rotary evaporation of solvent was subjected to HPLC with $15 \%$ ethyl acetate in hexanes as eluting solvent. Data for spatol benzyl ether ( + )-54 ( $3.6 \mathrm{mg}, 62.2 \%$ ) thus obtained: $[\alpha]^{22}{ }_{\mathrm{D}}+8^{\circ}\left(c 0.12, \mathrm{CHCl}_{3}\right) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 7.22(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=8.2 \mathrm{~Hz}), 6.83(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=8.2 \mathrm{~Hz}), 5.09$ $(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 5.02(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 4.48(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=11.8 \mathrm{~Hz}), 4.29(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=$ 11.8 Hz ), $3.77(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 3.43(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=4.4 \mathrm{~Hz}), 3.38(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=3$ $\mathrm{Hz}), 2.93(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 2.87(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, J=7.8,4.4 \mathrm{~Hz}), 2.52(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=$ 7.8 Hz ), 2.11-1.61 ( 10 H ), $1.41(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.30(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.01(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s})$, $0.89(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=6.4 \mathrm{~Hz})$.
$(+)$-Spatol (3). To a magnetically stirred solution of spatol benzyl ether $(+)-54(3.6 \mathrm{mg}, 0.0081 \mathrm{mmol})$ in methylene chloride $(1.5 \mathrm{~mL})$ and water ( $84 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ ) was added DDQ ( 6.0 mg ) at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, and stirring was continued at the same temperature. After 1 h , TLC analysis showed no unreacted starting material. Solvents were rotary evaporated, and the residue was passed through a short column of silica gel with $30 \%$ ethyl acetate in hexanes as eluant. The residue obtained after rotary evaporation was purified by HPLC with $24 \%$ ethyl acetate in hexanes as eluant to deliver ( + ) $-3\left(2.1 \mathrm{mg}, 81 \%\right.$ ): $[\alpha]^{22} \mathrm{D}^{+}+44.2^{\circ}\left(c 0.66, \mathrm{CHCl}_{3}\right)$ (reported ${ }^{2}[\alpha]_{\mathrm{D}}+45.6^{\circ}\left(c 1.56, \mathrm{CHCl}_{3}\right)$ ): ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 5.13(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, J=3.0,1.5 \mathrm{~Hz}$ ), $5.03(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 3.74(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=4.4$ Hz ), $3.44(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=3.8 \mathrm{~Hz}), 3.03(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{ddd}, J=14.5,5.5,5.5 \mathrm{~Hz})$, $2.87(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, J=7.9,4.3 \mathrm{~Hz}), 2.49(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=7.9 \mathrm{~Hz}), 2.28(1 \mathrm{H}$, ddd, $J=13.2,13.2,4.3 \mathrm{~Hz}$ ), 2.12-2.05 ( 2 H ), $1.97(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{t}, J=6.8 \mathrm{~Hz}$ ), $1.89-1.80(2 \mathrm{H}), 1.78-1.65(2 \mathrm{H}), 1.47-1.18$ ( 3 H ), $1.41(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.29$ ( $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$ ), $0.99(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 0.91\left(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=6.7 \mathrm{~Hz}\right.$ ); ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( 100.607 $\mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$, for APT spectra a $(+)$ indicates 0 or 2 attached protons and a $(-)$ indicates 1 or 3 attached protons) $\delta 141.5(+), 111.0(+), 79.96$ $(-), 58.42(+), 58.12(+), 57.06(-), 55.14(-), 47.21(+), 43.79(-)$, $43.40(-), 43.25(-), 37.82(-), 36.87(+), 36.56(-), 35.18(+), 27.87$ $(+), 24.23(-), 19.26(-), 14.47(-), 12.97(-)$.
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#### Abstract

The synthesis of the model systems 10 and 22 of dynemicin $\mathbf{A}(2)$ containing the nitrogen, enediyne, and epoxide functionalities has been achieved. These models are shown to undergo acid-induced triggering to give the corresponding Bergman-cyclized products in the presence of suitable H atom donors. Removal of the N protecting group from 22 gave the unstable free amine 30, which was shown to cause double-stranded-DNA cleavage, presumably in a manner similar to that of dynemicin A (2) itself. Some interesting chemistry related to dicobalt complexes of the enediynes is also presented.


## Introduction

A number of years ago, a new series of highly active antibiotics, the esperamicins ${ }^{1}$ and calicheamicins, ${ }^{2}$ was isolated. These antibiotics, containing a unique 1,5 -diyn- 3 -ene bridging ring, displayed extremely potent antitumor activity with $\mathrm{IC}_{50}$ values in the nanogram per milliliter range against a number of murine and human cell lines. ${ }^{3}$ The autitumor activity of these compounds has been ascribed to DNA damage resulting from H atom ab straction from the sugar phosphate backbone by a benzenoid diradical. This benzenoid diradical is generated by Bergman cyclization ${ }^{4}$ of the enediyne bridge upon triggering by conformational changes brought about by bioreductive cleavage of the trisulfide moiety and 1,4 -addition of the resulting thiol. The

[^0]potency of these molecules has spawned considerable interest in the synthetic community, with the synthesis of a number of model

[^1]Scheme I. Proposed Mechanism of Action of Dynemicin A

systems of the bicyclic core ${ }^{5}$ and total syntheses of the calicheamicin aglycone ${ }^{6}$ and calicheamicin $\gamma_{1}{ }^{1}$ (1) carbohydrate fragments. ${ }^{7}$


More recently, a novel violet-colored antibiotic was discovered in the fermentation broth of Micromonospora chersina. ${ }^{8}$ The antibiotic dynemicin A (2) exhibits very potent antibacterial activity against Gram-positive bacteria and antitumor activity with $\mathrm{IC}_{50}$ values of $\sim 4-5 \mathrm{ng} / \mathrm{mL}$ against a number of human cell lines and prolongs the life span of mice inoculated with P388 leukemia and B16 melanoma. Unlike the esperamicin antibiotics, dynemicin A (2) displays significant in vivo antibacterial activity and low toxicity. Structural studies ${ }^{9}$ revealed that dynemicin A (2), like the esperamicins/calicheamicins, belongs to the class of antibiotics containing a 1,5 -diyn-3-ene bridging ring; however, dynemicin A (2) is unique in combining the enediyne unit with the anthraquinone chromophore of the anthracycline antibiotics. ${ }^{10}$

[^2]A mechanism for the antitumor activity of dynemicin A (2) has been proposed ${ }^{11,12}$ that combines elements of the mechanisms of action of the esperamicin/calicheamicin, neocarzinostatin, and anthracycline classes of antibiotics and that is supported by the observation that DNA strand cleavage by dynemicin A (2) is enhanced by the presence of reducing agents such as NADPH and thiols. ${ }^{11}$ In this mechanism (Scheme I), the anthraquinone nucleus intercalates with the DNA and undergoes bioreduction to give the 9,10 -anthraquinol 3 . This rearranges via epoxide opening to give the quinone methide 4 , which is trapped by a nucleophile (e.g., $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ or $\mathrm{Cl}^{-}$) to give a cis-opened epoxide such as 5 . The strategically located nitrogen atom may also facilitate epoxide opening, either directly by electron donation or indirectly by acting as a base to deprotonate the adjacent acidic phenol in 3. Opening of the epoxide moiety causes a dramatic conformational change in the molecule such that the distance between the termini of the 1,5 -diyn- 3 -ene system (cd distance) is reduced from $3.54 \AA$ in dynemicin A (2) to $3.17 \AA$ [MMX-derived distance] ${ }^{13.14}$ in the cis-diol 5. The resulting increase in strain energy of the enediyne system facilitates Bergman cyclization to give the benzenoid diradical 6, which abstracts H atoms from the sugar phosphate backbone of the DNA, hence causing DNA cleavage. The proposed mechanism of action of dynemicin A (2) thus involves opening of the epoxide as the trigger for Bergman cyclization of the enediyne and the DNA cleavage/antitumor activity (cf. neocarzinostatin). ${ }^{15}$
The elegance and synthetic challenge of the dynemicin $A$ structure, combined with its potent antitumor activity, prompted us to explore the synthesis and properties of models for dynemicin

[^3]

Figure 1. MMX-minimized structures of compounds 10 and 11. Hydrogen atoms and carbamate omitted for clarity.

Scheme II. Possible Retrosynthetic Disconnections for Model System 10


A (2) with a view to synthesizing dynemicin A (2) itself and to shed further light upon the mechanism of action of this fascinating molecule. In a recent communication, we disclosed the first syntheses of model systems containing the nitrogen, epoxide, and enediyne moieties of the natural product, together with the acid-induced Bergman cyclization of one of these models. ${ }^{16}$ In this paper, we describe in more detail the syntheses of several dynemicin A models and the interesting chemistry associated with these molecules.

## Results and Discussion

Retrosynthetic Analysis and Synthesis of Dynemicin A Models. A search of the literature revealed that 7,8,9,10-tetrahydrophenanthridine (7) is readily prepared on a large scale in a few steps, ${ }^{17}$ and the electronic properties of this molecule suggested that it should be possible to selectively functionalize at the C6 and C10 positions (Scheme II). Thus, two possible approaches for the synthesis of a dynemicin A model presented themselves, namely, introduction of the enediyne at C10 followed by ring closure at C6 (path a), or vice versa (path b). Examination of molecular models and MMX calculations (Figure 1) ${ }^{13}$ indicated that path a would require ring closure of 8 to form a highly strained intermediate (11) in which the olefin was severely distorted. By contrast, path b would allow the prior introduction of the epoxide so that ring closure of 9 would give the much less strained 10. Therefore, synthetic efforts were directed along path b.

Scheme III summarizes the construction of the dynemicin A model 10 starting from 7,8,9,10-tetrahydrophenanthridine (7).

[^4]Scheme III. Synthesis of a Dynemicin A Model ${ }^{a}$


7


15





${ }^{a}$ Reagents and conditions: (a) 1.2 equiv of $m \mathrm{CPBA}, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}, 25$ ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 1 \mathrm{~h}, 78 \%$; (b) $\mathrm{Ac}_{2} \mathrm{O}$, reflux, $20 \mathrm{~h}, 87 \%$; (c) $\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{CO}_{3}$ (catalytic), $\mathrm{MeOH}, 25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 1 \mathrm{~h}, 100 \%$; (d) 1.2 equiv of $t-\mathrm{BuMe}_{2} \mathrm{SiOTf}, 1.5$ equiv of 2,6-lutidine, $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}, 0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 1 \mathrm{~h}, 92 \%$; (e) 1.2 equiv of ethynylmagnesium bromide, 1.2 equiv of $\mathrm{PhOCOCl}, \mathrm{THF},-78 \rightarrow+25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, 1 $\mathrm{h}, 97 \%$; (f) 2.0 equiv of $m \mathrm{CPBA}, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}, 25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 2 \mathrm{~h}, 85 \%$; (g) 1.2 equiv of TBAF, THF, $42^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 3 \mathrm{~h}, 100 \%$; (h) 1.7 equiv of pyridinium chlorochromate (PCC) $, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}, 4-\AA$ molecular sieves, $25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 1 \mathrm{~h}$, $80 \%$; (i) 1.5 equiv of $19,1.5$ equiv of $n-\mathrm{BuNH}_{2}, 0.25$ equiv of $\mathrm{PPh}_{3}$, 0.07 equiv of $\mathrm{Pd}(\mathrm{OAc})_{2}, 0.2$ equiv of $\mathrm{CuI}, \mathrm{PhH}, 25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 2 \mathrm{~h}, 86 \%$; (j) 4.0 equiv of $\mathrm{AgNO}_{3}, 7.0$ equiv of $\mathrm{KCN}, \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}, \mathrm{EtOH}, \mathrm{THF}, 25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 10$ $\min , 78 \%$; (k) 1.0 equiv of LDA, toluene, $-78{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 1 \mathrm{~h}, 80 \%$ based on $25 \%$ recovery of 9 .

