STUDIES ON THE DEPENDENCE OF OPTICAL ROTATORY POWER ON CHEMICAL CONSTITUTION

Part XXX. Rotatory Dispersion of Camphor Carboxylic Acids, Camphors and 1-Borneol

BY BAWA KARTAR SINGH, F.A.Sc. AND BAL KISHORE K. NAYAR (Panjab University Institute of Chemistry, Lahore, and the Department of Chemistry, Allahabad University)

Received July 31, 1947

In the present communication, we give our determinations of the rotatory dispersion of camphor carboxylic acids in 8 solvents. The influence of the wavelength of light and the nature of the solvent on rotatory power has been briefly discussed. We have also corrected the rotatory dispersion formula of camphor in alcoholic solution, given in an earlier paper.¹ Tables XII and XIII for *l*-borneol are calculated from data given in that paper.

NATURE OF ROTATORY DISPERSION

The rotatory dispersion of camphor carboxylic acids in all the solvents is "simple" and can be expressed by the one-term Drude equation, $[\alpha] = \frac{k_0}{\lambda^2 - \lambda_0^2}$. On plotting $1/\alpha$ against λ^2 a straight line is obtained in each case. The dispersion equations have been worked out and the results are given in Tables III to X. It is seen that the differences between the observed specific rotatory powers (o) and those calculated from the equation (c) agree within the limits of experimental error.

THE EFFECT OF THE NATURE OF THE SOLVENT ON ROTATORY POWER

The specific rotatory powers, $[\alpha]_{5461}^{35\circ}$, of camphor carboxylic acids in eight solvents are given in Table I. The sequence of decreasing rotatory powers is as follows:

Glacial acetic acid > chloroform > water > ethyl alcohol > methyl alcohol > acetone > pyridine > benzene. A comparison of the rotatory powers with the dielectric constants of these solvents [water (80) > methyl alcohol (31·2) > ethyl alcohol (25·8) > acetone (21·5) > pyridine (12·4) > glacial acetic acid $(6\cdot4)$ > chloroform $(5\cdot2)$ > benzene $(2\cdot28)$] shows that there is a close parallelism between them, only glacial acetic acid and chloroform being anomalous in behaviour. The order of methyl and ethyl alcohols is reversed, but the difference in rotatory power is negligible.

The above order of decreasing rotatory power for the Hg green line (5461 Å.U.) does not hold good for all wavelengths. For mercury violet (4358) it is glacial acetic acid > chloroform > water > methyl alcohol > ethyl alcohol > acetone > pyridine > benzene, the first two not falling in the sequence of decreasing dielectric constants. The order of decreasing

TABLE I

Rotatory Power of Camphor Carboxylic Acid in Different Solvents at 35° C.

Solvent		Dielectric constant	[a] ³⁵⁰	Absolute Rotation (K ₀)
Water		78.0	81 • 50*	19.02
Methyl alcohol	••	31.2	$72 \cdot 50$	16-46
Ethyl alcohol		25.8	$72 \cdot 58$	16.94
Acetone		21.5	70.08	16.92
Pyridine		12.4	47.58	10-42
Glacial acetic acid		6 • 4	90.58	22.54
Chloroform		$5 \cdot 2$	$85 \cdot 42$	21 - 15
Benzene		2.28	42.00	11-40

TABLE II

Compound	Structural formula	[a]350 in ethyl alcohol
1 Camphor	$C = O$ $C_8H_{14} $ CH_2	5 9 ·61°
2 Borneol	$C=O$ $C_8H_{14} H$ C OH	43 - 45
3 Camphorcorboxylic acid	$C=0$ $C_{\bullet}H_{14}$ $CH-C-OH$	72-5
4 Isonitroso camphor	$C = O$ $C_8 H_{14} = O$ $C = NOH$	241 · 2 (stable) 214 · 28 (unstable)
5 Camphorquinone	$C=0$ C_8H_{14} $C=0$	165.54
6 Oxymethylenecamphor	$C = C$ $C_{\bullet}H_{1\bullet} $ $C = C$	243 - 35
	ОН	

Table III

Camphorcarboxylic Acids in Water

$$[a] = \frac{19 \cdot 02}{\lambda^2 - 0 \cdot 0614}$$
 $\lambda_0 = 2478 \text{ Å.U.}$

