schematically the route $i \rightarrow iii$, and leads unequivocally to the naturally occurring sterols crinosterol (4) and brassicasterol (6). Additionally we draw conclusions about a possible mechanism which may explain the unexpected regio- and stereospecificity of this isomerization.



Results and discussion. – We previously reported [12] the synthesis of several model sterols containing diastereoisomerically pure, substituted three-membered rings in their side chain, of which the absolute configurations have been determined by either X-ray [13], spectroscopic (NMR.) and/or stereochemical correlations. Included were the synthesis and physical properties of the 23,24-methylene-cholesterol i-methyl ethers 7 and 14, which we used as starting materials for the subsequent isomerization experiments described herein. Acid-catalyzed ring-openings using gaseous HCl in polar solvents have proved to be useful for different applications in the terpene [14] [15] as well as in the steroid series [11] [15] [16]. Under the same conditions, the i-methyl ether protecting group may also be transformed into the 3β -chloro Δ^5 -system [13] [17]. Therefore we chose the i-methyl ethers as starting materials, since they represent an earlier precursor in the synthetic sequence compared to the corresponding acetates and free sterols.

To test the behavior of the Δ^5 -system under the reaction conditions, the three cholesterol derivatives **iv-vi** (*Table 1*) were treated with gaseous HCl in glacial acetic acid for several hours at RT. and under reflux. The results of these experiments which were evaluated by GC./MS. are summarized in *Table 1*. In spite of the fact that the acetate **v** gave the best results, the direct transformation of the i-methyl ether **vi** to the corresponding 3β -chloro derivative **viii** at or below RT. offered a good HPLC. separation of the expected, relatively non-polar products.

A 10^{-2} M solution of each of the i-methyl ethers 7 and 14 (Scheme 2) in glacial acetic acid was treated with gaseous HCl at RT. for 5 h, and the reaction monitored by GC. As expected, the starting material, 7 and 14, was transformed during

				Aco
		vii	vili	v
HO	RT.ª)	13	-	87
	rfl	23	12	65
Aco v	RT.	3	-	97
	rfl	23	11	66
UCH3	RT.	10	88	2
VI	rfl ^b)	15	55	30

 Table 1. Product analysis after treatment of three cholesterol derivatives (iv-vi) with gaseous HCl in acetic acid at RT. and under reflux (rfl) for 2 h

^a) After 3 h no starting material detected.

b) Product analysis after 3 h.



a fast initial reaction step (30-45 min) into the corresponding 3β -chloro derivatives 8 and 15. The side chain cyclopropane moiety in the initial products 8 and 15 could easily be recognized by GC./MS. analysis, because of the two diagnostic fragments at m/z 360 and 346 [12] ($M - C_4H_8$ and $M - C_5H_{10}$ respectively). In a subsequent slow reaction process, the GC. peak of the initial 3β -chloro steroidal cyclopropane diminishes in favor of an increasing peak with a somewhat shorter retention time but with the same mass spectral molecular ion as 8 and 15 respectively. Therefore we reran the whole experiment on a preparative scale and subjected the product mixture to separation by reverse-phase HPLC. The separation records of both ring-opening reactions starting from either diastereoisomeric steroidal cyclopropane 7 or 14 (Scheme 2) are reproduced in Figure 1. Owing to their spectroscopic properties (MS. and ¹H-NMR. spectra, see experimental part) the isolated HPLC. fractions (Fig. 1) can be divided into three categories. The first contains the anticipated 'true' isomers with an olefinic side chain (retention time $(t_R) \ge 160$ min), the second deals with the products which originate from HCl addition (t_R 120-160 min), and the third corresponds to the steroids with an acetoxylated side chain ($t_R 60-90 \text{ min}$).

Considering the isolated products starting from the i-methyl ether 7 (23 R, 24 S), the only 'true' isomer detectable in the reaction mixture (67% yield) is the crinosterol derivative 9 (22 E, 24 S). Its structural assignment could easily be done by comparison of the NMR. data with those of the well known crinosterol (4) and its acetate 23 (see *Table 2*). Definite constitutional assignment to the three chlorinated products 10-12 (all with molecular ions of m/z 452) was not feasible owing to some uncertainty because of the absence of reference data. Nevertheless we report their spectroscopic properties for completeness and emphasize that 3β -crinosteryl chloride (9) is the only 'true' isomer. More reliable, however, is the structure elucidation of the solely acetoxylated compound 13. Its MS. – after loss of acetic acid – is identical with that of 9 and the complexity of the signal at 5.137 ppm (H-C(23)) in its ¹H-NMR. spectrum is consistent with the presence of three coupling partners, thus confirming the 23 position of the acetoxy group. In view of the correlation with crinosterol and the mechanistic considerations (vide infra), the

absolute configuration of 13 at both chiral centers 23 and 24 has to be S as indicated in *Figure 1a*.

On the assumption that the acid-catalyzed ring-opening starting from the diastereoisomeric i-methyl ether 14 (23 S, 24 R) should supply the C(24)-epimer of 9, we assign the anticipated 3β -brassicasteryl chloride structure (16) to the first fraction (HPLC./t_R 185 min) of all isolated material (71%) as shown in Figure 1b and Table 2. In addition, an unexpected second 'true' isomer with a somewhat shorter HPLC. retention time (168 min) showed up as 17 (22 E) (16/17 = 4:1). Except for the latter's missing peak at m/z 373 $(M-C_3H_7)$, the mass spectrum of both isomers 16 and 17 are almost superimposable, thus indicating that the position of the side chain double bond is the same. Its (E)-configuration is based on the ¹H-NMR. data. Comparison of the ¹H-NMR. spectra of 16 and 17 shows that a methyl group signal is missing in the spectrum of 17. Therefore, we conclude that the side chain of 17 is homologous to that of 22-dehydrocholesterol. Indeed the side chain methyl group chemical shifts for both compound 17 and 22-dehydrocholesterol [18] are quite similar. As far as the products 18-20 are concerned (Fig. 1b), they all show M^+ 452 in their MS. (see Exper. Part), but further constitutional assignments are related to the problems mentioned above for their isomeric counterparts (Fig. 1a). The spectroscopic properties of the shortest retention time fraction (Fig. 1b) and the mechanistic considerations (vide infra) require that the acetoxy 3β -chloro derivative 21 must be the (23R, 24R)-diastereoisomer of 13 (23S, 24S).

