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The red, o-quinone degradation product of physostigmine (1), rubreserine (3), was refluxed in absolute EtOH under $\mathrm{NH}_{3}$ gas to afford two blue, isomeric products, compounds 5 and $\mathbf{6}$. The structures of these two blue compounds were derived from the consideration of their spectral data.

The colored degradation products of physostigmine (1) (eserine), an indole alkaloid from the Calabar bean (Physostigma venenosum Balf., Leguminosae), and its decomposition mechanism have been studied previously under various conditions. ${ }^{1-6} \mathrm{~J}$ obst and Hesse in 1864, ${ }^{1}$ and Hesse in $1867^{2}$ observed a red color in the alkaline solutions of 1, which appeared slowly in $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$ solution, more rapidly in $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{CO}_{3}$ solution, and immediately in $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{OH}$ solution. Ellis et al. ${ }^{7}$ also found that the destruction of $\mathbf{1}$ in phosphate buffer solutions ( $\mathrm{pH} 5-8$ ) depended on the hydroxide ion concentrations. These alkaline conditions cause the hydrolysis of the carbamate side chain of $\mathbf{1}$ to afford a phenolic, col orless compound, eseroline (2). In the presence of alkali, compound $\mathbf{2}$ absorbs oxygen rapidly and is then oxidized to rubreserine (red) (3), eserine blue (blue), and eserine brown (brown). ${ }^{3,8}$ The structure of $\mathbf{3}$ was confirmed as a resonance hybrid of the mesomers (between o-quinone and quinone methide) by Robinson ${ }^{9,10}$ from UV, IR, and ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$-N MR data in 1965, and by Schönenberger et al. ${ }^{11}$ in 1986 from X-ray diffraction analysis. The empirical formula of eserine blue was suggested as $\mathrm{C}_{17} \mathrm{H}_{23} \mathrm{~N}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{2}$ by Salway ${ }^{3}$ in 1912, and in 1967, Auterhoff and Hamacher ${ }^{6}$ proposed the structure of eserine blue as 4, a dimer of $\mathbf{3}$ with the molecular formula of $\mathrm{C}_{26} \mathrm{H}_{31} \mathrm{~N}_{5} \mathrm{O}_{3}$. Aspects of the chemistry of $\mathbf{1}$ have been reviewed. ${ }^{12,13}$

Recently, we reported on the isolation and the cytotoxic activity of a new, rearranged degradation product (red-orange) ${ }^{14}$ that is formed when $\mathbf{1}$ in absolute EtOH was refluxed with $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{OH}$. In this report, we have modified the preparation of eserine blue from 1, as described by Ellis, ${ }^{8}$ in order to study the degradation of 3 under $\mathrm{NH}_{3}$ gas, and this has resulted in the isolation and structure elucidation of two blue isomers, compounds 5 and 6.

## Results and Discussion

Compound $\mathbf{3}$ was prepared for this study according to the method of Robinson. ${ }^{9}$ The EtOH solution of $\mathbf{3}$ was refluxed under $\mathrm{NH}_{3}$ gas for 4.5 h , and the reaction was stopped before the blue col or devel oped and turned brown. The reaction mixture was then subjected to an $\mathrm{Al}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ (neutral) column using $\mathrm{CHCl}_{3}$ as an eluent to yield

[^0]
$1 \mathrm{R}^{1}=\mathrm{MeNHCO}, \mathrm{R}^{2}=\mathrm{H}$
$2 R^{1}=R^{2}=H$



fractions 23-29 and fractions 30-32, respectively. Fractions 23-29 were combined and purified, using an HPLC with an RP-18 column and 0.1\% HOAc in DI $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}$ (5:95) as a mobile phase, to give the isomer $5(3.5 \mathrm{mg})$ at 4.4 min as a blue compound. Fractions 30-32 from the $\mathrm{Al}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ column were pure, and they were combined to give the isomer $6(5.3 \mathrm{mg})$, also as a blue compound. The low yield of these two compounds indicated that these are transition products in that the reaction was not complete, and the products can degrade further to form eserine brown inasmuch as the reaction mixture turned darker when allowed to proceed.