Thus, treatment of $7^{17}$ with $m$-chloroperoxybenzoic acid ( $m \mathrm{CPBA}$ ) in dichloromethane gave the corresponding N -oxide, which underwent regiospecific rearrangement ${ }^{18}$ upon heating in acetic anhydride to give the acetoxy derivative 12 ( $68 \%$ overall yield). This was converted to the corresponding silyl ether 14 in $92 \%$ overall yield by standard methods via hydroxy compound 13. Addition of phenyl chloroformate ${ }^{19}$ to a mixture of compound 14 and ethynylmagnesium bromide at $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ led to the formation of compound 15 in $97 \%$ yield as a $3: 1$ mixture of isomers. Treatment of $\mathbf{1 5}$ with $m$ CPBA gave epoxide 16 (85\%) as a $3: 1$ mixture of isomers, and this was converted to ketone 18 via alcohol 17 by desilylation followed by oxidation ( $80 \%$ overall). Ketone 18 was obtained as a single isomer, indicating that epoxidation had taken place exclusively from the opposite face to the acetylene. Coupling 18 with vinyl chloride 19 via $\operatorname{Pd}(0)-\mathrm{Cu}(\mathrm{I})$ catalysis followed by $\mathrm{AgNO}_{3} / \mathrm{KCN}$ treatment resulted in the formation of the requisite precursor 9 via coupling product 20 ( $67 \%$ overall yield). Finally, treatment of 9 with lithium diisopropylamide (LDA) in toluene at $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ gave the targeted dynemicin A model 10 in $59 \%$ yield together with $25 \%$ recovered 9 (presumably due to enolization of the ketone).

[^5]
## Scheme IV ${ }^{a}$





ORTEP drawing of 22. $H$ atoms omltted for clarity.
${ }^{a}$ Reagents and conditions: (a) 3 equiv of thiocarbonyldiimidazole, 0.5 equiv of DMAP, $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}, 25{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 48 \mathrm{~h}, 95 \%$; (b) 2 equiv of $n$ $\mathrm{Bu}_{3} \mathrm{SnH}, \mathrm{AIBN}$ (catalytic), toluene, $80^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 2 \mathrm{~h}, 86 \%$.

Compound $\mathbf{1 0}$ crystallized from ether in colorless prisms mp $228-230^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ dec. X-ray crystallographic analysis confirmed its structure (see ortep drawing, Scheme III) and revealed some interesting structural features. The acetylenic moieties are bent from linearity with the following angles: $\mathrm{C} 14,162.1^{\circ} ; \mathrm{C} 15,170.5^{\circ}$; $\mathrm{C} 18,171.5^{\circ}$; and C19, $162.8^{\circ}$. The distance between carbons C 14 and CI9 (cd distance) was found to be $3.63 \AA$, a value that agrees well with the calculated one for the MMX-minimized structure of $10(3.63 \AA)^{13}$ and that of the experimentally derived distance in dynemicin A (2) (3.54 $\AA$ ). ${ }^{9}$

In order to obtain a closer model to dynemicin A (2), the tertiary hydroxyl group in 10 was removed to form compound 22 as shown in Scheme IV. Thus, exposure of $\mathbf{1 0}$ to thiocarbonyldiimidazole in the presence of 4 -(dimethylamino) pyridine (DMAP) resulted in the formation of $\mathbf{2 1}$ in $95 \%$ yield. This compound (21) led to the desired compound 22 in $86 \%$ yield upon treatment with $n$ $\mathrm{Bu}_{3} \mathrm{SnH}-\mathrm{AIBN}$ (catalytic) (AIBN $=2,2^{\prime}$-azobis(isobutyronitrile)) in toluene at $80^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. X-ray analysis of compound 22 (see ORTEP drawing, Scheme IV) revealed the following angles at the acetylenic carbons: $\mathrm{C} 14,163.7^{\circ} ; \mathrm{C} 15,170.1^{\circ} ; \mathrm{C} 18,170.2^{\circ} ; \mathrm{C} 19$, $162.0^{\circ}$. The distance between carbons C14 and C19 (cd distance) was found to be $3.59 \AA$ by both X-ray and MMX calculations. ${ }^{13}$

Triggering of the Dynemicin A Models. The observed sensitivity of dynemicin A (2) toward acid-induced epoxide opening and hence triggering of Bergman cyclization " prompted us to examine the triggering of our model systems. Scheme V outlines a cascade of novel transformations of model systems 10, 22, and 23. Compound 10 was converted to product 26 in $92 \%$ yield upon treatment with $p$-toluenesulfonic acid in benzene $/ 1,4$-cyclohexadiene ( $3: 1,0.05 \mathrm{M}$ ) at $25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 24 h . Thus, protonation and epoxide opening of $\mathbf{1 0}$ results in simultaneous pinacol-type rearrangement and Bergman cyclization, possibly via intermediates 24a and 25a or via direct pinacol rearrangement of the carbonium ion initially formed by epoxide opening. The structure of 26 was supported by its spectroscopic data and was confirmed by X-ray crystallographic analysis (see ORTEP drawing, Scheme V). Furthermore, it was found that TMSOTf in the presence of $\mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{SiH}^{20}$ induces the same transformation ( $\mathbf{1 0} \boldsymbol{\rightarrow 2 6}$, Scheme V) at $\mathbf{- 7 8}$ ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ in less than 5 min ( $68 \%$ yield), suggesting a very low energy of activation for the cyclization process. The dramatic shortening of the cd distance in going from epoxide 10 (cd $=3.63 \AA$, X-ray and MMX) to triol 24 a ( $\mathrm{cd}=3.19 \AA$, MMX) ${ }^{13.14}$ is noteworthy. In an attempt to prevent the pinacol rearrangement of triol 25a, the acetate derivative $\mathbf{2 3}$ was prepared from $10\left(\mathrm{Ac}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right.$, pyridine, DMAP, $100 \%$ ) and subjected to the epoxide-opening and cyclization reaction conditions as described above. Indeed, the acetate diol 25c was obtained ( $85 \%$ yield) as the final product of this cascade by starting with 23 with use of $p$-toluenesulfonic acid as the initiator. Similarly, the deoxygenated compound 22 gave the

[^6]Scheme $V^{a}$


ORTEP drawing of 25 c
ORTEP drawing of 26
${ }^{a}$ Chemistry of dynemicin models. Reagents and conditions: (a) (i) 1 equiv of $\mathrm{TsOH} \cdot \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}, 0.05 \mathrm{M}$ in benzene/1,4-cyclohexadiene (3:1), 25 ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 24 \mathrm{~h}, 83-92 \%(\mathrm{X}=\mathrm{OH} ; \mathrm{R}=\mathrm{OH}, \mathrm{OAc}$, or H$)$, (ii) 1 equiv of TMSOTf, 4 equiv of $\mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{SiH}, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2},-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 5 \mathrm{~min}, 68 \%(\mathrm{X}=\mathrm{OH}$; $\mathrm{R}=\mathrm{OH}$ ), or (iii) $\mathrm{HCl}(\mathrm{g}), 40$ equiv of 1,4 -cyclohexadiene, $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}, 25$ ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 1 \mathrm{~min}, 79-80 \%\left(\mathrm{X}=\mathrm{Cl} ; \mathrm{R}=\mathrm{OAc}\right.$ or H ); (b) excess $\mathrm{Ac}_{2} \mathrm{O}$, DMAP (catalytic), pyridine, $25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 2 \mathrm{~h}, 100 \%$.

Scheme VI ${ }^{\text {a }}$

${ }^{a}$ Reagents and conditions: (a) 2.2 equiv of $\mathrm{CO}_{2}(\mathrm{CO})_{8}, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}, 25$ ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 10 \mathrm{~min}, 98 \%$; (b) 3 equiv of TFA, $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}, 0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 30 \mathrm{~min}, 81 \%$; (c) 5 equiv of $\mathrm{Me}_{3} \mathrm{~N}^{+} \mathrm{O}^{-}, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}, 25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 1 \mathrm{~h}, 83 \%$.
cyclized product $\mathbf{2 5 b}$. The use of anhydrous HCl in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ in the presence of 1,4 -cyclohexadiene also resulted in triggering of the cyclization cascade leading from 23 to 25 d ( $80 \%$ yield) and 22 to $\mathbf{2 5 e}$ ( $79 \%$ yield), presumably via the intermediacy of 24 d $(\mathrm{cd}=3.14 \AA, \mathrm{MMX})^{13.14}$ and 24 e . These cyclizations are


Figure 2. ORTEP drawing of the acetate derivative of cobalt complex 28. Hydrogen atoms omitted for clarity.

