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A B-A-C route was investigated in which the $C$ ring was constructed using a [2+2] photoaddition reaction between acetylene and an $A B$ ring synthon, 6-carbomethoxy-9,9-diethoxy-5-oxo-8-(2'-trimethylsilyl)ethoxy-methoxy-2-oxabicyclo[2.2.0]deca-3-ene (111).
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In an alternative approach, cis-anti-cis-8-carbomethoxy-11,11-ethylenedioxy-6-methyl-7-oxo-2-oxatricyclo[6.4.0.03,6]docec-4-ene (176) was subjected to $p$-toluenesulfonic acid in refluxing benzene in a variation of the Cargill reaction. This reaction yielded lactone 178, processing the apotrichothecen skeleton.
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# APPROACHES TO THE SYNTHESIS OF TRICHOTHECENE 

## I. INTRODUCTION

Trichothecenes are a family of secondary fungal metabolites produced by organisms such as Trichothecium, Cephalosporium, Myrothecium and Fusarium species. The fungi responsible for producing these trichothecenes have been implicated in certain diseases of humans, animals, and plants such as alimentary toxic aleukia and red-mould disease. 1,2,3 These diseases can result from consumption of contaminated foodstuff. 4 The biological activity of the trichothecenes, ranging from antibacterial to antifungal to cytotoxic, has created widespread interest in their pharmacological profiles. For example, T-2 toxin (1) was found to be an effective inhibitor of $L 1210$ leukemia and KB human epidermal carcinoma in vitro. Other trichothecenes were shown to inhibit the growth of experimental tumors in rats and to inhibit protein synthesis in Hela and Ehrlich ascites tumor cells.


Figure 1: Representative Members of the Trichothecene Family The simplest trichothecenes are tetracyclic sesquiterpenes containing a relatively unreactive oxirane moiety. The more complex trichothecenes bear macrocyclic rings linked by ester linkages at the oxygenated C4 and C15 positions of the sesquiterpene nucleus. The structures of several representative non-macrocyclic trichothecenes including T-2 toxin (1) are recorded in Figure 1. Structure-activity relationships for some of the trichothecenes have been examined. 5 The minimal structural feature required for biological activity in T-2 toxin, for example, is the presence of the C12-C13 epoxide and C9-C10 double bond functionalities. Reduction of the epoxide leads to biologically inactive derivatives while reduction of the olefin greatly diminishes activity. ${ }^{6}$ The epoxide and olefin functionalities have been
implicated in the interaction of trichothecenes with the 60S subunit of an intact 80 s ribosome/mRNA complex that interferes with peptidyl transferase. 7 The hydroxyl or ester substituent at C4 is also necessary for in vitro inhibition of peptidyl transferase. However, structurally similar trichothecenes can inhibit protein synthesis in fundamentally different ways and, at the present time, there is only a poor understanding of the molecular basis for these activities.


Figure 2 : p-Bromobenzoate Derivative of Trichodermol (8)
The structure of the first reported trichothecene, trichodermol (8), was initially based on spectroscopic analysis and chemical studies. The original structure of trichodermol was later shown to be incorrect. A single-crystal X-ray analysis of the $p$-bromobenzoate derivative of trichodermol $(8)^{8}$ revealed its structure as that shown in Figure 2. The spirocyclic epoxide at C 12 has been found to be characteristic of all the trichothecenes.

Despite the identification of over 80 non-macrocyclic trichothecenes, only a few have yielded to total synthesis. The first synthesis of a trichothecene sesquiterpenoid was that of trichodermin (2), reported by Raphael and Colvin in 1971.9 Subsequently, Brooks ${ }^{14}$ reported an enantioselective synthesis of the trioxygenated trichothecene anguidine (5) in 1983. More recently, several polyhydroxylated trichothecenes have been successfully assembled. Syntheses of calonectrin (3) by Kraus, ${ }^{11}$ and of
verrucarol (4) by Schlessinger, 10 Trost ${ }^{12}$ and Roush ${ }^{13}$ are especially noteworthy. The most recent efforts in this area have involved an approach to the skeleton of anguidine reported by Ziegler ${ }^{15}$ and the synthesis of the tetraacetate of T-2 tetraol (6) reported by Colvin in 1990. ${ }^{16}$

## Previous Strategies for Trichothecene Synthesis
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Aldol Approach



Biomimetic Approach

Scheme 1
A survey of trichothecene syntheses in the literature reveals that approaches to the sesquiterpenoid nucleus can be categorized by the type of reaction used to construct the tricyclic ring system from a bicyclic precursor. In a retrosynthetic sense four different disconnections have been employed for assembling the trichothecene skeleton (Scheme 1). Disconnections 1 and 2 imply an aldol approach, while disconnections 3 and 4 represent a biomimetic approach.

## The Aldol Approach : Disconnection 1

The first successful synthesis of a trichothecene, that of trichodermin (2), involved the aldol disconnection 1. The key intermediate in Colvin's synthesis of $\mathbf{2 ~}^{9}$ (Scheme 2) was keto aldehyde 10, which was prepared from p-cresol methyl ether (9). However, all attempts to effect an aldol cyclization of aldehyde 10 to the tricycle $\mathbf{A}$ (Scheme 1) were unsuccessful. Fortunately, a modified approach gave better results; the conversion of 10 to the enol ester 11 and subsequent treatment with one equivalent of lithium tri- $t$ butoxyaluminum hydride of $\mathbf{1 1}$ gave the desired aldol product 12 in $\mathbf{7 \%}$ yield. Trichodermin was synthesized from 12 via a series of five steps.


Scheme 2

Colvin and Raphael failed to extend this aldol approach to a synthesis of verrucarol (4). In retrospect, the aldol approach represented by disconnection 1, although providing the first successful synthesis of a
trichothecenoid, ranks as the least versatile method for construction of the trichothecene ring system.

## An Alternative Aldol Approach : Disconnection 2

Fujimoto and Tatsuno ${ }^{17}$ were the first to examine the aldol approach symbolized in disconnection 2 as an entry to the trichothecene skeleton. They employed this stratagem as the key step in their 1974 synthesis of 12,13-epoxytrichothec-9-ene (19). The synthesis began with the hydrochromanone 14, prepared from the keto ester 13 in eight steps (Scheme 3). The stereocontrolled formation of the quaternary center at C5 was achieved via the Claisen rearrangement of enol ether $\mathbf{1 5}$, giving the desired isomer of ketone 16 in $60 \%$ yield. The key aldol cyclization of 17 to 18 proceeded in $90 \%$ yield. After removal of the 3-hydroxy group of 18, the C12-C13 epoxide of 19 was formed with the correct stereochemistry via epoxidation of the exo olefin.


Scheme 3

The same aldol approach has also been used by Kraus and Roth ${ }^{11}$ to synthesize calonectrin (3) (Scheme 4). The synthesis began with preparation of the cyclohexene 22, constructed via a Diels-Alder reaction, which served to introduce two of the requisite stereogenic centers. Transformation of DielsAlder adduct 22 to the hydrochromanone 23 was accomplished in 11 steps, highlighted by an intramolecular Knoevenagel condensation. Acylation and O-silylation of 23 yielded 24, which underwent a fluoride-induced intramolecular alkylation to afford $\mathbf{2 5}$ with a high degree of stereocontrol at $\mathbf{C 5}$. The key aldol cyclization of $\mathbf{2 6}$, obtained from the reduction and oxidation of 25 , introduced the two carbon bridge of the C ring of $\mathbf{2 7}$.



24

23


3


26


27

Scheme 4
The synthesis of the tetraacetate 34 of T-2 tetraol (6) was reported by Colvin ${ }^{16}$ using this variation of the aldol approach 17 years after his trichodermin synthesis was completed (Scheme 5). 6 The strategy is quite similar to that employed in Fujimoto's synthesis of 12,13-epoxytrichothec-9ene (19). 17 Thus, Claisen rearrangement of 30 , prepared by Diels-Alder addition of isoprene 28 to methyl coumalate (39), provided the $\alpha$-allyl ketone 31. Catalytic osmylation, followed by periodic acid treatment of 31, then
resulted in keto aldehyde 32. Aldol cyclization of 32 followed by alcohol protection gave the tricylic system 33 , from which 34 was obtained by straightforward means.


## Scheme 5

Several studies have been undertaken in order to elucidate the biosynthesis of trichothecenes. Isotopic labelling experiments using radioactive precursors such as $[3-3 \mathrm{H}]$-geranyl pyrophosphate, $[2-13 \mathrm{C}]$ mevalonic acid (35) and [2-3H]-farnesyl pyrophosphate have delineated the biosynthetic pathway to trichodiene (38). ${ }^{18}$ Feeding experiments using C2labelled mevalonic acid 35 led to 6,7-trans-farnesol pyrophosphate (36) labelled as shown in Scheme 6 and thus to 37. The isolation of trichodiene
(38) and trichodiol (39) from Trichothecium roseum 19 has been rationalized via the Wagner-Meerwein shifts in structure 37. A pair of 1,2-methyl shifts and a 1,4-hydride shift would give trichodiene (38). 20 Hanson suggested the trichodiol epoxide 39 as an intermediate in the conversion of 38 into 12,13-epoxytrichothec-9-ene (40). ${ }^{18 b}$



Scheme 6

The Biomimetic Approach : Disconnection 3

A biomimetic approach along lines of disconnection 3 has been the most popular route to the trichothecene skeleton. This biomimetic cyclization can proceed via either an allylic carbonium ion (path A) or a Michael reaction (path B). While path A yields the desired C9-C10 olefin directly, path B yields
a C9 keto group which must then be transformed into the olefin (Scheme 7). Hence, path A, which can also be entered from the enone, is the superior route. The principal challenge of this biomimetic approach has been control of the relative stereochemistry at the two quaternary centers C5 and C6. ${ }^{21}$


Scheme 7
Masuoka and Kubota21a reported the synthesis of the mycotoxin 12,13-epoxytrichothec-9-ene (19) based on this biomimetic strategy (Scheme 8). The desired configuration at C5 and C6 was obtained by a [2+2] photoaddition, and the photoadduct 43, when hydrolyzed by acid, underwent fragmentation to yield dione 44. After subsequent manipulations involving 8 steps, sodium borohydride reduction of the keto function yielded alcohol 45 with the incorrect stereochemistry for cyclization. This problem was circumvented by an alcohol inversion sequence. Methylation then furnished diol 46 which, upon exposure to acid, yielded the trichothecene 47 . This ring closure as applied to the trichothecene series yielded only cis fused product.

Treatment of the trichothecene 47 with $m$-chloroperbenzoic acid resulted in 12,13-epoxytrichothec-9-ene (19).



## Scheme 8

Still and Tsai21b also exploited disconnection 3 of Scheme 1 in their trichodermol (8) synthesis (Scheme 9). The unique feature of their plan was Favorskii ring contraction of the Diels-Alder adduct 50 to cyclopentenone 51 via basic epoxidation and Grob fragmentation of the hydroxy mesylate 52 to the bicyclic 53. The latter established the desired configurational relationship between C5 and C6. After removal of the benzoate group from 53, hydroxyl directed epoxidation of the cyclopentene double bond yielded 54. Acidic hydrolysis of epoxide 54 furnished the trichothecene skeleton 55 in $60 \%$ yield. Six steps involving standard reactions were required to complete the synthesis of 8 from 55.
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Scheme 9
The dienylium iron complex 56 was utilized by Pearson ${ }^{21 c}$ to obtain a 1:1 mixture of the bicyclodiene diastereomers 58 and 59 in his model trichothecene synthesis (Scheme 10). The ketone carbonyls were reduced to alcohols 60 and 61 by sodium borohydride and the alcohols were equilibrated to a mixture in which the desired diastereomer predominated. After a further series of manipulations, a tandem epoxide opening-cyclization of 62 led to the trichothecene skeleton 63.
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Scheme 10
Schlessinger ${ }^{21 d}$ reported a synthesis of verrucarol (4) based on a biomimetic approach (Scheme 11). He prepared as a key intermediate the bicyclic lactone 65 in ten steps from the dione 64. The Diels-Alder reaction of 65 with 1-methoxy-3-(trimethylsilyloxy)-1,3-butadiene (66), followed by hydrolysis and elimination, furnished the enone 67. Selective addition of methyllithium to 67 afforded 68. Reduction of 68 with lithium aluminum hydride yielded 69 which was cyclized under acidic catalysis to give 70. The tricyclic diene 70 was converted to verrucarol (4) via a series of four steps.


Scheme 11

Roush ${ }^{13}$ reported a synthesis of verrucarol (4) which closely parallels the route of Schlessinger described above. The diol 72 was obtained from 1-trimethylsilyl-3-methylcyclopentadiene (71) in ten steps (Scheme 12). After protection of diol of 72 , the lactone 73 was reacted with 1 -acetoxy-3-methyl-1,3-butadiene (74) to give 75 as a mixture of diastereomers. Reduction of 75 with lithium aluminum hydride yielded triol 76, which upon exposure to acid gave the skeleton of verrucarol. The triol 77 was converted to verrucarol (4) in six steps.


The first chiral synthesis of a trichothecene, anguidine (5), was reported by Brooks and Grothaus. ${ }^{14}$ Their synthesis started with an enantioselective microbial reduction of dione 78 yielding the undesired stereoisomer of alcohol 79 (Scheme 13). After an alcohol inversion sequence, a series of seven steps furnished the optically pure cyclopentane 80 . Further elaboration of $\mathbf{8 0}$ led to the heavily substituted oxabicyclo[3.2.1]octane 81. The A ring was incorporated by a Robinson annulation which provided the desired stereochemistry at C5 and C6 in 82. Reduction of 82 yielded the precursor 83 for cyclization to the trichothecene nucleus after protection of the primary alcohol. Cyclization smoothly afforded the 13-nortrichothecene 84. A series of
standard reactions completed the synthesis yielding the natural antipode of anguidine (5).



Scheme 13

Biomimetic Approach : Disconnection 4

Trost and McDougal ${ }^{12}$ successfully applied this biomimetic approach to the synthesis of verrucarol (4). As shown in Scheme 14, their synthesis started with the conversion of 2-methyl-1,3-cyclopentadione (85) to the acrylate 86 in which the quaternary carbon was installed by a Claisen rearrangement. DielsAlder reaction of $\mathbf{8 6}$ with the diene $\mathbf{8 7}$ afforded 88 . Further heating of 88 yielded the tricyclic compound 89 via an intramolecular ene reaction. After reduction and oxidation, a retro ene reaction furnished 90 . Following introduction of bromine at C2 in 90, the stereochemistry at C11 was inverted with trifluoroacetic acid, yielding 91. The key cyclization of 91 was carried out in $70 \%$ yield using fluoride ion as a catalyst, thus completing the carbon skeleton of verrucarol (4). A series of 8 steps closed out the synthesis of 4.
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Scheme 14
In 1990, Ziegler ${ }^{15}$ reported a synthesis of the carbon ring skeleton of anguidine (5) based on the disconnection 4 approach (Scheme 15). A Lewis acid-catalyzed carbonyl ene reaction of 93 afforded, after reduction, silylation and methoxymethylation, the cyclohexane 94. Reaction of 94 with singlet oxygen provided the diol 95, which was desilylated with tetra-nbutylammonium fluoride. Bromoetherification with 2,3,3,6tetrabromocyclohexadienone then gave 96 . Treatment of 96 with $m$ chloroperbenzoic acid gave an epoxide which was transformed into its
diacetate 97 for the critical cyclization. Opening of epoxide 97 with boron trifluoride etherate yielded 98. Deprotection, selective acetylation, and DessMartin periodinane oxidation of 98 resulted in 99 . Subsequent reductive cleavage of the bromo ether residue of 99 with zinc dust generated the hydroxyl and olefin functionality of 100. However, Ziegler failed to accomplish isomerization of this exocyclic olefin to the required C9-C10 endocyclic double bond of 101 at the final stage of his approach to anguidine.
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Scheme 15
With this substantial background of previous synthetic effort in the trichothecene area, the goal of this research became the development of a conceptually different method for the synthesis of trichothecenoids. The initial
objective was formation of the carbon skeleton of T-2 toxin (1), but it was envisioned that the route chosen would be amenable to modifications leading to other members of this class of sesquiterpenes.

