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The ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ and ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C} \mathrm{nmr}$ spectra of the rotational isomers $\mathbf{3 a}$ and $\mathbf{3 b}$ of 6 -( $N$-methyl- $N$-formylaminomethyl)thioquinanthrene were completely assigned with a combination of 1D and 2D nmr techniques. The key-parts of this methodology were long-range proton-carbon correlations and NOE experiments with N -methyl- N formylaminomethyl substituent. The X-ray study of 4-methyl-2-( $N$-methyl- $N$-formylaminomethyl)quinoline $\mathbf{4 a}$ as well as ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ and ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C} \mathrm{nmr}$ spectra show that $N$-methyl- $N$-formylaminomethyl substituent in $\mathbf{4 a}$ and $\mathbf{4 b}$ has a different steric arrangement than the same substituent in $\mathbf{3 a}$ and $\mathbf{3 b}$.
J. Heterocyclic Chem., 40, 201 (2003).

Introduction.
The reaction of protonated azine with DMF/hydroxyl-amine- $O$-sulfonic acid $/ \mathrm{Fe}^{++}$ion system led to $\alpha$ - and or $\gamma$-substituted azines with $\mathrm{N}, \mathrm{N}$-dimethylcarbamoyl and (or) N -methyl- N -formylaminomethyl substituents [1,2,3,4]. In the case of thioquinanthrene 1 both type of products, i.e., compounds $\mathbf{2}$ and $\mathbf{3}$ were isolated [5].

Scheme 1


1, $R=H$
2, $\mathrm{R}=\mathrm{C}(\mathrm{O}) \mathrm{N}\left(\mathrm{CH}_{3}\right)_{2}$
3, $\mathrm{R}=\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{~N}\left(\mathrm{CH}_{3}\right) \mathrm{CHO}$

The structure of dimethylcarbamoyl derivative 2 was completely assigned both by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ and ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C} \mathrm{nmr} \mathrm{study} \mathrm{[5]} \mathrm{and}$ by X-ray diffraction examination [6]. In the case of $6-(\mathrm{N}-$ methyl- $N$-formylaminomethyl)thioquinanthrene $\mathbf{3}$ a serious problem arose. Its ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ and ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C} \mathrm{nmr} \mathrm{spectra} \mathrm{show} \mathrm{reso-}$ nances of the same functional groups of two species, having the same intensities and very similar coupling patterns [5]. This observation was interpreted in terms of restricted rotation about the $\mathrm{C}(\mathrm{O})-\mathrm{N}$ bond in amides, taking into account that in the case of numerous unsymmetrical $\mathrm{N}, \mathrm{N}-$ disubstituted amides [7] hindered rotation can give rise to cis- and trans- rotational isomers [8]. They often occur to an equal extent, as it was shown for $N$-methyl- N -ethylnicotinamide [9].
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To confirm this hypothesis, the present study dealt with the complete ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ and ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C} \mathrm{nmr}$ assignment of $\mathbf{3 a}$ and $\mathbf{3 b}$ isomers. To evaluate spectroscopic effects observed for 3a and 3b, nmr and X-ray study of 4-methyl-2-( $N$-methyl- $N$ formylaminomethyl)quinoline 4 were also acquired.

NMR Study of 3a and 3b.
The proton nmr spectrum of $\mathbf{3}$, i.e., of the mixture of $\mathbf{3 a}$ and $\mathbf{3 b}$ rotational isomers, shows two singlets of the $N$-methyl protons at $\delta=3.04 \mathrm{ppm}$ and $\delta=2.92 \mathrm{ppm}$, two singlets of the $N$-methylene protons at $\delta=5.14 \mathrm{ppm}$ and $\delta=5.01 \mathrm{ppm}$, two singlets of the formyl protons at $\delta=8.57$ ppm and $\delta=8.93 \mathrm{ppm}$, two singlets of $\alpha$-quinolinyl protons H13 ( $\delta=8.93 \mathrm{ppm}$ and $\delta=8.91 \mathrm{ppm}$ ) and multiplets of sixteen benzene-ring protons. A COSY ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}-{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ experiment allowed the segregation of sixteen benzene ring protons into four ABMX systems of quinolinyl type. The next step was to find the correlation in the two 3,4-disubstituted quinoline moieties, i.e., between $\alpha$-quinolinyl proton H 13 with benzene ring protons: $\mathrm{H} 8, \mathrm{H} 9, \mathrm{H} 10, \mathrm{H} 11$ for both $\mathbf{3 a}$ and $\mathbf{3 b}$ isomers. It could be achieved with the help of long-range
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}-{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ correlations presented in Scheme 3 (formula a) and shows the spectral positions of protons and carbons being members of area A, (Scheme 4).
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Scheme 4