Since the isomerization of steroidal cyclopropanes might provide some preparative utility for the synthesis of specifically labelled material, we applied the same conditions to the corresponding acetates 22 and 28 (Scheme 3). In spite of



Fig. 1. HPLC. of the reaction mixtures starting from a) 7 (23R, 24S) \rightarrow 9-13 and b) 14 (23S, 24R) \rightarrow 16-21

Crinosterol derivatives	9	23	4	
(22E, 24S)	3β -chloro	3β -acetoxy ^b)	3β -hydroxy ^c)	
1 H-C(6)	5.368	5.375	5.349	
2 H - C(22, 23)	5.158	5.160	5.162	
1 H - C(3)	3.77	4.60	3,53	
3 H - C(19)	1.028	1.019	1.010	
3 H-C(21)	1.000 (6.63)	1.002 (6.68)	1.001 (6.20)	
3 H - C(28)	0.910 (6.84)	0.909 (6.78)	0.910 (6.86)	
6 H-C(26,27)	0.834 (6.61)	0.835 (6.52)	0.836 (6.45)	
	0.816 (6.66)	0.817 (6.63)	0.817 (6.62)	
3 H-C(18)	0.689	0.690	0.693	
Brassicasterol derivatives	16	29	6	
(22E, 24R)	3β -chloro	3β -acetoxy ^b)	3β-hydroxy ^b)	
1 H-C(6)	5.368	5.372	5.348	
2 H - C(22, 23)	5.179	5.181	5.181	
1 H - C(3)	3.77	4.60	3.53	
3 H-C(19)	1.028	1.020	1.010	
3 H - C(21)	1.009 (6.61)	1.011 (6.49)	1.011 (6.34)	
3 H-C(28)	0.909 (6.81)	0.910 (6.80)	0.910 (6.84)	
6 H-C(26,27)	0.834 (5.81)	0.834 (6.5)	0.834 (6.10)	
	0.817 (6.54)	0.818 (6.5)	0.817 (6.22)	
3 H-C(18)	0.689	0.690	0.693	
^a) Given as δ values, (J) valu	es in Hz. b) See Exper. H	Part and [18]. °) See Exper. Pa	urt and [19].	

Table 2. Selected¹ H-NMR. (360 MHz, CDCl₃) chemical shifts^a)

focusing primarily on the 'true' isomers 23, 29 and 30, we separated all by-products which were accessible by reverse-phase HPLC. The spectroscopic properties of the isolated compounds 23-27 and 29-34 (see *Exper. Part*) are in complete agreement with the above reported results in the 3β -chloro series. The yields of the analytically pure acetates of crinosterol 23, brassicasterol 29 and the 22-dehydrocholesterol homolog 30 were 41%, 24% and 6%, respectively. Treatment of each acetate with lithium aluminium hydride provided the free sterols 4, 6 and 35 (Scheme 3).



^a) HCl (gas)/HOAc; RT., 5 h.

Mechanistic considerations. - The remarkable regio- and stereospecific course of the above described acid-catalyzed cyclopropane-alkene isomerization merits some mechanistic consideration. Except for the thermally induced cyclopropanepropene isomerization, which seems to follow a concerted reaction pathway [20], practically no attention has been paid to the mechanistic features of olefin generation by electrophilic cyclopropane ring-opening. This may be due to the fact that the competition against nucleophilic attack on the initially generated carbonium ion under the present conditions is usually low; the olefinic 'by-products' in the hitherto published investigations [21] [22] are deliberately neglected. However as mentioned in the introduction, some interesting applications of such isomerization reactions are known, especially in natural product chemistry. Concerning the in vivo isomerization of $1 \rightarrow 2$, which shows an unequivocal stereoselectivity in proton abstraction by chosing only one out of six possibilities, we note that with respect to the breaking cyclopropane bond, the only H-atom with a somewhat syn-periplanar arrangement (position 8 of cycloeucalenol (1)) is lost to form the 8(9)-double bond of obtusifoliol (2). Indeed, such a formal syn-elimination process - referring to the concerted fission of the cyclopropane C, C- and the adjacent C, H-bond would also best explain our own observations about the electrophilic 23,24methylenecholesterol cleavage. The fact that the only detectable olefins, which arise from a Markovnikov cleavage of the three-membered ring are crinosterol (4) and brassicasterol (6), strongly supports such a concerted, stereospecific olefin generation step. Based on this conclusion, any addition/elimination mechanism, which immediately would lead to other isomers, such as for example the Δ^{23} -analog, can be excluded. Even the occurrence of the homolog 35, which accompanies brassicasterol (6), does not affect the accuracy of this statement, because this isomer results from an exceptional [23] anti-Markovnikov cleavage of the cyclopropane ring. Assuming the concerted C, C-bond fission/H-elimination to be correct, the initial protonation of the three-membered ring becomes the rate-determining step. This is consistent with the hitherto accepted mechanistic considerations about electrophilic cyclopropane ring-openings [21]. While these conclusions may explain



the stereochemistry of the isomerization process, what is the answer to the unparalleled regiospecificity in our cyclopropanes which are capable of a fair degree of conformational flexibility? We attribute this to an unsymmetrically protonated three-membered ring [22] [24], which may be due to steric hindrance and which is especially notable in the case yielding the two isomeric compounds **6** and **35**. We summarize in *Scheme 4* all these mechanistic considerations, which may explain the reported cyclopropane-alkene isomerization. The absolute configurations which we assigned to the only detectable steroids having an acetoxylated side chain (*Fig. 1*) are based on the fact, that nucleophilic attack onto a protonated cyclopropane predominantly occurs under the present conditions with inversion of configuration [21].

Financial support by the *National Institutes of Health* (Grants No. GM-06840 and AM-04257) is gratefully acknowledged. In addition we thank Ms. *A. Wegmann* for mass spectral measurements and Dr. *L.J. Durham* for the 360-MHz NMR. spectra which were obtained at the Stanford NMR. facility funded by *NIH* Grant No. RR-0711 and *NSF* Grant No. GP-23633. We are especially indebted to Dr. *W.C. M.C. Kokke* for assistance in the HPLC. separations. *R.W.L.* thanks the *Schweizerischer Nationalfonds zur Förderung der Wissenschaftlichen Forschung* for a postdoctoral fellowship.