## II. DISCUSSION

Our plan, in retrosynthetic format, directed toward T-2 toxin (1) is represented in Figure 3. It can be described as a "B-A-C" approach in which the $A-B$ ring system is formed first via a Diels-Alder reaction. The fivemembered C ring would then be constructed via a [2+2] photoaddition with acetylene followed by ring enlargement of the resulting cyclobutene. The key ring expansion was expected to proceed via solvolytic rearrangement of a cyclobutenyl carbinol. Transposition of the enone function would be necessary prior to $[2+2]$ photoaddition. The A ring methyl group at C9 and the C9-C10 double bond would be incorporated via Grignard reaction at the C9 carbonyl (trichothecene numbering) followed by elimination of the resulting tertiary alcohol. A Prevost reaction was envisioned as the source of the diol at C3, C4. 22 Finally, the oxirane unit would be formed from an exocyclic olefin, which would be obtained by Wittig reaction of a C12 ketone employing methodology used by Trost in his verrucarol synthesis. ${ }^{23}$


> T-2 toxin (1)



Figure 3: Retrosynthetic Scheme for T-2 toxin
Construction of the AB ring system began with the Diels-Alder reaction of 2 -ethoxy-1,3-butadiene (102) with methyl coumalate (103) to yield adduct 105.24 The regiochemistry of this [4+2] cycloaddition is governed by the directing groups present in the diene and dienophile. In the case of 2 substituted dienes such as 2-ethoxy-1,3-butadiene the regiochemistry of Diels-Alder addition to an olefin which is activated by an electron withdrawing group (EWG) is known to be predominantly "para". The regiochemistry can be explained using molecular orbital theory. 25 In an aromatic, Huckel-type transition state like that shown in Figure 4, complementarity can occur between the electron-withdrawing and electron-donating substituents when
they are "para". Therefore, 105 and not 104 is the expected product from the reaction of 103 with 102 . Diels-Alder adduct 105 was treated with $p$ toluenesulfonic acid in ethylene glycol to afford 106. Physical data for 106 were identical with those reported for the ketal ${ }^{26}$ which had been prepared from methyl enol ether 107 in the same manner as ethyl enol ether 105 (Scheme 16). An X-ray crystal structure of 106 obtained from 107 had been obtained previously and had shown the compound to possess the expected regiochemistry. ${ }^{27}$


Figure 4 : Huckel-type Transitin State of an Aromatic


Scheme 16

The cis-fused bicyclic lactone 105 appeared to be a versatile precursor to the $A B$ ring system of the trichothecenes, including $T-2$ toxin. Epoxidation of 105 using $m$-chloroperbenzoic acid in ethanol ${ }^{28}$ was expected to occur at the more electrophilic olefin site in ring A from the less hindered exo face. Alcoholysis would then yield a hydroxy group at C8 needed for synthesis of the A ring of T-2 toxin and related trichothecenes. Treatment of 105 with $m$-chloroperbenzoic acid in ethanol afforded 108, and the alcohol was protected as its 2-(trimethylsilyl)ethoxymethyl ether yielding 109 (Scheme17). ${ }^{29}$
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Scheme 17
In order to annulate a cyclobutene on to $\mathrm{C} 3-\mathrm{C} 4$ of this bicyclic core structure, transposition of the enone function of 109 to that of 111 was required (Scheme 18). Since transpositions of allylic alcohols are well known, ${ }^{30} 109$ was reduced with diisobutylaluminum hydride to the lactol 110 with the intention of oxidizing this substrate to effect rearrangement. Oxidation with pyridinium chlorochromate (PCC) ${ }^{31}$ is one of the most frequently used methods for this process. However, chromium (VI) oxidation of allylic lactol

110 using pyridinium chlorochromate or Collins' reagent ${ }^{32}$ gave back lactone 109 rather than the desired 4-pyranone 111. The reluctance of 110 to undergo oxidation with transposition can be attributed to the fact that the intermediate, bulky chromate ester will not migrate to the more sterically hindered C5 position.


Scheme 18
An alternative possibility for converting 110 to 111 would be [2.3]sigmatropic rearrangement using phenyl sulfenyl chloride ${ }^{33}$ or [3.3]sigmatropic rearrangement employing $\mathrm{N}, \mathrm{N}$-dimethyl thiocarbamoyl chloride. ${ }^{34}$ However, only the starting material 110 was recovered from attempted sulfenate-sulfoxide rearrangement, and treatment of $\mathbf{1 1 0}$ with sodium hydride and $\mathrm{N}, \mathrm{N}$-dimethyl thiocarbamoyl chloride resulted in decomposition.

Palladium(II)-catalyzed transposition of allylic acetates has been developed independently by Henry ${ }^{35 a}$ and by Overman, ${ }^{35 b}$ and Grieco has exploited this rearrangement with conversion of 112 into 113 in his approach to prostaglandins (Scheme 19). ${ }^{36}$ Following this proctocol, lactol

110 was acetylated with acetic anhydride to afford allylic acetate 114 (Scheme 20). However, attempts to effect Pd(II)-catalyzed rearrangement of 114 using $\mathrm{Pd}(\mathrm{OAc})_{2}, \mathrm{Pd}\left(\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}\right)_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ or $\mathrm{Pd}(\mathrm{OAc})_{2}\left(\mathrm{PPh}_{3}\right)_{2}$ resulted in no reaction. Usually, the driving force for $\mathrm{Pd}(\mathrm{II})$-catalyzed rearrangement is the formation of a thermodynamically more stable olefin or the removal of steric congestion at the site of the acetate group. $35 \mathrm{~b}, 36$ Allylic acetate 114 appears to have little effective driving force for rearrangement on this basis but it is, nevertheless, surprising that none of the isomeric acetate 115 is present in this presumed equilibration process.
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Scheme 20

Since attempts to prepare 111 had been unsuccessful, an alternative approach to this pyranone derivative was sought. Although there was no precedent in which a 4-pyranone operated as a dienophile in the Diels-Alder reaction, ${ }^{37} 3$-carbomethoxy-4-pyranone (116) was thought to be a good candidate as an effective dienophile because of the activation of the C2-C3 double bond by the carbomethoxy group (Scheme 21).


## Scheme 21

At the outset of this work preparative routes to 4-pyranones bearing a carboalkoxy function at $\mathrm{C}-3$ position were not well known, and consequently a general method for synthesizing these useful dienophiles was developed. The 4-pyranone 116 was readily prepared from methyl 3,3dimethoxypropionate (117) in four steps in $39 \%$ overall yield.


## Scheme 22

The first step in the sequence entailed the known formylation of 117 in high yield using sodium sand and methyl formate (Scheme 22) ${ }^{38}$ and gave the diformyl ester 118 upon acidic work-up. Hetero Diels-Alder reactions in which $\alpha, \beta$-unsaturated carbonyl compounds serve as heterodienes are
characterized by "inverse electron demand". In these cycloadditions the electronic roles of the addends are reversed compared to the normal DielsAlder reaction. The introduction of an electron-withdrawing group at the $\alpha$ position of the $\alpha, \beta$-unsaturated carbonyl compound would be expected to lower the LUMO energy, and therefore increase the reactivity of such a heterodiene. ${ }^{39}$ In fact, the hetero Diels-Alder 40 reaction of 118 with ethyl vinyl ether (119), an electron-rich diene, afforded dihydropyran 120 in good yield. Oxidation of 120 with pyridinium dichromate (PDC) in the presence of powdered molecular sieves and anhydrous acetic acid ${ }^{41}$ gave 121 in higher than $90 \%$ yield. Finally, elimination of ethanol from 121 catalyzed by trifluoroacetic acid afforded the desired pyranone 116 (Scheme 23).
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Scheme 23
3-Carbomethoxy-4-pyranone (116) reacted cleanly with 2-ethoxy-1,3butadiene (102) at $200^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ in a pressure tube, yielding the Diels-Alder adduct 122 in 85\% yield. Epoxidation of 122 using $m$-chloroperbenzoic acid ( $m$ CPBA) in the presence of ethanol ${ }^{28}$ afforded a mixture of alcohols 123 and 124 in a ratio of ca $2.5: 1$, which were separated by flash column
chromatography. An X-ray crystallographic analysis of 124 elucidated the configuration of alcohols 123 and 124 as well as the regiochemistry of DielsAlder adduct 122 as shown in Scheme 24. The ORTEP of 124 is shown in Figure 5. The relatively low selectivity for formation of 123 is attributed to the near planarity of the A ring of the bicyclic Diels-Alder adduct 122 which results in a low degree of curvature to this cis fused structure. In order to avoid complications from the free hydroxyl, alcohol 123 was protected as its 2(trimethylsilyl)ethoxymethyl (SEM) ether to give 111.
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Figure 5 : ORTEP of 124
The $[2+2]$ photoaddition of $\alpha, \beta$-unsaturated ketones to olefins and acetylenes has been known since 1908 when Ciamician reported conversion of carvone (125) to carvone camphor (126) upon exposure to Italian sunlight (Scheme 25). 42 More recent work on the photoreaction has led to partial elucidation of the mechanism and to a fair ability to predict the stereo- and regiochemistry of addition. The generally accepted mechanism is outlined in Figure 6.43 In brief, the $\alpha, \beta$-unsaturated ketone moiety $E$ absorbs a quantum of light and is excited ( $n \longrightarrow \pi^{*}$ ) to a singlet state $S_{1}$, which undergoes intersystem crossing to the triplet state $\mathrm{T}_{1}$. The $\mathrm{T}_{1}$ triplet state of E then interacts reversibly with a molecule of alkene $A$ to give an exciplex which can lead to $[2+2]$ product EA via either a concerted or a diradical pathway.


## Scheme 25
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Figure 6 : Regiochemistry of $[2+2]$ photoaddition of Cyclohexenone with 1,1-Dimethoxyethylene

The regiochemistry of addition is controlled largely by dipolar interactions in the exciplex, although solvent polarity is known to play a role. For example, an exciplex of cyclohexenone and ketene dimethyl acetal would have the molecular orientation shown in Figure 6. The polarity of the $\alpha, \beta$ unsaturated ketone in the excited state is the opposite of its ground state polarization. Thus, this exciplex would be expected to give the "head to tail" product. The stereochemistry of $[2+2]$ photoaddition is influenced by the
polarity of the alkene and by the presence or absence of a substituent on the $\beta$-carbon of the enone. Thus, while electron-rich olefins such as ketene dimethyl acetal yield a preponderance of trans-fused product upon addition to unsubstituted enones, the presence of a $\beta$-methyl group in 3-methylcyclohex-2-enone leads exclusively to cis-fused product with ketene dimethyl acetal. 44 The use of alkynes such as acetylene is known to lead to exclusive formation of the cis-fused photo adduct. 45 The photochemical addition of alkene partners to cis-fused bicyclic enones gives tricyclic products possessing the cis-anti-cis configuration. For example, addition of ethylene to 127 led to a $75: 8$ ratio of 128 to 129 (Scheme 26). 46,47


Scheme 26
Substituents at the $\alpha$-carbon of conjugated enones have little effect in photoadditions to cyclopentenone systems, but they prevent or dramatically retard photoadditions to cyclohexenone. ${ }^{48}$ This has been attributed to a facile conversion of triplet cyclohexenone to a vibrationally excited, twisted ground state. 49 Such a process is less accessible to the corresponding cyclopentenone. In contrast to 2-methylcyclohex-2-enone, 6-methyluracil derivative 130 underwent efficient cycloaddition to isobutylene (Scheme 27). 50 A possible explanation for this result involves the increased tendency of
uracil derivatives to maintain planarity and thus deprive the uracil excited state of energy-wasting deactivation via a twisted ground state.


## Scheme 27

Addition of a photopartner to the A-B framework of 111 was anticipated to occur from the $\alpha$ or exo face yielding the cyclobutene 133 as a major product. 46,51 A solution of 111 in acetone was saturated with a slow stream of acetylene and then irradiated with a 450 Watt medium-pressure Hanovia mercury lamp through a Pyrex filter. This yielded a mixture of cyclobutenes 133 and 134 in a ratio of $10: 1$, which was separated by flash column chromatography (Scheme 28).
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## Scheme 28

Solvolytic rearrangement of a cyclobutenyl carbinol in a bicyclo[4.2.0] skeleton to a cyclopenten-4-ol in a bicyclo[3.2.1] system is represented schematically as $135 \longrightarrow 136$ (Figure 7 ). It was intended to use this rearrangement to convert an oxabicyclo[4.2.0]octene system to the oxabicyclo[3.2.1]octene framework of the trichothecenoids. Expansion of the cyclobutene to a cyclopentene would be driven by release of the high strain energy of the four-membered ring ( $28.5 \mathrm{Kcal} / \mathrm{mol})^{52}$ First, 133 was converted to the methyl carbinol 137 and exposure of 133 to either methylmagnesium bromide or methyllithium at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ or at $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ respectively produced 137 in good yield (Scheme 29).
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Figure 7 : Solvolytic Rearrangement of a Bicyclo[4.2.0]oct-7-ene to a Bicyclo[3.2.1]oct-2-ene
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## Scheme 29

The high stereoselectivity of attack of the Grignard reagent at the ketone carbonyl (C7) of $\mathbf{1 3 3}$ can be rationalized by both steric and stereoelectronic factors. The $\alpha$-face of the ketone is sterically more accessible to the Grignard reagent than the $\beta$-face. Further, $\alpha$ attack by the Grignard reagent is in accord with the Cieplak effect. In 1981, Cieplak proposed a hyperconjugative stereoelectronic effect to explain the selectivity of nucleophilic addition to ketones. 53 He postulated that the critical factor determining the stereoselectivity of the reaction is a low-lying vacant $\sigma_{\neq}^{*}$ orbital in the transition state associated with the $\sigma$ bond being formed. Electronic delocalization into that orbital will stabilize the transition state and thereby enhance the reaction rate. According to this postulate, stereoselectivity is controlled by the donor ability of the C-C bond and the C-H bond in hyperconjugative interactions with the developing $\sigma^{*}$ orbital. The Baker-Nathan effect has established that the relative donor ability of a C-H bond is better than a C-C bond. 54 Thus, the Cieplak effect argues that an axial approach is preferred over an equatorial approach to the carbonyl since the C-H bond contributes a greater hyperconjugative stabilization of the $\sigma^{*}$ orbital than the C-C bond (Figure 8). The combination of steric and stereoelectronic factors predict $\beta$-alcohol 137 as the major product from 133 and this is, indeed, the case. In fact, none of the epimeric C-7 alcohol was detected.


133

Figure 8 : Approach Trajectories of a Nucleophile to the Ketone Carbonyl of 133

The configuration of the tertiary alcohol at C 7 was confirmed to be $\beta$ by a difference n.O.e. (nuclear Overhauser effect) experiment. Irradiation of the methyl group at C7 induced an enhancement of peak height of the vinyl hydrogen at $\mathrm{C} 5(3.5 \%)$ and the ring angular hydrogen at $\mathrm{C} 1(5.2 \%)$. As shown in the conformational representation of 137 , the $7 \alpha$ methyl group is situated spatially in close proximity to hydrogens at C 1 and C 5 (Figure 9).