. . . . - NOE interraction

The long-range proton-carbon correlations of benzene ring members of 2,3,4-trisubstituted quinoline moiety as well as those of $N$-methyl- $N$-formylaminomethyl substituent (Scheme 3, formula b) show connectivities between the carbon and proton atoms as depicted by areas B or C (Scheme 4), respectively. The ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}-{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NOE experiments proved 3a to be conformer $E$ and $\mathbf{3 b}$ to be conformer $Z$. The positions of $\alpha$-quinolinyl carbon C 6 and $\beta$-quinolinyl carbon C6a were confirmed with ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}-{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ long-range correlations (Tables 1, 2), they fit well with literature data as $\alpha$-quinolinyl carbon was usually observed at 150 ppm but $\beta$-quinolinyl one near 130 ppm [10].

Due to the folded shape of $\mathbf{3 a}$ and $\mathbf{3 b}$ rotamers, distances between some protons of alkyl substituents and benzene rings protons of $\mathbf{3}$ are within the limit required for the occurrence of NOE (Tables 1, 2). Thus, connectivities between areas $\mathrm{A}, \mathrm{B}$ and C for both rotamers could be deduced from NOE experiments indicating the interaction of methylene group protons with H8 proton and methyl group protons with H4 proton (see Scheme 4 and Figure 1). To evaluate the spatial requirement for the occurrence of NOE structure of $\mathbf{3 a}$ and $\mathbf{3 b}$ were simulated by means of AM1 and PM3 methods [11]. The calculations show that the $\mathrm{H} 8 / \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ protons distances are $3.54 \AA$ or 3.67

Scheme 5
The values $\Delta \delta=\delta(\mathbf{3 a}$ or $\mathbf{3 b})-\delta($ thioquinanthrene, $\mathbf{1})$



Figure 1. a./ ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \mathrm{nmr}$ spectrum of $\mathbf{3 a}$ and $\mathbf{3 b}\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right)$ - region $7.90-8.90 \mathrm{ppm}$, b./ The NOE difference spectrum after irradiation of $\mathrm{CH}_{3}$ group protons ( $\delta=3.04 \mathrm{ppm}$ ), c./ The NOE difference spectrum after irradiation of $\mathrm{CH}_{2}$ group protons ( $\delta=5.12 \mathrm{ppm}$ ).