The isomers 5 and $\mathbf{6}$ appeared as blue spots on neutral $\mathrm{Al}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ TLC with the same $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}$ values and the same masses (i.e., 415.2452 amu for 5 and 415.2456 amu for 6), which correspond to a molecular formula of $\mathrm{C}_{25} \mathrm{H}_{29} \mathrm{~N}_{5} \mathrm{O}$. They al so showed similar UV, IR, and ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}-$ and ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}-N M R$ spectra. The IR spectrum showed only an imine ( $\nu \max 1625 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$ ) functionality, the carbonyl groups of rubreserine being absent. Slight differences

Table 1. COSY Correlations of Compounds 5 and 6

| compd 5 |  |  | compd $\mathbf{6}$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | H | correlations |  | H |
| $2 \alpha$ and $2 \beta$ | $3 \alpha, 3 \beta$ |  | correlations |  |
| $3 \alpha$ | $2 \beta, 3 \beta$ | $2 \beta$ | $2 \alpha, 3 \alpha, 3 \beta$ |  |
| $3 \beta$ | $2 \alpha, 2 \beta, 3 \alpha$ | $3 \alpha$ | $2 \alpha, 3 \beta$ |  |
| $7 \alpha$ | $7 \beta, 8 \alpha$ | $3 \beta$ | $2 \alpha, 3 \beta$ |  |
| $7 \beta$ | $7 \alpha, 8 \alpha, 8 \beta$ |  | $9 \alpha$ and $9 \beta$ | $2 \alpha, 2 \beta, 3 \beta$ |
| $8 \alpha$ | $7 \alpha, 7 \beta, 8 \beta$ |  | $10 \alpha$ and $10 \beta$ | $9 \alpha$ and $10 \beta$ |
| $8 \beta$ | $7 \beta, 8 \alpha$ |  |  |  |



Figure 1. NOESY correlations of compounds 5 and 6.
in the aromatic ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{NMR}$ chemical shifts (i.e., $\delta 7.18$, $6.89,6.79$, and 6.16 for 5 , and $\delta 7.10,6.70,6.60$, and 6.08 for 6 ) established that these two compounds were isomers. The chemical shifts of eight methylene protons ( $\delta 1.86,2.01,2.49,2.80,1.98,2.03,2.75$, and 2.75 for 5 , and $\delta 1.81,1.96,2.48,2.75,2.71,2.71,1.99$, and 1.99 for $\mathbf{6}$ ), three N -methyl ( $\delta 3.08,2.65$, and 2.60 for 5 , and $\delta 3.02,2.64$, and 2.57 for $\mathbf{6}$ ), and two methyl groups ( $\delta$ 1.47 and 1.45 for 5 , and $\delta 1.43$ and 1.41 for 6 ) were very similar to those of $\mathbf{3}$, indicating that the pyrrolidine portions of $\mathbf{3}$ had remained intact (with the exception of one N -methyl group). The masses and the proton numbers of $\mathbf{5}$ and $\mathbf{6}$ were twice those of $\mathbf{3}$, implying that these two isolates were dimers of a derivative of $\mathbf{3}$. The molecular formula, with only one oxygen and five nitrogen atoms, suggested that the o-quinone groups of two molecules of $\mathbf{3}$ had reacted with $\mathrm{NH}_{3}$ to form a phenoxazine ring, linking the two mol ecules together. There were two possibilities in the formation of 5 and 6 from two molecules of the derivative of $\mathbf{3}$, that is, the two monomeric units were in the same orientation or in the opposite orientation (all of the pyrrolopyrrolidine nitrogens were on the same side). The other two possible isomers of $\mathbf{5}$ and $\mathbf{6}$, where the oxygen and nitrogen were at positions 5 and 12, respectively, were ruled out because these latter two isomers did not provide a conjugated system in the central portion of these two molecules as in the two proposed isomers.
The COSY correlations of $\mathbf{5}$ and $\mathbf{6}$ (Table 1) confirmed the positions of eight methylene protons in these two compounds, and the HMQC correlations supported the assignments of all of the carbons of the methine, methylene, and methyl groups. The NOESY (Figure 1) correlations between the $\mathrm{C}-15$ methyl group and $\mathrm{H}-4$, the C-16 methyl group and $\mathrm{H}-6$, and the methyl group on $\mathrm{N}-10$ and $\mathrm{H}-11$ of 5 , and between the $\mathrm{C}-15$ methyl group and $\mathrm{H}-4$, the methyl group on $\mathrm{N}-7$ and $\mathrm{H}-6$, and the $\mathrm{C}-18$ methyl group and $\mathrm{H}-11$ of 6 supported the