Experimental Part

General. Conditions and equipment used for the physical measurements in the synthetic section were those described in [12]. ¹H-NMR. (360 MHz): chemical shifts are given in ppm (TMS.) and coupling constants (J) in Hz. MS.: fragments (m/z) are given with relative intensity in parentheses. For scparation of the mixtures (cf. Fig. 1), high-performance liquid chromatography (HPLC. retention time=t_R) was carried out by using two Altex UltrasphereTM ODS. columns 5 µm (10 mm i.d.×25 cm) in series and abs. methanol as the mobile phase. The synthesis and the spectroscopic properties of the steroidal cyclopropanes 3 and 5 as well as of the i-methyl ethers 7 and 14 are described in [12].

Regeneration of the 3β -hydroxy- Δ^5 -system from the 3β -acetoxy- Δ^5 -system was accomplished generally by treatment of 5 mg of the acetate in 5 ml of dry ether with a 4-fold excess of LiAlH₄ at RT. for 30 min. The excess of the reagent was decomposed with saturated Na₂SO₄-solution, and after dilution with water, the free sterol was extracted with ether, dried (MgSO₄) and recrystallized from methanol after evaporation.

General procedure for the treatment of steroidal cyclopropanes with gaseous HCl in acetic acid. – The flexible part of the glass apparatus (gas connections) is constructed with teflon tubes. A silicon oil gas-bubbler for the HCl-stream monitoring (4-5 bubbles/s) is inserted. In a typical preparative run, 0.15 mmol of the steroidal cyclopropane were dissolved in 15 ml of glacial acetic acid (reagent grade) and treated with gaseous HCl (*Liquid Carbonic Corp.*, Chicage, Ill.) under constant stirring for 5 h at RT. The reaction was monitored by GC. (OV-17). Work-up was effected by dilution with water and extraction with ether. The organic layer was washed carefully with saturated NaHCO₃-solution, brine and water, dried (MgSO₄) and evaporated in a rotary evaporator. After filtration over silica gel (hexane/ethyl acetate 1:1) the reaction mixture was separated by HPLC.

Reaction of 7 with HCl in acetic acid. – The i-methyl ether 7 (55.0 mg, 0.133 mmol) was treated as described above. The reaction mixture was separated by HPLC. (*Fig. 1a*). Five fractions 9-13 in a ratio 45:15:10:10:20 yielding together 67% were collected.

Fraction 1 ((22E, 24S)-3 β -Crinosteryl chloride, **9**). M.p. 112-116° (MeOH); HPLC.: t_R 180 min. – ¹H-NMR.: 5.368 (*m*, 1H, H–C(6)); 5.158 (*m*, 2 H, H–C(22) and H–C(23)); 3.77 (*m*, 1H, H_a–C(3)); 1.028 (*s*, 3 H, H₃C(19)); 1.000 (*d*, J=6.63, 3 H, H₃C(21)); 1.910 (*d*, J=6.84, 3 H, H₃C(28)); 0.834 (*d*, J=6.61, 3 H) and 0.816 (*d*, J=6.66, 3 H), H₃C(26) and H₃C(27)); 0.689 (*s*, 3 H, H₃C(18)). – HRMS.: 416.3220 (86, M^+ , Calc. for C₂₈H₄₅Cl 416.3207); 401.2965 (10, C₂₇H₄₂Cl, M–CH₃); 380.3456 (6, C₂₈H₄₄, M–HCl); 373.2708 (15, C₂₅H₃₈Cl, M–C₃H₇); 332.2280 (10, C₂₂H₃₃Cl, M–C₆H₁₂);

318.2127 (67, $C_{21}H_{31}Cl$); 303.1881 (15, $C_{20}H_{28}Cl$); 291.1836 (58, $C_{19}H_{28}Cl$); 289.1729 (54, $C_{19}H_{26}Cl$); 276.1642 (17, $C_{18}H_{25}Cl$); 255.2108 (8, $C_{19}H_{27}$); 251.1499 (6, $C_{16}H_{24}Cl$); 249.1393 (12, $C_{16}H_{22}Cl$); 69.0702 (100, $C_{5}H_{9}$).

Fraction 2 (10). M.p. 135-138° (MeOH); HPLC.: t_R 156 min. - ¹H-NMR.: 5.373 (*m*, 1H, H-C(6)); 4.112 (*m*, 1H, CHCl); 3.77 (*m*, 1H, H_a-C(3)); 1.032 (*s*, 3 H, H₃C(19)); 0.942 (*d*, J = 7, 3 H, H₃C(21)); 0.922 (*d*, J = 6.97, 3 H, H₃C(28)); 0.910 (*d*, J = 6.88, 3 H) and 0.864 (*d*, J = 6.70, 3 H) H₃C(26) and H₃C(27)); 0.724 (*s*, 3 H, H₃C(18)). - MS.: 452 (44, M^+), 437 (8, M-CH₃), 416 (20, M-HCl), 401 (5). 380 (6, M - 2 HCl), 349 (12), 332 (12), 323 (24), 318 (36), 303 (12), 291 (86), 289 (40), 276 (10), 264 (18), 255 (16), 251 (40), 249 (100), 235 (18), 213 (28).

Fraction 3 (11). M.p. 123-130° (MeOH); HPLC.: t_R 147 min. - ¹H-NMR.: 5.370 (*m*, 1H, H-C(6)); 4.358 (*m*, 1H, CHCl); 3.77 (*m*, 1H, H_a -C(3)); 1.028 (*s*, 3 H, H₃C(19)); 0.955 (*d*, J=6.46, 3 H, H₃C(21)); 0.945 (*d*, J=6.50, 3 H, H₃C(28)); 0.945 (*d*, J=6.50, 3 H, H₃C(28)); 0.945 (*d*, J=6.50, 3 H, H₃C(28)); 0.945 (*d*, J=6.50, 3 H, H₃C(27)); 0.688 (*s*, 3 H, H₃C(18)). - MS.: 452 (20, M^+), 437 (3, M-CH₃), 416 (20, M-HCl), 401 (4), 380 (10, M-2 HCl), 349 (5), 332 (55), 319 (36), 313 (42), 303 (6), 291 (60), 289 (100), 276 (6), 264 (15), 255 (13), 251 (36), 249 (85), 235 (18), 213 (33).

Fraction 4 (12). HPLC.: t_R 133 min. - ¹H-NMR.: 5.369 (*m*, 1H, H-C(6)); 4.013 (*m*, 1H, CHCl); 3.77 (*m*, 1H, H_a -C(3)); 1.027 (*s*, 3 H, H_3 C(19)); 0.962 (*d*, J = 6.25, 3 H, H_3 C(21)); 0.910 (*d*, J = 6.54, 3 H) and 0.892 (*d*, J = 6.54, 3 H, H_3 C(26) and H_3 C(27)); 0.691 (*s*, 3 H, H_3 C(18)). - MS.: 452 (53, M^+), 437 (12, M-CH₃), 416 (12, M-HCl), 401 (5), 380 (11, M-2 HCl), 349 (16), 323 (31), 318 (21), 303 (5), 291 (89), 289 (45), 277 (7), 264 (34), 255 (30), 251 (70), 249 (100), 235 (28), 213 (55).