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{5}{|c|}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Table 1 \\
Summary of the \({ }^{1} \mathrm{H}\) and \({ }^{13} \mathrm{C}\) correlations \((\delta, \mathrm{ppm})\) and NOE enhancement recorded for \(\mathbf{3 a}\)
\end{tabular}} \& \multicolumn{5}{|c|}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Table 2 \\
Summary of the \({ }^{1} \mathrm{H}\) and \({ }^{13} \mathrm{C}\) correlations ( \(\delta, \mathrm{ppm}\) ) and NOE enhancement recorded for \(\mathbf{3 b}\)
\end{tabular}} \\
\hline Position \& Proton \& Carbon \& Long range proton-carbon couplings [a] \& Proton enhancement ( \(\delta, \mathrm{ppm} / \%\) ) \& Position \& Proton \& Carbon \& Long range proton-carbon couplings [a] \& Proton enhancement ( \(\delta, \mathrm{ppm} / \%\) ) \\
\hline 1 \& 8.37 \& 123.6 [a],[b] \& \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { C3 (130.6) } \\
\text { C4a (146.1) } \\
\text { C14a (145.9) }
\end{gathered}
\] \& \& 1 \& 8.36 \& 123.6 [a], [b] \& \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { C3 (130.3) } \\
\text { C4a (146.1) } \\
\text { C14a (145.4) }
\end{gathered}
\] \& \\
\hline 2 \& 7.67 \& 128.0 [a],[b] \& \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { C4 (129.8) } \\
\text { C14b (126.5) }
\end{gathered}
\] \& \& 2 \& 7.63 \& 128.6 [a], [b] \& \[
\begin{gathered}
\mathrm{C} 4(129.7) \\
\mathrm{C} 14 \mathrm{~b}(126.5)
\end{gathered}
\] \& \\
\hline 3 \& 7.76 \& 130.6 [a],[b] \& \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { C1 (123.6) } \\
\text { C4a (146.1) }
\end{gathered}
\] \& \& 3 \& 7.73 \& 130.3 [a], [b] \& \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { C1 (123.6) } \\
\text { C4a (146.1) }
\end{gathered}
\] \& \\
\hline 4 \& 8.06 \& 129.8 [a],[b] \& \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { C2 (128.0) } \\
\text { C14b (126.5) }
\end{gathered}
\] \& \& 4 \& 8.04 \& 129.7 [a], [b] \& \[
\begin{gathered}
\mathrm{C} 2(128.6) \\
\mathrm{C} 14 \mathrm{~b}(126.5)
\end{gathered}
\] \& \\
\hline 4 a
6 \& \& 146.1 [a] \& \& \& 4a \& \& \& \& \\
\hline 6
60 \& \& 152.0 [a] \& \& \& 6 \& \& \[
152.1 \text { [a] }
\] \& \& \\
\hline \(6 a\)
\(7 a\) \& \& 126.0 [a] \& \& \& 6a \& \& 126.3 [a] \& \& \\
\hline 7 b \& \& 126.7 [a] \& \& \& 7a \& \& 143.6 [a] \& \& \\
\hline 8 \& 8.36 \& 123.4 [a],[b] \& C7a (143.0) \& \& \({ }_{8}^{7}\) \& \& 126.9
[a]

cb] \& \& <br>

\hline \& \& \& C10 (130.3) \& \& 8 \& 8.44 \& 123.8 [a], [b] \& $$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { C7a (143.6) } \\
& \text { C10 (130.2) }
\end{aligned}
$$ \& <br>

\hline 9 \& \& \& C11a (147.1) \& \& \& \& \& C11a (147.0) \& <br>

\hline , \& \& \& $$
\mathrm{C} 11 \text { (130.0) }
$$ \& \& 9 \& 7.68 \& 128.1 [a], [b] \& C7b (126.9) \& <br>

\hline 10 \& 7.77 \& 130.3 [a],[b] \& C8 (123.4) \& \& \& \& \& C11 (129.8) \& <br>
\hline \& \& \& C11a (147.1) \& \& 10 \& 7.75 \& 130.2 [a], [b] \& C8 (123.8) \& <br>
\hline 11 \& 8.11 \& 130.0 [a],[b] \& C7b (126.7) \& \& \& \& \& C11a (147.0) \& <br>
\hline \& \& \& C9 (128.2) \& \& 11 \& 8.09 \& 129.8 [a], [b] \& C7b (126.9) \& <br>
\hline 11a \& \& 147.1 [a] \& \& \& \& \& \& C9 (128.1) \& <br>
\hline 13 \& 8.93 \& 147.9 [a] \& C7a (143.0) \& \& 11 a \& \& 147.0 [a] \& \& <br>
\hline \& \& \& C7b (126.7) \& \& 13 \& 8.91 \& 147.8 [a] \& C7a (143.6) \& <br>
\hline \& \& \& C11a (147.1) \& \& \& \& \& C7b (126.9) \& <br>
\hline \& \& \& C13a (127.3) \& \& \& \& \& C11a (147.0) \& <br>
\hline 13a \& \& 127.3 [a] \& \& \& \& \& \& C13a (127.2) \& <br>
\hline 14a \& \& 145.9 [a] \& \& \& 13a \& \& 127.2 [a] \& \& <br>
\hline 14b \& \& 126.5 [a] \& \& \& 14a \& \& 145.4 [a] \& \& <br>