Figure 9 : Nuclear Overhauser Enhancement of H1 and H5 Upon Irradiation of the C7 Methyl Group

Although solvolytic ring enlargement of cyclobutyl carbinols is well precedented, 55 few examples involving a cyclobutene ${ }^{51,56}$ appear to have been described. However, one example of this rearrangement has been reported in a 4-oxa system similar to 137 , in which acid-catalyzed rearrangement of 138 to 139 was claimed by Fetizon (Scheme 30). ${ }^{56}$


Scheme 30
Hess found that an 80:20 mixture of tosylates 140 and 141 rearranged to give an 80:16:4 mixture of 142,143 and 144 upon refluxing in acetic acid (Scheme 31). 57 Although 140 and 141 were not solvolyzed separately, a plausible assumption is that 142 arises from 140 via synchronous shift of the 1,8 bond and displacement of tosylate. The resulting carbonium ion was trapped by acetic acid from the endo face, presumably due to a stereoelectronic effect in which the developing positive charge is partially delocalized into the pi system of the ethylene bridge. 58 Correspondingly, 143 and 144 arise from a synchronous shift of the 1,6 bond of 141 with displacement of tosylate, followed by trapping of the resulting allylic cation with acetic acid.
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Scheme 31
The results obtained upon solvolysis of pure isomers 145 and 147 containing a saturated bicyclo[4.2.0]system supports this mechanistic picture (Scheme 32). For example, solvolysis of 145 gave 146 as the sole product whereas solvolysis of 147 furnished only 148.59 Thus, the equatorial mesylate rearranges by migration of bond a to give a bicyclo[3.3.0]octane ring system whereas the axial mesylate rearranges by migration of bond $b$ to give a bicyclo[3.2.1]octane ring system. The products of these specific rearrangements are in good agreement with a concerted mechanism which requires an antiperiplanar alignment of the migrating $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{C}$ bond and the leaving group.
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Scheme 32
Based on the precedent seen in the rearrangement of 147 to 148 it was hoped that transformation of 137 to the trichothecene nucleus could be effected under acid-catalysis. However, attempts to effect rearrangement of 137 to 150 using $98 \%$ formic acid or $p$-toluenesulfonic acid in aqueous acetone failed. An attempt to convert the trifluoroacetate 149, which was prepared from 137 and trifluoroacetic anhydride, into 150 via rearrangement was also unsuccessful. These reactions yielded only the ketone 151 or 152 in which the ketal had been hydrolyzed (Scheme 33). An alternate substrate, tricyclic compound 155 was prepared from Diels-Alder adduct 122 via ketalization with ethylene glycol, photoaddition with acetylene and addition of methyllithium. Again acid treatment of 155 afforded no evidence of rearrangement but resulted only in ketal hydrolysis (Scheme 34).
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A plausible explanation for the failure of these cyclobutenyl carbinols to undergo rearrangement is that the migrating C5-C6 bond of 137, 149, and 155 is not well aligned, ie antiperiplanar, to the leaving hydroxy group, a factor which would make the rearrangement unfavorable.

In order to compare the efficacy of $\mathrm{sp}^{3}$ hybridized carbon in ring enlargement of our trichothecene precursor with that of $\mathrm{sp}^{2}$ carbon, solvolytic rearrangement of the cyclobutanylcarbinol 158 was examined. The olefin of the cyclobutene in 133 was hydrogenated to afford 157 in almost quantitative yield, and the latter was reacted with methyllithium to give tertiary alcohol 158. However, treatment of 158 with formic acid again yielded only 159 in which the ketal was hydrolyzed. No product from ring enlargement was observed (Scheme 35).


Scheme 35
Reasoning that the tertiary alcohol terminus towards which migration was desired might be the source of our problem, we next considered other functionality at this site. For example, transformation of the ketone carbonyl of 133 into an exo methylene group would provide an $\mathrm{sp}^{2}$ terminus whereas conversion of 133 to an exo oxirane would afford a precursor possessing ring strain which could assist rearrangement.

Treatment of 133 with methylenetriphenylphosphorane under conventional conditions 60 yielded unreacted starting material and a small amount of a fragmentation product 161 resulting from a retro-Dieckmann condensation (Scheme 36). An alternative methylenation procedure described by Lombardo using zinc, dibromomethane, and titanium tetrachloride, 61 when performed on 133, gave a complex mixture of products in which 160 was not present. Attempted epoxide formation from 133 with dimethylsulfonium methylide ${ }^{62}$ also gave the retro Dieckmann product 161 rather than the desired oxirane 162 (Scheme 37).



Scheme 37
A rearrangement discovered by Cargill ${ }^{63}$ has been shown to be a useful method for converting a bicyclo[4.2.0]octene system to the bicyclo[3.2.1]octene framework and we therefore decided to examine the application of this process for constructing the oxabicyclo[3.2.1]octene system present in the trichothecene nucleus. An example of Cargill rearrangement is shown in Figure 10 where 6-methylbicyclo[4.2.0]oct-7-en-2-one (163) undergoes transformation in the presence of an acid catalyst to 1-methylbicyclo[3.2.1]oct-6-en-8-one (166). ${ }^{64}$ The mechanism of this rearrangement is thought to involve initial migration of the $\mathrm{C} 1-\mathrm{C} 6$ bond of 163 to the C2 center via the protonated intermediate 164 affording 165. The intermediate 165 undergoes further bond reorganization, as shown in Figure 10, to afford the bicyclo[3.2.1]octene system of 166.


Figure 10 : Cargill Rearrangement of 6-Methylbicyclo[4.2.0]-oct-7-en-2-one (163) to 1 -Methylbicyclo[3.2.1]-oct-6-en-8-one (166)

In order to apply this strategy to 133, introduction of a methyl group at C6 is necessary prior to the rearrangement. Although deuterium exchange of the angular hydrogen in bicyclo[4.2.0]octene systems is known, 65 the corresponding alkylation at this ring position is not precedented. Therefore, prior to undertaking attempts at methylation at C6 of 133, enolization of the ketone carbonyl was examined. Exposure of $\mathbf{1 3 3}$ to lithium diisopropylamide, followed by addition of tetradeuterioacetic acid, resulted in a 50\% incorporation of deuterium into 167 at C6 (Scheme 38). By contrast, neither methylation nor phenylsulfenylation at this site in 133 could be accomplished and only starting material was recovered after neutralization of the enolate.
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Scheme 38

An alternative approach to incorporating a methyl group at C6 of 133, would be through the use of 3 -carbomethoxy-5-methyl-4-pyranone (169) as the starting material. A Diels-Alder reaction of 2-ethoxy-1,3-butadiene (102) with 169 , followed by photoaddition with acetylene (170) would lead to 168 , the methylated analogue of 133 (Scheme 39).


## Scheme 39

The methyl substituted 4-pyranone 169 was prepared by a procedure analogous to that used for 3-carbomethoxy-4-pyranone (116). Hetero DielsAlder reaction of 118 with ethyl 1-propenyl ether 171 (mixture of cis and trans isomers) afforded 172 as a mixture of four diastereomers in $70 \%$ yield. Oxidation of 172 with pyridinium dichromate, followed by acid-catalyzed elimination of ethanol, resulted in 169 (Scheme 40).


The reaction of 169 with 2-ethoxy-1,3-butadiene (102) afforded the bicyclic adduct 174, further illustrating the utility of a 4-pyranone-3carboxylate as a Diels-Alder dienophile. At this point it was decided to forego introduction of the hydroxyl group at C8 of the trichothecene nucleus since its presence is not critical for testing the BC ring construction. Enol ether 174 was therefore converted directly to the corresponding ketal 175 by stirring in ethylene glycol with a small amount of camphorsulfonic acid. Irradiation of 175 in the presence of acetylene with a Hanovia 450 Watt mercury lamp at $20^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ yielded the photoadduct 176 in $44 \%$ yield based on recovered starting material (Scheme 41).
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Scheme 41
The stereochemistry of the BC ring fusion in 176 was determined by a series of difference nuclear Overhauser experiments (Figure 11). Irradiation of the signal due to Hc caused the enhancement of signals due to the protons Ha and Hb by 3.7 and $3.4 \%$, respectively. In addition, irradiation of Ha induced a $3.7 \%$ peak enhancement of Hc. These experiments define a stereochemical relationship between the cyclobutene and the A ring of 176 which is anti.
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Figure 11: Nuclear Overhauser Enhancement of Ha and Hb Upon Irradiation of Hc

Having developed a stereocontrolled route to cyclobutene 176, the Cargill rearrangement of this material was next examined. To this end, 176 was exposed to a variety of Bronsted and Lewis acids, including $p$ toluenesulfonic acid, boron trifluoride etherate, and aqueous 2 N sulfuric acid. In virtually all cases it was found that acidic treatment of 176 gave the interesting product 178, often in high yield (23~80\%) (Scheme 42).


The structure of 178 was unambiguously determined by X-ray crystallography. An ORTEP is shown in Figure 12. The proposed mechanism of the conversion of 176 to 178 is shown in Scheme 43. The first bond migration of the Cargill rearrangement which connects C3 with C7 occurs rapidly but is followed by intramolecular trapping of the resulting tertiary, allylic carbocation by the carbomethoxy group of 181 rather than by the desired pinacol rearrangement of C 8 to C 6 . The carbomethoxy group of 181 is located in an ideal position on the endo face of 181 to interrupt the second
migration, and the relatively unstrained conformation of lactone 178 reflects the favorable geometry for this participation by the angular ester group.


Figure 12: ORTEP of 178
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## Scheme 43

It was hoped that the Cargill rearrangement might be continued from 178 towards the desired trichothecene skeleton, eg 182, using a palladium catalyst since it is well known that $\operatorname{Pd}(0)$ forms $\pi$-allyl complexes with allylic acetates. In principle, $\mathrm{Pd}(0)$ could regenerate the equivalent of allylic carbocation 181 through formation of a $\pi$-allyl complex. 66 Palladiumcatalyzed alkylation of allylic acetates usually results in net retention of configuration in the product since formation of the intermediate $\pi$-allyl complex occurs with inversion and nucleophilic alkylation of the complex also occurs with inversion. 67 The double inversion of this sequence is, of course compatible with the transformation of 178 to 182 . However, no rearrangement of the very stable lactone 178 could be induced with $\mathrm{Pd}\left(\mathrm{PPh}_{3}\right)_{4}$, the only result being complete recovery of starting material (Scheme 44).


## Scheme 44

We were nevertheless encouraged by the fact that, in the conversion of 176 to 178 , the first step of our planned rearrangement had taken place. It was hoped that some appropriate variation of this strategy could circumvent interception of 181 by the angular ester grouping and thus lead to completion of the skeletal reorganization.

First, acid-catalyzed rearrangement of 176 was attempted in solvents such as methanol and glacial acetic acid (Scheme 45). p-Toluenesulfonic acid catalyzed rearrangement of 176 in methanol resulted in a mixture of 178 and 183 in a ratio of $1: 3$, whereas treatment of 176 with glacial acetic acid alone yielded 184, 185 and 186. In all cases, C3 migration has occurred to yield the presumed allylic carbocation intermediate 181. However, the allylic carbocation was again trapped internally by the carbomethoxy group at C6 to produce 178, 184, and 186 or was intercepted by intermolecular attack of solvent at C4 to produce the methyl ether 183 or the acetate 185.
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The possibility that a base-catalyzed rearrangement of $\mathbf{1 8 5}$ could lead to the desired oxabicyclo[3.2.1]system was also considered (Scheme 46). However, treatment of 185 with sodium hydride was found to give ester 189 in good yield rather than 177. This result is consistent with formation of alkoxide 187 which subsequently undergoes consecutive retro aldol fission via 188. The expected byproduct 190 was not isolated from this reaction
perhaps due to the fact that this species may also be unstable in the presence of base.




An alternative tactic for circumventing formation of the $\gamma$-lactone 178 would entail conversion of the carbomethoxy function at C8 in 176 into a non-participating functional group before attempting the acid-catalyzed rearrangement. A methyl substituent at this position would obviously prevent interception of the allylic carbocation resulting from Cargill rearrangement of 176 and, although this simplification removes T-2 toxin (1), verrucarol (4) and other trichothecenes from our range of targets, many natural trichothecenoids contain a C8 methyl group. It was, therefore, decided to attempt conversion of the carbomethoxy group of 176 into a methyl group using Barton's deoxygenaton procedure. 68 Reduction of 176 with lithium aluminum hydride
proceeded smoothly to afford the alcohol 191 in $85 \%$ yield. Selective thioacylation of the primary alcohol of 191 with thiocarbonyl diimidazole was unsuccessful, affording the thionocarbonate 193 rather than the desired imidazole derivative 192. In contrast, reaction of 191 with phenyl chlorothionoformate (194)69 gave the 2'-phenoxythiocarbonyl ester 195 in $59 \%$ yield. Surprisingly, treatment of 195 with tributyltin hydride under standard reduction conditions 70 resulted the formation of carbonate 197. No evidence for the desired reduction product 196 was found (Scheme 47).
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Scheme 47
In view of these unsuccessful attempts to remove the hydroxyl group from the C8 primary alcohol of 191, an alternative plan involving protection of this functionality was explored. For this purpose the hydroxymethyl group of 191 was converted to its acetate 198 and to the benzyl ether 199 (Scheme 48). Oxidation of 198 and 199 with pyridinium dichromate afforded new substrates 200 and 201 on which rearrangement could be tested. It was
assumed that neither acetate 200 nor benzyl ether 201 would interfere with the rearrangement process previously interrupted at allylic cation 181 by the angular ester and that conversion to the desired oxabicyclo[3.2.1]octene system would ensue. However, to our surprise, treatment of both 200 and 201 with $p$-toluenesulfonic acid resulted in the formation of the tetracyclic ether 204. It is evident from these results that the very favorable geometry for participation by the angular acetate in cation 202 and benzyl ether in 203 overrides all other factors which might encourage migration of C8 to C6.



Scheme 48
Reasoning that a tosylate, being less nucleophilic than either an acetate or benzyl ether, would be less likely to intercept the allylic cation during rearrangement, the primary alcohol of 191 was selectively converted to its $p$-toluenesulfonate 205. This was followed by oxidation with pyridinium dichromate to give ketone 206. Treatment of this ketone again produced an unexpected result, for although the tosyl group in 206 did not participate in
rearrangement, the diene 208 resulting from elimination of a proton from cation 207 was the principal outcome (Scheme 49).


It must be concluded from the failure of many attempts to effect the transformation of the linear, fused tricyclic structures 176, 200, 201 and 206 to the bridged framework found in the trichothecenes that Cargill-type rearrangement in these systems is opposed by factors that are poorly understood. There is no doubt that the first step of the rearrangement, driven by relief of strain in the cyclobutene, occurs rapidly. The second step, although it has no direct precedent, would be a variant of the pinacol rearrangement, but the carbocationic species unfortunately finds other exits. Any future development of this strategy for synthesis of the trichothecene nucleus must reckon with the intransigence of this rearrangement.

## III. EXPERIMENTAL

## General

Starting materials and reagents purchased from commercial suppliers were generally used without further purification. When necessary, liquids were distilled under argon and solids were recrystallized from the appropriate solvent. Solvents were dried by distillation from the appropriate drying agent immediately prior to use. Tetrahydrofuran (THF) and diethyl ether were distilled from potassium and benzophenone under an argon atmosphere. Diisopropylamine, triethylamine, diisopropylethylamine, dimethylsulfoxide (DMSO), hexamethylphosphoramide (HMPA), toluene, benzene and dichloromethane were distilled from calcium hydride under argon. Acetone was distilled from calcium sulfate. Methanol and ethanol were distilled from magnesium turnings. Pyridine was distilled from barium oxide under argon. All solvents used for routine isolation of products and chromatography were reagent grade and glass distilled. Moisture and air sensitive reactions were carried out under an atmosphere of argon.

Concentration under reduced pressure refers to the use of a rotary evaporator at water aspirator pressure. Residual solvent was removed by vacuum pump at pressures less than 2 torr. Reaction flasks were flame dried under a stream of argon. Syringes were oven dried at $160^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and cooled to room temperature in a dessicator over anhydrous calcium sulfate.

Analytical thin layer chromatography (TLC) was conducted using $1.5 \times$ 5.0 cm precoated aluminum E. Merck TLC plates ( 0.2 mm layer thickness of silica gel $60 \mathrm{~F}-254$ ). Spots were visualized by ultraviolet light, exposure to iodine vapor, or by heating the plate after dipping in a $3-5 \%$ solution of
phosphomolybdic acid in ethanol, or a $1 \%$ solution of vanillin in $0.1 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$ in methanol. Flash chromatography was carried out using E. Merck silica gel 60 (230-400 mesh ASTM).