Fraction 5 ((23S, 24S)-23-Acetoxy-3 β -chloro-24-methylcholest-5-ene, **13**). M.p. 144-148° (MeOH); HPLC.: t_R 78 min. - ¹H-NMR.: 5.366 (*m*, 1H, H-C(6)); 5.137 (*m*, 1H, H-C(23)); 3.77 (*m*, 1H, H₄-C(3)); 2.004 (*s*, 3 H, COCH₃); 1.025 (*s*, 3 H, H₃C(19)); 0.981 (*d*, J=6.41, 3 H, H₃C(21)); 0.904 (*d*, J=6.91, 3 H, H₃C(28)); 0.885 (*d*, J=6.89, 3 H) and 0.881 (*d*, J=6.95, 3 H, H₃C(26) and H₃C(27)); 0.679 (*s*, 3 H, H₃C(18)). - MS.: 476 (not detectable, M^+), 440 (3, M-HCl), 416 (67, M-HOAc), 401 (12, 416-CH₃), 380 (4), 373 (4), 332 (20), 318 (100), 303 (29), 289 (70), 276 (26), 264 (18), 249 (53), 235 (15), 233 (14), 213 (28).

Reaction of 14 with HCl in acetic acid. – The i-methyl ether **14** (55.0 mg, 0.133 mmol) was treated as described above. The mixture was separated by HPLC. (*Fig. 1b*). Six fractions **16–21** in a ratio 27:9:14:12:14:24 yielding together 71% were collected.

*Fraction 1 ((22*E, 24R)-3β-Brassicasteryl chloride, **16**). M.p. 134° (MeOH); HPLC.: t_R 185 min. – ¹H-NMR.: 5.368 (*m*, 1H, H–C(6)); 5.179 (*m*, 2 H, H–C(22) and H–C(23)); 3.77 (*m*, 1H, H_a–C(3)); 1.028 (*s*. 3 H, H₃C(19)); 1.009 (*d*, *J*=6.61, 3 H, H₃C(21)); 0.909 (*d*, *J*=6.81, 3 H, H₃C(28)); 0.834 (*d*, *J*=5.81, 3 H) and 0.817 (*d*, *J*=6.54, 3 H, H₃C(26) and H₃C(27)); 0.689 (*s*, 3 H, H₃C(18)). – HRMS.: 416.3181 (81, *M*⁺, Calc. for C₂₈H₄₅Cl 416.3207); 401.2967 (9, C₂₇H₄₂Cl, *M*–CH₃); 380.3432 (12, C₂₈H₄₄, *M*–HCl); 373.2680 (13, C₂₅H₃₈Cl, *M*–C₃H₇); 332.2263 (13, C₂₂H₃₃Cl, *M*–C₆H₁₂); 318.2121 (55, C₂₁H₃₁Cl); 303.1879 (14, C₂₀H₂₈Cl); 291.1825 (53, C₁₉H₂₈Cl); 289.1719 (51, C₁₉H₂₆Cl); 276.1648 (15, C₁₈H₂₅Cl); 255.2097 (7, C₁₉H₂₇); 251.1374 (3, C₁₆H₂₄Cl); 249.1372 (11, C₁₆H₂₂Cl); 69.0706 (100, C₅H₉).

Fraction 2 ((22E)-3 β -Chloro-23-homocholesta-5,22-diene, **17**). M.p. 130–132° (MeOH); HPLC.: t_R 168 min. - ¹H-NMR.: 5.367 (*m*, 1H, H-C(6)); 5.245 (*m*, 2 H, H-C(22) and H-C(23)); 1.027 (*s*, 3 H, H₃C(19)); 0.997 (*d*, J = 6.62, 3 H, H₃C(21)); 0.865 (*d*, J = 6.55, 3 H) and 0.862 (*d*, J = 6.68, 3 H, H₃C(26) and H₃C(27)); 0.689 (*s*, 3 H, H₃C(18)). - HRMS.: 416.3287 (64, M^+ , Calc. for C₂₈H₄₅Cl 416.3207); 401.2922 (13, C₂₇H₄₂Cl, M-CH₃); 380.3464 (9, C₂₈H₄₄, M-HCl); 318.2086 (81, C₂₁H₃₁Cl); 291.1840 (61, C₁₉H₂₈Cl); 289.1711 (36, C₁₉H₂₆Cl); 276.1638 (12, C₁₈H₂₅Cl); 255.2121 (9, C₁₉H₂₇); 249.1352 (12, C₁₆H₂₂Cl); 69.0703 (100, C₅H₉).

Fraction 3 (18). M.p. 137–140° (MeOH); HPLC.: t_R 154 min. – ¹H-NMR.: 5.371 (*m*, 1H, H–C(6)); 4.18 (*m*, 1H, CHCl); 3.77 (*m*, 1H, H_a –C(3)); 1.030 (*s*, 3 H, H₃C(19)); 0.951 (*d*, J=6.61, 3 H, H₃C(21)); 0.951 (*d*, J=6.61, 3 H, H₃C(28)); 0.947 (*d*, J=6.32, 3 H) and 0.888 (*d*, J=6.75, 3 H, H₃C(26) and H₃C(27)); 0.720 (*s*, 3 H, H₃C(18)). – MS.: 452 (46, M^+), 437 (7, M–CH₃), 416 (12, M–HCl), 401 (4), 380 (14), 349 (11), 332 (4), 325 (15), 323 (12), 318 (30), 303 (12), 291 (86), 289 (30), 276 (8), 264 (10), 255 (13), 251 (18), 249 (100), 235 (14), 213 (16).

Fraction 4 (19). HPLC.: t_R 140 min. - MS.: 452 (25, M^+), 437 (6, $M - CH_3$), 416 (3, M - HCl), 401 (2), 380 (1), 349 (6), 332 (3), 323 (10), 318 (8), 303 (5), 291 (34), 289 (17), 277 (6), 265 (15), 251 (35), 249 (100), 235 (12), 219 (8), 213 (18).