Scheme VII ${ }^{a}$

${ }^{a}$ Reagents and conditions: (a) 3 equiv of $\mathrm{NaOMe}, \mathrm{MeOH}, 60^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 2$ h. $80 \%$.
analogous to those observed for dynemicin A (2) itself. ${ }^{11}$
An alternative mode of triggering the cyclization of $\mathbf{1 0}$ based upon cobalt complexation of the acetylenes was devised (Scheme VI). ${ }^{21}$ This pathway was designed so as to prevent the acetylenes from spontaneously cyclizing upon epoxide opening and thus allow isolation of the postulated cis-diol intermediate 24a in the form of its corresponding cobalt complex. Thus, reaction of $\mathbf{1 0}$ with $\mathrm{Co}_{2}(\mathrm{CO})_{8}$ ( 2.2 equiv) resulted in the formation of the bis(dicobalt) complex 27 in $98 \%$ yield. Treatment of 27 with trifluoroacetic acid in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\left(0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)$ followed by aqueous workup surprisingly led to the isolation of compound 28 ( $81 \%$ yield) in which epoxide opening had apparently been accompanied by pinacol-type rearrangement and loss of one of the dicobalt complexes. This structure was supported by its spectroscopic data and confirmed by X-ray crystallographic analysis of its acetate (Figure 2). Like Magnus' earlier work, ${ }^{5 d}$ this rearrangement provides a stable nine-membered ring containing the 1,5-diyn-3-ene unit, albeit in a protected form. Oxidative removal of the dicobalt complex from 28 with the use of trimethylamine N -oxide in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ in the presence, or absence, of $\mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{SiH}$ at $25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ resulted in the spontaneous Bergman cyclization of the liberated nine-membered enediyne to give the aromatized product 26. The same experiment carried out in $\mathrm{CD}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ resulted in the incorporation of two deuterium atoms in 26, confirming dichloromethane as an effective hydrogen atom donor in these aromatization studies. ${ }^{2 b}$

Deprotection of the Dynemicin A Models and DNA-Cleavage Studies. With the synthesis of N -protected models of dynemicin A completed, we naturally turned our attention to the deprotection of these molecules to give the free amine. In the absence of acid and with the nitrogen protected as a carbamate, we were somewhat surprised by the robustness of our model systems $\mathbf{1 0}$ and $\mathbf{2 2}$. Thus, treatment of $\mathbf{1 0}$ with 3 equiv of sodium methoxide in dry methanol at $25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ resulted in a very sluggish reaction; heating the reaction mixture to $60^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 2 h completed the reaction to give an $80 \%$

[^7]Scheme VIII ${ }^{a}$

${ }^{a}$ Reagents and conditions: (a) 2.5 equiv of $\mathrm{LiAlH}_{4}, \mathrm{THF}, 0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 30$ min: (b) 2.2 equiv of $\mathrm{Co}_{2}(\mathrm{CO})_{8}, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}, 0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 1 \mathrm{~h}, 25 \%$; (c) $\mathrm{EtOH}, 25$ ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 5 \mathrm{~h}, 28 \%$.


Figure 3. $\Phi \times 174$ form I DNA ( $50 \mu \mathrm{M} /$ base pair) incubated for 12 h at $37^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ with compound 30 (in $20 \%$ THF in phosphate buffers, pH 7.4 , 50 mM ) and analyzed by gel electrophoresis ( $1 \%$ agarose, ethidium bromide stain): lane 1, control; lanes $2-6,5000,2000,1000,500$, and $100 \mu \mathrm{M}$ of $\mathbf{3 0}$, respectively. Key: I, form I DNA; II, form II DNA, III, form III DNA.
yield of the transesterified compound 29 (Scheme VII). However, attempted hydrolysis of either $\mathbf{1 0}$ or $\mathbf{2 9}$ by treatment with hydroxide under a variety of conditions led to the gradual decomposition of the material. Similarly, other standard procedures for carbamate cleavage resulted in decomposition of both 10 and $\mathbf{2 9 .}{ }^{22}$

Treatment of 22 with 2.5 equiv of $\mathrm{LiAlH}_{4}$ in THF at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 30 min , quenching with a minimum amount of aqueous sodium bicarbonate solution, filtration, and storage at $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ gave a solution that was demonstrated to contain a significant quantity of the free amine $\mathbf{3 0}$ (Scheme VIII) by fast atom bombardment (FAB+) mass spectral analysis ( $98 \%$ intensity). ${ }^{23}$ However, attempted purification of $\mathbf{3 0}$ gave a complex mixture of products as shown by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectroscopy. It was found, though, that the crude amine 30 from the $\mathrm{LiAlH}_{4}$ reduction could be stabilized as its bis(dicobalt) complex 31, isolated in $25 \%$ overall yield, and characterized. Storage of the amine 30 at $25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ resulted in the rapid formation of the aromatized product 32 , which was isolated in $28 \%$ yield.

None of the N -protected model systems displayed any DNAcleavage activity when incubated with $\Phi \mathrm{X} 174 \mathrm{DNA}$ as determined by agarose gel electrophoresis. By contrast, the freshly prepared crude solution of amine $\mathbf{3 0}$ made by $\mathrm{LiAlH}_{4}$ reduction of 22 as described above was found to cause significant DNA cleavage when incubated with $\Phi$ X 174 DNA (see Figure 3, concentrations

[^8]
## Scheme IX ${ }^{a}$


${ }^{a}$ Proposed DNA-cleavage mode of action of dynemicin A model 30.
of $\mathbf{3 0}$ calculated assuming quantitative conversion of 22). Furthermore, these results clearly indicate that, like dynemicin A (2) itself, ${ }^{11}$ compound 30 causes cleavage of double-stranded DNA (giving linear form III DNA). This is in contrast to other DNA-cleaving agents possessing an alkylating mode of action that have been produced within these laboratories and that display single-stranded cleavage (giving relaxed form II DNA). ${ }^{24}$ DNA cleavage by compound 30 was found to be pH -independent over the range $5-8.5$. The DNA-cleavage activity of the THF solution of 30 stored at $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ was not found to significantly decrease over a period of 7 days, but storage at $25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ resulted in the rapid loss of DNA-cleavage activity, thus reflecting the low stability of 30 .

These results suggest a DNA-cleavage mode of action of dynemicin A model 30 as outlined in Scheme IX. Opening of the epoxide moiety of $\mathbf{3 0}$ is initiated by the lone pair of the nitrogen (which is unavailable due to delocalization in the case of the carbamates) to give the $o$-quinone methide-type intermediate 33. Nucleophilic trapping of $\mathbf{3 3}$ gives the cis-opened epoxide 34 (cd $=3.15 \AA$, MMX), ${ }^{13,14}$ which undergoes the Bergman cyclization to give the benzenoid diradical 35 and which in turn abstracts H atoms from the sugar phosphate backbone of DNA, resulting in DNA cleavage. It is also expected that the introduction of oxygen or nitrogen at strategic positions on the aromatic moiety of dynemicin A models may serve as a suitable trigger for epoxide opening and thus radical generation.

## Conclusion

The synthesis of the model systems 10 and 22 of dynemicin A (2) containing the nitrogen, enediyne, and epoxide functionalities has been achieved. These models have been shown to undergo acid-induced triggering to give the corresponding Bergman-cyclized products in the presence of suitable H atom donors, supporting epoxide opening as a triggering mechanism for the mode of action of dynemicin A (2). Removal of the N protecting group from 22 gave the unstable free amine 30 , which was shown to cause double-stranded-DNA cleavage, presumably in a manner similar to that of dynemicin A (2) itself. The synthesis of these models paves the way for the total synthesis of dynemicin A (2) itself and

[^9]suggests the potential of these and related systems as novel DNA-cleaving molecules and anticancer agents.

## Experimental Section

General Techniques, NMR spectra were recorded on a Bruker AMX- 500 instrument. IR spectra were recorded on a Nicolet 205 FT-IR spectrophotometer. High-resolution mass spectra (HRMS) were recorded on a VG ZAB-ZSE mass spectrometer under electron impact (EI) or fast atom bombardment (FAB) conditions. Elemental analyses were performed by Galbraith Laboratories, Inc., Knoxville, TN.
All reactions were monitored by thin-layer chromatography carried out on $0.25-\mathrm{mm}$ E. Merck silica gel plates ( $60 \mathrm{~F}-254$ ) with UV light, $7 \%$ ethanolic phosphomolybdic acid, or $p$-anisaldehyde solution and heat as the developing agent. Preparative layer chromatography was performed on 0.5 or $0.25 \mathrm{~mm} \times 20 \mathrm{~cm} \times 20 \mathrm{~cm}$ E. Merck silica gel plates ( 60 F 254). E. Merck silica gel ( 60 , particle size $0.040-0.063 \mathrm{~mm}$ ) was used for flash column chromatography.

All reactions were carried out under an argon atmosphere with dry, freshly distilled solvents under anhydrous conditions unless otherwise noted. Yields refer to chromatographically and spectroscopically ( ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR) homogeneous materials, unless otherwise stated.
$\mathbf{7 , 8 , 9 , 1 0 - T e t r a h y d r o p h e n a n t h r i d i n e ~} \mathbf{N}$-Oxide (7a), A solution of 7 ( $27.5 \mathrm{~g}, 150 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) in dichloromethane ( 500 mL ) was treated at $25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ with $m$ CPBA ( 56.58 g of a $55 \%$ sample, 180 mmol ) and stirred for 1 h . The solution was poured into saturated sodium bicarbonate solution ( 500 mL ) and extracted. The aqueous layer was extracted with further dichloromethane ( $2 \times 500 \mathrm{~mL}$ ), the combined organic layers were dried ( $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$ ) and evaporated in vacuo, and the residue was purified by flash chromatography (silica, $25 \%$ methanol in ethyl acetate) to give the $N$ oxide $7 \mathrm{a}\left(23.35 \mathrm{~g}, 78 \%\right.$ ): off-white crystalline solid; $\mathrm{mp} 131-132{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ (from ethyl acetate); $R_{f}=0.34$ ( $25 \%$ methanol in ethyl acetate); IR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \nu_{\text {max }} 2950,1580,1390,1300,1210,1140 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( 500 $\left.\mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 8.72(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H} 4), 8.31(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H} 6), 7.91$ (d, $J=8.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H} 1$ ), $7.68(\mathrm{t}, J=8.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H} 2$ or H3), $7.61(\mathrm{t}$, $J=8.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H} 2$ or H 3 ), $3.02(\mathrm{t}, J=6.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H} 10), 2.79(\mathrm{t}$, $J=6.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H} 7$ ), $1.98-1.84$ ( $\mathrm{m}, 4 \mathrm{H}$ ); MS ( $\mathrm{FAB}+$ ) $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{e}$ (rel intens) $200(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}, 100), 184(12)$; HRMS for $\mathrm{C}_{13} \mathrm{H}_{14} \mathrm{NO}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})$, caled 200.1075, found 200.1055.

10-Acetoxy-7,8,9,10-tetrahydrophenanthridine (12). A solution of $7,8,9,10$-tetrahydrophenanthridine $N$-oxide (7a) ( $23.35 \mathrm{~g}, 117 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) in acetic anhydride ( 400 mL ) was heated to $100^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 20 h , evaporated to dryness, dissolved in dichloromethane ( 500 mL ), and washed with saturated sodium bicarbonate solution ( 200 mL ). The aqueous layer was extracted with dichloromethane ( $2 \times 200 \mathrm{~mL}$ ), the combined organic layers were dried $\left(\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}\right)$ and evaporated in vacuo, and the residue was purified by flash chromatography (silica, ether) to give the acetate 12 ( $24.55 \mathrm{~g}, 87 \%$ ): white crystalline solid; $\mathrm{mp} 128-129^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ (from ether); $R_{f}=0.33$ (ether); IR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \nu_{\max } 2970,1728,1241 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 8.70(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H} 6$ ), 8.08 (d, $J=9.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H} 4$ ), $7.76(\mathrm{~d}, J=9.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H} 1), 7.63(\mathrm{t}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H} 2$ or H3), 7.52 ( $\mathrm{t}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H} 2$ or H 3 ), 6.57 (br s, $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CHOAc}$ ), 3.02 (br d, $J=17.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H} 7$ ) $2.88-2.80(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H} 7$ ), 2.27 (br d, $J=13.8 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H} 9$ ), 2.05 ( $\mathrm{s}, 3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{OAc}$ ), $2.01-1.88$ (m, 3 H ); ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( 125 MHz , $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 170.2,152.3,147.5,137.8,131.8,130.1,127.9,127.0,126.8$, 122.2, 64.5, 29.1, 27.8, 21.7, 18.4; MS (FAB+) m/e (rel intens) 242 (M $+\mathrm{H}, 100$ ), 182 (23); HRMS for $\mathrm{C}_{15} \mathrm{H}_{16} \mathrm{NO}_{2}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})$, caled 242.1181, found 242.1181. Anal. Calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{15} \mathrm{H}_{15} \mathrm{NO}_{2}: \mathrm{C}, 74.67 ; \mathrm{H}, 6.27$; N , 5.80. Found: C, $74.59 ; \mathrm{H}, 6.31$; N, 5.82 .