Melting points were measured using a Buchi melting point apparatus and are uncorrected. Infrared (IR) spectra were recorded with a Nicolet 5DXB FT-IR spectrometer. All chemical shifts are reported in parts per million ( ppm ) downfield from tetramethylsilane using the d scale. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectral data are reported in the order of: chemical shift, number of protons, multiplicity, ( $s=$ singlet, $d=$ doublet, $t=$ triplet, $q=$ quartet, $m=$ multiplet, and $b r=b r o a d)$, and coupling constant (J) in Hertz. Mass spectra (MS) were obtained using either a Varian MAT CH-7 or a Finnigan 4500 spectrometer at an ionization potential of 70 eV . High resolution mass spectra were recorded using a Kratos MS-50 TC spectrometer. Elemental analyses were performed by Desert Analytics, Tucson, Arizona.

## 6-Carbomethoxy-9-ethoxy-3-oxo-2-oxabicyclo[4.4.0]deca-4,8-

diene (105). Methyl coumalate ( $212 \mathrm{mg}, 1.38 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) and 2-ethoxy-1,3butadiene ( $269.6 \mathrm{mg}, 2.75 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was heated in 5 mL of benzene in a pressure-tube at $100^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. After 20 h , the solvent was evaporated under reduced pressure to leave 410 mg of crude product. This was chromatographed on silica-gel with hexane/ethyl acetate (3:1) as eluent to give $230.7 \mathrm{mg}(66 \%)$ of 105: mp $106^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; IR (KBr) 2980, 1731, 1664, 1438, 1248, 1223, $1195,1038 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 6.91(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}$, $\mathrm{J}=10 \mathrm{~Hz}), 6.05(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=10 \mathrm{~Hz}), 5.03(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=6,2 \mathrm{~Hz}), 4.61(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.78$ $(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 3.69(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=7 \mathrm{~Hz}), 2.80(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 2.42(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 2.27(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.27(3 \mathrm{H}$, $\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=7 \mathrm{~Hz}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 171.6,163.1,151.5,149.3,120.9$,
$90.3,76.2,62.3,53.0,46.3,31.6,29.7,14.4 ; \mathrm{MS} \underline{\mathrm{m}} / \underline{z} 252\left(\mathrm{M}^{+}\right), 221,193,175$, 155, 123, 98 ( $100 \%$ ), 83, 70; HRMS 252.0998 (calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{13} \mathrm{H}_{16} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ 252.0998); Anal. calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{13} \mathrm{H}_{16} \mathrm{O}_{5} ; \mathrm{C}, 61.9 ; \mathrm{H}, 6.19$. Found: $\mathrm{C}, 62.02$; H , 6.29

## 6-Carbomethoxy-9,9-ethylenedioxy-2-oxabicyclo[4.4.0]deca-4-

ene-3-one(106). Diels-Alder adduct 105 ( $50 \mathrm{mg}, 0.19 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was refluxed in 6 mL of benzene containing 1.3 mL of ethylene glycol and 10 mg of $p$ toluenesulfonic acid for 24 h with removal of water with a Dean-Stark trap. The product mixture was washed with saturated sodium bicarbonate solution ( $\times 3$ ) and brine. The organic layer was dried over magnesium sulfate and solvent was removed under reduced pressure to leave 49 mg of crude product. This was chromatographed on silica-gel with hexane/ethyl acetate (1:1) as eluent to give $47.7 \mathrm{mg}(90 \%)$ of 106: IR (neat) 2980, 1731, 1728, 1246, 1226, 1047 $\mathrm{cm}^{-1} ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 6.70(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=10 \mathrm{~Hz}), 6.11(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}$, $\mathrm{J}=10 \mathrm{~Hz}), 3.97(4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.75(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 2.16(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 2.03(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.62(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m})$

## 6-Carbomethoxy-9,9-diethoxy-8-hydroxy-3-0x0-2-

oxabicyclo[4.4.0]deca-4-ene (108). To a solution of 105 (299 mg, 1.19 mmol ) in dry ethanol ( 5.3 mL ) was added $m$-chloroperbenzoic acid ( 307 mg , 1.78 mmol ) and the resulting solution was stirred for 3.5 h at room temperature. After the solvent was evaporated under reduced pressure, the remaining material was dissolved in ethyl acetate ( 20 mL ). The solution was washed with saturated sodium bicarbonate solution and the aqueous phase was extracted with ethyl acetate (x2). The combined ethyl acetate extract was dried over sodium sulfate, filtered, and the solvent was evaporated to leave

529 mg of crude product. This was chromatographed on silica-gel with hexane/ethyl acetate ( $1: 1$ ) as eluent to give $253 \mathrm{mg}(68 \%)$ of 108: IR (neat) $3478,2877,1731,1729,1252,1072 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 6.81$ ( $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=9 \mathrm{~Hz}$ ), $6.02(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=9 \mathrm{~Hz}), 5.02(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.85(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}), 3.78(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s})$, 3.4-3.57 ( $4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}$ ), 2.0-2.6 ( $4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}$ ), $1.17(6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $\left(75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta$ 172.0, 162.6, 148.6, 120.9, 98.9, 75.9, 67.6, 57.1, 55.0, 52.7, 44.0, 33.8, 29.6, 15.3, 15.0; Anal. calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{15} \mathrm{H}_{20} \mathrm{O}_{7}$; C, 57.32 ; H, 7.05. Found: C, 57.12 ; H, 6.78

## 6-Carbomethoxy-9,9-diethoxy-3-0xo-8-(2'-

 trimethylsilyl)ethoxymethoxy-2-oxabicyclo[4.4.0]deca-4-ene (109). To 108 ( $932 \mathrm{mg}, 2.97 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) in dry dichloromethane ( 11 mL ) was added diisopropylethylamine ( 1.6 mL ) and 2-(trimethylsilyl)ethoxymethyl chloride $(1.04 \mathrm{~mL})$. The solution was refluxed overnight and then washed with saturated sodium bicarbonate solution. The dichloromethane layer was dried over magnesium sulfate, filtered, and the solvent was evaporated to leave 1.1 g of crude product. This was chromatographed on silica-gel with hexane/ethyl acetate (3:1-2:1) as eluent to give 792 mg ( $61 \%$ ) of 109: $\mathbb{R}$ (neat) 2957, 1736, $1436,1370,1251 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 6.73(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=10 \mathrm{~Hz}$ ), $6.02(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=10 \mathrm{~Hz}), 5.06(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 4.65(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=7 \mathrm{~Hz}), 4.55(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=7 \mathrm{~Hz})$, $3.9(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.74(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 3.71(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.35-3.58(4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 2.53(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 2.33$ (2H, br s), 2.02( $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=2,4 \mathrm{~Hz}$ ), $1.17(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=7 \mathrm{~Hz}), 1.15(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=7 \mathrm{~Hz}), 0.91$ $(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 0.02(9 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C} \operatorname{NMR}\left(75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 171.9,162.6,148.4$, 129.0, 98.2, 92.9, 76.0, 70.8, 66.3, 56.2, 54.8, 52.9, 44.6, 32.4, 30.4, 18.1, 15.1, 15.0, -1.4 (x3); MS $\underline{m} / \underline{z} 444\left(M^{+}\right), 386,371,297,270,252,207,155,139$, 129, 116 (100\%), 98, 89, 73; HRMS 444.2180 (calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{21} \mathrm{H}_{36} \mathrm{O}_{8} \mathrm{Si}$444.2180); Anal. calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{21} \mathrm{H}_{36} \mathrm{O}_{8} \mathrm{Si}: \mathrm{C}, 56.73 ; \mathrm{H}, 8.16$. Found: $\mathrm{C}, 56.81$; H, 8.25

## 6-Carbomethoxy-9,9-diethoxy-3-hydroxy-8-(2'-

 trimethylsilyl)ethoxymethoxy-2-oxabicyclo[4.4.0]deca-4-ene (110). To a solution of $109(18.9 \mathrm{mg}, 0.043 \mathrm{mmol})$ in 2 mL of dry THF was added diisobutylaluminum hydride ( 1 M solution in hexane; 0.1 mL ) slowly at $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The reaction mixture was stirred at this temperature for 1 h and quenched with 0.5 mL of methanol. The product mixture was poured into 10 mL of water, and the aqueous phase was extracted with ether ( $\times 3$ ). The combined ether extract was dried over anhydrous magnesium sulfate and filtered, and the solvent was evaporated to give $17.9 \mathrm{mg}(94 \%)$ of 110 as a mixture of diastereomers: IR (neat) $3500,2952,1735,1437,1249,1132,1113 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $(300 \mathrm{MHz}$, $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 5.85(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 5.82(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 4.68(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 4.65(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{ds}, \mathrm{J}=7 \mathrm{~Hz}), 3.88$ $(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.77-3.69(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.67(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 3.47(4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 2.93(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=4 \mathrm{~Hz})$, $2.45-1.92(4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.15(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=7 \mathrm{~Hz}), 1.12(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=7 \mathrm{~Hz}), 0.97-0.86(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m})$, $0.01(9 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 174.1,133.0,126.6,98.9,92.5$, 88.0, 70.5, 65.9, 64.8, 55.9, 54.3, 52.1, 44.0, 31.1, 30.8, 18.1, 15.2, -1.4; Anal. calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{2} \mathrm{H}_{3} \mathrm{H}_{34} \mathrm{O}$ : C, $56.48 ; \mathrm{H}, 8.58$. Found: $\mathrm{C}, 56.79 ; \mathrm{H}, 8.31$
## 3-Acetoxy-6-carbomethoxy-9,9-diethoxy-8-(2'-trimethylsilyl)ethoxymethoxy-2-oxabicyclo[4.4.0]deca-4-ene

To a solution of lactol 110 ( $107.4 \mathrm{mg}, 0.24 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) in 6 mL of dry ether was added triethylamine ( 0.67 mL ), acetic anhydride ( 0.23 mL ) and a catalytic amount of 4-dimethylaminopyridine. The reaction mixture was stirred at room temperature overnight. The mixture was washed with $5 \%$ sodium bicarbonate
solution and the aqueous phase was extracted with ether ( $\times 2$ ). The combined ether extract was dried over anhydrous sodium sulfate and filtered, and the solvent was evaporated to leave 110.7 mg of crude product. This was chromatographed on silica-gel with hexane/ethyl acetate (2:1) as eluent to give 104.4 mg ( $89 \%$ ) of 114 : $\mathrm{mp} 83^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; IR (neat) 2953, 1738, 1245, 1129, $1056 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 6.22(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=3 \mathrm{~Hz}), 5.98(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}$, $J=10 \mathrm{~Hz}), 5.80(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=10,3 \mathrm{~Hz}), 4.66(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=7 \mathrm{~Hz}), 4.59(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 4.48(1 \mathrm{H}$, $d, J=7 \mathrm{~Hz}), 3.88(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.52-3.78(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.68(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 3.33-3.52(4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m})$, $2.44(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 2.26(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=6,4 \mathrm{~Hz}), 2.14(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 2.08(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.98(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m})$, $1.17(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=3 \mathrm{~Hz}), 1.12(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=3 \mathrm{~Hz}), 0.92(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 0.01(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $\left(75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 173.7,170.0,134.2,123.9,98.6,92.5,88.4,70.5,67.5$, $66.1,56.0,54.1,52.2,43.7,31.1,30.2,21.3,18.1,15.1,-1.4$ (x3); MS $\underline{m} / \underline{z} 488$ $\left(\mathrm{M}^{+}\right), 443,415,387,355,325,314,253,177,155,139,129,116$ (100\%), 89; HRMS 488.2498 (calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{23} \mathrm{H}_{40} \mathrm{O}_{9} \mathrm{Si} 488.2498$ ); Anal. calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{23} \mathrm{H}_{40 \mathrm{O} 9 \mathrm{Si}: \mathrm{C}, 56.53 ; \mathrm{H}, 8.25 \text {. found: } \mathrm{C}, 56.85 ; \mathrm{H}, 8.48 \mathrm{l}}$

Methyl Diformylacetate (118). To 5.25 g of sodium sand in 120 mL of dry ether was transferred a solution of methyl 3,3-dimethoxypropionate ( 16.7 g , 0.11 mol ) and 57 mL of methyl formate in dry ether ( 60 mL ) via cannula under an argon gas stream. The resulting mixture was stirred at room temperature for 24 h . Additional methyl formate ( 57 mL ) in 60 mL of dry ether was added to the solution, and the resulting mixture was stirred for 24 h under an argon atmosphere. The reaction mixture was diluted with water and the aqueous phase was made basic with $10 \% \mathrm{NaOH}$ solution. After washing with ether, the aqueous phase was acidified with aq. HCl and extracted with ether. The ether was washed with brine ( $\times 3$ ), dried over sodium sulfate and filtered. Removal of
solvent under reduced pressure yielded $12.5 \mathrm{~g}(85 \%)$ of crude 118 , that was used without further purification : ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 9.14(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s})$, $3.82(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s})$

## 5-Carbomethoxy-3,4-dihydro-2-ethoxy-4-hydroxy-2H-pyran (120).

 A solution of crude $118(2 \mathrm{~g})$ in 100 mL of ethyl vinyl ether was stirred at room temperature for 5 days. After the excess ethyl vinyl ether was evaporated under reduced pressure, the residual material was chromatographed on silica-gel with hexane/ethyl acetate ( $4 / 1$ then $2 / 1$ ) as eluents to give 11.8 g of 120 (mixture of isomers) in $60 \%$ yield. Spectroscopic data were obtained for one of four isomers: IR (neat) 3500, 2980, 1708, 1625, 1440, 1171, $1093 \mathrm{~cm}^{-}$ 1; ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 7.49(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 5.13(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=8,2 \mathrm{~Hz}), 4.64$ $(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.96(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dq}, \mathrm{J}=9,7 \mathrm{~Hz}), 3.75(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 3.66(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dq}, \mathrm{J}=9,7 \mathrm{~Hz}), 3.01$ $(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 2.1(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{ddd}, \mathrm{J}=14,4,2 \mathrm{~Hz}), 1.93(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.25(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=7 \mathrm{~Hz}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 167.8,154.6,109.3,99.0,65.5,59.9,51.4,34.5,15.0$; MS $\underline{m} / \underline{z} 202\left(M^{+}\right), 185,171,156,139,125,99,85,72(100 \%) ;$ HRMS 202.0844 (calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{9} \mathrm{H}_{14} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ 202.0841).5-Carbomethoxy-3,4-dihydro-2-ethoxy-2H-pyran-4-one (121). To a solution of $120(6.3 \mathrm{~g}, 0.03 \mathrm{~mol})$ in 150 mL of dry dichloromethane was added pyridinium dichromate ( $17.9 \mathrm{~g}, 0.045 \mathrm{~mol}$ ), activated 4A molecular sieves powder ( 18 g ), followed by 2.8 mL of glacial acetic acid. The resulting suspension was stirred at room temperature for 1 h . The product mixture was diluted with dry ether and stirred with Celite for 10 min . The ethereal solution was filtered through anhydrous magnesium sulfate and Celite. The filtrate was diluted with ether and stirred with Celite again. This was filtered once more
through magnesium sulfate and Celite. Removal of the solvent under reduced pressure left 5.74 g of $\mathbf{1 2 1}$, which was used without further purification: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 8.23(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 5.54(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=5,10 \mathrm{~Hz}), 3.92(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m})$, $3.81(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 3.68(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 2.78(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.23(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=6 \mathrm{~Hz})$

3-Carbomethoxypyran-4-one (116). To a solution of 121 ( $720 \mathrm{mg}, 3.6$ mmol ) in 11 mL of dry dichloromethane was added 0.5 mL of trifluoroacetic acid and the resulting solution was stirred for 1 h at room temperature. After removal of solvent, the crude product was passed through a short column of silica-gel column with ethyl acetate as eluent. The product mixture was rechromatographed on short silica-gel with hexane/ethyl acetate(1:3) as eluent to give 448 mg of $116(81 \%)$ as a solid: $\mathrm{mp} \mathbf{8 4}^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; IR (KBr) 1739, 1661, 1440, 1323, 1292, 1202, $1090 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} ; 1 \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 8.50(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}$, $J=1 \mathrm{~Hz}), 7.73(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=6,1 \mathrm{~Hz}), 6.48(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=6 \mathrm{~Hz}), 3.90(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 173.7,163.4,161.4,154.3,121.1,119.9,52.5 ; \mathrm{MS} \underline{\mathrm{m} / \underline{z}}$ 154( $M^{+}$), 136, 123, 112, 96 (100\%), 79, 69; HRMS 154.0266 (calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{7} \mathrm{H}_{6} \mathrm{O}_{4}$ 154.0266); Anal. calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{7} \mathrm{H}_{6} \mathrm{O}_{4} ; \mathrm{C}, 54.55 ; \mathrm{H}, 3.92$. Found: C, 54.80; H, 4.04

## 6-Carbomethoxy-9-ethoxy-5-0xo-2-oxabicyclo[4.4.0]-3,8-

decadiene (122). A solution of 4-pyranone $116(640 \mathrm{mg}, 4.15 \mathrm{mmol})$ and 2-ethoxy-1,3-butadiene ( $4.3 \mathrm{~g}, 43.9 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) in 5 mL of toluene was sealed under vacuum after degassing. The sealed tube was heated to $200^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 20 $h$. The solvent and excess diene was evaporated under reduced pressure to leave 1.02 g of a viscous product. This was chromatographed on silica-gel with hexane/ethyl acetate (6:1) as eluent to give $890 \mathrm{mg}(85 \%)$ of 122: mp 99 -
$101^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; IR (KBr) 2980, 1754, 1731, 1677, 1598, $1216 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR (300 $\left.\mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 7.33(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=6 \mathrm{~Hz}) 5.42(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=6 \mathrm{~Hz}), 5.16(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=5.2$, $\mathrm{Hz}), 4.69(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=5 \mathrm{~Hz}), 3.77(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 3.70(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dq}, \mathrm{J}=7,2 \mathrm{~Hz}), 2.77(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=$ $\mathrm{Hz}), 2.52-2.40(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.27(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=7 \mathrm{~Hz}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $\left(75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta$ 191.1 169.2 $162.2149 .8104 .8,91.9,78.2,62.2,56.3,52.9,30.3,24.9,14.5 ;$ MS $\underline{m} / \underline{z} 252\left(\mathrm{M}^{+}\right), 220,193$ (100\%), 181, 175, 147, 119, 94, 67; HRMS 252.0998 (calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{13} \mathrm{H}_{16} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ 252.0998); Anal. calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{13} \mathrm{H}_{16} \mathrm{O}_{5}$; C , 61.90; H, 6.39. Found: C, 61.68 ; H, 6.45.