Fraction 5 (20). M.p. 136–142° (MeOH); HPLC.: t_R 134 min. – ¹H-NMR.: 5.369 (*m*, 1H, H–C(6)); 3.94 (*m*, 1H, CHCl); 3.77 (*m*, 1H, H_a–C(3)); 1.030 (*s*, 3 H, H₃C(19)); 0.935 (*d*, J=6.28, 3 H, H₃C(21)); 0.896 (*d*, J=6.52, 3 H) and 0.887 (*d*, J=6.54, 3 H, H₃C(26) and H₃C(27)); 0.718 (*s*, 3 H, H₃C(18)). – MS.: 452 (47, M⁺), 437 (13, M–CH₃), 416 (6, M–HCl), 401 (4), 380 (2), 349 (13), 323 (25), 303 (2), 291 (51), 277 (5), 264 (27), 251 (42), 249 (100), 235 (20), 213 (25).

Fraction 6 ((23 R, 24 R)-23-Acetoxy-3β-chloro-24-methylcholest-5-ene, **21**). M.p. 116-117° (MeOH); HPLC.: t_R 77 min. - ¹H-NMR.: 5.372 (m, 1H, H-C(6)); 5.086 (m, 1H, H-C(23)); 3.77 (m, 1H, H_a-C(3)); 2.039 (s, 3 H, COCH₃); 1.024 (s, 3 H, H₃C(19)); 0.955 (d, J=6.93, 3 H, H₃C(21)); 0.928 (d, J=6.78, 3 H, H₃C(28)); 0.820 (d, J=6.73, 3 H) and 0.813 (d, J=6.93, 3 H, H₃C(26) and H₃C(27)); 0.658 (s, 3 H, H₃C(18)). - MS.: 476 (not detectable, M^+), 440 (3, M-HCl), 416 (81, M-HOAc), 401 (9, 416-CH₃), 380 (3), 373 (4), 332 (30), 318 (100), 303 (14), 289 (88), 276 (28), 264 (18), 249 (50), 235 (18), 233 (18), 213 (25).

(23R, 24S)-3β-Acetoxy-23, 24-methylenecholest-5-ene (22). Transformation of the i-methyl ether 7 into the anticipated acetate was accomplished by using zinc acetate in acetic acid [25]. Usual workup and recrystallization from hot methanol yielded 90% of analytically pure 22; m.p. 165-166° (MeOH); HPLC.: t_R 126 min. - ¹H-NMR.: 5.38 (m, 1H, H-C(6)); 4.60 (m, 1H, H_a-C(3)); 2.033 (s, 3 H, COCH₃); 1.020 (s, 3 H, H₃C(19)); 1.011 (d, J=6.48, 3 H) and 0.986 (d, J=6.22, 3 H, H₃C(26) and H₃C(27)); 0.948 (d, J=6.19, 3 H, H₃C(21)); 0.694 (s, 3 H, H₃C(18)); 0.55 (d×d×d, J=5, 8.5 and 8.5, 1H, H-C(28)); 0.44 (d×d×d×d, J=5.5, 8.5, 8.5 and 8.5, 1H, H-C(24)); -0.33 (d×d×d, J=5, 5 and 5, 1H, H-C(28)). - HRMS.: 440 (not detectable, M⁺); 380.3440 (100, M-HOAc, Calc. for C₂₈H₄₄ 380.3443); 365.3207 (6, C₂₇H₄₁, 380-CH₃); 324.2819 (4, C₂₄H₃₆, 380-C₄H₈); 310.2633 (2, C₂₃H₃₄, 380-C₅H₁₀); 283.2438 (3, C₂₁H₃₁); 259.2416 (3, C₁₉H₃₁); 255.2102 (6, C₁₉H₂₇); 253.1947 (6, C₁₉H₂₅); 213.1651 (5, C₁₆H₂₁).

Reaction of 22 with HCl in acetic acid. – The acetate **22** (40.0 mg, 0.09 mmol) was treated in the usual way. Separation of the reaction mixture by HPLC. gave 5 fractions (**23-27**) in a ratio 42:9:15:23:11, whereby the isolated yield of the main product **23** (fraction 1) was 41%.

Fraction 1 ((22E, 24S)-3β-Crinosteryl acetate, **23**). M.p. 148–150° (MeOH); HPLC.: t_R 112 min. – ¹H-NMR.: 5.375 (*m*, 1 H, H–C(6)); 5.160 (*m*, 2 H, H–C(22) and H–C(23)); 4.601 (*m*, 1 H, H_a–C(3)); 2.033 (*s*, 3 H, COCH₃); 1.019 (*s*, 3 H, H₃C(19)); 1.002 (*d*, J=6.68, 3 H, H₃C(21)); 0.909 (*d*, J=6.78, 3 H, H₃C(28)); 0.835 (*d*, J=6.52, 3 H) and 0.817 (*d*, J=6.63, 3 H, H₃C(26) and H₃C(27)); 0.690 (*s*, H₃C(18)). – HRMS.: 440 (not detectable, M^+); 380.3420 (100, M–HOAc, Calc. for C₂₈H₄₄ 380.3443); 365.3189 (5, C₂₇H₄₁, 380–CH₃); 337.2897 (4, C₂₅H₃₇, 380–C₃H₇); 295.2459 (1, C₂₂H₃₁); 282.2334 (5, C₂₁H₃₀); 272.2532 (2, C₂₀H₃₂); 267.2118 (1, C₂₀H₂₇); 259.2447 (2, C₁₉H₃₁); 255.2126 (27, C₁₉H₂₇); 253.1972 (6, C₁₉H₂₅); 228.1883 (5, C₁₇H₂₄); 213.1646 (5, C₁₆H₂₁); 201.1630 (2, C₁₅H₂₁).

Fraction 2 (24). M.p. 134–138° (MeOH); HPLC.: t_R 99 min. – MS.: 476 (not detectable, M^+), 416 (100, M–HOAc), 401 (12, 416–CH₃), 380 (18, 416–HCl), 365 (2, 416–CH₃–HCl), 308 (16), 295 (14), 283 (10), 267 (2), 259 (10), 255 (36), 241 (3), 239 (2), 228 (8), 213 (27), 201 (6).

Fraction 3 (25). M.p. 123-125° (MeOH); HPLC.: t_R 95 min. - MS.: 476 (not detectable, M^+); 416 (100, M-HOAc), 401 (10, 416-CH₃), 380 (80, 416-HCl), 365 (6, 416-CH₃-HCl), 308 (15), 296 (45), 283 (25), 281 (18), 267 (5), 259 (15), 255 (50), 253 (47), 241 (3), 239 (3), 213 (45), 201 (15).