10-Hydroxy-7,8,9,10-tetrahydrophenanthridine (13). A solution of 12 ( $24.55 \mathrm{~g}, 102 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) in methanol ( 400 mL ) was treated with potassium carbonate ( 2.0 g , catalytic) and stirred at $25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 1 h . The solution was concentrated to ca. 100 mL , poured into saturated sodium bicarbonate solution ( 500 mL ), and extracted with dichloromethane ( $1 \times$ $500 \mathrm{~mL}, 2 \times 250 \mathrm{~mL}$ ). The combined organic layers were dried ( $\mathrm{Na}_{2}-$ $\mathrm{SO}_{4}$ ) and evaporated in vacuo, and the residue was purified by flash chromatography (silica, ethyl acetate) to give alcohol 13 ( $20.36 \mathrm{~g}, 100 \%$ ): white crystalline solid; $\mathrm{mp} 176-177^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ (from ether); IR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \nu_{\max }$ $3600,2950,1510 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 8.51(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}$, H6), $8.20(\mathrm{~d}, J=9.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H} 4), 8.00(\mathrm{~d}, J=9.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H} 1), 7.61$ (t, $J=6.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H} 2$ or H 3 ), $7.55(\mathrm{t}, J=6.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H} 2$ or H3), 5.39 (br s, $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CHOH}$ ), 2.89 (br d, $J=16.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H} 7$ ), $2.80-2.72$ ( $\mathrm{m}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H} 7$ ) , $2.80-2.60$ (br s, $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{OH}$ ), 2.24 (br d, $J=12.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$, H8 or H9), 2.07-1.88 (m, 3 H); MS (FAB+) m/e (rel intens) 200 (M $+\mathrm{H}), 100$ ), 154 (41), 136 (37), 109 (24); HRMS for $\mathrm{C}_{13} \mathrm{H}_{14} \mathrm{NO}(\mathrm{M}+$ H), calcd 200.1075, found 200.1085 .

10-[(tert-Butyldimethylsilyl)oxy]-7,8,9,10-tetrahydrophenanthridine (14). A stirred solution of $13(20.36 \mathrm{~g}, 102 \mathrm{mmol})$ in dry dichloromethane ( 300 mL ) was cooled to $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and treated with $2,6-\mathrm{lutidine}$ ( 17.9 $\mathrm{mL}, 150 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) and tert-butyldimethylsilyl triflate ( $23.5 \mathrm{~mL}, 120 \mathrm{mmol}$ ). After 1 h at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, methanol ( 10 mL ) was added, stirring was continued
for 5 min , and the reaction mixture was poured into saturated sodium bicarbonate solution ( 500 mL ) and extracted. The aqueous layer was extracted with further dichloromethane $(2 \times 250 \mathrm{~mL})$, the combined organic layers were dried $\left(\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}\right)$ and evaporated in vacuo, and the residue was purified by flash chromatography (silica, $50 \%$ ether in petroleum ether) to give silyl ether 14 ( $29.40 \mathrm{~g}, 92 \%$ ): colorless oil; $R_{f}=$ 0.50 (70\% ether in petroleum ether); IR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \nu_{\text {max }} 2970,2930,2860$ $\mathrm{cm}^{-1}$; ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 8.68(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H} 6), 8.08(\mathrm{~d}, J=4.7$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H} 1$ or H 4$), 8.05(\mathrm{~d}, J=4.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H} 1$ or H 4$), 7.62(\mathrm{t}, J$ $=4.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H} 2$ or H3), $7.53(\mathrm{t}, J=4.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H} 2$ or H3), 5.45 ( $\mathrm{t}, J=2.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H} 10$ ), 3.00 (dd, $J=5.5,16.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}(\mathrm{Ar})$ ), 2.81 (m, $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}(\mathrm{Ar})$ ), 2.23-2.10 (m, $2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH} \mathrm{H}_{2}$ ), $1.88-1.78(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}$, $\left.\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right), 0.84(\mathrm{~s}, 9 \mathrm{H}, t-\mathrm{Bu}), 0.22\left(\mathrm{~s}, 6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{Si}\left(\mathrm{CH}_{3}\right)_{2}\right) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C} \mathrm{NMR}(125 \mathrm{MHz}$ $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 152.8,147.0,141.2,129.8,129.3,127.9,126.9,126.1,123.6$, $63.2,31.8,27.0,25.8,18.2,16.4,-3.6,-4.5$; MS (FAB+) $m / e$ (rel intens) $314(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}, 100), 256$ (7), 182 (11); HRMS for $\mathrm{C}_{19} \mathrm{H}_{28} \mathrm{NOSi}(\mathrm{M}+$ H), caled 314.1940 , found 314.1951 .
$\boldsymbol{N}$-[(Phenyloxy)carbonyl]-10-[(tert -butyldimethylsilyl)oxy]-6-ethynyl-5,6,7,8,9,10-hexahydrophenanthridine (15). A solution of quinoline $14(32.33 \mathrm{~g}, 103 \mathrm{mmol})$ in dry THF ( 500 mL ) was cooled to -78 ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and treated with ethynylmagnesium bromide $(250 \mathrm{~mL}$ of a 0.5 M solution in THF, 125 mmol ). The solution was briefly warmed to $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and cooled to $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ again, and phenyl chloroformate ( $15.7 \mathrm{~mL}, 125$ mmol ) was added. The reaction mixture was allowed to slowly warm to $25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ over 1 h , quenched with saturated ammonium chloride solution ( 50 mL ), poured into saturated sodium bicarbonate solution ( 1 L ), and extracted. The aqueous layer was extracted with dichloromethane ( $2 \times$ $300 \mathrm{~mL})$, the combined organic layers were dried $\left(\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}\right)$ and evaporated in vacuo, and the residue was purified by flash chromatography (silica, $10 \%$ ether in petroleum ether) to give the carbamate 15 (45.71 $\mathrm{g}, 97 \%$ ): colorless oil (ca. 3:1 mixture of isomers as judged by NMR); $R_{f}=0.85$ ( $30 \%$ ether in petroleum ether); IR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \nu_{\text {max }} 3300,2952$, $2858,2250,1715,1473,1204 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 7.68$ (d, $J=7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H} 4), 7.40-7.12(\mathrm{~m}, 8 \mathrm{H}), 5.68$ and $5.61(2 \mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}$, H6), 5.00 and $4.69(2 \mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H} 10), 2.50-1.50(\mathrm{~m}, 7 \mathrm{H}), 0.80$ and 0.92 ( $2 \mathrm{~s}, 9 \mathrm{H}, t$ - Bu ), $0.28,0.19,0.10$, and 0.09 (singlets, $6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{Si}\left(\mathrm{CH}_{3}\right)_{2}$ ) ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $125 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $151.1,136.3,132.9,129.8,129.3,127.2$, $126.0,125.4,125.1,124.2,124.1,123.9,122.0,80.2,72.3,65.0$ and 64.2, 48.7 and $48.2,32.3$ and $31.4,28.0,26.1,18.4$ and $16.3,-4.1$ and -4.8 ; MS $m / e$ (rel intens) $459\left(\mathrm{M}^{+}, 10\right), 402(100), 366(10), 308(24), 206$ (26), 151 (27), 75 (29); HRMS for $\mathrm{C}_{28} \mathrm{H}_{33} \mathrm{O}_{3} \mathrm{NSi}\left(\mathrm{M}^{+}\right)$, caled 459.2230, found 459.2233 .

N-[(Phenyloxy)carbonyl]-10-[(tert-butyldimethylsilyl)oxy]-6a,10a-ep-oxy-6-ethynyl-5,6,6a,7,8,9,10,10a-octahydrophenanthridine (16). A solution of $15(45.71 \mathrm{~g}, 99.6 \mathrm{mmol})$ in dichloromethane ( 300 mL ) was treated with mCPBA ( 62.5 g of a $55 \%$ sample, 200 mmol ) and stirred at $25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 2 h . The reaction mixture was poured into saturated sodium bicarbonate solution ( 500 mL ) and extracted, and the aqueous layer was extracted with further dichloromethane ( $2 \times 300 \mathrm{~mL}$ ). The combined organic layers were dried $\left(\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}\right)$ and evaporated in vacuo, and the residue was purified by flash chromatography (silica, $10 \%$ ether in petroleum ether) to give epoxide $16(40.02 \mathrm{~g}, 85 \%)$ : white foam (ca. $3: 1$ mixture of isomers as judged by NMR); $R_{f}=0.73$ ( $30 \%$ ether in petroleum ether); IR ( $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\nu_{\max } 3307,2953,2250,1721,1494,1384$, $1322,1250,1207 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \mathrm{NMR}\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 7.88(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.1$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H} 4), 7.50-7.10(\mathrm{~m}, 8 \mathrm{H}), 5.58$ (br s, $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H} 6$ ), 4.82 (dd, $J=$ $10.0,5.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H} 10), 2.34(\mathrm{dd}, J=14.8,5.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.09(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 1.95-1.85(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.78-1.62(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.40-1.30(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $\left(125 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 153.9$ and $151.1,135.5,129.2,129.2,129.1$, $128.3,128.1,127.9,127.1,125.5,121.6,78.5,73.8,72.8,69.9,60.4,48.0$, 31.0 and $29.6,26.0$ and $25.8,24.0$ and $26.5,18.2$ and $20.3,-0.28,-0.28$, -0.37 ; MS $m / e$ (rel intens) 475 ( $\mathrm{M}^{+}, 2$ ), 419 (100), 325 (28), 268 (10), 222 (14), 151 (18), 73 (42); HRMS for $\mathrm{C}_{28} \mathrm{H}_{33} \mathrm{O}_{4} \mathrm{NSi}\left(\mathrm{M}^{+}\right)$, calcd 475.2179, found 475.2175.