Table 2. HMBC Correlations of Compounds 5 and 6 ( ${ }^{3}{ }^{\mathrm{J}} \mathrm{CH}=7$ Hz)

| compd 5 |  | compd 6 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ | ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ | ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ | ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ |
| $2 \alpha$ and $2 \beta$ | 3a, 14a, 19 | 6 | 11a |
| $3 \alpha$ | $\begin{gathered} (2,3 a), a 3 b \\ 14 a, 15 \end{gathered}$ | 7 a | 9, 17 |
| $3 \beta$ | $\begin{gathered} (2,3 a),{ }^{\text {a }} 3 \mathrm{~b} \\ 14 \mathrm{a}, 15 \end{gathered}$ | $9 \alpha$ and $9 \beta$ | 7a, 10a, 10 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |
| 6 | 11a | $10 \alpha$ and $10 \beta$ | $(9,10 a)^{\text {a, }} 10 \mathrm{~b}$ |
| $7 \alpha$ | (6b, 8) ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 13 | 4a, (13a) ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |
| $7 \beta$ | 6 a | 14a | 2, 13a, 19 |
| 14 a | 13a | 15 | $2^{\text {a }}$ |
| 15 | $\begin{aligned} & 3,(3 a),,^{a} 3 b, \\ & (13 a),{ }^{,} 14 a \end{aligned}$ | 16 | $\begin{gathered} \text { 7a, (10, 10a, } \\ 10 \mathrm{~b})^{\mathrm{a}} \end{gathered}$ |
| 16 | $6 \mathrm{a},(6 \mathrm{~b}, 10 \mathrm{a})^{\text {a }}$ | 17 | 7a, 9 |
| 17 | 8, 9a | 18 | 7a, (10a) ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |
| 19 | 2, 14a | 19 | 2 |

${ }^{\text {a }}$ Carbon numbers in parentheses indicate non-three-bond enhancements.
assignments of $\mathrm{H}-4, \mathrm{H}-6$, and $\mathrm{H}-11$ of 5 and $\mathbf{6}$, respectively. As described previously, the COSY, HMQC, and NOESY correlations allowed the confident assignments of all of the proton and carbon resonances in the pyrrol opyrrolidine portions of both compounds.