## 6-Carbomethoxy-9,9-diethoxy-8-hydroxy-5-0xo-2

 oxabicyclo[4.4.0]-deca-3-ene (123). To a solution of 122 (149 mg, 0.59 mmol ) in 6 mL of dry ethanol was added $m$-chloroperbenzoic acid ( 141 mg ; 1.2 equivalent). The mixture was stirred at room temperature for 3.5 h . After the solvent was evaporated under reduced pressure, the residue was taken up into ethyl acetate and organic solution was washed with saturated sodium bicarbonate solution. The aqueous layer was extracted with ethyl acetate (5 $\mathrm{mL} \times 2$ ), and the combined ethyl acetate extract was dried over sodium sulfate. The crude product was chromatographed on silica-gel with hexane/ethyl acetate (2:1) as eluent to give $86.2 \mathrm{mg}(46 \%)$ of 123 and 34.5 $\mathrm{mg}(19 \%)$ of 124 : IR (neat) $3500,2995,1737,1681,1678,1601,1266 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 7.20(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=6 \mathrm{~Hz}), 5.39(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=6 \mathrm{~Hz}), 5.16$ $(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=5,8 \mathrm{~Hz}), 3.8-3.75(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.75(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 3.66-3.53(4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 2.53(1 \mathrm{H}$, br $\mathrm{s}, \mathrm{J}=13 \mathrm{~Hz}$ ); ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 187.9,170.1,161.2,104.8,98.7$, $78.0,69.7,57.2,56.2,55.3,53.0,31.7,30.5,15.4,15.3 ; M S \underline{m} / \underline{z} 314\left(M^{+}\right), 244$, $213,155,139,116$ (100\%), 89; HRMS 314.1366 (calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{15} \mathrm{H}_{22} \mathrm{O}_{7}$314.1366); Anal. calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{15} \mathrm{H}_{22} \mathrm{O} 7$ : C, 57.31 ; $\mathrm{H}, 7.05$. Found: $\mathrm{C}, 57.34 ; \mathrm{H}$, 6.84

## 6-Carbomethoxy-9,9-diethoxy-5-oxo-8-(2'-

trimethylsilyl)ethoxymethoxy-2-oxabicyclo[2.2.0]deca-3-ene (111). To a solution of 123 ( $293 \mathrm{mg}, 0.93 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) in 20 mL of dry dichloromethane was added diisopropylethylamine ( $0.81 \mathrm{~mL}, 5.0$ equiv.), followed by 3.0 equiv. of 2-(trimethylsilyl)ethoxymethyl chloride ( 0.49 mL ) and the resulting solution was refluxed overnight. The mixture was washed with $5 \%$ sodium bicarbonate solution and the aqueous layer was extracted with dichloromethane. The dichloromethane extract was washed with brine, and dried over anhydrous magnesium sulfate. Removal of the solvent left 97 mg of crude product which was chromatographed on silica-gel with hexane/ethyl acetate (2:1) as eluent to give $76 \mathrm{mg}(96 \%)$ of $111: \mathrm{mp} 63-64^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; $\mathrm{IR}(\mathrm{KBr}) 2995,1739,1684,1604$, 1262, 1238, $1108 \mathrm{~cm}-1 ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 7.18$ ( $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=7 \mathrm{~Hz}$ ), $5.38(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=7 \mathrm{~Hz}), 5.23(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 4.73(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=7 \mathrm{~Hz}), 4.68(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}), 3.72$ $(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 3.73-3.45(6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 2.60-2.35(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}), 2.25-1.87(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{br}$ m), $1.16(3 \mathrm{H}$, $\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=7 \mathrm{~Hz}$ ), $1.13(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=7 \mathrm{~Hz}), 0.93(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 0.01(9 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( 75 MHz , $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 187.4,169.6,161.1,104.8,99.0,94.0,78.2$ (x2), 65.7, 56.1 ( x 2 ), 52.9, 29.8, 18.0 ( $\times 2$ ), 15.5, 15.3 ( $\times 2$ ), - 1.43 ( $\times 3$ ); MS $\underline{m} / \underline{z} 444$ ( $M^{+}$), 371, 313, 299, 281, 270, 252, 145, 129, 116 (100\%), 89; HRMS 444.2180 (calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{21} \mathrm{H}_{36} \mathrm{O}_{8} \mathrm{Si} 444.2180$ ); Anal. calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{2} 1 \mathrm{H}_{36} \mathrm{O}_{8} \mathrm{Si}: \mathrm{C}, 56.7$; $\mathrm{H}, 8.16$. Found: C, 56.98; H, 8.20

```
cis-anti-cis-8-Carbomethoxy-11,11-diethoxy-10-[2'-(trimethylsilyl)ethoxy]methoxy-2-oxatricyclo[6.4.0.03,6]dodec-4-
```

ene-7-one (133). A solution of 111 ( $21 \mathrm{mg}, 0.047 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) in 120 mL of dry acetone was flushed with argon for 15 min and with acetylene for 0.5 h . The solution was irradiated with a 450 watt Hanovia mercury lamp at $-20^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 0.5 $h$ while acetylene was passed through the solution. After the solvent was obtained which was evaporated under reduced pressure, 39 mg of a pale yellow oil was chromatographed on silica-gel with hexane/ethyl acetate (6:1) as eluent to afford $10.8 \mathrm{mg}(45 \%)$ of 133 as a colorless oil: IR (neat) 2995, $1706,1129,1113,1088,1066 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 6.40(1 \mathrm{H}$, $d, J=3 H z), 6.13(1 H, d d, J=3,1 H z), 5.09(1 H, d d, J=4,4 H z), 5.00(1 H, d$, $J=3 H z), 4.74(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=7 \mathrm{~Hz}), 4.53(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=7 \mathrm{~Hz}), 4.84(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=5,2 \mathrm{~Hz}), 3.72$ $(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.69(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 3.63(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=3 \mathrm{~Hz}), 3.47(4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 2.46(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{ddd}, \mathrm{J}=14,5$, $1 \mathrm{~Hz}), 2.19(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=14,2 \mathrm{~Hz}), 2.08(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=4 \mathrm{~Hz}), 1.15(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=7 \mathrm{~Hz}), 1.13$ $(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=7 \mathrm{~Hz}), 0.99(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}),-0.00(9 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 204.0$, $169.0,143.0,136.2,98.3,92.8,74.0,71.7,67.9,66.0,58.6,56.3,54.7,54.6$, 5.6, 31.2, 29.7, 19.5, 15.9 (x2), -1.4 (x3); MS m/z 471(M+1), 426, 425 (100\%), 398, 397, 367, 353, 277, 117; HRMS 471.2413 (calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{23} \mathrm{H}_{39} \mathrm{O}_{8} \mathrm{Si}$ 471.2414); Anal. calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{23} \mathrm{H}_{38} \mathrm{O}_{8} \mathrm{Si}: \mathrm{C}, 58.7$; $\mathrm{H}, 8.14$. Found: $\mathrm{C}, 58.77$; H , 8.23
cis-anti-cis-8-Carbomethoxy-11,11-diethoxy-7b-hydroxy-7a-methyl-10-[2'-(trimethylsilyl)ethoxy]methoxy-2-oxatricyclo-[6.4.0.03,6]dodec-4-ene (137) To a solution of 46 mg of 133 in 1.5 mL of dry tetrahydrofuran was added methylmagnesium bromide (3.0 M solution in ether: 1.5 equivalent) at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The reaction mixture was stirred at this temperature for 2.5 h . The mixture was quenched with saturated ammonium chloride solution, diluted with ether, and washed with saturated ammonium
chloride solution. The organic layer was dried over anhydrous magnesium sulfate and the solvent was evaporated. The crude product was chromatographed on silica-gel with hexane/ethyl acetate (4:1) as eluent to give 32.2 mg (68\%) of 137: IR (neat) $3500,1701,1262,1063,1038,979,836$ $\mathrm{cm}^{-1} ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 6.36(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=3,3 \mathrm{~Hz}$ ), $6.19(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}$, $J=3 \mathrm{~Hz}), 4.86(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=3,3 \mathrm{~Hz}), 4.71(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}), 4.58(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=7 \mathrm{~Hz}), 4.49(1 \mathrm{H}$, d, J=7Hz), 3.95 ( $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}$ ), 3.81 ( 1 H , br s, $\mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ exchanged), $3.71(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 3.65$ ( $2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}$ ), $3.48(4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.16(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=4 \mathrm{~Hz}), 2.62(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 2.15(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.19$ $\left.(6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.14(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 0.91(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 0.01(9 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C} \mathrm{NMR} \mathrm{(75MHZ,CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta$ 175.9, 139.9, 139.8, 98.7, 92.7, 73.5, 72.6 (x2), 70.4, 65.9, 55.6, 54.4, 52.5, 51.4, 49.3, 33.6, 27.7, 23.8, 18.1, 15.6, 15.2, -1.4 (x3); Anal. calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{24} \mathrm{H}_{42} \mathrm{O} 8 \mathrm{Si}: \mathrm{C}, 58.23 ; \mathrm{H}, 8.7$. Found: C, $58.29 ; \mathrm{H}, 8.36$

## cis-anti-cis-8-Carbomethoxy-11,11-diethoxy-7b-trifluoroacetoxy-

 7a-methyl-10-[2'-(trimethylsilyl)ethoxy]methoxy-2-oxatricyclo [6.4.0.03,6]dodec-4-ene (149). To a solution of 137 ( $4.6 \mathrm{mg}, 0.01 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) in 0.5 mL of pyridine was added trifluroacetic anhydride ( 20 equivalents: 29 mL ) at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, followed by a catalytic amount of 4-dimethylaminopyridine. After 10 min , the mixture was diluted with ether and washed with saturated cupric sulfate solution and saturated sodium bicarbonate solution. The organic layer was dried over anhydrous magnesium sulfate. Removal of the solvent under reduced pressure left $5.8 \mathrm{mg}(98 \%)$ of 149: IR (neat) 2995, 1781, 1728, 1218, $1168,1155,1126,1063 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; 1 H NMR ( $300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 6.48$ ( $1 \mathrm{H}, \cdot \mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=3$, $3 \mathrm{~Hz}), 6.24(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=3 \mathrm{~Hz}), 4.98$ ( $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=3,3 \mathrm{~Hz}$ ), 4.90 ( $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{br}$ s), 4.69 ( $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}$, $J=7 \mathrm{~Hz}), 4.55(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=7 \mathrm{~Hz}), 4.00(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}), 3.74-3.59(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}) 3.69(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s})$, 3.56-3.42 ( $4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}$ ), 3.27 ( $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=4 \mathrm{~Hz}$ ), 2.78 ( $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=15,2 \mathrm{~Hz}$ ), 2.22~2.03$(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.52(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.19(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=7 \mathrm{~Hz}), 2.22-2.03(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.52(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.19$ $(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=7 \mathrm{~Hz}), 1.16(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=7 \mathrm{~Hz}), 0.92(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 0.02(9 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s})$

