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An efficient optical resolution of 2 -methylpiperazine was achieved by complex formation with the title host compounds. $X-R a y$ crystal structure of a $1: 2$ complex of $(S)-(+)$-piperazine and $(R)-$ (-) -1-phenyl-1-(o-chlorophenyl) prop-2-yn-l-ol was studied.

It is very difficult to obtain optically pure 2 -methylpiperazine ( $\frac{1}{\sim}$ ). Only partial resolution has been achieved hitherto, by recrystallization of the 2methylpiperazinium ( $2 R, 3 R$ )-di-O-benzoyltartarate salt from MeOH , and ( $S$ )-(+)isomer ( ${\underset{\sim}{l}}_{\sim}^{a}$ ) of $44 \%$ ee and $(R)-(-)$-isomer ( $(\underset{\sim}{d})$ of $30 \%$ ee have been obtained.

We succeeded in obtaining $l_{d a}$ and $d \mathfrak{d}$ in optically pure state by complexation of racemic $\underset{\sim}{l}$ with optically active host compounds, ( $R$ )-(-)-l-phenyl-l-(o-chloro2,3) phenyl) prop-2-yn-l-ol (2) and $(R, R)-(-)-1,6-$ diphenyl-1,6-di(o-chlorophenyl)-hexa-2,4-diyne-l,6-diol ( ${ }_{\text {人 }}$ ).

When a solution of racemic $\underset{\sim}{1}(100 \mathrm{~g}, \mathrm{l} \mathrm{mol})$ and $\underset{\sim}{2}(243 \mathrm{~g}, 1 \mathrm{~mol})$ in $\mathrm{BuOH}(50$ $\mathrm{cm}^{3}$ ) was kept at room temperature for 12 h , a $1: 2$ complex of $\underset{\sim}{l}{ }_{\sim}^{a}$ and $\underset{\sim}{2}$ was obtained as colorless prisms, which upon three recrystallizations from BuOH gave pure crystals ( $60 \mathrm{~g}, 20 \%$ yield, $\mathrm{mp} 85-87{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C},[\alpha]{ }_{\mathrm{D}}-109^{\circ}(c 0.66, \mathrm{MeOH})$ ). Heating of the crystals in vacuo gave la of $100 \%$ ee by distillation ( $9.5 \mathrm{~g}, 19 \%$ yield, ${ }^{[\alpha]}{ }_{\mathrm{D}}$ $+8.02^{\circ}(c 0.54, \mathrm{MeOH})$ ). When a solution of racemic $\underset{\sim}{l}(100 \mathrm{~g}, \mathrm{l} \mathrm{mol})$ and $\underset{\sim}{3}(242 \mathrm{~g}$, 0.5 mol ) in $\mathrm{MeOH}\left(500 \mathrm{~cm}^{3}\right.$ ) was kept at room temperature for 12 h , a $1: 1$ complex of ld and $\mathcal{N}^{3}$ was obtained as colorless prisms, which upon three recrystallizations



2

$\underbrace{3}_{2}$

| $\begin{array}{cc}  & \stackrel{1}{\sim} \\ \text { a: } & (S)-(+) \text {-form } \\ \text { b: } & (R)-(-) \text {-form } \end{array}$ |
| :---: |
|  |  |
|  |  |

b: ( $R$ ) - (-) -form
from MeOH gave pure crystals (75 g, $26 \%$ yield, mp $86-88^{\circ} \mathrm{C},{ }^{[\alpha]}{ }_{\mathrm{D}}-101^{\circ}$ (c 0.22 , $\mathrm{MeOH})$ ). Heating of the crystals in vacuo gave 1 d of $100 \%$ ee by distillation (12.5
 the distillation can be used again for resolution. Treatments of the filtrate left after the former and the latter experiments with $\underset{\sim}{ }$ and $\underset{\sim}{2}$, respectively, gave $d, d$ and da, respectively in the yield around 20\%.

The optical purity of $l a$ and $l d x$ can be determined by measuring ${ }^{l_{H}}{ }_{H}$ NMR spectra of their complexes with $\underset{\sim}{2}$ and $\left\{\right.$ in $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$, because $\underset{\sim}{2}$ and $\mathcal{Z}$ work as a chiral shift reagent. Methyl signal of racemic $\underset{\sim}{d}$ in the presence of two molar amounts of $\underset{\sim}{2}$ and an equimolar amount of 3 appeared as two doublet signals centered at $\delta 0.77$ and 0.90 and 0.77 and 0.83 ppm , respectively.

In order to know mechanism of the chiral recognition between $\underset{\sim}{1}$ and $\underset{\sim}{2}$ or $\underset{\sim}{3}$, $x-$ ray crystal structure of a $1: 2$ complex ( $\underset{\sim}{4}$ ) of $\frac{1}{d}$ and $\underset{\sim}{2}$ was studied. Crystal data of $\mathrm{C}_{5} \mathrm{H}_{12} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \cdot 2 \mathrm{C}_{15} \mathrm{H}_{11} \mathrm{OCl}(\underset{\sim}{4})$ are as follows: $\mathrm{FW}=585.58$, monoclinic, space group $\mathrm{P}_{1}{ }_{1}$, $\mathrm{a}=12.688(6), \mathrm{b}=7.920(4), \mathrm{c}=15.971(3) \stackrel{\circ}{\AA}, \mathrm{B}=104.82(3)^{\circ}, \mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{c}}=1.25 \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{cm}^{3}$, $\mu=2.5 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$ and $Z=2$.