Fraction 4 (26). M.p. 122-124° (MeOH); HPLC.: t_R 86 min. – MS.: 476 (4, M^+), 416 (60, M–HOAc), 401 (4, 416–CH₃), 380 (100, 416–HCl), 365 (10, 416–CH₃–HCl), 349 (8), 337 (10), 313 (11), 308 (15), 295 (15), 282 (20), 267 (10), 255 (98), 253 (40), 241 (6), 239 (5), 228 (18), 213 (50), 201 (15).

Fraction 5 ((23S, 24S)-3 β , 23-Diacetoxy-24-methylcholest-5-ene, **27**). HPLC.: t_R 49 min. - ¹H-NMR.: 5.38 (m, 1H, H-C(6)); 5.14 (m, 1H, H-C(23)); 4.60 (m, 1H, H_a-C(3)); 2.031 (s, 3 H) and 2.006 (s, 3 H, 2 COCH₃); 1.017 (s, 3 H, H₃C(19)); 0.983 (d, J=6.35, 3 H, H₃C(21)); 0.906 (d, J=7, 3 H, H₃C(28)); 0.885 (d, J=7, 3 H) and 0.881 (d, J=7, 3 H, H₃C(26) and H₃C(27)); 0.681 (s, 3 H, H₃C(18)). - MS.: 500 (not detectable, M^+), 440 (100, M-HOAc), 425 (1, 440-CH₃), 380 (15, M-2 HOAc), 365 (10, 380-CH₃), 337 (1), 326 (5), 309 (2), 296 (3), 282 (12), 272 (10), 267 (7), 259 (15), 255 (18), 253 (30), 228 (15), 213 (25), 211 (12), 201 (10).

(23S, 24R)-3 β -Acetoxy-23, 24-methylenecholest-5-ene (28). The i-methyl ether protecting group was converted into the 3β -acetoxy- Δ^5 system as mentioned above ($7 \rightarrow 22$). Usual workup and recrystallization from hot methanol yielded 76% of analytical pure 28; m.p. 130-132° (MeOH). - ¹H-NMR.: 5.38 (m, 1H, H-C(6)); 4.60 (m, 1H, H_a-C(3)); 2.031 (s, 3 H, COCH₃); 1.037 (d, J=6.55, 3 H) and

0.988 (d, J = 5.10, 3 H, H₃C(26) and H₃C(27)); 1.020 (s, 3 H, H₃C(19)); 0.975 (d, J = 5.93, 3 H, H₃C(21)); 0.80 (m, 1H, H-C(23)); 0.693 (s, 3 H, H₃C(18)); ca. 0.61 ($d \times d \times d$, 1H, H-C(28)); 0.36 ($d \times d \times d \times d$, J = 5.5, 8.5, 8.5 and 8.5, 1H, H-C(24)); -0.26 ($d \times d \times d$, J = 5.5 and 5, 1H, H-C(28)); -0.26 ($d \times d \times d$, J = 5.5 and 5, 1H, H-C(28)); -0.26 ($d \times d \times d$, J = 5.5 and 5, 1H, H-C(28)); -0.26 ($d \times d \times d$, J = 5.5 and 5, 1H, H-C(28)); -0.26 ($d \times d \times d$, J = 5.5 and 5, 1H, H-C(28)); -0.26 ($d \times d \times d$, J = 5.5 and 5, 1H, H-C(28)). - HRMS.: 440 (not detectable, M^+); 380.3453 (100, M - HOAc, Calc. for C₂₈H₄₄ 380.3443); 365.3274 (6, C₂₇H₄₁, 380-CH₃); 324.2814 (4, C₂₄H₃₆, 380-C₄H₈); 310.2641 (2, C₂₃H₃₄, 380-C₅H₁₀); 283.2426 (3, C₂₁H₃₁); 259.2420 (3, C₁₉H₃₁); 255.2143 (5, C₁₉H₂₇); 253.1965 (7, C₁₉H₂₅); 213.1642 (6, C₁₆H₂₁).

Reaction of 28 with HCl in acetic acid. – Treatment of the acetate **28** (20.0 mg, 0.045 mmol) in the usual way and separation of the mixture by HPLC. gave 6 fractions (**29**–**34**) in a ratio 25:7:13:15:17:23. The two products with olefinic side chains (fractions 1 and 2) together amounted to 30%.

Fraction 1 ((22E, 24R)-3β-Brassicasteryl acetate, **29**). M.p. 152–154° (MeOH); HPLC.: t_R 118 min. – ¹H-NMR.: 5.372 (*m*, 1H, H–C(6)); 5.181 (*m*, 2 H, H–C(22) and H–C(23)); 4.60 (*m*, 1H, H–C(3)); 2.032 (*s*, 3 H, COCH₃); 1.020 (*s*, 3 H, H₃C(19)); 1.011 (*d*, J=6.49, 3 H, H₃C(21)); 0.910 (*d*, J=6.80, 3 H, H₃C(28)); 0.834 (*d*, J=6.5, 3 H) and 0.818 (*d*, J=6.5, 3 H, H₃C(26) and H₃C(27)); 0.690 (*s*, 3 H, H₃C(18)). – HRMS.: 440 (not detectable, M^+); 380.3452 (100, M–HOAc, Calc. for C₂₈H₄₄ 380.3443); 365.3156 (6, C₂₇H₄₁, 380–CH₃); 337.2893 (3, C₂₅H₃₇, 380–C₃H₇); 295.2420 (1, C₂₂H₃₁); 282.2357 (6, C₂₁H₃₀); 272.2499 (2, C₂₀H₃₂); 267.2117 (1, C₂₀H₂₇); 259.2438 (2, C₁₉H₃₁), 255.2111 (28, C₁₉H₃₇); 253.1946 (7, C₁₉H₂₅), 228.1883 (5, C₁₇H₂₄); 213.1652 (6, C₁₆H₂₁); 201.1627 (3, C₁₅H₂₁).