## 6-Carbomethoxy-9,9-ethylenedioxy-5-0x0-2-oxabicyclo[4.4.0]

deca-3-ene (153). To a solution of 122 ( $0.53 \mathrm{~g}, 2.1 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) in 35 mL of ethylene glycol was added 10 mg of camphorsulfonic acid. The resulting solution was stirred at room temperature for 24 h . The mixture was diluted with water and extracted with dichloromethane (x2). The combined dichloromethane extract was washed with water and dried over anhydrous magnesium sulfate. Removal of the solvent under reduced pressure yielded $0.53 \mathrm{~g}(94 \%)$ of 153: IR (neat) 2959, 1734, 1680, 1601, 1254, 1240, 1096, $1034 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 7.23(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=6 \mathrm{~Hz}$ ), $5.43(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=$ $6 \mathrm{~Hz}), 5.24(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=1 \mathrm{~Hz}), 4.01-3.95(4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.75(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s})$, 2.49-2.41(1H, m), $2.17(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=13,10 \mathrm{~Hz}), 2.04-1.82(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.66-1.61(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 188.4,170.4,161.0,107.7,105.3,79.2,64.6,64.4,56.4$, 53.0, 34.6, 31.1, 25.0; MS m/z 268 (M+1), 198, 183, 167, 155, 99, 86 (100\%); HRMS 268.0947 (calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{13} \mathrm{H}_{16} \mathrm{O}_{6}$ 268.0947); Anal. calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{13} \mathrm{H}_{16} \mathrm{O}_{6}$ : C, 58.20; H, 6.01. Found; C, 58.00; H, 6.06
cis-anti-cis-8-Carbomethoxy-11,11-ethylenedioxy-7-oxo-2-oxatricyclo[6.4.0.03,6]dodec-4-ene (154). A solution of 153 ( 40 mg , 0.15 mmol ) in 110 mL of acetone was flushed with argon for 0.5 h , and was then acetylene for 0.5 h . The solution was irradiated with a 450 Watt Hanovia mercury lamp in a stream of acetylene at $-20^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 40 min . The solvent was evaporated under reduced pressure to leave a pale yellow residue. This residue was chromatographed on silica-gel with hexane/ethyl acetate (2:1) as
eluent to afford 23.5 mg (51\%) of 154: IR (neat) 2957, 1745, 1704, 1437, $1272,1245,1163,1133,1094,1020,731 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} ; 1 \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta$ $6.35(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=2.7 \mathrm{~Hz}), 6.18(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=2.7 \mathrm{~Hz}), 5.16(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=3.4 \mathrm{~Hz}), 4.92(1 \mathrm{H}$, dd, $J=8,4 \mathrm{~Hz}), 4.09-4.86(4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.73(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 3.60(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=3,1 \mathrm{~Hz})$, 2.14$1.97(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.92-1.73(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $75 \mathrm{MHZ}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 204.2,269.8$, $142.1,136.6,107.0,73.8,69.2,65.0,63.9,61.0,52.8,52.7,37.0,31.5,24.8$; MS m/z $295\left(\mathrm{M}^{+}, 100 \%\right)$, 251, 199, 167, 99; HRMS 295.1182 (calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{15} \mathrm{H}_{19} \mathrm{O}_{6} 295.1182$ ); Anal. calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{15} \mathrm{H}_{19} \mathrm{O}_{6}: \mathrm{C}, 61.61 ; \mathrm{H}, 6.40$. Found: C, $61.97 ; H, 6.05$
cis-anti-cis-8-Carbomethoxy-11,11-diethoxy-7b-hydroxy-7a-methyl-2-oxatricyclo[6.4.0.0 ${ }^{3,6}$ ]dodec-4-ene (155). To a solution of 154 ( $22.1 \mathrm{mg}, 0.075 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) in 1 mL of dry ether was added methyllithiuim ( 80 $\mathrm{mL} ; 1.4 \mathrm{M}$ solution in ether) at $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The reaction mixture was stirred at this temperature for 1 h , and quenched with saturated ammonium chloride solution. The mixture was diluted with ether and was washed with saturated ammonium chloride solution and brine. The organic layer was dried over anhydrous magnesium sulfate. After the solvent was evaporated under reduced pressure, the crude product was chromatographed on silica-gel with hexane/ethyl acetate (1:2-2:3) as eluent to give 8 mg of 155 : IR (neat) 3502, 2951, 1722, 1290, 1256, 1224, 1207, 1176, 1115, 1091, $1041 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 6.29(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=3 \mathrm{~Hz}), 6.14(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=3 \mathrm{~Hz}), 5.00(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}$, $\mathrm{J}=4 \mathrm{~Hz}), 4.51(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=2,2 \mathrm{~Hz}), 4.10-3.83(4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.76(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 3.12(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}$, $\mathrm{J}=4 \mathrm{~Hz}), 2.83(1 \mathrm{H}$, br s; D2O exchange), 2.25-1.82(6H, m), $1.21(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}) ; \mathrm{MS}$ $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z} 311(\mathrm{M}+1), 309,293(100 \%), 279,249,227,199,99 ;$ HRMS 311.1495
(calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{16} \mathrm{H}_{23} \mathrm{O}_{6} 311.1495$ ). In addition, 10 mg of recovered 154 was also isolated.
cis-anti-cis-8-Carbomethoxy-7b-hydroxy-7a-methyl-11-oxo-2oxatricyclo[6.4.0.0 ${ }^{3,6}$ ]dodec-4-ene (156). A solution of 155 (7.1 mg, 0.023 mmol ) in 0.5 mL of $98 \%$ formic acid was stirred overnight at room temperature. The solvent was evaporated under reduced pressure to leave a yellow residue. This residue was chromatographed on silica-gel using hexane/ethyl acetate ( $1: 1$ ) as eluent to give $5.8 \mathrm{mg}(95 \%)$ of 156: IR (neat) $3450,2995,1719,1289,1252,1150,1117 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}:{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) for the major isomer $\delta 6.29(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=3 \mathrm{~Hz}), 6.09(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=3 \mathrm{~Hz}), 4.88(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}$, $\mathrm{J}=4 \mathrm{~Hz}), 4.49(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.82(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 3.13(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=4 \mathrm{~Hz}), 2.89(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=12$, $3 \mathrm{~Hz}), 2.60-2.06(5 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.30(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta$ 209.1, $174.3,140.3,139.3,73.2,69.8,54.6,52.2,51.9,51.0,45.1,38.2,26.7,24.9$

## cis-anti-cis-8-Carbomethoxy-11,11-diethoxy-10-[2'-

 (trimethylsilyl)ethoxy]methoxy-2-oxatricyclo[6.4.0.03,6]dodec-7one (157). To a solution of $133(11 \mathrm{mg}, 0.023 \mathrm{mmol})$ in 0.4 mL of ethanol was added 2 mg of $10 \%$ palladium-on-carbon at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The resulting suspension was stirred under a hydrogen atmosphere at room temperature for 0.5 h . The mixture was filtered through anhydrous magnesium sulfate. Removal of the solvent under reduced pressure yielded $11.2 \mathrm{mg}(100 \%)$ of 157: IR (neat) $2952,1739,1708,1122 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta$ $4.83(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=10,4 \mathrm{~Hz}), 4.72(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=7 \mathrm{~Hz}), 4.68(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=7 \mathrm{~Hz}), 4.58(1 \mathrm{H}$, $\mathrm{m}), 3.77(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 3.74-3.46(7 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.52(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 2.52(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=13,4 \mathrm{~Hz})$, 2.38-2.12 $(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m})$, 2.09-1.59 $(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.68-1.56(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C} \mathrm{NMR}(75 \mathrm{MHz}$,$\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 205.7,170.8,99.0,73.1,71.5,65.7,59.9,56.5,56.3,52.6,44.9$, $33.6,29.7,26.4,18.0,15.5,15.4,-1.4(x 3)$
cis-anti-cis-8-Carbomethoxy-11,11-diethoxy-7b-hydroxy-7a-methyl-10-[2'-(trimethylsilyl)ethoxy]methoxy-2-oxatricyclo-
[6.4.0.03,6]dodecane (158). To a solution of $157(7.7 \mathrm{mg}, 0.016 \mathrm{mmol})$ in 0.5 mL of dry ether was added methyllithium ( $12 \mathrm{~mL}, 0.016 \mathrm{mmol} ; 1.6 \mathrm{M}$ solution in ether) at $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The mixture was stirred at this temperature for 1 h and quenched with saturated ammonium chloride solution at $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The mixture was diluted with ether and washed with saturated ammonium chloride solution and brine. The organic layer was dried over anhydrous magnesium sulfate and the solvent was evaporated. The crude product was chromatographed on silica-gel using hexane/ethyl acetate (4:1) as eluent to give 4.6 mg ( $65 \%$ based on recovered starting material) of 158: IR (neat) $3600,2950,1725,1250,1233,1125 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 4.79$ ( $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}$ ), $4.66(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=7 \mathrm{~Hz}), 4.48(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=7 \mathrm{~Hz}), 4.44(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=14,7 \mathrm{~Hz})$, $3.89(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.80-3.59(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.69(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 3.55-3.35(4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 2.40-1.72(9 \mathrm{H}$, m), $1.19(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.15(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=7 \mathrm{~Hz}), 1.13(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=7 \mathrm{~Hz}), 0.89(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 0.00$ $(9 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 173.6,98.8,92.7,72.4,71.3,67.6,67.3$, 66.0, 55.6, 54.3, 51.7, 49.6, 41.2, 32.6, 28.3, 26.5, 24.6, 18.2, 16.0. 15.3, 15.2, $-1.4(\times 3)$; MS $\underline{m} / \underline{\underline{z}} 487\left(\mathrm{M}^{+}\right), 443,415,399,385,369,325,301,295,225,181$ ( $100 \%$ ), 117. In addition, 0.7 mg of recovered 157 was also isolated.

Methyl 4,4-Diethoxy-5-[2'-(trimethylsilyl)ethoxy]methoxy cyclohexene carboxylate (161). A suspension of sodium hydride $(5 \mathrm{mg}$, $60 \%$ dispersion in mineral oil) in 0.3 mL of dimethylsulfoxide was heated
under an argon atmosphere at $70^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 20 min . The solution was cooled to room temperature and diluted with 0.5 mL of tetrahydrofuran. To this solution was added a solution of 25.5 mg of trimethylsulfonium iodide in 0.5 mL of dimethylsulfoxide at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, and the mixture was stirred for 1 min . To the above solution was added a solution of 133 ( $14.7 \mathrm{mg}, 0.03 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) in 0.5 mL of tetrahydrofuran. The reaction mixture was stirred for 10 min at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and for 7 h at room temperature. The mixture was diluted with water and extracted with ether ( $\times 2$ ). The combined ether extract was washed with water and brine. The organic layer was dried over potassium carbonate and the solvent was evaporated under reduced pressure. The crude product was chromatographed on silica-gel with hexane/ethyl acetate (6:1) as eluent to give 8.3 mg of 161: IR (neat) 2970, 1722, 1150, 1129, 1040, $803 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $300 \mathrm{MHZ}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 6.85(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 4.79(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=7 \mathrm{HZ}), 4.73(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}$, $J=7 \mathrm{~Hz}), 4.04(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.71(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 3.65-3.53(4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.47(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=7 \mathrm{~Hz})$, 2.71-2.62 ( $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}$ ), 2.58-2.47 (3H, m), $1.18(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=7 \mathrm{~Hz}), 1.11(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=7 \mathrm{~Hz})$, $1.13(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=5 \mathrm{~Hz}), 0.00(9 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 167.4,136.1$, 127.2, $99.5,93.8,70.8,65.3,55.7,55.6,51.6,31.4,29.7,29.5,18.0,15.4$, 15.3, -1.4 (x3); MS $\underline{m} / \underline{z} 374\left(\mathrm{M}^{+}\right), 301,258,226,213,199,181,139,116,101$, 73 ( $100 \%$ ); HRMS 374.2125 (calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{18} \mathrm{H}_{34} \mathrm{O}_{6} \mathrm{Si} 374.2125$ ).

## 5-Carbomethoxy-3,4-dihydro-2-ethoxy-4-hydroxy-3-methyl-2H-

 pyran (172). A solution of 118 ( $2.0 \mathrm{~g}, 0.015 \mathrm{~mol}$ ) in 80 mL of ethyl propenyl ether (171) was stirred at room temperature for 5 days. After removal of exess ethyl propenyl ether, the residue was chromatographed on silica-gel using hexane/ethyl acetate ( $2: 1$ ) as eluent to yield $2.28 \mathrm{~g}(65 \%)$ of 172 as a mixture of four diastereomers: IR (neat) 3442, 2995, 1713, 1633, 1439, 1300, 1177,1139, 1121, 1094, 1071, $891 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) for the major isomer $\delta 7.47(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 4.39(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=14 \mathrm{~Hz}), 4.27(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.82(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.77$ ( $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$ ), $3.55(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.26(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 2.02(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.23(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=7 \mathrm{~Hz})$

## 5-Carbomethoxy-3,4-dihydro-2-ethoxy-3-methyl-4-oxo-2H-pyran

 (173). To a solution of 172 ( $2.28 \mathrm{~g}, 0.01 \mathrm{~mol}$; a mixture of four diastereomers) in 50 mL of dry dichloromethane was added 6.08 g of pyridinium dichromate, followed by 6.2 g of 4A molecular sieves powder and 1 mL of glacial acetic acid. The resulting mixture was stirred for 1 h at room temperature. The mixture was diluted with ether and stirred with Celite for 10 min . The ethereal solution was filtered through anhydrous magnesium sulfate and Celite. The filtrate was diluted with ether, stirred with Celite again, and filtered once more through magnesium sulfate and Celite. Removal of the solvent left 1.8 g (80\%) of 173 as mixture of two diastereomers: IR (neat) 2997, 1744, 1706, 1595, 1437, 1389, 1295, 1180, 1129, 1107, $1076 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) for the major isomer $\delta 8.16(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 5.40(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=3.4 \mathrm{~Hz}), 3.79(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 3.73-$ $3.60(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.20(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C} \mathrm{NMR}\left(75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right)$ for the major isomer $\delta$ 188.6, 167.3 (x2), 110.6, 105.8, 65.9, 51.7, 44.8, 14.6, 8.43-Carbomethoxy-5-methyl-4-oxo-2H-pyran (169). To a soluton of 173 $(1.8 \mathrm{~g}, 0.08 \mathrm{~mol})$ in 80 mL of dry dichloromethane was added 3 mL of trifluoroacetic acid at room temperature. The mixture was stirred for 2.5 h and the solvent was evaporated under reduced pressure to yield a crude yellow solid. This was passed through a short silica-gel pad with ethyl acetate as eluent. The mixture was re-chromatographed on a short column of silica-gel with hexane/ethyl acetate (1:3) as eluent to afford $1.15 \mathrm{~g}(82 \%)$ of 169: mp $100-101^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; IR (KBr) 1747, 1654, 1445, 1409, 1326, 1291, 1124, $1028 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$;
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 8.49(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 7.73(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 3.91(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.96(3 \mathrm{H}$, $\mathrm{s}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 174.7,163.9,161.3,150.7,128.5,119.3$, 52.4, 30.9, 11.0; MS $\underline{m} / \underline{z} 168\left(\mathrm{M}^{+}\right), 150,136,(100 \%), 122,110,80$; HRMS 168.0420 (calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{8} \mathrm{H}_{8} \mathrm{O}_{4}$ : 168.0423); Anal. calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{8} \mathrm{H}_{8} \mathrm{O}_{4}$ : $\mathrm{C}, 57.14$; H, 4.80. Found: C, 57.11; H, 4.77

## 6-Carbomethoxy-9-ethoxy-4-methyl-5-ox0-2-oxabicyclo[4.4.0]

 deca-3,8-diene (174). A mixture of 169 ( $410 \mathrm{mg}, 2.4 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) and 2-ethoxy-1,3-butadiene ( $1.2 \mathrm{~g}, 0.012 \mathrm{~mol}$ ) in 6 mL of toluene was heated in a pressuretube at $200^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 21 h . After removal of the solvent under reduced pressure, the crude product was chromatographed on silica-gel with hexane/ethyl acetate (6:1) as eluent to yield $320 \mathrm{mg}(86 \%)$ of 174 : mp $105^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; IR (KBr) 2978, 1930, 1754, 1730, 1674, 1622, 1383, $1195 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( 300 MHz , $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 7.21(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 5.09(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=3,3 \mathrm{~Hz}), 4.69(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{br} \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=5 \mathrm{~Hz}), 3.76$ ( $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$ ), $3.69(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=7 \mathrm{~Hz}), 2.74(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=16,5 \mathrm{~Hz}), 2.50-2.35(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.67$ $(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.26(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=7 \mathrm{~Hz}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta$ 191.7, $169.5,158.4$, 149.9, 111.5, 92.0, 78.0, 56.0, 52.7, 30.5, 24.8, 14.4, 10.5; MS m/z $266\left(\mathrm{M}^{+}\right)$, 237, 207 ( $100 \%$ ), 182, 161, 151, 121, 95, 85, 77; HRMS 266.1149 (calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{14} \mathrm{H}_{18} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ 266.1154); Anal. calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{14} \mathrm{H}_{18} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ : $\mathrm{C}, 63.15 ; \mathrm{H}, 6.81$. Found: C, 63.06; H, 6.77
## 6-Carbomethoxy-9,9-ethylenedioxy-4-methyl-5-0xo-2-

 oxabicyclo[4.4.0]deca-3-ene (175). To a solution of 174 ( $90 \mathrm{mg}, 0.34$ mmol ) in 30 mL of ethylene glycol was added 4 mg of camphorsulfonic acid. The mixture was stirred at room temperature for 24 h , diluted with dichloromethane and washed with water ( $100 \mathrm{~mL} \times 2$ ) and brine. The organiclayer was dried over anhydrous magnesium sulfate and the solvent was evaporated. Removal of the solvent under reduced pressure yielded 90.1 mg (96\%) of 175: IR (neat) 2958, 1734, 1674, 1624, 1241, 1174, $1097 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 7.10(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=1 \mathrm{~Hz}), 5.15(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=10,5 \mathrm{~Hz})$, $3.98-$ $3.91(4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.74(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 2.45-2.35(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 2.13(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=14,10 \mathrm{~Hz}), 1.96-$ $1.88(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.68(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=1 \mathrm{~Hz}), 1.65-1.57(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (75 MHZ, $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 189.2,170.5,157.2,112.0,107.7,78.9,64.5,64.3,56.1,52.9,34.8$, 31.1, 24.9, 10.7; MS m/z $282\left(M^{+}\right), 251,223,198,183,167,99,86$ (100\%); HRMS 282.1098 (calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{14} \mathrm{H}_{18} \mathrm{O}_{6} \mathrm{Si} 282.1103$ ); Anal. calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{14} \mathrm{H}_{18} \mathrm{O}_{6} \mathrm{Si}: \mathrm{C}, 59.57$; $\mathrm{H}, 6.43$. Found: C, $59.00 ; \mathrm{H}, 6.59$
cis-anti-cis-8-Carbomethoxy-11,11-ethylenedioxy-6-methyl-7-0xo-2-oxatricyclo[6.4.4.03,6]dodec-4-ene (176). A solution of 175 (87 $\mathrm{mg}, 0.3 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) in 120 mL of acetone was flushed with argon for 0.5 h and with acetylene for 0.5 h . The solution was irradiated with a 450 Watt Hanovia mercury lamp for 1.5 h while acetylene was passed through the solution. After the solvent was evaporated under reduced pressure a yellow oil was obtained, which was chromatographed on silica-gel with hexane/ethyl acetate (6:1) as eluent to yield 20.7 mg ( $21 \%$ ) of 176: IR (neat) 2957, 1745, 1700, 1248, 1183, 1098, 1048, $1009 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 6.28,(1 \mathrm{H}$, d, J=2.7Hz), $6.09(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=2.7 \mathrm{~Hz}), 4.90(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=3.6,3.5 \mathrm{~Hz}), 4.76,(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s})$, 4.13-4.05 (1H, m), 4.01-3.85 (3H, m), 3.72 (3H, s), 2.11-1.74 (6H, m), $1.35(3 \mathrm{H}$, $\mathrm{s}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 206.9,169.8,141.2,139.2,107.0,79.8,69.2$, $65.1,63.8,60.8,56.9,52.6,37.0,31.6,24.7,19.3 ; M S \underline{m} \underline{\underline{2}} 310\left(\mathrm{M}^{+}, 100 \%\right)$, $307,295,291,277,265,228,211,200,199,167,156,140,112,100,60 ;$ HRMS 309.1337 (calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{16} \mathrm{H}_{21} \mathrm{O}_{6} 309.1338$ ).