\hline $\mathrm{CH}_{3}$ \& 2.92 \& 30.2 [a], [b] \& $\mathrm{CH}_{2}$ (54.3) \& $\mathrm{CH}_{2}(5.01) / 2.4$ \& 14b \& \& $$
126.5 \text { [a] }
$$ \& \& <br>

\hline \& \& \& CHO (163.8) \& $$
\begin{gathered}
\text { CHO (8.57) / } 0.8 \\
\text { H4 (8.06) / } 0.4
\end{gathered}
$$ \& $\mathrm{CH}_{3}$ \& 3.04 \& 34.9 [a], [b] \& \[

$$
\begin{gathered}
\mathrm{CH}_{2}(49.0) \\
\mathrm{CHO}(162.8)
\end{gathered}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{gathered}
\mathrm{CH}_{2}(5.14) / 2.5 \\
\mathrm{CHO}(8.31)
\end{gathered}
$$
\] <br>

\hline $\mathrm{CH}_{2}$ \& 5.01 \& 54.3 [a],[b] \& $\mathrm{CH}_{3}$ (30.2) \& $\mathrm{CH}_{3}(2.92) / 6.0$ \& 11.6 \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline \& \& \& CHO (163.8) \& CHO (8.57) / 20.6 \& \& \& \& \& H4 (8.04) / 0.3 <br>
\hline \& \& \& C6a(126.0) \& H8 (8.36) / 1.3 \& $\mathrm{CH}_{2}$ \& 5.14 \& 49.0 [a], [b] \& $\mathrm{CH}_{3}$ (34.9) \& $\mathrm{CH}_{3}(3.04) / 5.0$ <br>
\hline \& \& \& C6 (152.0) \& \& \& \& \& CHO (162.8) \& CHO (8.31) / 0.3 <br>
\hline CHO \& 8.57 \& 163.8 [a],[b] \& $\mathrm{CH}_{3}$ (30.2) \& \& \& \& \& C6a (126.3) \& H8 (8.44) / 1.7 <br>
\hline \& \& \& $\mathrm{CH}_{2}$ (54.3) \& \& \& \& \& C6 (152.1) \& <br>
\hline \& \& \& \& \& CHO \& 8.31 \& 162.8 [a], [b] \& $\mathrm{CH}_{3}$ (34.8) \& <br>
\hline [a] From \& HMBC \& pectra (schem \& ) [b] From HSQ \& spectra. \& \& \& \& $\mathrm{CH}_{2}$ (49.0) \& <br>
\hline
\end{tabular}

[a] From HMBC spectra (scheme 3). [b] From HSQC spectra.
of the changes in geometry of the 1,4-dithiin ring. It should act in a similar manner as it was concluded from X-ray diffraction study of compound 2 [6], where the presence of a bulky dimethylcarbamoyl substituent in the ortho position relative to 1,4 -dithiin ring causes differentiation between respective bond lengths and bond angles in all heterocyclic rings of $\mathbf{2}$. For example, in the case of non-planar, butterflytype shaped, 1,4 -dithiin moiety, the length of $\beta$-quinolinylsulfur bond (C6a-S7, 1.770(5) Å) being sterically affected by the dimethylcarbamoyl substituent is longer than the
A for $\mathbf{3 a}$ and 3.34 A or 3.44 A for $\mathbf{3 b}$, but those of $\mathrm{H} 4 / \mathrm{CH}_{3}$ are of the magnitude of $4.25 \AA$ or $4.31 \AA$ for $\mathbf{3 a}$ and $4.06 \AA$ or $3.91 \AA$ for $\mathbf{3 b}$. Thus, taking into account the opinion found in the literature that: "the NOE enhancements can be used to connected protons up to about $4.5 \AA$ apart" [12], our measurements of NOE for $\mathbf{3 a}$ and $\mathbf{3 b}$ gave correctly the correlations presented in Scheme 4. Differences between the respective $\delta_{\mathrm{H}}$ and $\delta_{\mathrm{C}}$ values of ring protons and carbons of $\mathbf{3 a}$ and $\mathbf{3 b}$ are close and do not exceed 0.09 ppm for $\Delta \delta_{\mathrm{H}}$ and 0.6 ppm for $\Delta \delta_{\mathrm{C}}$. (see Scheme 5)