Dext Conc.: 0.5000	_	Wayalangth	[a]	Conc. : 0.5000	
[a] _{obs} .	o-c	Wavelength	[a] _{cal.} (c)	o*-c	[a] _{obs.}
48·50°	-0·49°	Li 6708	±48.99°	+0.01°	49·00°
	••	Cd ₆₄₃₈	53.92	-0.42	53.50
62.00	+0.81	Li ₆₁₀₄	$61 \cdot 19$	+0.48	$61 \cdot 67$
66.50	-0.12	Na ₅₈₉₃	$66 \cdot 62$	+0.38	67.00
71 - 33	+1.52	Hg5780	69.81	+1.36	$71 \cdot 17$
81.50	+1.16	Hg ₅₄₆₁	80.34	+1.16	81 • 50
90 • 67	-0.02	Ag5209	90 • 69	-0.19	90·5 0
97.17	+0.70	Cd ₅₀₈₆	$96 \cdot 47$	+0.37	96.84
114.0	+1.30	Cd4800	$112 \cdot 7$	+0.90	113.6
120.5	-0.40	Cd4678	$120 \cdot 9$	-0.60	120.3
127.0	+0.40	Li4602	126 • 6	+0.70	127·3
145.0	-3⋅0 0	Hg ₄₃₅₈	1 4 8 · 0	+0.50	148.5

Table IV

Camphorcarboxylic Acids in Methyl Alcohol

$$[a] = \frac{16 \cdot 46}{\lambda^2 - 0 \cdot 0680}$$
 $\lambda_0 = 2608 \text{ Å.U.}$

Dex onc.: 0.5000	tro gm./100 c.c.		[a] _{cal} .	Conc.: 0.5000	vo) gm./100 c.
[a] _{obs} .	o-c	Wavelength	(c)	o*-c	[a] _{obs.}
41·67°	-1.41°	Li ₆₇₀₈	±43·08°	-0.08°	43·00°
48.00	+0.50	Cd ₆₄₃₈	47.50	±0.00	47.50
54.00	-0.05	Li ₆₁₀₄	54.05	+0.12	54.17
59.00	+0.05	Na ₅₈₉₃	$58 \cdot 95$	+0.05	59.00
62.17	-0.67	Hg ₅₇₈₀	61.84	1 ± 0.00	61.84
72.67	$+1 \cdot 17$	Hg ₅₄₆₁	71.50	+0.83	$72 \cdot 33$
81.00	+0.03	Ag_{5209}	$80 \cdot 97$	-0.47	80.50
86 · 17	-0.13	Cd ₅₀₈₆	86 · 30	+1.03	87.33
102.0	+0.60	Cd ₄₈₀₀	101-4	-0.40	101-00
110-3	+1.20	Cd ₄₆₇₈	109.1	+0.20	109.30
113.0	-1.50	Li ₄₆₀₂	114.5	-0.50	114.0
133.0	-1.90	Hg4358	$134 \cdot 9$	+0.10	135.0

TABLE V

Camphorcarboxylic Acids in Ethyl Alcohol

$$[a] = \frac{16 \cdot 94}{\lambda^2 - 0 \cdot 065}$$

$$\lambda_0 = 2550 \text{ Å.U.}$$

Dex nc.; 0. 5000	tro gm./100 c.c.	N7 1 11	[a] _{cal} .	Conc.: 0.5000	
[a] _{obs.}	o-c	Wavelength	(c)	o'-c	[a] _{obs.}
43·50°	-0·50°	Li ₆₇₀₈	±44.00°	-0.33°	43·67°
49.00	+0.51	Cd ₆₄₃₈	48.49	+0.51	49.00
55.00	-0.11	Li ₆₁₀₄	55 • 11	+0.06	55 • 17
60-00	-0.03	Na ₅₈₉₃	60.03	-0.03	60 · 0 0
63.00	+0.05	Hg5780	$62 \cdot 95$	+0.05	63 • 00
72.50	-0.14	Hg5461	$72 \cdot 64$	+0.03	$72 \cdot 67$
82.37	+0.24	Ag5209	$82 \cdot 13$	+0.37	82-50
87.33	-0.13	Cd5086	$87 \cdot 46$	-0.46	87-00
103.5	+1.10	Cd4800	$102 \cdot 4$	-0.40	102.0
110.0	-0.10	Cd4678	110 · 1	+0.40	110.5
116.7	+1.13	Li ₄₆₀₃	115.4	+0.10	115.5
132.5	-3.00	Hg ₄₃₅₈	135.5	-0.50	135.0

TABLE VI

Camphorcarboxylic Acids in Acetone

$$[\mathbf{c}] = \frac{16 \cdot 92}{\lambda^2 - 0 \cdot 0564}$$

$$\lambda_0 = 2375 \text{ Å.U.}$$

Dext onc.: 0.5000	gmi.'100 c.c.		[a] _{cal.}	Conc.: 0.5008	
[a] _{obs} .	•-c	Wavelength	(c)	o'-c	[a] _{obs.}
43·00°	+0.02°	Li ₆₇₀₈	±42-98°	-0·14°	42.84
48 • 84	+1.59	Cd ₈₄₃₈	47-25	+0.29	47.54
53.50	-0-03	Li ₆₁₀₄	53 • 53	-0.57	52.96
58.84	+0.65	Na ₅₈₉₈	58 • 19	-0.23	57· 9 6
61.00	+0.08	Hg5780	60.92	+0.04	60.96
70.00	+0.02	Hg5461	69-98	+0.18	70.16
79 • 17	+0.43	Ag ₅₂₀₉	$78 \cdot 74$	-0.10	78 · 64
83.00	-0.64	Cd ₅₀₈₆	83-64	+0.32	83.96
97-17	-0.08	Cd ₄₈₀₀	97-25	-0.45	96.80
104.3	+0.20	Cd4878	104 • 1	+0.10	104.2
108.5	+0.40	Li4603	108-9	-1.00	107.9
125.0	-1.70	Hg4358	126-7	+0.60	127.3