## 9,15-Dioxo-5-hydroxy-4-methyl-4,15-epoxyapotrichothec-2-ene

 (178). A solution of 176 ( $12 \mathrm{mg}, 0.039 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) in 2.5 mL of dry benzene was stirred with 3 mg of $p$-toluenesulfonic acid at room temperature for 48 h . The solvent was evaporated under reduced pressure to leave a crude solid residue. This was chromatographed on silica-gel with hexane/ethyl acetate (1:1) as eluent to afford $5.5 \mathrm{mg}(57 \%)$ of 178 : $\mathrm{mp} 214-215^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; $\mathrm{IR}(\mathrm{KBr}) 3429$, 2937, 2908, 1759, 1733, 1710, 1689, 1406, 1354, 1264, 1253, 1105, 1088, $1049,1019 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 6.11(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=6 \mathrm{~Hz}), 5.82(1 \mathrm{H}$, dd, $J=6,2 \mathrm{~Hz}$ ), $4.94(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=2 \mathrm{~Hz}), 4.37(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=3,3 \mathrm{~Hz}), 2.70(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}$, $\mathrm{J}=3 \mathrm{~Hz}$ ), $2.53\left(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s} ; \mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right.$ exchange), 2.48-2.30 (4H, m), $1.55(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 208.4,176.3,138.6,130.8,95.0,93.8,93.2,79.1$, $57.0,40.6,34.7,21.3,19.3 ; M S \underline{m} / \underline{z} 251(M+1,100 \%), 233,205,169,141,111$; HRMS 251.0915 (calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{13} \mathrm{H}_{15} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ 251.0919).
## 9,9-Ethylenedioxy-6-hydroxy-4-methyl-15-0x0-4,15-

 epoxyapotrichothec-3-ene (179). A solution of 176 ( $11 \mathrm{mg}, 0.04 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) in 1 mL of dry benzene was stirred with a catalytic amount of pyridinium $p$ toluenesulfonate. The mixture was stirred at room temperature for 5 days. After removal of the solvent the crude product was chromatographed on silica-gel with hexane/ethyl acetate (1:1) as eluent to yield 1.9 mg ( $20 \%$ ) of 179: IR (neat) 3422, 2997, 1761, 1742, 1268, 1120, 1102, 1080, $930 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 6.05$ ( $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=6 \mathrm{~Hz}$ ), 5.84 ( $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=6,2 \mathrm{~Hz}$ ), 4.92 ( $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}$, $\mathrm{J}=2 \mathrm{~Hz}$ ), $4.34(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=5,5 \mathrm{~Hz}), 4.06-3.91(4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 2.36\left(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s} ; \mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right.$ exchange), 2.14-1.82 ( $6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}$ ), $1.51(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta$ 176.9, 138.7, 131.4, 107.2, 94.4, 93.4, 92.8, 80.5, 64.7, 65.0, 55.1, 35.2, 29.9,21.7, 19.5; MS $\underline{m} / \underline{z} 294\left(\mathrm{M}^{+}\right), 183,165,153,115,99$ ( $100 \%$ ), 86; HRMS 294.1103 (calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{15} \mathrm{H}_{18} \mathrm{O}_{6}$ 294.1103); Anal. calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{15} \mathrm{H}_{18} \mathrm{O}_{6}$; C, 61.22; H, 6.16. Found: C, 60.99; H, 5.95. In addition, 7.5 mg of recovered 176 was also isolated.

## 7-Hydroxy-4-methoxy-8-(methoxycarbonyl)-6-methyl-11-0x0-2-

 oxatricyclo[6.4.0.03,7]docec-5-ene (183). To a solution of 176 (10 mg, 0.03 mmol ) in 1.5 mL of dry methanol was added a catalytic amount of $p$ toluenesulfonic acid. The mixture was refluxed overnight and the solvent was evaporated under reduced pressure to leave a light brown residue, which was chromatographed on silica-gel with hexane/ethyl acetate (1:1-1:2) as eluent to give 3.3 mg of 183: IR (neat) $3340,2897,1723,1265,1096,1062,1020 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; 1H NMR ( $300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 5.82(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 4.45(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 4.18(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 3.97$ $(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=2 \mathrm{~Hz}), 3.82(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 3.39(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 2.68-2,12(6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.68(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 208.3,172.4,143.5,132.5,94.9,90.3,87.2,79.6$, $57.0,54.8,52.3,41.4,37.7,27.1,12.0 ;$ MS m/z $297\left(\mathrm{M}^{+}\right)$, 278, 264, 214, 205, 179, 154, 142, 125 ( $100 \%$ ), 111, 85, 82; HRMS 297.1340 (calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{15} \mathrm{H}_{21} \mathrm{O}_{6} 297.1340$ ); Anal. calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{15} \mathrm{H}_{21} \mathrm{O}_{6} ; \mathrm{C}, 60.80 ; \mathrm{H}, 6.80$. Found: C, $60.71 ; \mathrm{H}, 6.65$5-Acetoxy-9,9-ethylenedioxy-4-methyl-15-oxo-4,15-epoxyapotrichothec-2-ene (184). A solution of 176 ( $70.3 \mathrm{mg}, 0.23$ mmol ) in 3 mL of glacial acetic acid was stirred at room temperature overnight. The solvent was evaporated under reduced pressure and the residual material was chromatographed on silica-gel with hexane/ethyl acetate (1:1) as eluent to give $19.6 \mathrm{mg}(26 \%)$ of 184: IR (neat) 2980, 1768, 1755, 1230, 1105,
$1082,1043 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 6.09(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=6 \mathrm{~Hz}), 5.87(1 \mathrm{H}$, br s), $5.63(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{br}$ s), $4.20(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=4 \mathrm{~Hz}), 3.47(4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 2.15(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{S}), 2.18-2.01$ $(6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.48(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C} \mathrm{NMR}\left(75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 175.4,169.8,137.4,131.1$, 106.8, 99.6, 93.4, 87.7, 78.0, 64.9, 64.0, 55.9, 34.6, 55.9, 34.6, 29.7, 21.8, 21.1, 19.6; MS $\underline{m} / \underline{z} 336\left(M^{+}\right), 232,165,153,115,99(100 \%), 86 ;$ HRMS 336.1209 (calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{17} \mathrm{H}_{20} \mathrm{O}_{7}$ 336.1209); Anal. calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{17} \mathrm{H}_{20} 0 \mathrm{O}$ : C , 60.71 ; H, 5.99. Found: C, 60.99; H, 5.95

Methyl 4,4-Ethylenedioxycyclohexene Carboxylate (189). To a solution of 185 ( $14.8 \mathrm{mg}, 0.04 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) in 1.5 mL of dry tetrahydrofuran was added 1.8 mg of sodium hydride ( $60 \%$ in mineral oil) at room temperature. The reaction mixture was refluxed for 1 h and was washed with saturated sodium bicarbonate solution. The organic layer was dried over magnesium sulfate, and the solvent was evaporated. The crude product was chromatographed on silica-gel with hexane/ethyl acetate (2:1) as eluent to give 5.8 mg (78\%) of 189: IR (neat) 2951, 1715, 1256, 1140, 1119, 1088, 1061, $1014 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl} 3$ ) $\delta 6.87(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 4.01(4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s})$, $3.72(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 2.58-2.49(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 2.47-2.43(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.81(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=7 \mathrm{~Hz}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 167.3,136.5,129.8,107.2,64.5,51.6,36.1,30.7$, 23.6, 14.1; MS $\mathrm{m} / \underline{\underline{z}} 198\left(\mathrm{M}^{+}\right), 183,167,86$ (100\%); HRMS 198.0891 (calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{10} \mathrm{H}_{14 \mathrm{O}}^{4}$ 198.0892).
cis-anti-cis-11,11-Ethylenedioxy-7-hydroxy-8-hydroxymethyl-6-methyl-2-oxatricyclo[6.4.4.03,6]dodec-4-ene (191). To a solution of 176 ( $102 \mathrm{mg}, 0.33 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) in 12 mL of dry ether was added lithium aluminum hydride ( $87 \mathrm{mg}, 2.3 \mathrm{mmol}$ ). The resulting suspension was stirred at room
termperature for 3 h and then refluxed for 1 h . The mixture was quenched with saturated sodium sulfate solution cautiously, and filtered through Celite and anhydrous magnesium sulfate. Removal of the solvent under reduced pressure yielded $80 \mathrm{mg}(85 \%)$ of 191: IR (neat) $3439,2961,1152,1133$, $1096,1066,997,731 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 6.31(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=3 \mathrm{~Hz}$ ), $5.96(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=3 \mathrm{~Hz}), 4.52(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 4.14(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 4.08-3.79(4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.67(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}$, $\mathrm{J}=3,3 \mathrm{~Hz}), 3.52(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}), 3.48\left(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}, \mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right.$ exchangeable), $1.87(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}$, $\mathrm{J}=3 \mathrm{~Hz}), 1.81-1.67(4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.18(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 147.0$, 135.7, 108.3, 79.7, 79.5, 70.2, 66.6, 64.9, 63.5, 49.6, 41.1, 36.6, 30.4, 18.3, 17.7; MS $\underline{m} / \underline{z} 283$ ( $M^{+}, 100 \%$ ), 265, 247, 203, 175, 153, 99; HRMS 283.1543 (calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{15} \mathrm{O}_{5} \mathrm{H}_{23}$ 283.1546); Anal. calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{15} \mathrm{H}_{22} \mathrm{O}_{5} ; \mathrm{C}, 63.81 ; \mathrm{H}, 7.85$. Found: C, 63.64; H, 7.70
cis-anti-cis-11,11-Ethylenedioxy-6-methyl-7,15-O-thionyl-2-oxatricyclo[6.4.4.03,6]dodec-4-ene (193). To a solution of 191 (24.5 $\mathrm{mg}, 0.087 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) in 2 mL of dry dichloromethane was added 19 mg of $1,1-$ thiocarbonyldiimidazole at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The mixture was stirred at this temperature under argon for 2.5 h . After removal of the solvent under reduced pressure the residual material was chromatographed on silica-gel with hexane/ethyl acetate (1:5) as eluent to give 13.8 mg ( $50 \%$ ) of 193: IR (neat) 2957, 1273, 1267, 1242, 1214, 1101, 1052, $\mathrm{cm}^{-1}$; ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 6.37(1 \mathrm{H}$, $d, J=3 H z), 6.10(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=3 \mathrm{~Hz}), 4.70(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 4.63(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 4.58(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=11 \mathrm{~Hz})$, 4.12-3.80 ( $4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}$ ), $4.04(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=11 \mathrm{~Hz}), 3.77(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 2.12-1.99(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.91$ $(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.71(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.61(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.35(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta$ 189.1, 145.8, 137.1, 107.0, 86.7, 79.9, 74.3, 70.9, 65.2, 63.8, 47.7, 36.5, 34.7, 30.1, 17.9, 17.5; MS m/z 325 ( ${ }^{+}$), 303, 293, 265, 247, 233, 203, 155, 154,

153, 111, 99, 95, 86, 69 ( $100 \%$ ); HRMS 325.1110 (calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{16} \mathrm{H}_{21} \mathrm{O}_{5} \mathrm{~S}$ 325.1110); Anal. calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{16} \mathrm{H}_{20} \mathrm{SO}_{5}$; C, 59.06; H, 6.50. Found: C, 59.25 ; H, 6.13

## cis-anti-cis-8-Benzoyloxymethyl-11,11-ethylenedioxy-7-hydroxy-

 6-methyl-8-phenoxythiocarbonyloxymethyl-2-oxatricyclo[6.4.4.03,6]dodec-4-ene (195). To a solution of 191 (25.9 $\mathrm{mg}, 0.09 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) in 2 mL of dry dichloromethane was added 35 mL of diisopropylethylamine, 14 mL of phenyl chlorothionoformate and a catalytic amount of 4-dimethylaminopyridine. The mixture was stirred at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 2 h and the solvent was evaporated under reduced pressure to leave an oily residue. This was chromatographed on silica-gel with hexane/ethyl acetate (1:2) as eluent to yield 21.5 mg ( $59 \%$ ) of 195: IR (neat) 3482, 2964, 1292, 1216, 1203, 1155, 1096, 1043, 1019, $732 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta$ $7.41(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 7.32(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 7.08(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 6.35(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=3 \mathrm{~Hz}), 6.04(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}$, $\mathrm{J}=3 \mathrm{~Hz}), 4.81(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=11 \mathrm{~Hz}), 4.62(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=11 \mathrm{~Hz}), 4.56(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 4.09(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m})$, 4.02-3.84 ( $4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}$ ), 2.11-1.55 ( $6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}$ ), $1.25(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 194.9,153.2,147.0,135.8,129.6,126.6,121.7,108.0,79.8,74.3,73.6,69.0$, $64.9,63.7,49.8,41.1,36.5,30.7,19.8,19.0,64.9,63.7,49.8,41.1,36.5,30.7$, 19.8, 19.0cis-anti-cis-11,11-Ethylenedioxy-7,15-O-carbonyl-6-methyl-2-oxatricyclo[6.4.4.03,6]dodec-4-ene (197). To a solution of 195 (14.1 $\mathrm{mg}, 0.034 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) in 0.5 mL of toluene was added azo-bisisobutyronitrile ( 1.5 mg ) with 1 mL of toluene. The mixture was flushed with an argon gas for 10 min . To the above solution was added 21 mL of tri- $n$-butylstannane. The
resulting mixture was heated to $80^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 1 h . After the solvent was evaporated under reduced pressure the residual material was chromatographed on silicagel with hexane/ethyl acetate (1:4) as eluent to yield 5.9 mg ( $57 \%$ ) of 197: IR (neat) $3040,1758,1212,1139,1114,1098 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 6.36(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=3 \mathrm{~Hz}), 6.10(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=3 \mathrm{~Hz}), 4.70(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 4.58(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 4.51(1 \mathrm{H}$, $\mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=11 \mathrm{~Hz}$ ), $4.12(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 4.03-3.81(4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.74(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{br} \mathrm{s})$, 2.08-1.58 ( $6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}$ ), $1.31(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 148.1,146.0,136.9,107.2,85.4$, 79.9, 72.5, 71.1, 65.2, 63.8, 48.1, 36.7, 34.6, 30.1, 17.4 (x2)