N-[(Phenyloxy)carbonyl]-6a,10a-epoxy-6-ethynyl-10-hydroxy$5,6,6 a, 7,8,9,10,10 a-$ octahydrophenanthridine (17). A solution of epoxide $16(40.02 \mathrm{~g}, 84.3 \mathrm{mmol})$ in THF ( 400 mL ) was treated with tetrabutylammonium fluoride ((TBA)F) ( 100 mL of a 1.0 M solution in THF, 100 mmol ) and heated to $42^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 3 h . The solution was evaporated in vacuo and the residue purified by flash chromatography (silica, $50 \%$ ether in petroleum ether) to give alcohol $17(30.43 \mathrm{~g}, 100 \%)$ : white crystalline solid (ca. 3:1 mixture of isomers as judged by NMR); mp $78-79^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ (from ether); $R_{f}=0.31$ ( $50 \%$ ether in petroleum ether); IR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \nu_{\text {max }} 3580,3306,2951,2250,1720,1595,1494,1382,1322$, $1206 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 7.91$ and $7.88(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.0 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H} 4), 7.50-7.08(\mathrm{~m}, 8 \mathrm{H}), 5.62$ and $5.59(\mathrm{~d}, J=1.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H} 6)$, 4.89 and $4.70(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H} 10), 2.47-1.35(\mathrm{~m}, 8 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( 125 MHz , $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 150.9,135.5,129.3,128.7,128.6,128.4,127.7,127.3,126.1$, $125.8,121.5,78.7$ and $78.2,74.8$ and $70.8,73.2,66.6,65.9$ and $64.4,60.9$ and 58.2, 47.8, 30.3 and 27.0, 24.1 and 19.0, 15.2 and 13.8; MS m/e (rel
intens) 361 ( $\mathrm{M}^{+}, 65$ ), 224 (100), 196 (24), 180 (29), 167 (30), 94 (40), 77 (45); HRMS for $\mathrm{C}_{22} \mathrm{H}_{19} \mathrm{NO}_{4}\left(\mathrm{M}^{+}\right)$, calcd 361.1314 , found 361.1317 .
$\boldsymbol{N}$-[(Phenyloxy)carbonyl]-6a,10a-epoxy-6-ethynyl-10-oxo$5,6,6 \mathrm{a}, 7,8,9,10,10 \mathrm{a}-o c t a h y d r o p h e n a n t h r i d i n e ~(18)$. Alcohol 17 ( 30.43 g , 84.3 mmol ) was dissolved in dichloromethane ( 600 mL ) and treated with activated, powdered $4-\AA$ molecular sieves ( 30 g ) and pyridinium chlorochromate ( $31.7 \mathrm{~g}, 147 \mathrm{mmol}$ ). The suspension was stirred for 1 h at $25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, diluted with ether ( 600 mL ), filtered through Celite, and concentrated in vacuo, and the residue was purified by flash chromatography (silica, $30 \%$ ether in petroleum ether) to give ketone $18(24.1 \mathrm{~g}, 80 \%)$ : white foam; $R_{f}=0.51$ ( $50 \%$ ether in petroleum ether); IR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \nu_{\text {max }}$ 3306, 2259, 1721, 1491, 1321, $1206 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $500 \mathrm{MHZ}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 8.50(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H} 4), 7.53-7.10(\mathrm{~m}, 8 \mathrm{H}$, aromatic), 5.73 (d, $J=2.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H} 6$ ), 2.76 (dt, $J=15.2,4.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H} 9$ ), 2.60 (ddd, $J=15.2,10.4,6.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H} 9), 2.37-2.28(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H} 7$ ), 2.21 (br s, $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{C} \equiv \mathrm{CH}$ ), $2.04-1.90(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H} 8) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $125 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 201.0,153.9,151.0,135.8,129.9,129.3,129.0,127.6,126.1,125.9$, 123.0, 121.5, 77.7, 74.9, 74.2, 57.4, 47.3, 38.9, 23.8, 18.3; MS m/e (rel intens) 359 ( $\mathrm{M}^{+}, 100$ ), 266 (52), 222 (65), 194 (54), 180 (51), 146 (45), 69 (80); HRMS for $\mathrm{C}_{22} \mathrm{H}_{17} \mathrm{NO}_{4}\left(\mathrm{M}^{+}\right)$, calcd 359.1158 , found 359.1154. Anal. Calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{22} \mathrm{H}_{17} \mathrm{NO}_{4}: \mathrm{C}, 73.53 ; \mathrm{H}, 4.77 ; \mathrm{N}, 3.90$. Found: C , 73.27; H, 4.79; N, 3.91
$N$-[(Phenyloxy) carbonyl]-6-[6-(trimethylsilyl)-3( $Z$ )-hexene-1,5-di-ynyl]-6a,10a-epoxy-10-ox0-5,6,6a,7,8,9,10,10a-octahydrophenanthridine (20). Palladium(II) acetate ( $364 \mathrm{mg}, 1.63 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) and triphenylphosphine ( $1.58 \mathrm{~g}, 6.02 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) in dry, degassed benzene ( 200 mL ) were heated under argon at $60^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 1 h . The resulting dark red solution was cooled to $25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, and the ( $Z$ )-chloroeyne $19(5.50 \mathrm{~g}, 34.8 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) in dry, degassed benzene ( 50 mL ) was added, followed by $n$-butylamine ( 3.64 $\mathrm{mL}, 36.8 \mathrm{mmol}$ ). The solution was stirred for 15 min at $25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and cooled to $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, and the acetylene $18(8.51 \mathrm{~g}, 23.7 \mathrm{mmol})$ in dry, degassed benzene ( 120 mL ) was added, followed by copper(I) iodide ( $973 \mathrm{mg}, 5.11$ mmol ). The solution was stirred for 2 h at $25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, poured into saturated sodium bicarbonate solution ( 400 mL ), and extracted. The aqueous layer was extracted with dichloromethane ( $2 \times 200 \mathrm{~mL}$ ), the combined organic layers were dried $\left(\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}\right)$ and evaporated in vacuo, and the residue was purified by flash chromatography (silica, $20 \%$ ether in petroleum ether) to give the enediyne 20 ( $9.83 \mathrm{~g}, 86 \%$ ): colorless gum; $R_{f}=0.51$ ( $30 \%$ ether in petroleum ether); IR ( $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\nu_{\text {max }} 2962,1720,1492,1378,1322$, $1252,1206,846 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 8.36(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.5$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H} 4), 7.52-7.09(\mathrm{~m}, 8 \mathrm{H}$, aromatic), $5.99(\mathrm{~d}, J=1.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$, H6), 5.82 (d, $J=11.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$, olefinic), 5.66 (dd, $J=11.2,1.6 \mathrm{~Hz}$, 1 H , olefinic), 2.76 (dt, $J=15.3,4.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H} 9$ ), 2.71 (ddd, $J=15.3$, $10.8,6.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H} 9$ ), 2.39-2.30 (m, $2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H} 7$ ), $2.07-1.89$ (m, $2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H} 8$ ), $0.25\left(\mathrm{~s}, 9 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{Si}\left(\mathrm{CH}_{3}\right)_{2}\right) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $125 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 201.1,150.9$, 135.8, 129.9, 129.2, 128.9, 128.4, 127.7, 126.0, 125.8, 122.9, 121.4, 120.8, $118.9,103.6,101.5,90.4,83.0,74.9,57.5,48.3,38.9,23.9,18.2,0.00$; MS $m / e$ (rel intens) $481\left(\mathrm{M}^{+}, 11\right), 360$ (100), 146 (10); HRMS for $\mathrm{C}_{29} \mathrm{H}_{27} \mathrm{O}_{4} \mathrm{NSi}\left(\mathrm{M}^{+}\right)$, calcd 481.1709 , found 481.1705 .
$\boldsymbol{N}$-[(Phenyloxy)carbonyl]-6-(3(Z)-hexene-1,5-diynyl)-6a,10a-epoxy-$10-$ ox0-5,6,6a, $7,8,9,10,10$ a-octahydrophenanthridine (9). Silver nitrate $(13.8 \mathrm{~g}, 81.6 \mathrm{mmol})$ was added to a solution of the silylacetylene 20 ( 9.83 $\mathrm{g}, 20.4 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) in 200 mL of a $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{EtOH}-\mathrm{THF}$ mixture ( $1: 1: 1$ ) at 25 ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, and the mixture was stirred until TLC analysis ( $30 \%$ ether in petroleum ether) indicated consumption of 20 (approximately 5 min ). Potassium cyanide ( $10.7 \mathrm{~g}, 143 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was then added and the mixture stirred for 10 min , poured into saturated sodium bicarbonate solution $(200 \mathrm{~mL})$, and extracted with dichloromethane $(3 \times 200 \mathrm{~mL})$. The combined organic layers were dried $\left(\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}\right)$ and evaporated in vacuo, and the residue was purified by flash chromatography (silica, $30 \%$ ether in petroleum ether) to give the enediyne $9(6.51 \mathrm{~g}, 78 \%)$ : colorless gum; $R_{f}=0.38$ (30\% ether in petroleum ether); IR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \nu_{\max } 3304,2940$, 2260, 2240, 1720, 1492, 1378, 1321, $1206 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( 500 MHz , $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 8.36(\mathrm{dd}, J=7.8,1.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H} 4), 7.53-7.09(\mathrm{~m}, 8 \mathrm{H}$, aromatic), 5.93 (d, $J=1.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H} 6$ ), 5.78 and 5.79 (AB quartet, $J=10.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}$, olefinic), $3.16(\mathrm{~d}, J=1.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{C} \equiv \mathrm{CH})$, 2.79-2.66 (m, 2 H, H9), 2.38-2.29 (m, $2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H} 7$ ), 2.04-1.89 (m, 2 H , H 8 ) ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $125 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 201.2,150.9,135.9,130.0,129.3$, $129.3,128.8,127.6,125.9,125.8,123.0,121.4,120.4,120.2,90.6,85.1$, 82.8, 80.1, 75.1, 57.4, 48.1, 38.9, 23.9, 18.3; MS m/e (rel intens) 409 $\left(\mathrm{M}^{+}, 2\right), 262(15), 212(18), 162(59), 58(100) ;$ HRMS for $\mathrm{C}_{26} \mathrm{H}_{19} \mathrm{NO}_{4}$ $\left(\mathrm{M}^{+}\right)$, calcd 409.1314 , found 409.1308.