Transmission of the steric hindrance effects induced by $E$ or $Z \mathrm{~N}$-methyl- N -formylaminomethyl substituents on the values of $\delta_{\mathrm{H}}$ and $\delta_{\mathrm{C}}$ in $\mathbf{3 a}$ or $\mathbf{3 b}$ may be rationalized in terms
second $\beta$-quinolinyl-sulfur bond (C13a-S14, 1.726(5) A) by
Table 3
Summary of the ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ and ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ correlations $(\delta, \mathrm{ppm})$
and NOE enhancement recorded for $\mathbf{4 a}$

| Position | Proton | Carbon | Long range proton-carbon couplings [a] | Proton enhancement ( $\delta, \mathrm{ppm} / \%$ ) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 |  | 155.9 [a] |  |  |
| 3 | 7.14 | 119.4 [a], [b] | $\begin{gathered} \text { C2 (155.9) } \\ \text { C4a (127.5) } \end{gathered}$ |  |
| 4 |  | 145.8 [a] |  |  |
| 4a |  | 127.5 [a] |  |  |
| 5 | 8.00 | 123.7 [a], [b] | $\begin{aligned} & \text { C4 (145.8) } \\ & \text { C7 (129.7) } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| 6 | 7.58 | 126.6 [a], [b] | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{C} 4 \mathrm{a}(127.5) \\ \mathrm{C} 8(129.7) \end{gathered}$ |  |
| 7 | 7.73 | 129.7 [a], [b] | $\begin{aligned} & \text { C5 (123.7) } \\ & \text { C8a (147.6) } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| 8 | 8.06 | 129.7 [a], [b] | $\begin{aligned} & \text { C4a (127.5) } \\ & \text { C6 (126.6) } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| 8a |  | 147.6 [a] |  |  |
| $\mathrm{CH}_{3}$ | 2.69 | 18.8 [a], [b] | $\begin{gathered} \text { C3 (119.4) } \\ \text { C4a (127.5) } \end{gathered}$ |  |
| $\mathrm{NCH}_{3}$ | 2.89 | 30.1 [a], [b] | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{NCH}_{2}(55.9) \\ & \mathrm{CHO}(163.2) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \mathrm{CHO}(8.38) / 0.9 \\ \mathrm{CH}_{2}(4.65) / 1.5 \end{array}$ |
| $\mathrm{NCH}_{2}$ | 4.65 | 55.9 [a], [b] | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{NCH}_{3}(30.1) \\ \mathrm{CHO}(163.2) \\ \mathrm{C} 3(119.4) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{CH}_{3}(2.89) / 1.2 \\ \mathrm{CHO}(8.38) / 12.3 \\ \mathrm{H} 3(7.14) / 3.1 \end{gathered}$ |
| CHO | 8.38 | 163.2 [a], [b] | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{NCH}_{3}(30.1) \\ & \mathrm{NCH}_{2}(55.9) \end{aligned}$ |  |

[a] From HMBC spectra. [b] From HSQC spectra.

Table 4
Summary of the ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ and ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ correlations ( $\delta, \mathrm{ppm}$ ) and NOE enhancement recorded for $\mathbf{4 b}$

| Position | Proton | Carbon | Long range <br> proton - carbon <br> couplings [a] | Proton <br> enhancement <br> $(\delta, \mathrm{ppm} / \%)$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | $156.4[\mathrm{a}]$ |  |
| 2 | 7.22 | $120.5[\mathrm{a}],[\mathrm{b}]$ | $\mathrm{C} 2(156.4)$ <br> $\mathrm{C} 4 \mathrm{a}(127.5)$ |  |
| 3 |  | $145.5[\mathrm{a}]$ |  |  |
| 4 |  | $127.5[\mathrm{a}]$ |  |  |

[a] From HMBC spectra. [b] From HSQC spectra.