Fraction 2 ((22E)-3 β -Acetoxy-23-homocholesta-5, 22-diene, **30**). M.p. 148-150° (MeOH); HPLC.: t_R 113 min. - ¹H-NMR.: 5.372 (*m*, 1H, H-C(6)); 5.249 (*m*, 2 H, H-C(22) and H-C(23)); 2.032 (*s*, 3 H, COCH₃); 1.019 (*s*, 3 H, H₃C(19)); 0.999 (*d*, J=6.63, 3 H, H₃C(21)); 0.866 (*d*, J=6.64, 3 H) and 0.862 (*d*, J=6.64, 3 H, H₃C(26) and H₃C(27)); 0.686 (*s*, 3 H, H₃C(18)). - HRMS.: 440 (not detectable, M^+); 380.3454 (100, M-HOAc, Calc. for C₂₈H₄₄ 380.3443); 365.3211 (7, C₂₇H₄₁, 380-CH₃), 295.2450 (1, C₂₂H₃₁); 282.2327 (8, C₂₁H₃₀); 267.2113 (3, C₂₀H₂₇); 259.2421 (4, C₁₉H₃₁); 255.2111 (26, C₁₉H₃₇); 253.1944 (7, C₁₉H₂₅); 228.1872 (3, C₁₇H₂₄); 213.1642 (6, C₁₆H₂₁); 201.1639 (2, C₁₅H₂₁).

Fraction 3 (31). M.p. 140° (MeOH); HPLC.: t_R 104 min. – MS.: 476 (not detectable, M^+), 416 (100, M–HOAc), 401 (10, 416–CH₃), 380 (60, 416–HCl), 365 (5, 416–CH₃–HCl), 308 (15), 296 (15), 283 (15), 259 (13), 255 (40), 253 (27), 213 (30), 201 (8).

Fraction 4 (32). M.p. 110° (MeOH); HPLC.: t_R 97 min. - MS.: 476 (not detectable, M^+), 416 (50, M-HOAc), 401 (5, 416-CH₃), 380 (100, 416-HCl), 365 (9, 416-CH₃-HCl), 308 (8), 296 (30), 283 (27), 267 (6), 259 (9), 255 (51), 253 (43), 239 (6), 228 (15), 213 (37), 201 (13).

Fraction 5 (33). M.p. $135-140^{\circ}$ (MeOH); HPLC.: t_R 93 min. - MS.: 476 (not detectable, M^+), 416 (30, M-HOAc), 401 (4, 416-CH₃), 380 (100, 416-HCl), 365 (10, 416-CH₃-HCl), 308 (6), 295 (10), 283 (14), 267 (6), 259 (9), 255 (60), 253 (28), 239 (4), 228 (12), 213 (28), 201 (10).

Fraction 6 ((23R, 24R)-3 β , 23-Diacetoxy-24-methylcholest-5-ene, 34). HPLC.: t_R 51 min. - ¹H-NMR.: 5.38 (m, 1H, H-C(6)); 5.09 (m, 1H, H-C(23)); 4.60 (m, 1H, H_a-C(23)); 2.038 (s, 3 H) and 2.032 (s, 3 H, 2 COCH₃); 1.016 (s, 3 H, H₃C(19)); 0.957 (d, J=6.39, 3 H, H₃C(21)); 0.929 (d, J=6.78, 3 H, H₃C(28)); 0.821 (d, J=6.75, 3 H) and 0.813 (d, J=6.91, 3 H, H₃C(26) and H₃C(27)); 0.660 (s, 3 H, H₃C(18)). - MS.: 500 (not detectable, M^+), 440 (100, M-HOAc), 380 (30, M-2 HOAc), 365 (15, 380-CH₃), 326 (3), 296 (5), 282 (20), 272 (12), 259 (23), 255 (35), 253 (65), 239 (8), 228 (15), 213 (40), 201 (15).

(22E, 24S)-Crinosterol (4). The 3β -hydroxy- Δ^5 system was regenerated from 23 in the usual manner to give the crystalline sterol 4, m.p. 152-154° (MeOH). - ¹H-NMR.: 5.349 (m, 1H, H-C(6)); 5.162 (m, 2 H, H-C(22) and H-C(23)); 3.53 (m, 1H, H_a-C(3)); 1.010 (s, 3 H, H₃C(19)); 1.001 (d, J=6.20, 3 H, H₃C(21)); 0.910 (d, J=6.86, 3 H, H₃C(28)); 0.836 (d, J=6.45, 3 H) and 0.817 (d, J=6.62, 3 H, H₃C(26) and H₃C(27)); 0.693 (s, 3 H, H₃C(18)). - HRMS.: 398.3551 (100, M^+ , Calc. for C₂₈H₄₆O 398.3549); 383.3325 (8, C₂₇H₄₃O, M-CH₃); 380.3451 (15, C₂₈H₄₄, M-H₂O); 365.3217 (9, C₂₇H₄₁, M-CH₃-H₂O); 355.3037 (5, C₂₅H₃₉O, M-C₃H₇); 337.2917 (11, C₂₅H₃₇, M-C₃H₇-H₂O); 313.2918 (5, C₂₃H₃₇); 300.2457 (40, C₂₁H₃₂O); 299.2380 (7, C₂₁H₃₁O); 285.2210 (8, C₂₀H₂₉O); 282.2330 (6, C₂₁H₃₀); 273.2204 (15, C₁₉H₂₉O); 271.2059 (40, C₁₉H₂₇O); 267.2133 (6, C₂₀H₂₇); 255.2124 (44, C₁₉H₂₇); 241.1946 (5, C₁₈H₂₅); 229.1595 (4, C₁₆H₂₁O); 213.1638 (11, C₁₆H₂₁); 201.1661 (4, C₁₅H₂₁).

(22E, 24R)-Brassicasterol (6). Cleavage of the acetoxy group in 29 as usual gave the desired free sterol 6; m.p. 156-158° (MeOH); HPLC. (ODS-2): t_R 55 min. - ¹H-NMR.: 5.348 (m, 1H, H-C(6)); 5.181 (m, 2H, H-C(22) and H-C(23)); 3.53 (m, 1H, H_a-C(3)); 1.011 (d, J=6.34, 3H, H_3C(21));

1.010 (*s*, 3 H, H₃C (19)); 0.910 (*d*, J = 6.84, 3 H, H₃C (28)); 0.834 (*d*, J = 6.10, 3 H) and 0.817 (*d*, J = 6.22, 3 H, H₃C (26) and H₃C (27)); 0.693 (*s*, 3 H, H₃C (18)). – HRMS.: 398.3545 (100, M^+ , Calc. for C₂₈H₄₆O 398.3549); 383.3328 (7, C₂₇H₄₃O, $M - CH_3$); 380.3469 (11, C₂₈H₄₄, $M - H_2O$); 365.3234 (8, C₂₇H₄₁, $M - CH_3 - H_2O$); 355.2961 (7, C₂₅H₃₉O, $M - C_3H_7$); 337.2919 (9, C₂₅H₃₇, $M - C_3H_7 - H_2O$); 313.2882 (6, C₂₃H₃₇); 300.2454 (42, C₂₁H₃₂O); 299.2389 (7, C₂₁H₃₁O); 285.2216 (7, C₂₀H₂₉O); 283.2436 (8, C₂₁H₃₁); 271.2057 (34, C₁₉H₂₇O); 267.2071 (6, C₂₀H₂₇); 255.2100 (35, C₁₉H₂₇); 231.1740 (5, C₁₆H₂₃O); 227.1800 (6, C₁₇H₂₃); 213.1637 (13, C₁₆H₂₁); 201.1623 (3, C₁₅H₂₁).