For 5, the HMBC correlations (Table 2) between H-6 and $\mathrm{C}-11 \mathrm{a}, \mathrm{H}-7 \beta$ and $\mathrm{C}-6 \mathrm{a}, \mathrm{H}-14 \mathrm{a}$ and $\mathrm{C}-13 \mathrm{a}, \mathrm{H}-15$ and $\mathrm{C}-3 \mathrm{~b}, \mathrm{H}-15$ and $\mathrm{C}-13 \mathrm{a}$ (four-bond enhancement), $\mathrm{H}-16$ and $\mathrm{C}-6 \mathrm{a}$, and $\mathrm{H}-16$ and $\mathrm{C}-10 \mathrm{a}$ (four-bond enhancement) confirmed the assignments of C-11a, C-6a, C-13a, C-3b, and $\mathrm{C}-10 \mathrm{a}$. Compound $\mathbf{5}$ was a dimer of the derivative of 3 , however, the assignments of $\mathrm{C}-3$ and $\mathrm{C}-7$, and $\mathrm{C}-3 \mathrm{~b}$ and C-6a were interchangeable because of the overlapping of the chemi cal shifts among these carbons. In 6, the HMBC correlations (Table 2) between $\mathrm{H}-6$ and $\mathrm{C}-11 \mathrm{a}, \mathrm{H}-10 \alpha$ and $\mathrm{H}-10 \beta$ and $\mathrm{C}-10 \mathrm{~b}, \mathrm{H}-13$ and $\mathrm{C}-4 \mathrm{a}$, $\mathrm{H}-13$ and $\mathrm{C}-13 \mathrm{a}$ (two-bond enhancement), $\mathrm{H}-14 \mathrm{a}$ and $\mathrm{C}-13 \mathrm{a}, \mathrm{H}-16$ and $\mathrm{C}-10 \mathrm{~b}$ (four-bond enhancement) confirmed the assignments of $\mathrm{C}-11 \mathrm{a}, \mathrm{C}-10 \mathrm{~b}, \mathrm{C}-4 \mathrm{a}$, and C-13a. Unfortunately, very few correlations for the central, heteroaromatic portion of the molecules were observed in the HMBC spectra. An NH HMBC experiment ${ }^{15}\left(\mathrm{JNH}_{\mathrm{NH}}=2 \mathrm{~Hz}\right)$ failed to provide any useful information to confirm the assignments of the quaternary carbons in the central portion of these molecules.
As mentioned earlier, there were two possibilities for the arrangement of two molecules of the derivative of 3 to form isomers $\mathbf{5}$ and $\mathbf{6}$. The overall shapes of the CD spectra of the two isomers were different, and when compared with that of $\mathbf{3},{ }^{14}$ the CD data of isomer $\mathbf{6}$ were similar to those of $\mathbf{3}$. Therefore, it is tentatively proposed that isomer $\mathbf{6}$ was formed from two mol ecules of the derivative of $\mathbf{3}$ that were in the same orientation and that these two molecules retained the CD properties of 3. In contrast, two opposite orientations of the derivatives of $\mathbf{3}$ formed the isomer $\mathbf{5}$, which demonstrated a quite different CD spectrum from that of $\mathbf{3}$.

The proposed structures of these two blue compounds are different from that postulated for eserine blue (4) by Auterhoff and Hamacher ${ }^{6}$ in 1967 due to the absence of the carbonyl and one of the N -methyl groups and the presence of one extra aromatic proton in these two compounds. However, the unambiguous differentiation of the structures of isomers $\mathbf{5}$ and $\mathbf{6}$ by NMR and CD data was not possible. Further studies with model compounds to distinguish between the structures of 5 and $\mathbf{6}$, and the mechanism of formation are presently under investigation.

Compounds 5 and 6 were evaluated for their cytotoxic activity using a battery of human cancer cell lines and were judged to be inactive.

## Experimental Section

General Experimental Procedures. Physostigmine was purchased from Sigma Chemical Co. Column chromatography utilized $\mathrm{Al}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ (neutral, Brockman Activity 1) (80-200 mesh, Fisher), and TLC, $\mathrm{Al}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ (neutral) (Merck). TLCs were viewed under a UV Iamp (Chromato-Vue C-70 G UV Viewing System). HPLC (Water LC Module I system with a 996 Photodiode Array Detector (set at 610 nm ) add-on, model 600 pump, autoinjector), RP-18 $250 \times 10 \mathrm{~mm}$ col umn, el uted with $0.1 \% \mathrm{HOAc}$ in DI $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}$ (5:95). CD spectra were measured on a J ASCO J-710 CD/ORD spectropolarimeter. UV spectra were obtained in MeOH , using a Beckman DU-7 spectrophotometer, and IR spectra on a Midac Collegian FT-IR spectrophotometer. The NMR spectra were recorded on a Varian XL-300 NMR spectrometer at $299.9 \mathrm{MHz}\left({ }^{1} \mathrm{H}\right)$, and at $75.4 \mathrm{MHz}\left({ }^{13} \mathrm{C}, \mathrm{APT}\right)$ in $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$, using tetramethylsilane (TMS) as an internal standard. The ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{NMR}(499.8 \mathrm{MHz}),{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}-\mathrm{NMR}$ ( 125.7 MHz ), COSY, HMQC, HMBC, NH-HMBC, and NOESY experiments were performed with a Varian Unity 500 MHz NMR spectrometer. LRMS and HRMS were obtained using a Finnigan MAT 90 mass spectrometer operating at 70 eV .