Table 5
Crystal Data and Structure Refinement for the Compound 4a

| Empirical formula | $\mathrm{C}_{13} \mathrm{H}_{14} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| Formula weight | 214.26 |
| Temperature, K | 293(2) |
| Diffractometer | KUMA KM4CCD |
| Wavelength, $\AA$ | 0.71073 |
| Crystal system | orthorombic |
| Space group | Pbca |
| Unit cell dimensions: |  |
| a, $\AA$ | 8.217(2) |
| b, $\AA$ | 8.917(2) |
| c, $\AA$ | 28.162(2) |
| Volume, $\AA^{3}$ | 2314.6(9) |
| Z | 8 |
| Cell measurement refl. number | 1851 |
| Cell measurement theta range, deg. | 5-20 |
| Density (calculated), mg/m ${ }^{3}$ | 1.230 |
| Density (measured), mg/m ${ }^{3}$ | 1.22 |
| Absorption coefficient, $\mathrm{mm}^{-1}$ | 0.079 |
| F(000) | 912 |
| Crystal size, mm | $0.22 \times 0.25 \times 0.35$ |
| Data collection method | Hemisphere run |
| $\theta$ range for data collection, deg. | 2.64-24.71 |
| Index ranges | -10 10, -10 10,-32 33 |
| Reflections collected | 17931 |
| Independent reflections | 1971 |
| Refinement method | Full-matrix least-squares on $\mathrm{F}^{2}$ |
| Data / restraints/parameters | 1971/0/160 |
| Goodness-of-fit on $\mathrm{F}^{2}$ | 1.129 |
| Final R indices [ $\mathrm{I}>4 \sigma(\mathrm{I})$ ] | 0.0531 |
| Weighting Scheme: | $\begin{aligned} & 1 /\left[\operatorname{sigma}^{2}\left(\mathrm{Fo}^{2}\right)+(0.0572 * \mathrm{P})^{2}+\right. \\ & 0.90 * \mathrm{P}] \text { where } \mathrm{P}=\left(\mathrm{Max}\left(\mathrm{Fo}^{2}, 0\right)\right. \\ & \left.+2 * \mathrm{Fc}^{2}\right) / 3 \end{aligned}$ |
| Largest diff. peak and hole | 0.16, -0.13 |

$9 \sigma$. It means that the transmission of the steric effects induced by 6 -substituent via 1,4 -dithiin ring affects the environment of the positions $\mathrm{C}-13$ and $\mathrm{H}-13$. In the case of rotational isomers 3a and 3b, non-identical $E$ or $Z N$-methyl $-N$ formylaminomethyl substituents should influence the environment of H-13 differently, therefore two signals of H13 attributed to $\mathbf{3 a}$ and $\mathbf{3 b}$ should be observed.

The Structural Study on 4-Methyl-2-( $N$-methyl- $N$-formy-laminomethyl)-quinoline 4.

To evaluate the structural and spectroscopic effect induced by $N$-methyl- $N$-formylaminomethyl substituent in the molecule of $\mathbf{3}$, the same properties of 4-methyl-2-( $N$ -methyl- $N$-formylaminomethyl)quinoline $\mathbf{4}$ were then studied. The ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ and ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C} \mathrm{nmr}$ assignment of 4 (Table 3,4) was performed in the same way as for $\mathbf{3}$ (Scheme 3). In a $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ solution two rotational isomers $\mathbf{4 a}$ and $\mathbf{4 b}$ were observed to an equal extent. The NOE data presented in Table 4 proved $\mathbf{4 a}$ to be the conformer $E$ and those for $\mathbf{4 b}$ the conformer $Z$, respectively.