(22E)-23-Homocholesta-5,22-dien- 3β -ol (35). Regeneration of the 3β -hydroxy- Δ^5 -system from the acetate **30** yielded the desired free sterol **35**; HPLC. (ODS-2): t_R 49 min. – ¹H-NMR.: 5.349 (*m*, 1 H, H–C(6)); 5.249 (*m*, 2 H, H–C(22) and H–C(23)); 3.53 (*m*, 1 H, H_a–C(3)); 1.009 (*s*, 3 H, H₃C(19)); 0.999 (*d*, J = 6.46. 3 H, H₃C(21)); 0.866 (*d*, J = 6.47, 3 H) and 0.863 (*d*, J = 6.75, 3 H, H₃C(26) and H₃C(27)); 0.689 (*s*, 3 H, H₃C(18)). – HRMS.: 398.3520 (100, M^+ , Calc. for C₂₈H₄₆O 398.3549); 383.3289 (12, C₂₇H₄₃O, M–CH₃); 380.3405 (C₂₈H₄₄, M–H₂O); 365.3191 (10, C₂₇H₄₁, M–CH₃–H₂O); 300.2450 (69, C₂₁H₃₂O); 287.2726 (9, C₂₁H₃₅); 285.2215 (17, C₂₀H₂₉O); 282.2331 (6, C₂₁H₃₀); 273.2199 (21, C₁₉H₂₉O); 271.2064 (42, C₁₉H₂₇O); 267.2091 (9, C₂₀H₂₇); 258.1967 (10, C₁₈H₂₆O); 255.2109 (54, C₁₉H₂₇); 253.1970 (10, C₁₉H₂₅); 241.1954 (8, C₁₈H₂₅); 239.1795 (7, C₁₈H₂₃); 228.1866 (5, C₁₇H₂₄); 215.1812 (9, C₁₆H₂₃); 213.1646 (17, C₁₆H₂₁); 201.1635 (5, C₁₅H₂₁).

REFERENCES

- C. Djerassi, N. Theobald, W. C. M. C. Kokke, C.S. Pak & R. M. K. Carlson, Pure Appl. Chem. 51, 1815 (1979).
- [2] E. Lederer, Quart. Rev. 23, 453 (1969).
- [3] For a review see W. R. Nes & M. L. McKean, "Biochemistry of Steroids and other Isopentenoids", University Park Press, Baltimore 1977.
- [4] a) R. Heintz & P. Benveniste, J. Biol. Chem. 249, 4267 (1974); b) L. Cattel, L. Delprino, P. Benveniste & A. Rahier, J. Am. Oil Chem. Soc. 56, 6 (1979).
- [5] C. Djerassi, Pure Appl. Chem. 53, 873 (1981), and ref. therein.
- [6] a) C.A. Mattia, L. Mazzarella, R. Puliti, D. Sica & F. Zollo, Tetrahedron Lett. 1978, 3953;
 b) B.N. Ravi, W. C. M. C. Kokke, C. Delseth & C. Djerassi, Tetrahedron Lett. 1978, 4379.
- [7] E. Fattorusso, S. Magno, L. Mayol, C. Santacroce & D. Sica, Tetrahedron 31, 1715 (1975).
- [8] a) R. L. Hale, J. Leclercq, B. Tursch, C. Djerassi, R.A. Gross, A.J. Weinheimer, K. Gupta & P.J. Scheuer, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 92, 2179 (1970); b) N.C. Ling, R.L. Hale & C. Djerassi, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 92, 5281 (1970).
- [9] F.J. Schmitz & J. Pattabhiraman, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 92, 6073 (1970).
- [10] P.-A. Blanc & C. Djerassi, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 102, 7113 (1980).
- [11] C. Tarchini, M. Rohmer & C. Djerassi, Helv. Chim. Acta 62, 1210 (1979).
- [12] R. W. Lang & C. Djerassi, J. Org. Chem., in press.
- [13] R. W. Lang, C. Djerassi, P. D. Strong, D. C. Swenson & W. L. Duax, Helv. Chim. Acta, 64, 2853 (1981).
- [14] J.L. Simonsen, J. Chem. Soc. 1920, 570.
- [15] D. H. R. Barton, J. E. Page & E. W. Warnhoff, J. Chem. Soc. 1954, 2715.
- [16] H. Schmid & K. Kaegi, Helv. Chim. Acta 33, 1582 (1950).
- [17] C. W. Shoppee & G. H. R. Summers, J. Chem. Soc. 1952, 3361.
- [18] I. Rubinstein, L.J. Goad, A.D.H. Clague & L.J. Mulheirn, Phytochemistry 15, 195 (1975).
- [19] M. Kobayashi & H. Mitsuhashi, Steroids 26, 605 (1975).
- [20] K. Jug, Theoret. Chim. Acta 42, 303 (1976).
- [21] C. H. DePuy, P. C. Fuenfschilling, A. H. Andrist & J. M. Olson, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 99, 6297 (1977).
- [22] For reviews see a) P. H. Boyle in "Rodd's Chemistry of Carbon Compounds", M.F. Ansell, Ed., Vol. II (Supplement to IIA/IIB) Elsevier, Amsterdam 1974, pp. 18; b) C. H. DePuy in "Topics in Current Chemistry", Vol. 40, Springer Verlag Berlin 1973, pp. 73.
- [23] J. B. Hendrickson & R. K. Boeckman, jr., J. Am. Chem. Soc. 91, 3269 (1969).
- [24] W. Kirmse, K. Loosen & E.-C. Prolingheuer, Chem. Ber. 113, 129 (1980).
- [25] J.A. Steele & E. Mosettig, J. Org. Chem. 28, 571 (1963).