The cell dimensions and intensities were collected on a Synthex R3 four-circle diffractometer with graphite-monochromated Mo-K $\alpha$ radiation by the $\omega$-scan mode within $2 \theta$ less than $45^{\circ}$. A total of 2947 independent reflections were collected, among which 2231 reflections (I>l.96o(I)) were stored as observed. The structure was solved by the direct method using MULTAN in Syntex program. All the hydrogen atoms except seven atoms were found on difference Fourier maps. A perspective drawing of $\underset{\sim}{4}$, including the numbering scheme, is shown in Fig. 1. Figure 2 shows the contents of the unit cell viewed down the b-axis. Bond lengths in $\underset{\sim}{4}$ are also shown in Fig. 1.

The refinement of atomic parameters was carried out by a block-diagonal leastsquares method. Thermal parameters were refined anisotropically for all the nonhydrogen atoms and isotropically for the hydrogen atoms. The final $R$-value was 0.068 .


Fig. 1. Host-guest interaction of $\underset{\sim}{4}$ and atom labelling, with the $\mathrm{OH} \cdot \cdots \mathrm{N}$ hydrogen bonds represented by broken lines. Bond lengths ( $\AA$, standard deviations in parentheses) : ClA-C(1)A $1.750(9), C l B-C(1) B 1.733(8), O A-C(7) 1.425(8), O B-C(7) B$ $1.436(8), N(1) C-C(1) C 1.451(9), N(1) C-C(4) C 1.466(11), N(2) C-C(2) C 1.479(11)$, $\mathrm{N}(2) \mathrm{C}-\mathrm{C}(3) \mathrm{C} 1.425(12), \mathrm{C}(1) \mathrm{A}-\mathrm{C}(2) \mathrm{A} 1.383(10), \mathrm{C}(1) \mathrm{A}-\mathrm{C}(6) \mathrm{A} 1.363(12), \mathrm{C}(2) \mathrm{A}-\mathrm{C}(3) \mathrm{A}$ $1.385(12), C(2) A-C(7) A 1.530(10), C(3) A-C(4) A 1.420(12), C(4) A-C(5) A 1.298(13)$, $\mathrm{C}(5) \mathrm{A}-\mathrm{C}(6) \mathrm{A} 1.353(16), \mathrm{C}(7) \mathrm{A}-\mathrm{C}(8) \mathrm{A} 1.509(10), \mathrm{C}(7) \mathrm{A}-\mathrm{C}(10) \mathrm{A} 1.532(10), \mathrm{C}(8) \mathrm{A}-\mathrm{C}(9) \mathrm{A}$ $1.188(10), C(10) A-C(11) A 1.338(10), C(10) A-C 915) A 1.379(11), C(11) A-C(12) A 1.393(12)$, $\mathrm{C}(12) \mathrm{A}-\mathrm{C}(13) \mathrm{A} 1.4 .6(15), \mathrm{C}(13) \mathrm{A}-\mathrm{C}(14) \mathrm{A} 1.337(13), \mathrm{C}(14) \mathrm{A}-\mathrm{C}(15) \mathrm{A} 1.384(11), \mathrm{C}(1) \mathrm{B}-$ $\mathrm{C}(2) \mathrm{B} 1.391(11), \mathrm{C}(1) \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{C}(6) \mathrm{B} 1.386(12), \mathrm{C}(2) \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{C}(3) \mathrm{B} 1.375(10), \mathrm{C}(2) \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{C}(7) \mathrm{B} \mathrm{l} .561(10)$, C(3)B-C(4)B $1.458(14), C(4) B-C(5) B 1.328(14), C(5) B-C(6) B 1.355(12), C(7) B-C(8) B$ $1.436(9), C(7) B-C(10) B 1.504(9), C(8) B-C(9) B 1.161(10), C(10) B-C(11) B 1.387(9)$, $\mathrm{C}(10) \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{C}(15) \mathrm{B} 1.358(9), \mathrm{C}(11) \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{C}(12) \mathrm{B} 1.393(11), \mathrm{C}(12) \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{C}(13) \mathrm{B} 1.376(12), \mathrm{C}(13) \mathrm{B}-$ $C(14) B 1.366(11), C(14)-C(15) B 1.407(11), C(1) C-C(2) C 1.490(10), C(1) C-C(5) C$ $1.535(13), \mathrm{C}(3) \mathrm{C}-\mathrm{C}(4) \mathrm{C} 1.444(13)$.

In the crystal structure of $\underset{\sim}{4}$, two hydrogen bonds between $O H$ of $\underset{\sim}{2}$ and $N$ of $\underset{\sim}{l}$ a play an important role to fix the host and guest molecules close together and to recognize chirality of each other efficiently in the crystalline lattice (Figs. l and 2). The combination of $\underset{\sim}{2}$ of $(R)$-configuration and $\underset{\sim}{1}$ of (S)-configuration ( $1 \underset{\sim}{ }$ ) would be important to form the stable complex ( ${\underset{\sim}{4}}_{4}$ ), because $\underset{\sim}{2}$ does not form complex with $\underset{\sim}{l}$ of ( $R$ )-configuration ( $1, R$ ). This is probably the same in the complex of $\frac{1}{\sim}$
 $(S)$-configuration (la). For the present, it is not clear why $\underset{\sim}{2}$ and $\underset{\sim}{3}$ of the same configuration include $\frac{1}{\sim}$ of the different configuration, $\frac{l}{d}$ and $\underset{d}{ }{ }_{d}, ~ r e s p e c t i v e l y$.


Fig. 2. The crystal structure projected along b-axis showing the hydrogen bonds (A).

From the Figs. 1 and 2 , the absolute configuration of $(+)-1$ can be determined directly to be $(S)$, because the configuration of ( $(-)-2$ has been determined to be (R). 2,3) This is identical with the reported ( $S$ ) -configuration which has been (R) determined by an indirect method.
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