Compound 10. A solution of enediyne $9(6.51 \mathrm{~g}, 15.9 \mathrm{mmol})$ in dry toluene ( 400 mL ) was cooled to $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and treated with lithium diisopropylamide ( 10.6 mL of a 1.5 M solution in cyclohexane, 15.9 mmol ). After the solution was stirred for 1 h at $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, the reaction was quenched with saturated ammonium chloride solution ( 10 mL ) and the solution allowed to warm to room temperature, poured into saturated sodium bicarbonate solution ( 400 mL ), and extracted. The aqueous layer was extracted with dichloromethane ( $2 \times 200 \mathrm{~mL}$ ), and the combined
organic layers were dried $\left(\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}\right)$ and evaporated in vacuo, and the residue was purified by flash chromatography (silica, $30 \rightarrow 50 \%$ ether in petroleum ether) to give recovered $9(1.61 \mathrm{~g}, 25 \%)$ followed by the 10 -membered enediyne 10 ( $3.86 \mathrm{~g}, 59 \%$ ): white crystalline solid; mp $228-230^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ dec (from ether); $R_{f}=0.42$ ( $50 \%$ ether in petroleum ether); IR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \nu_{\text {max }} 3420,2205,2192,1720 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $(500 \mathrm{MHz}$, $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 8.60(\mathrm{dd}, J=8.1,1.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$, aromatic), $7.47-7.10(\mathrm{~m}, 8 \mathrm{H}$, aromatic), 5.83 (d, $J=10.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$, olefinic), 5.67 (dd, $J=10.1,1.6$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$, olefinic), $5.53(\mathrm{~d}, J=1.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{C} H \mathrm{~N}), 2.35-1.71(\mathrm{~m}, 6 \mathrm{H}$, $\mathrm{CH}_{2}$ ); ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $125 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 151.0,135.8,131.3,129.3,128.0$, 127.8, 126.3, 125.8, 125.3, 124.0, 122.2, 121.6, 121.6, 100.4, 94.3, 93.9, 88.8, 74.1, 73.2, 64.4, 50.5, 35.4, 23.2; 19.1; MS m/e (rel intens) 409 ( $\mathrm{M}^{+}, 26$ ), 368 (18), 236 (11), 162 (13), 131 (100); HRMS for $\mathrm{C}_{26} \mathrm{H}_{19}-$ $\mathrm{NO}_{4}\left(\mathrm{M}^{+}\right)$, caled 409.1314, found 409.1314. Anal. Caled for $\mathrm{C}_{26} \mathrm{H}_{19} \mathrm{NO}_{4} \cdot \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}: \mathrm{C}, 73.06 ; \mathrm{H}, 4.95 ; \mathrm{N}, 3.28$. Found: C, 73.44; H, 5.04; N, 3.26 .

Compound 21, Thiocarbonyldiimidazole ( $180 \mathrm{mg}, 0.99 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was added to a solution of the alcohol 10 ( $137 \mathrm{mg}, 0.335 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) and DMAP $(25 \mathrm{mg}, 0.18 \mathrm{mmol})$ in dichloromethane ( 2 mL ) at $25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. After 48 h , the solution was concentrated in vacuo and the residue purified by flash chromatography (silica, $80 \%$ ether in petroleum ether) to give thionoimidazolide 21 ( $160 \mathrm{mg}, 95 \%$ ): white crystalline solid; $\mathrm{mp} 178-179^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ dec (from ether/dichloromethane); $R_{f}=0.62$ ( $70 \%$ ether in petroleum ether); IR ( $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\nu_{\text {max }} 3042,2912,2195,1710,1500,1495,1212,1105$ $\mathrm{cm}^{-1} ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 8.49(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{NCH}=\mathrm{N}) 7.71-7.05$ (m, 11 H , aromatic), 5.93 (d, $J=10.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$, olefinic), 5.73 (dd, $J$ $=10.3,1.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$, olefinic), $5.60(\mathrm{~d}, J=1.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{NCHC} \equiv \mathrm{C})$, $3.08\left(\mathrm{~d}, J=11.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}_{2}\right), 2.46-1.70\left(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $\left(125 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 179.1,153.4,151.0,137.0,135.9,130.9,129.4$, 129.3, 128.2, 127.0, 126.4, 125.8, 125.4, 123.9, 123.2, 121.3, 117.7, 100.6, 94.3, 93.9, 88.9, 85.4, 74.5, 65.9, 63.2, 50.3, 28.0, 22.7, 18.4; MS (FAB+) $m / e$ (rel intens) 653 (M + Cs, 21 ), 419 (19), 379 (15), 286 (100), 154 (30); HRMS for $\mathrm{C}_{30} \mathrm{H}_{21} \mathrm{~N}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{4} \mathrm{SCs}$ (M + Cs), calcd 653.0385, found 653.0360. Anal. Caled for $\mathrm{C}_{30} \mathrm{H}_{21} \mathrm{~N}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{4} \mathrm{~S}: \mathrm{C}, 69.35 ; \mathrm{H}, 4.07 ; \mathrm{N}, 8.09$; S, 6.17. Found: C, 69.01; H, 4.17 ; N, 7.91 ; S, 6.19

Compound 22. A solution of thionoimidazolide 21 ( $144.5 \mathrm{mg}, 0.278$ mmol ) in toluene ( 5 mL ) was treated with $n-\mathrm{Bu}_{3} \mathrm{SnH}(150 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.56$ mmol ) and AIBN ( 10 mg , catalytic) and stirred at $80^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 2 h . The solution was concentrated in vacuo and the residue purified by flash chromatography (silica, $5 \rightarrow 30 \%$ ether in petroleum ether) to give the deoxygenated compound 22 ( $94.3 \mathrm{mg}, 86 \%$ ): white crystalline solid; mp $248-250^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ dec (from ether); $R_{f}=0.62$ ( $30 \%$ ether in petroleum ether); IR ( $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\nu_{\text {max }} 2945,2872,2232,2205,1712,1465,1325,1185 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 7.67(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$, a romatic), $7.6-7.14$ (m, 8 H , aromatic), 5.84 (dd, $J=10.5,1.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$, olefinic), 5.72 (dd, $J=10.5,1.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$, olefinic), 5.57 (d, $J=1.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$, $\mathrm{NC} H \mathrm{C} \equiv \mathrm{C}), 3.85(\mathrm{~d}, J=1.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{C} \equiv \mathrm{CCHC}), 2.49\left(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)$, $2.30\left(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}_{2}\right), 2.12-1.60\left(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)$; ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( 125 MHz , $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 151.0,135.5,129.4,129.4,128.2,127.3,125.8,125.8,125.4$, $125.0,122.0,122.0,121.5,101.8,94.9,91.4,88.8,70.5,61.1,50.0,29.8$, 22.9, 22.5, 15.5; MS m/e (rel intens) 393 ( $\mathrm{M}^{+}, 20$ ), 294 (9), 262 (15), 212 (11), 149 (42); HRMS for $\mathrm{C}_{26} \mathrm{H}_{19} \mathrm{O}_{3} \mathrm{~N}\left(\mathrm{M}^{+}\right)$, calcd 393.1365, found 393.1332.

Compound 23, A solution of enediyne $\mathbf{1 0}$ ( $100.1 \mathrm{mg}, 0.224 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) in pyridine ( 2 mL ) was treated with acetic anhydride ( $0.50 \mathrm{~mL}, 5.31 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) and DMAP ( 10 mg , catalytic) at $25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. After 2 h , the reaction mixture was poured into saturated sodium bicarbonate solution ( 25 mL ) and extracted with dichloromethane ( $3 \times 25 \mathrm{~mL}$ ), the combined organic layers were dried $\left(\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}\right)$ and evaporated in vacuo, and the residue was purified by flash chromatography (silica, $30 \%$ ether in petroleum ether) to give acetate 23 ( $110.7 \mathrm{mg}, 100 \%$ ): white crystalline solid; $\mathrm{mp} 212-214$ ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ dec (from ether); $R_{f}=0.55$ ( $50 \%$ ether in petroleum ether); IR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \nu_{\text {max }} 3075,2950,2215,1742,1720,1500,1216,769 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 7.92(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$, a romatic), $7.50-7.09$ (m, 8 H , aromatic), 5.83 (d, $J=10.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$, olefinic), 5.65 (d, $J=10.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$, olefinic), $5.53(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{NCH}(\mathrm{C}) \mathrm{C}), 2.51-1.70(\mathrm{~m}$, $6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ ), $2.18(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{OAc}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $125 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 169.1$, $150.8,130.0,129.3,128.4,128.1,128.0,127.2,126.8,125.7,125.2,124.3$, $122.9,121.5,97.9,96.5,93.7,88.9,78.0,73.5,62.6,50.3,29.8,22.7,21.8$, 18.8; MS (FAB+) m/e 452 (M + H, 52), 410 (37), 392 (100), 316 (32), 272 (43), 242 (30), 154 (77), 136 (70); HRMS for $\mathrm{C}_{28} \mathrm{H}_{28} \mathrm{NO}_{5}$ (M + H), calcd 452.1498 , found 452.1469 .

Compound 25b. A solution of enediyne $22(30 \mathrm{mg}, 0.076 \mathrm{mmol})$ and 1,4 -cyclohexadiene ( 0.5 mL ) in benzene ( 1.5 mL ) was treated with $p$ toluenesulfonic acid ( $18 \mathrm{mg}, 0.09 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) and stirred at $25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 24 h . The solvent was removed in vacuo and the residue purified by flash chromatography (silica, $50 \%$ ether in petroleum ether) to give diol 25b ( $26 \mathrm{mg}, 85 \%$ ): colorless gum; $R_{f}=0.35$ ( $50 \%$ ether in petroleum ether); $1 \mathrm{R}\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \nu_{\text {max }} 3310,3082.2925,1705,1592,1395,1200 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 7.58$ (br d, $J=4.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$, aromatic), 7.47
(br d, $J=7.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$, aromatic), $7.40-7.09(\mathrm{~m}, 10 \mathrm{H}$, aromatic), 6.81 (d, $J=8.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$, aromatic), 5.78 (s, $1 \mathrm{H}, N$-benzylic), 4.00 (br s, 2 $\mathrm{H}, \mathrm{OH}$ ), 3.24 (s, 1 H , benzylic), $2.42-0.72$ ( $\mathrm{m}, 6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}$ ) ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $\left(125 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 151.0,138.2,134.7,129.4,129.4,129.3,128.8$, 128.4, 128.3, 127.1, 126.9, 125.7, 125.0, 124.4, 121.8, 121.8, 121.5, 83.0, $66.2,65.1,51.2,33.5,27.1,18.7$; MS (FAB+) $m / e$ (rel intens) 546 (M $+\mathrm{Cs}, 15$ ), $379(31), 312(30), 286(100)$; HRMS for $\mathrm{C}_{26} \mathrm{H}_{23} \mathrm{O}_{4} \mathrm{NCs}(\mathrm{M}$ + Cs), calcd 546.0681, found 546.0691 .
Compound 25 c , A solution of enediyne $23(93.0 \mathrm{mg}, 0.206 \mathrm{mmol})$ and 1,4-cyclohexadiene ( 1.0 mL ) in benzene ( 3.0 mL ) was treated with p toluenesulfonic acid ( $39 \mathrm{mg}, 0.23 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) and stirred at $60^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 2 h . The solvent was removed in vacuo and the residue purified by flash chromatography (silica, $50 \%$ ether in petroleum ether) to give diol $\mathbf{2 5 c}$ ( $80.2 \mathrm{mg}, 83 \%$ ): white crystalline solid; $\mathrm{mp} 198-200^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ (from ether); $R_{f}=0.22$ ( $50 \%$ ether in petroleum ether); IR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \nu_{\max } 3360,3072$, $2950,1738,1715,1500,1192 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 7.57$ (d, $J=7.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$, aromatic), $7.40-7.01$ (m, 12 H , aromatic), 6.83 (br $\mathrm{s}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{OH}$ ), 5.59 (s, $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{NCH}(\mathrm{C}) \mathrm{C}), 3.17\left(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}_{2}\right), 2.28(\mathrm{~m}$, $\left.1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}_{2}\right), 2.26(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{OAc}), 1.80-1.40\left(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}_{2}\right), 0.72(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}$, $\left.\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $125 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 174.9,150.8,137.7,134.8,133.5$, 129.7, 129.3, 129.2, 129.0, 128.8, 128.5, 128.2, 127.8, 127.7, 125.5, 124.8, $123.4,121.8,93.8,75.1,70.6,61.4,32.5,31.4,22.6,19.8 ; \mathrm{MS} \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{e}$ (rel intens) $471\left(\mathrm{M}^{+}, 19\right), 245(100), 162(100), 94$ (42); HRMS for $\mathrm{C}_{28^{-}}$ $\mathrm{H}_{25} \mathrm{O}_{6} \mathrm{~N}\left(\mathrm{M}^{+}\right)$, calcd 471.1682, found 471.1683. Anal. Calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{28} \mathrm{H}_{25} \mathrm{O}_{6} \mathrm{~N}: \mathrm{C}, 71.33 ; \mathrm{H}, 5.34 ; \mathrm{N}, 2.97$. Found: C, 71.36; H, $5.54 ; \mathrm{N}$, 2.84 .