Preparation of Rubreserine. Rubreserine (3) was prepared from physostigmine (1) according to the method of Robinson. ${ }^{9}$

Reaction of Rubreserine (3) with $\mathbf{N H}_{3}$. Rubreserine (3) ( 95.7 mg ) was dissolved in absolute EtOH (8 mL ) and was refluxed under $\mathrm{NH}_{3}$ gas for 4.5 h . The reaction mixture was worked up in $\mathrm{CHCl}_{3}$ and dried under vacuum to afford a residue that was subjected to column chromatography.

Isolation of Compounds 5 and 6. Elution of the residue with $\mathrm{CHCl}_{3}$ from an $\mathrm{Al}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ (neutral) column yielded fractions 23-29, which, when combined and further purified on HPLC, gave compound $5\left(R_{f} 0.36\right.$; $\mathrm{CHCl}_{3}-\mathrm{MeOH}, 5: 0.5$ ) as a blue solid ( 3.5 mg ), and fractions 30-32, which gave compound 6 also as a blue solid ( 5.3 mg ) with the same $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}$ value $\left(\mathrm{CHCl}_{3}-\mathrm{MeOH}\right.$, 5:0.5).

Compound 5: a blue solid; CD $[\theta]_{219}-89738,[\theta]_{254}$ $-6101,[\theta]_{281}-6899$; UV (MeOH) $\lambda_{\max }(\log \epsilon) 610(4.28)$ nm; IR (film) $v_{\max } 2926,1625(\mathrm{C}=\mathrm{N}), 1494,1298 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}, 499.8 \mathrm{MHz}\right) \delta 7.18(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}, \mathrm{H}-6), 6.89$ (1H, s, H-4), 6.79 (1H, br s, H-13), 6.16 (1H, s, H-11), 4.90 (1H, s, H-9a), 4.31 (1H, s, H-14a), 3.08 (3H, s, H-18), $2.80(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}, \mathrm{H}-8 \beta), 2.75(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=6.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, \mathrm{H}-2 \alpha$ and $\mathrm{H}-2 \beta), 2.65(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}, \mathrm{H}-17), 2.60(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}, \mathrm{H}-19), 2.49(1 \mathrm{H}$, $\mathrm{m}, \mathrm{H}-8 \alpha), 2.03(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=6.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, \mathrm{H}-3 \beta), 2.01(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$, $\mathrm{H}-7 \alpha), 1.98(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=6.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, \mathrm{H}-3 \alpha), 1.86(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}, \mathrm{H}-7 \beta)$, 1.47 (3H, s, H-15), $1.45(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}, \mathrm{H}-16) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C} \mathrm{NMR} \mathrm{(CDCl} 3$, 125.7 MHz ) $\delta 166.0$ (s, C-13a), 150.7 (s, C-5a), 149.8 (s, C-11a), 147.6 (s, C-4a), 138.1 (s, C-3b), 134.6 (s, C-6a), 131.4 (s, C-12a), 128.8 (s, C-10a), 123.1 (d, C-6), 122.2 (d, C-4), 97.4 (d, C-14a), 97.0 (d, C-13), 96.9 (d, C-9a), 90.8 (d, C-11), 53.2 (t, C-2), 52.2 ( $\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{C}-8$ ), 51.8 ( $\mathrm{s}, \mathrm{C}-3 \mathrm{a}$ ), 51.2 ( $\mathrm{s}, \mathrm{C}-6 \mathrm{~b}$ ), 40.8 (t, C-7), 40.2 (t, C-3), 39.7 (q, C-19), 37.2 ( $q, C-17$ ), 33.6 ( $q, C-18$ ), 26.1 ( $q, C-15$ ), 25.0 ( $q$, $\mathrm{C}-16)$; $\mathrm{HRESI}+\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+} 416.2452\left(\mathrm{C}_{25} \mathrm{H}_{30} \mathrm{~N}_{5} \mathrm{O}\right)$ requires 416.2450 ; EIMS ( 70 eV ) $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}[\mathrm{M}]^{+} 417$ (100), 416 (17), 415 (20), 373 (19), 359 (22), 153 (17), 109 (10).