| Table 6 |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
|  | Atomic Coordinates and Equivalent Isotropic <br> Displacement Parameters for the Compound 4a |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Atom | x | y | z | Ueq |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| N1 | $0.5918(2)$ | $0.2254(2)$ | $0.6630(1)$ | $0.048(1)$ |
| C24 | $0.6099(3)$ | $0.5893(3)$ | $0.5519(1)$ | $0.069(1)$ |
| C23 | $0.5412(3)$ | $0.6155(3)$ | $0.6343(1)$ | $0.065(1)$ |
| C4a | $0.4076(2)$ | $0.430(2)$ | $0.6385(1)$ | $0.042(1)$ |
| C4 | $0.4179(2)$ | $0.964(2)$ | $05910(1)$ | $0.047(1)$ |
| C2 | $0.5961(2)$ | $0.2738(2)$ | $0.6189(1)$ | $0.047(1)$ |
| N22 | $0.6166(2)$ | $0.5393(2)$ | $0.5964(1)$ | $0.050(1)$ |
| C21 | $0.6965(2)$ | $0.4039(2)$ | $0.6087(1)$ | $0.057(1)$ |
| C3 | $0.5118(2)$ | $0.2117(2)$ | $0.5821(1)$ | $0.051(1)$ |
| C8a | $0.4982(2)$ | $0.1099(2)$ | $0.6731(1)$ | $0.043(1)$ |
| C5 | $0.3128(2)$ | $-0.727(2)$ | $0.6532(1)$ | $0.055(1)$ |
| C8 | $0.4922(3)$ | $0.0580(2)$ | $0.7204(1)$ | $0.058(1)$ |
| C6 | $0.3084(2)$ | $-0.1187(2)$ | $0.6991(1)$ | $0.063(1)$ |
| C7 | $0.3989(3)$ | $-0.0538(3)$ | $0.7328(1)$ | $0.067(1)$ |
| O25 | $0.5437(3)$ | $0.7000(2)$ | $0.5388(1)$ | $0.0101(1)$ |
| C21 | $0.3293(3)$ | $0.0290(3)$ | $0.5515(1)$ | $0.073(1)$ |

$\mathrm{U}(\mathrm{eq})$ is defined as one third of the trace of the orthogonalized, Uij tensor.

Table 7
Selected Bond Lengths [ $\AA$ ] and Angles [ ${ }^{\circ}$ ] for the Compound 4a

| bond lengths [ $\AA$ ] |  |  |  | bond lengths [ A ] |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | C2 | 1.314(2) | C4 | C | 1 | 1.504(3) |
|  |  | C8a | 1.374(2) | C2 | C3 |  | 1.410 (3) |
|  |  | O25 | 1.219(3) | C2 | C2 | 1 | 1.512(3) |
|  |  | N22 | 1.331(3) | N5 | C2 |  | 1.456 (3) |
|  |  | N22 | 1.444(3) | C4a | C |  | 1.423(3) |
|  |  | C8a | $1.415(2)$ |  |  |  |  |
| angles [ ${ }^{\circ}$ ] |  |  | angles [ ${ }^{\circ}$ ] |  |  |  |  |
| C2 | N1 | C8a | 117.44(16) | C24 | N22 | C2 | 121.65(19) |
| O25 | C24 | N22 | 125.5(2) | C23 | N22 | C21 | 117.24(18) |
| C3 | C4 | C4a | 117.88(17) | N5 | C21 | C2 | 111.83(16) |
| C3 | C4 | C41 | 120.52(19) | C4 | C3 | C2 | 120.55(18) |
| C4a | C4 | C41 | 121.61(19) | C3 | C2 | C21 | 119.89(18) |
| N1 | C2 | C3 | 123.34(18) | C24 | N22 | C23 | 121.1(2) |
| N1 | C2 | C21 | 116.76(18) |  |  |  |  |

X-ray Diffraction Study of 4a.
Recrystallization of $\mathbf{4}$ from ethanol gave crystals of $\mathbf{4 a}$ rotational isomer, i.e., $E$ isomer (see Figure 2). X-ray analysis data of 4a are collected in Tables 5, 6 and 7. They show planarity around the amide bond in N -methyl- N formylaminomethyl substituent of $\mathbf{4 a}$. Thus, taking into account the planarity of the quinoline unit, the molecule $\mathbf{4 a}$ is composed of two planar moieties with the angles

Conclusion.
X-ray study of $E-2-(N$-methyl- $N$-formylaminomethyl)lepidine 4 a show that the molecule of $\mathbf{4 a}$ is built from two planar moieties: quinoline moiety and N -