## cis-anti-cis-8-Acetoxymethyl-11,11-ethylenedioxy-7-hydroxy-6-

 methyl-2-oxatricyclo[6.4.4.03,6]dodec-4-ene (198). To a solution of $191(11.4 \mathrm{mg}, 0.04 \mathrm{mmol})$ in 1 mL of dry dichloromethane was added 12 mL of triethylamine and 4 mL of acetic anhydride at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The mixture was stirred at this temperature for 2 h and washed with saturated sodium bicarbonate solution. The organic layer was dried over anhydrous magnesium sulfate and the solvent was evaporated. The crude product was chromatographed on silica-gel with hexane/ethyl acetate (1:2) as eluent to afford $6.6 \mathrm{mg}(50 \%)$ of 198: IR (neat) 3482, 2990, 1739, 1241, 1098, $1035 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( 300 MHz , $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 6.35(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=3 \mathrm{~Hz}), 6.04(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=3 \mathrm{~Hz}), 4.55(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 4.47(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}$, $J=12 \mathrm{~Hz}$ ), 4.13 ( $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=12 \mathrm{~Hz}$ ), 4.11-4.04 ( $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}$ ), 3.99-3.82 ( $5 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}$ ), 2.21 ( 1 H , $d, J=7 \mathrm{~Hz}), 2.08(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 2.07-1.93(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.81-1.79(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.69(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}$, $\mathrm{J}=14,4 \mathrm{~Hz}$ ), $1.60-1.50(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.24(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta$ 171.4, 147.2, 135.7, 108.0, 79.8, 74.1, 69.5, 64.9, 64.8, 63.7, 49.7, 40.8, 36.6, 30.6, 20.9, 19.9, 18.9; MS $\underline{m} / \underline{z} 373$ ( $\mathrm{M}^{+}, 100 \%$ ), 371, 356, 337, 325, 311, 295, 281, 265, 263, 259, 247, 235, 221, 203, 154; HRMS 373.2014 (calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{22} \mathrm{H}_{29} \mathrm{O}_{5} 373.2015$ ). These was also isolated 2.1 mg of a diacetate: IR(neat) 2992, 1742, 1371, 1242, 1102, 1053, $1029 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( 300 MHz , $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 6.39(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=3 \mathrm{~Hz}), 6.02(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=3 \mathrm{~Hz}), 5.09(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 4.06(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s})$, 4.18 ( $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=14 \mathrm{~Hz}$ ), 4.14 ( $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=14 \mathrm{~Hz}$ ), 4.12-4.08 ( $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}$ ), $4.05(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m})$, 3.97-3.82 (3H, m), $2.09(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 2.05(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 2.09-1.52(6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.05(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}) ;$ ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 170.9,170.7,147.2,135.5, .107 .7,79.7,75.1$, 68.8, 65.1, 63.6, 63.5, 48.5, 39.1, 36.2, 30.5, 20.8, 20.6, 19.1; MS m/z 367 ( $\mathrm{M}^{+}$), 353, 307, 265, 247, 117, 99, 87, 73, 59 (100\%); HRMS 367.1757 (calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{19} \mathrm{H}_{26} \mathrm{O}_{7}$ 367.1757).
cis-anti-cis-8-Benzoyloxymethyl-11,11-ethylenedioxy-7-hydroxy-6-methyl-2-oxatricyclo[6.4.4.03,6]dodec-4-ene (199). To a solution of 191 ( $35 \mathrm{mg}, 0.12 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) in 4 mL of dry tetrahydrofuran was added 11 mg of sodium hydride ( $60 \%$ in mineral oil) at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The suspension was stirred at this temperature for 0.5 h . To this mixture was added 16 mL of benzyl bromide at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The resulting mixture was stirred at room temperature overnight. The mixture was quenched with saturated ammonium chloride solution and washed with brine. The organic layer was dried over anhydrous magnesium sulfate and the solvent was evaporated. The crude product was chromatographed on silica-gel with hexane/ethyl acetate (1:1) as eluent to give $13.6 \mathrm{mg}(30 \%)$ of 199: IR (neat) 3498, 2957, 2926, 1098, 1065, 1045,m $1028 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) d $7.33(5 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 6.34(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=3 \mathrm{~Hz})$, $5.99(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=3 \mathrm{~Hz}), 4.52(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 4.14(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 4.09(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.99-3.79(4 \mathrm{H}$, m), 3.70 ( $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=3,3 \mathrm{~Hz}$ ), 3.54 ( $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=2 \mathrm{~Hz}$ ), 3.34 ( $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=9 \mathrm{~Hz}$ ), $1.95-$ $1.79(4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.67-1.56(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.20(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) d 147.6, 137.2, 135.2, 128.6 (x2), 108.3, 80.8, 78.5, 74.5, 74.1, 69.8, 65.0, 63.6,
49.2, 41.3, 36.8, 30.6, 18.6, 18.3; MS $\underline{m} / \underline{\underline{z}} 325\left(\mathrm{M}^{+}\right), 307,265,247,203,118$, 88, 60(100\%); HRMS 325.1652 (calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{17} \mathrm{H}_{25} \mathrm{O}_{6} 325.1651$ ).
cis-anti-cis-8-Acetoxymethyl-11,11-ethylenedioxy-6-methyl-7-ox0-2-oxatricyclo[6.4.4.03,6]dodec-4-ene (200). To a solution of 198 (9.3 $\mathrm{mg}, 0.03 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) in 1.5 mL of dry dichloromethane was added pyridinium dichromate ( $16.5 \mathrm{mg}, 0.045 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) and 17 mg of 4 A sieves powder. The mixture was stirred at room temperature for 1 h , diluted with ether and stirred with Celite to precipitate residual chromium salts. The supernatant material was filtered through magnesium sulfate and Celite. Removal of the solvent under reduced pressure left 9.5 mg of crude product. This was chromatographed on silica-gel with hexane/ethyl acetate (1:1) as eluent to give 8.7 mg (95\%) of 200: IR (neat) 2990, 1743, 1700, 1375, 1236, 1183, 1103, 1082, 1054, $1040 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) d $6.31(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}$, $J=3 H z), 6.03(1 \mathrm{H}, d, J=3 H z), 4.70(1 H, s), 4.57(1 H, m), 4.45(1 H, d, J=14 H z)$, 4.39 ( $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=14 \mathrm{~Hz}$ ), 4.11-4.06 (1H, m), 3.97-3.88 (3H, m), 2.21-2.01 (3H, m), $1.98(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.72-1.58(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.45-1.37(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.35(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (75 $\mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) d 211.0, 170.5, 140.6, 139.1, 107.1, 79.8, 68.6, 65.1 (x2), 63.9, $57.8,51.3,36.1,30.5,25.6,20.7,19.2$; Anal. calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{17} \mathrm{H}_{22} \mathrm{O}_{6}: \mathrm{C}, 63.34$; H , 6.88. Found: C, 63.31; H, 6.96
cis-anti-cis-8-Benzoyloxymethyl-11,11-ethylenedioxy-6-methyl-7-oxo-2-oxatricyclo[6.4.4.03,6]dodec-4-ene (201). To a solution of 199 ( $3.2 \mathrm{mg}, 0.009 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) in 0.5 mL of dry dichloromethane was added 5.1 mg of pyridinium dichromate and 5.0 mg of 4 A sieves powder. The mixture was stirred at room temperature for 1 h , diluted with ether and was further stirred
with 20 mg of Celite. The suspension was filtered through anhydrous magnesium sulfate and Celite. Removal of the solvent under the reduced pressure left 4 mg of crude product. This was chromatrographed on silica-gel with hexane/ethyl acetate (1:1) as eluent to give $3.1 \mathrm{mg}(97 \%)$ of 201: IR (neat) 2956, 2927, 1698, 1097, $1051 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta$ $7.38-7.19(5 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 6.28(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=3 \mathrm{~Hz}), 6.01(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=12 \mathrm{~Hz}), 4.84(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}$, $J=3,3 \mathrm{~Hz}), 4.69(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 4.48(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=12 \mathrm{~Hz}), 4.37(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=12 \mathrm{~Hz}), 4.09(1 \mathrm{H}$, m), 3.98-3.86 (3H, m), $3.96(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=9 \mathrm{~Hz}), 3.59(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=9 \mathrm{~Hz}), 2.09-1.93(2 \mathrm{H}$, m), 1.68-1.53 (2H, m), 1.42-1.31 (2H, m), $1.34(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( 75 MHz , $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 212.2,140.9,138.8,138.2,128.2$ ( x 2 ), 127.5, 127.1 (x2), 107.3, 79.9, 73.4, 71.2, 68.6, 65.0, 63.8, 57.7, 52.5, 36.0, 30.8, 25.6, 19.3; Anal. calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{22} \mathrm{H}_{26} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{C}, 70.33 ; \mathrm{H}, 7.07$. Found: $\mathrm{C}, 70.28 ; \mathrm{H}, 7.07$

## 5-Hydroxy-4-methyl-9-ox0-4,15-epoxyapotrichothec-2-ene (204).

To a solution of 201 ( $7.3 \mathrm{mg}, 0.023 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) in 1.2 mL of dry benzene was added a catalytic amount of $p$-toluenesulfonic acid. The resulting mixture was stirred at room temperature for 40 h . After removal of the solvent the crude product was chromatographed on silica-gel with hexane/ethyl acetate (1:1$1: 2$ ) as eluent to yield 3.5 mg ( $55 \%$ ) of 204: IR (neat) 3400, 1713, 1104, 1044, $991 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 5.88(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=6 \mathrm{~Hz}), 5.69(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}$, $J=6,2 H z), 4.73(1 H, d, J=2 H z), 4.29(1 H, d d, J=4,3 H z), 3.81(1 H, d, J=9 H z)$, $3.71(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=9 \mathrm{~Hz}), 2.70(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{J}=17,4 \mathrm{~Hz}), 2.60-2.48(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 2.33-2.22$ $(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 2.12-2.05(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.68-1.57(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.36(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $(75 \mathrm{MHz}$, $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 210.2,139.3,130.2,97.8,94.8,91.9,80.7,75.6,55.5,41.4,36.0$, 22.4, 18.7; MS $\underline{m} / \underline{\underline{z}} 236\left(M^{+}\right), 208,191,177,160,151,145,136,121,111$, 103, 95, 87, 79 (100\%); HRMS 236.1049 (calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{13} \mathrm{H}_{16} \mathrm{O}_{4}$ 236.1049).
cis-anti-cis-11,11-Ethylenedioxy-6-methyl-7-hydroxy-8-p-toluenesulfonyloxymethyl-2-oxatricyclo[6.4.4.03,6]dodec-4-ene (205). To a solution of $191(75 \mathrm{mg}, 0.27 \mathrm{mmol})$ in 8 mL of dry dichloromethane was added 0.14 mL of diisopropylethylamine, 55.6 mg of $p$ toluenesulfonyl chloride and a catalytic amount of 4-dimethylaminopyridine. The mixture was stirred at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 6 h and washed with saturated sodium bicarbonate solution. The organic layer was dried over anhydrous magnesium sulfate and the solvent was evaporated. The crude product was chromatographed on silica-gel with dichloromethane/ethyl acetate (2:1) as eluent to give $58 \mathrm{mg}(55 \%$ ) of 205: IR (neat) $3350,3059,1359,1176,1097$, $953,838 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $300 \mathrm{MHZ}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 7.78(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=8 \mathrm{~Hz}$ ), $7.37(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}$, $\mathrm{J}=8 \mathrm{~Hz}), 6.26(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=3 \mathrm{~Hz}), 6.01(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=3 \mathrm{~Hz}), 4.50(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 4.27(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}$, $\mathrm{J}=10 \mathrm{~Hz}), 4.09(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=10 \mathrm{~Hz}), 4.06(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 4.07-4.01(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.89(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m})$, $3.71(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 2.46(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 2.04-1.83(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.81-1.62(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.48-1.37(2 \mathrm{H}$, $\mathrm{m}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta$ 147.0, 145.2, 135.8, 132.4, 130.1, 130.0, $127.9,79.7,72.7,69.9,68.8,64.8,63.7,50.0,41.1,36.2,30.5,21.7,19.8$, 19.0; MS $\underline{m} / \underline{z} 437(M+1), 419,391,371,265,247,217,173(100 \%), 153,125$, 113, 109; HRMS 437.1633 (calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{22} \mathrm{H}_{29} \mathrm{O} 7 \mathrm{~S} 437.1634$ ).

## cis-anti-cis-11,11-Ethylenedioxy-6-methyl-7-ox0-8-p-

toluenesulfonyloxymethyl-2-oxatricyclo[6.4.4.03,6]dodec-4-ene (206). To a solution of 205 ( $13.7 \mathrm{~mL}, 0.03 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) in 3 mL of dry dichloromethane was added 18 mg of pyridinium dichromate and 19 mg of 4A sieves powder. The mixture was stirred at room temperature for 1 h , diluted with 3 mL of diethyl ether and stirred with Celite. The suspension was filtered through Celite and anhydrous magnesium sulfate. Removal of the solvent
under reduced pressure left 13.4 mg (98\%) of 206: $\mathbb{R}$ (neat) 3059, 1700, 1364, 1178, 1101, 1053, $953 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 7.72(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}$, $J=8 \mathrm{~Hz}), 7.36(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=8 \mathrm{~Hz}), 6.29(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=3 \mathrm{~Hz}), 5.94(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=3 \mathrm{~Hz}), 4.68$ ( $2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$ ), $4.41(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=9 \mathrm{~Hz}), 4.19(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=9 \mathrm{~Hz}), 3.98(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 3.95-3.83(3 \mathrm{H}$, m), $2.59(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 2.08(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 2.00(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=4 \mathrm{~Hz}), 1.58-1.28(4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 1.43$ $(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 209.7,145.0,140.5,139.4,132.3,129.9$, 127.9, 106.8, 79.7, 70.2, 67.8, 65.1, 63.9, 57.7, 51.1, 35.7, 30.5, 25.3, 21.7, 19.0; MS $\underline{m} / \underline{\underline{z}} 435(M+1), 345,263,173$ (100\%), 151, 93; HRMS 435.1478 (calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{22} \mathrm{H}_{27} \mathrm{O}_{7} \mathrm{~S} 435.1478$ ).

## 7-Hydroxy-6-methylene-11-0x0-8-p-toluenesulfonylmethyl-11-0x0-

 2-oxatricyclo[6.4.0.03,7]dodec-4-ene (208). To a solution of 206 (34.1 $\mathrm{mg}, 0.08 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) in 3.5 mL of dry benzene was added 15 mg of camphorsulfonic acid. The mixture was refluxed for 1.5 h , and the solvent was evaporated under reduced pressure. The residual material was chromatographed on silica-gel with dichloromethane/ethyl acetate (2:1-1:2) as eluent to leave $18.5 \mathrm{mg}(60 \%)$ of 208: IR (neat) $3470,1717,1361,1176$, $1099,988,961,791 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 7.78(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=8 \mathrm{~Hz})$, $7.37(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=8 \mathrm{~Hz}), 6.37(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=6 \mathrm{~Hz}), 5.39(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 5.22(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 5.16(1 \mathrm{H}$, s), $4.87(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=2 \mathrm{~Hz}), 4.03(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=10 \mathrm{~Hz}), 3.98(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=10 \mathrm{~Hz}), 3.85(1 \mathrm{H}$, m), 2.61-2.13 ( $4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}$ ), $2.47(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 2.01-1.93(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $(75 \mathrm{MHz}$, $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 209.3,153.5,145.4,136.6,133.8,132.3,130.1,127.8,109.5,92.6$, 78.7, 71.6, 48.1, 41.4, 36.3, 23.4, 21.7; MS m/z 390, 279, 218, 200, 155, 125, 109 (100\%), 91, 81; HRMS 390.1138 (calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{20} \mathrm{H}_{22} \mathrm{O}_{6} \mathrm{~S} 390.1138$ ); Anal. calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{20} \mathrm{H}_{22} \mathrm{O}_{6} \mathrm{~S}: \mathrm{C}, 61.52 ; \mathrm{H}, 5.68$. Found: C, $61.14 ; \mathrm{H}, 5.77$
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