Compound 6: a blue solid; CD $[\theta]_{224}-2897,[\theta]_{254}$ $-1259,[\theta]_{281}-1488,[\theta]_{342}+246,[\theta]_{383}-145,[\theta]_{414}$ $+133 ;$ UV (MeOH) $\lambda_{\text {max }}(\log \epsilon) 610$ (3.79) nm; IR (film) $v_{\max }$ 2926, 2859, 1625 (C=N ), 1494, 1377, $1298 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}, 499.8 \mathrm{MHz}\right) \delta 7.10(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}, \mathrm{H}-11), 6.70$ ( $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}, \mathrm{H}-4$ ), $6.60(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}, \mathrm{H}-13), 6.08$ (1H, s, H-6), 4.82 (1H, s, H-14a), 4.23 (1H, s, H-7a), 3.02 (3H, s, H-16), $2.75(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}, \mathrm{H}-2 \beta), 2.71(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=6.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, \mathrm{H}-9 \alpha$ and H-9 $), 2.64$ ( $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}, \mathrm{H}-19$ ), 2.57 (3H, s, H-17), 2.48 (1H, $\mathrm{m}, \mathrm{H}-2 \alpha), 1.99(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=6.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, \mathrm{H}-10 \alpha$ and $\mathrm{H}-10 \beta$ ), $1.96(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=6.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, \mathrm{H}-3 \alpha), 1.81(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}, \mathrm{H}-3 \beta), 1.43$ (3H, s, H-18), 1.41 (3H , s, H-15); ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (CDCl $3,125.7$ $\mathrm{MHz}) \delta 166.9$ (s, C-13a), 155.5 (s, C-6a), 149.9 (s, C-5a), 148.0 (s, C-4a), 146.9 (s, C-11a), 138.4 (s, C-12a), 134.7 (s, C-10b), 128.8 (s, C-3b), 122.8 (d, C-11), 121.3 (d, C-4), 99.6 (d, C-14a), 98.7 (d, C-13), 97.5 (d, C-7a), 91.1 (d, C-6), 53.3 ( $\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{C}-9$ ), 52.6 (t, C-2), 51.2 (s, C-3a), 51.7 ( s , C-10a), 40.7 (t, C-3), 40.2 (t, C-10), 39.6 (q, C-17), 37.5 (q, C-19), 33.7 (q, C-16), 26.2 (q, C-18), 24.7 (q, C-15); HRESI $+\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+} 416.2456\left(\mathrm{C}_{25} \mathrm{H}_{30} \mathrm{~N}_{5} \mathrm{O}\right)$ requires 416.2450; EIMS (70 ev) m/ z [M]+ 417 (100), 416 (28), 415 (43), 374 (14), 373 (35), 372 (17), 360 (20), 359 (49).

Evaluation of Cytotoxic Activity. Compounds 5 and 6 were evaluated for their cytotoxic activity, using procedures described previously. ${ }^{16}$
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