Figure 2. The ORTEP view for compound $\mathbf{4 a}$.
methyl- $N$-formylaminomethyl group with the angle between them $112.3^{\circ}$. The calculation of this angle by means of AM1 method using X-ray parametrization gave the value $114.2^{\circ}$, and the $\mathrm{H} 8-\mathrm{CH}_{3}$ distance $4.83 \AA$. That explains the lack of NOE with H8 ( $\delta=8.36 \mathrm{ppm}$ ) proton when $\mathrm{CH}_{3}$ protons ( $\delta=2.92 \mathrm{ppm}$ ) of $\mathbf{4 a}$ or $\mathbf{4 b}$ were irradiated. On the other hand, the angle between the quinoline plane and N -methyl- N -formylaminomethyl group, which was calculated with AM1 method for $E$-isomer 3a gave the value $84.1^{\circ}$. Thus, perpendicular arrangement of quinoline and N -methyl- N -formylaminomethyl planes in $\mathbf{3 a}$, caused by the 3 -sulfide substituent, make the distance $\mathrm{H} 8 / \mathrm{CH}_{3}$ shorter ( $3.54 \AA$ -from the calculation with AM1 method) and therefore, fortunately available for NOE.

Differences between the respective $\delta_{\mathrm{H}}$ and $\delta_{\mathrm{C}}$ values of ring protons and carbons of $\mathbf{3 a}$ and $\mathbf{3 b}$ are close (see Scheme 5). This indicates that the dithiinodiquinoline moiety in 3a and 3b acts as a rigid system and that the hindered rotation in N -methyl- N -formylaminomethyl group leading to two non-identical $E$ or $Z 6$-substituents slightly influences the 1,4-dithiin ring environment.

## EXPRERIMENTAL

## Materials.

Lepidine was purified by destillation, ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \mathrm{nmr}$ spectrum $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}, 500 \mathrm{MHz}, \delta(\mathrm{ppm})\right]: 2.59\left(\mathrm{CH}_{3}\right), 7.12(\mathrm{H} 3), 7.49$ (m, H6), 7.65 (H7), 7.89 (H5), $8.10(\mathrm{H} 8), 8.73$ (H2). ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C} \mathrm{nmr}$ spectrum $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}, 126 \mathrm{MHz}, \delta(\mathrm{ppm})\right]: 149.8$ (C2), 147.7 (C8), 143.9 (C4), 129.7 (C8), 128.8 (C7), 128.0 (C4a), 126.0 (C6), 123.5 (C5), 121.5 (C3).

6-( $N$-Methyl- $N$-formylaminomethyl)thioquinanthrene (3).
This compound was prepared from thioquinanthrene 1 and DMF as described previously [5].

4-Methyl-2-( $N$-formyl- $N$-methylaminomethyl)quinoline (4).
This compound was obtained according to the procedure of Minisci at al.[4]. The crystals of $\mathbf{4 a}$ were grown from ethanol solution, mp. $73-75^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$.

Anal. Calcd. For $\mathrm{C}_{13} \mathrm{H}_{14} \mathrm{~N}_{2}$ : C, 72.87; H, 6.59; N, 13.07; O, 7.47. Found: C, 72.83; H, 6.52; N, 13.11; O, 7.69.

## Nmr Study.

The ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ and ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ nmr spectra of $\mathbf{3}$ and $\mathbf{4}$ were recorded on Bruker 500 MHz spectrometer at 500 MHz for ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ nuclei and 126 MHz for ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ nuclei in 0.1 M deuteriochloroform solution at 303 K , with tetramethylsilane as the internal standard. The 1D and 2D experiments were carried out with standard Bruker pulse programs.

The NOE spectra for compounds 3 and 4 were obtained using standard Bruker 500 MHz programs. The spectral widths were ca. 5000 Hz , power for NOE build up 84 dB , aquisition time 3.3 s , relaxation delay 1 s , overall irradiation time 3 s , pulse width $7.6 \mu \mathrm{~s}$, number of scans 64 for each multiplet.

The crystallographic data were collected on four circle diffractometer KUMA KM4CCD using SHELXS 86 [13] and SHELXL 97 [14] programs.

The crystallographic data (excluding structure factors) for the structure reported in this paper have been deposited with the Cambridge Crystallographic Data Centre as supplementary publication no. CCDC-184357. Copies of the available material can be obtained, free of the charge, on application to the CCDC, 12 Union Road, Cambridge CB2 1EZ UK. (Fax: +44-(0)1223-336033 or e-mail: deposit @ ccdc.cam.ac.uk.).
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