Compound 25d, Dry HCl gas was bubbled through a solution of acetate 23 ( $32 \mathrm{mg}, 0.071 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) and 1,4 -cyclohexadiene ( $40 \mathrm{mg}, 0.32$ mmol ) in dichloromethane ( 4 mL ) at $25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 1 min . The solvent was removed in vacuo and the residue purified by flash chromatography (silica, $50 \%$ ether in petroleum ether) to give chloride $\mathbf{2 5 d}$ ( $25 \mathrm{mg}, 80 \%$ ): colorless gum; $R_{f}=0.21$ ( $50 \%$ ether in petroleum ether); IR ( $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\nu_{\text {max }} 3500,2945,1710,1492,1400,1225,789 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( 500 MHz , $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 7.72(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$, aromatic), $7.45-6.96(\mathrm{~m}, 12 \mathrm{H}$, aromatic), 5.85 (s, 1 H , benzylic), 2.56 (br s, $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{OH}$ ), 2.37 (br s, 1 H , $\mathrm{OH}), 2.34-1.42\left(\mathrm{~m}, 6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C} \operatorname{NMR}\left(125 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 151.2$, 134.7, 132.6, 130.4, 129.4, 129.3, 128.6, 128.5, 128.2, 128.2, 128.1, 127.5, 125.7, 124.5, 124.2, 124.0, 121.7.81.2, 80.4, 70.2, 62.7, 35.4, 33.7, 18.8; MS (FAB+) $m / e$ (rel intens) 580 (M + Cs, 100), 419 (42), 286 (100), 154 (37); HRMS for $\mathrm{C}_{26} \mathrm{H}_{22} \mathrm{O}_{4} \mathrm{NClCs}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Cs}$ ), calcd 580.0291 , found 580.0286 .

Compound 25e. Dry HCl gas was bubbled through a solution of enediyne $22(28 \mathrm{mg}, 0.071 \mathrm{mmol})$ and 1,4 -cyclohexadiene ( $40 \mathrm{mg}, 0.32$ mmol ) in dichloromethane ( 4 mL ) at $25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 1 min . The solvent was removed in vacuo and the residue purified by flash chromatography (silica, $50 \%$ ether in petroleum ether) to give chloride 25 e ( 24.3 mg , $79 \%$ ): pale yellow solid; mp $114-116{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ (from ether); $R_{f}=0.62$ ( $50 \%$ ether in petroleum ether); IR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \nu_{\max } 3500,3065,2932,1712,1495$, $1382,1200 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 7.71-6.73(\mathrm{~m}, 13 \mathrm{H}$, aromatic), 5.87 (s, $1 \mathrm{H}, N$-benzylic), 3.62 (s, 1 H , benzylic), 2.52 (br s, $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{OH}), 2.50-1.60\left(\mathrm{~m}, 6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; \mathrm{MS} m / e$ (rel intens) $564(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Cs}$, 5), 419 (100), 379 ( 58 ); HRMS for $\mathrm{C}_{26} \mathrm{H}_{22} \mathrm{O}_{3} \mathrm{NClCs}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Cs}$ ), caled 564.0343, found 564.0351.

Compound 26. Method i. A solution of enediyne $\mathbf{1 0}$ ( $57.8 \mathrm{mg}, 0.141$ mmol ) and 1,4 -cyclohexadiene ( 0.5 mL ) in benzene ( 1.5 mL ) was treated with $p$-toluenesulfonic acid ( $29.6 \mathrm{mg}, 0.155 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) and stirred at $25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 24 h . The solvent was removed in vacuo and the residue purified by flash chromatography (silica, $50 \%$ ether in petroleum ether) to give ketone 26 ( $53.7 \mathrm{mg}, 92 \%$ ).

Method ii. Trimethylsilyl triflate ( $15 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.08 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was added to a solution of enediyne 10 ( $32 \mathrm{mg}, 0.078 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) and triethylsilane ( 40 mg , 0.32 mmol ) in dichloromethane ( 2 mL ) at $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. After 5 min , the mixture was quenched at $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ with saturated ammonium chloride solution ( 1 mL ), diluted with ether ( 10 mL ), washed with water ( $2 \times 3$ mL ) and brine ( 3 mL ), and dried ( $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$ ). The organic solvent was removed in vacuo, and the residue was purified by flash chromatography (silica, $50 \%$ ether in petroleum ether) to give ketone 26 ( $22 \mathrm{mg}, 68 \%$ ).

Method iii. Dry HCl gas was bubbled through a solution of enediyne $10(32 \mathrm{mg}, 0.078 \mathrm{mmol})$ and 1,4 -cyclohexadiene ( $40 \mathrm{mg}, 0.32 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) in dichloromethane ( 4 mL ) at $25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 30 s . The solvent was removed in vacuo and the residue purified by flash chromatography (silica, $50 \%$ ether in petroleum ether) to give ketone 26 ( $25 \mathrm{mg}, 78 \%$ ): white crystalline solid; $\mathrm{mp} 191-193^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ (from dichloromethane/ether); $R_{f}=0.63$ ( $70 \%$ ether in petroleum ether); IR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \nu_{\text {max }} 3480,3080,2935,1712,1490$, $1264,1192 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 8.33$ (dd, $J=7.9,1.3$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$, aromatic), 8.09 (d, $J=7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$, aromatic), $7.54-7.02$ (m, 11 H , aromatic), 5.65 (s, 1 H, benzylic), 2.75 (br s, 1 H, OH), 2.69-1.80 ( $\mathrm{m}, 6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ ); ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $125 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 207.5,153.0,150.9$, 148.2, 137.1, 134.2, 129.8, 129.5, 128.5, 128.2, 127.8, 127.1, 126.1, 126.0, 124.3, 122.8, 121.8, 121.3, 82.5, 65.0, 64.1, 40.0, 30.2, 23.5; MS m/e (rel
intens) 411 ( $\mathrm{M}^{+}, 100$ ), 318 (58), 274 (49), 246 (12), 217 (55), 94 (29); HRMS for $\mathrm{C}_{26} \mathrm{H}_{21} \mathrm{O}_{4} \mathrm{~N}\left(\mathrm{M}^{+}\right)$, calcd 411.1471 , found 411.1468 . Anal. Calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{26} \mathrm{H}_{21} \mathrm{O}_{4} \mathrm{~N}$ : C, $75.90 ; \mathrm{H}, 5.14 ; \mathrm{N}, 3.40$. Found: C, 75.66 ; H, 5.45; N, 3.14 .

Compound 27. A solution of enediyne $10(124 \mathrm{mg}, 0.30 \mathrm{mmol}) \mathrm{in}$ dichloromethane ( 4 mL ) was treated with $\mathrm{Co}_{2}(\mathrm{CO})_{8}(260 \mathrm{mg}, 0.76$ mmol ) and stirred at $25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 10 min . The solution was concentrated in vacuo and the residue purified by flash chromatography (silica, $30 \%$ ether in petroleum ether) to give the bis(dicobalt) complex 27 ( 291 mg , $98 \%$ ): green crystalline solid; $\mathrm{mp}>300^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ (from ether); $R_{f}=0.80(50 \%$ ether in petroleum ether); IR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \nu_{\max } 3500,2950,2872,2095,2070$, $2025,1725,1492,1207 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(500 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{Hz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) 88.87(\mathrm{br}$ $\mathrm{s}, 1 \mathrm{H}$, aromatic), $7.61-7.02(\mathrm{~m}, 8 \mathrm{H}$, aromatic), 6.47 (br s, $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{NCH}-$ (C)C), $6.38(\mathrm{brd}, J=10.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$, olefinic), $6.19(\mathrm{brd}, J=10.7 \mathrm{~Hz}$, 1 H , olefinic), $3.50(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{OH}), 2.70-1.71\left(\mathrm{~m}, 6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $\left(125 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 199.1,198.6,197.8,151.3,134.9,132.9,130.9$, $129.4,128.8,127.2,125.8,125.3,125.1,124.8,123.4,121.6,98.5,88.9$, 81.5, 80.1, 78.0, 73.9, 63.1, 59.0, 44.2, 24.9, 17.1; MS (FAB+) m/e (rel intens) $1114(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Cs}, 11), 1086(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Cs}-\mathrm{CO}, 18), 1058(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Cs}-$ $2 \mathrm{CO}, 6), 1030(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Cs}-3 \mathrm{CO}, 19), 1002(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Cs}-4 \mathrm{CO}, 11), 943$ ( $\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Cs}-4 \mathrm{CO}-\mathrm{Co}, 10$ ), 918 (11), 890 (24), 862 (34), 813 (100); HRMS for $\mathrm{C}_{38} \mathrm{H}_{19} \mathrm{O}_{16} \mathrm{NCO}_{4} \mathrm{Cs}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Cs})$, calcd 1113.7086, found 1113.7001 .

Compound 28. A solution of the cobalt complex 27 ( $291 \mathrm{mg}, 0.30$ mmol ) in dichloromethane ( 4 mL ) was treated at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ with trifluoroacetic acid $(68.6 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.89 \mathrm{mmol})$. After 5 min , the mixture was poured into saturated sodium bicarbonate solution ( 25 mL ) and extracted with dichloromethane ( $3 \times 25 \mathrm{~mL}$ ). The combined organic layers were dried ( $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$ ) and evaporated in vacuo, and the residue was purified by flash chromatography (silica, $50 \%$ ether in petroleum ether) to give ketone 28 ( $167.4 \mathrm{mg}, 81 \%$ ): brown crystalline solid; $\mathrm{mp}>300^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ (from ether); $R_{f}$ $=0.25(50 \%$ ether in petroleum ether $) ; I R\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \nu_{\text {max }} 3408,2945$, $2100,2065,2032,1875,1735,1680,1512,1217 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR (500 $\left.\mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 7.81(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$, aromatic), $7.42-7.11(\mathrm{~m}, 8$ H, aromatic), 7.00 (d, $J=10.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$, olefinic), 6.39 (s, $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{NCH}-$ (C)C), $5.52(\mathrm{~d}, J=10.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$, olefinic), $3.35-1.82(\mathrm{~m}, 7 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}$, $\mathrm{OH}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $125 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 202.9,198.9,198.1,154.3,150.9$, 144.0, 133.2, 132.8, 129.6, 128.3, 128.1, 126.7, 126.0, 125.8, 123.3, 121.8, $108.7,93.2,92.5,82.1,81.0,68.5,56.2,38.0,30.2,21.6$; MS (FAB+) $m / e$ (rel intens) 828 ( $\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Cs}, 17$ ), 800 (18), 688 (74), 639 (20), 555 (32), 527 (100); HRMS for $\mathrm{C}_{32} \mathrm{H}_{19} \mathrm{NO}_{10} \mathrm{Co}_{2} \mathrm{Cs}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Cs})$, calcd 827.8727, found 827.8730. Anal. Calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{32} \mathrm{H}_{19} \mathrm{NO}_{10} \mathrm{CO}_{2}$ : C, 55.27; H, 2.75; N, 2.01; Co, 16.97. Found: C, 54.98; H, 2.79; N, 1.86; Co, 15.22.

Compound 26. A solution of cobalt complex 28 ( $42 \mathrm{mg}, 0.060 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) in dichloromethane ( 1 mL ) was treated with trimethylamine $N$-oxide ( $32.7 \mathrm{mg}, 0.29 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) and stirred at $25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 1 h . The solution was concentrated in vacuo and the residue purified by flash chromatography (silica, $50 \%$ ether in petroleum ether) to give aromatized product 26 (17.7 $\mathrm{mg}, 83 \%$ ).

Compound 29. A solution of the phenyl carbamate 10 ( $42 \mathrm{mg}, 0.103$ mmol) in dry methanol ( 4 mL ) was treated with sodium methoxide ( 17 $\mathrm{mg}, 0.31 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) and heated at $60^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 2 h . The reaction mixture was diluted with dichloromethane ( 25 mL ), washed with sodium bicarbonate solution ( 25 mL ), dried ( $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$ ), and evaporated in vacuo, and the residue was purified by flash chromatography (silica, $40 \%$ ether in petroleum ether) to give methyl carbamate 29 ( $28.5 \mathrm{mg}, 80 \%$ ): white crystalline solid; mp $126-127^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ (from ether/petroleum ether); $R_{f}=$ 0.43 ( $50 \%$ ether in petroleum ether); IR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \nu_{\max } 3600,3450,2957$, 2257, 2250, $1706 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$, ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 8.65(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.0$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$, aromatic), $7.25-7.10(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}$, aromatic), $5.81(\mathrm{~d}, J=10.1 \mathrm{~Hz}$, 1 H , olefinic), $5.69(\mathrm{~d}, J=10.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$, olefinic), $5.45(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CHN})$, $3.82\left(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{OCH}_{3}\right), 2.79(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{OH}), 2.27-1.72\left(\mathrm{~m}, 6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $\left(125 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 135.9,131.3,127.8,127.5,126.1,124.9$, $123.9,122.1,100.7,94.1,88.3,74.2,73.1,65.8,64.2,53.7,50.1,35.2$, 23.2, 19.2, 15.2; MS $m / e$ (rel intens) $347\left(\mathrm{M}^{+}, 100\right) 291$ (35), 204 (50); HRMS for $\mathrm{C}_{21} \mathrm{H}_{17} \mathrm{NO}_{4}\left(\mathrm{M}^{+}\right)$, calcd 347.1158, found 347.1159. Anal, Calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{21} \mathrm{H}_{17} \mathrm{NO}_{4}$ : $\mathrm{C}, 72.61 ; \mathrm{H}, 4.93 ; \mathrm{N}, 4.03$. Found: $\mathrm{C}, 72.63$; H, 5.24; N, 3.79.

Compound 30. Carbamate 22 ( $39 \mathrm{mg}, 0.10 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) in THF ( 3 mL ) was treated at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ with $\mathrm{LiAlH}_{4}(0.25 \mathrm{~mL}$ of a 1.0 M solution in ether,
0.25 mmol ). After the solution was stirred for 30 min , the reaction was quenched with saturated sodium bicarbonate solution ( 1 mL ) and the solution diluted with ether ( 20 mL ), washed with 1.0 M aqueous LiOH solution ( $2 \times 5 \mathrm{~mL}$ ) in order to remove phenol, dried $\left(\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}\right)$, filtered, and stored under argon at $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ until required. MS (FAB+) $m / e$ (rel intens) 290 (97), 278 (75), 274 (M + H, 98), 235 (100); HRMS for $\mathrm{C}_{19} \mathrm{H}_{16} \mathrm{NO}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})$. calcd 274.1232, found 274.1247 .

Compound 31. The ethereal solution of 30 produced as above by the $\mathrm{LiAlH}_{4}$ reduction of $22(39 \mathrm{mg}, 0.10 \mathrm{mmol})$ was concentrated in vacuo at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, and the residue was dissolved in dichloromethane ( 5 mL ) at 0 ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and treated with $\mathrm{Co}_{2}(\mathrm{CO})_{8}(75 \mathrm{mg}, 0.22 \mathrm{mmol})$. The reaction mixture was stirred for 1 h and concentrated in vacuo, and the residue was purified by flash chromatography (silica, $10 \%$ ether in petroleum ether) to give the bis(dicobalt) complex 31 ( $15.5 \mathrm{mg}, 25 \%$ ): green solid; mp $>300^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ (from ether); $R_{f}=0.80(30 \%$ ether in petroleum ether); IR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \nu_{\text {max }} 2870,2080,2040,1510 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right)$ $\delta 7.50(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$, aromatic), $7.04(\mathrm{t}, J=7.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$, aromatic), $6.73(\mathrm{t}, J=7.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$, aromatic), $6.40(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$, aromatic), 6.31 (d, $J=12.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$, olefinic), $6.19(\mathrm{~d}, J=12.3 \mathrm{~Hz}$, 1 H , olefinic), 4.97 ( $\mathrm{s}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{C} H \mathrm{~N}$ ), 4.30 and $4.20(2 \mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CHCCo}$, $\mathrm{N} H), 2.60-1.50\left(\mathrm{~m}, 6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)$; MS (FAB+) m/e (rel intens) $978(\mathrm{M}$ + Cs, 19), 950 (20), 894 (25), 838 (28), 810 (25), 705 (39), 677 (78), 633 (80), 593 (74), 523 (100); HRMS for $\mathrm{C}_{31} \mathrm{H}_{15} \mathrm{O}_{13} \mathrm{NCO}_{4} \mathrm{Cs}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Cs})$, calcd 977.6926, found 977.6966.

Compound 32. Carbamate 22 ( $42 \mathrm{mg}, 0.11 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) in THF ( 3 mL ) was treated at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ with $\mathrm{LiAlH}_{4}(0.25 \mathrm{~mL}$ of a 1.0 M solution in ether, 0.25 mmol ). After the solution was stirred for 30 min , the reaction was quenched with saturated ammonium chloride solution ( 1 mL ) and the solution diluted with ether ( 15 mL ), washed with water $(2 \times 10 \mathrm{~mL})$ and brine ( 10 mL ), and dried ( $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$ ). The solvent was removed in vacuo, and the residue was dissolved in ethanol and stirred 5 h . The ethanol was removed in vacuo and the residue purified by flash chromatography (silica, $30 \%$ ether in petroleum ether) to give $32(11 \mathrm{mg}, 28 \%)$ : colorless gum; $R_{f}=0.45$ ( $50 \%$ ether in petroleum ether); IR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \nu_{\max } 3400$, $3350,2920,2840,1500 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 7.40(\mathrm{br}$ $\mathrm{s}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{N} H), 7.30(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$, aromatic), $7.20(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.7 \mathrm{~Hz}$, 1 H , aromatic), $7.17(\mathrm{t}, J=6.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$, aromatic), $7.12(\mathrm{t}, J=7.1 \mathrm{~Hz}$, 1 H , aromatic), $7.03(\mathrm{t}, J=7.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}$, aromatic), $6.97(\mathrm{t}, J=7.7 \mathrm{~Hz}$, 1 H , aromatic), $6.93(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$, aromatic), $6.82(\mathrm{t}, J=7.1 \mathrm{~Hz}$, 1 H , aromatic), 6.77 (d, $J=8.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}$, aromatic), $6.72(\mathrm{t}, J=7.1 \mathrm{~Hz}$, 1 H , aromatic), $6.45(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$, aromatic), $4.42(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}, 1 \mathrm{H}$, $\mathrm{CHN}), 3.60(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{OH}), 3.52(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}$, benzylic), $2.61(\mathrm{t}, J=11.1$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ ), 2.29 (dt, $J=3.3,10.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ ), 1.69 (dd, $J=3.3$, $10.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ ), $1.50\left(\mathrm{dd}, J=8.3,10.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}_{2}\right), 1.38(\mathrm{~d}, J$ $\left.=10.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}_{2}\right), 0.88\left(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $(125 \mathrm{MHz}$, $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 158.1,147.8,140.7,138.2,137.9,128.4,128.2,128.1,127.9$, $127.6,126.9,126.4,120.5,120.3,119.6,116.8,80.3,70.4,64.5,56.2$, 32.3, 27.9, 18.7; MS $m / e$ (rel intens) $276\left(\mathrm{M}^{+}-\mathrm{OPh}, 59\right), 258(100)$, 218 (21), 204 (25), 162 (14), 141 (10); HRMS for $\mathrm{C}_{19} \mathrm{H}_{18} \mathrm{NO}\left(\mathrm{M}^{+}-\right.$ OPh), calcd 276.1388, found 276.1379.

DNA-Cleavage Assay of Compound 30, The ethereal solution of 30 produced as above by the $\mathrm{LiAlH}_{4}$ reduction of $\mathbf{2 2}$ ( $39 \mathrm{mg}, 0.10 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was evaporated in vacuo to dryness and dissolved in THF ( 4 mL ) to give a 25 mM solution of $\mathbf{3 0}$, assuming complete conversion of $\mathbf{2 2}$. Analysis of compound 30 induced damage to supercoiled, covalently closed, circular (form I) $\Phi$ X 174 DNA was performed by incubation at varying concentrations of $30(100-5000 \mu \mathrm{M})$ in buffered aqueous solution at 37 ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 12 h , followed by agarose gel electrophoresis to separate the various DNA products-namely, nicked relaxed circular DNA (form II) and linearized DNA (form III). DNA bands were visualized with use of ethidium bromide binding and UV illumination.
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