TABLE VII

Camphorcarboxylic Acids in Pyridine

$$[\alpha] = \frac{10 \cdot 42}{\lambda^2 - 0 \cdot 078}$$
 $\lambda_0 = 2793 \text{ Å.U.}$

Dextonc.: 0.5004	gm./100 c.c.	XX and an arth	[a] _{cal} .	Lævo Conc.: 0.5000 gm./	
[a] obs.	0-0	Wavelength	(c)	o*-c	[a] _{obs.}
28·04°	+0.03°	Li ₆₇₀₈	±28.01°	-0.01°	28 · 00°
30.96	±0.00	Cd ₆₄₃₈	30.96	-0.79	30.17
35.32	-0.06	Li ₆₁₀₄	$35 \cdot 38$	+0.62	36-00
38.94	+0.24	Na ₅₈₉₃	$38 \cdot 70$	+0.14	38.84
40.48	-0.20	Hg ₅₇₈₀	$40 \cdot 68$	-0.01	40-67
47.64	+0.32	Hg5461	$47 \cdot 32$	+0.18	47.50
53.32	-0.57	Ag5209	$53 \cdot 89$	-0.22	53-67
57.16	-0.50	Cd ₅₀₈₆	$57 \cdot 66$	-1.16	56-50
69·5 2	+1.15	Cd ₄₈₀₀	68.37	-0.04	$68 \cdot 33$
73.08	-0.88	Cd_{4678}	$73 \cdot 96$	+0.21	74.17
78 • 16	+0.31	Li ₄₆₀₃	77.85	+0.15	78-00
94.32	+1.29	Hg4358	$93 \cdot 03$	-0.03	93.00

TABLE VIII

Camphorcarboxylic Acids in Glacial Acetic Acid

$$[a] = \frac{22 \cdot 54}{\lambda^2 - 0.0449}$$
 $\lambda_0 = 2119 \text{ Å.U.}$

Dex Conc.: 0.500		Wavelength	[a]	Conc. : 0.5000	
[α] _{obs} . (ο)	0-c	waverength	[a] _{cal} . (c)	♂ −c	[a] obs. (o')
53.84° 61.00 67.84 75.50 78.00 90.84 100.00 105.3 120.5 130.0 135.0	$ \begin{array}{c} -1.80^{\circ} \\ +0.01 \\ -0.98 \\ +1.17 \\ +0.06 \\ +1.84 \\ +0.44 \\ -0.07 \\ -1.00 \\ +0.40 \\ -0.10 \\ +2.70 \end{array} $	Li ₆ 708 Cd ₆ 438 Li ₆ 104 Na ₅₈₉₃ Hg5780 Hg5461 Ag5209 Cd ₅₀₈₆ Cd ₄₈₀₀ Cd ₄₆₇₈ Li ₄₆₀₃ Hg4858	±55.64° 60.99 68.82 74.33 77.94 89.00 99.56 105.4 121.5 129.6 135.1 155.3	-1·47° +0·34 -0·82 +1·34 +0·23 +1·33 +0·61 -0·40 -0·50 -0·10 +0·40 -0·30	54·17° 61·33 68·00 75·67 78·17 90·33 100·17 105·0 121·0 129·5 135·5 155·0

TABLE IX

Camphorcarboxylic Acids in Chloroform

$$[a] = \frac{21 \cdot 15}{\lambda^2 - 0 \cdot 0454}$$

$$\lambda_0 = 2031$$
 Å.U.

Dextonc. : 0.5000	gm./100 c.c.		[α] .	Læv Conc.: 0.5000	
[a] _{obs.}	o-c	Wavelength	[a] _{c al.}	o*-c	[a] _{obs.}
+50.50	-1.78°	Li ₆₇₀₈	±52·28°	-1·78°	-50·50°
	• •	Cd6438	57·31		
64.00	-0.68	Li ₅₁₀₄	$64 \cdot 68$	-1-01	63.67
70 - 17	+0.09	Na ₅₈₉₃	70.08	-0.08	70.0 0
73 •84	+0.60	Hg5780	$73 \cdot 24$	+0.60	73.84
85 • 33	+1.67	Hg5461	83.66	+1.84	85.50
92.50	-1.13	Ag5209	$93 \cdot 63$	-0.96	92.67
100.0	+0.62	Cd5086	99.38	+0.46	99.84
114.0	-0.30	Cd4800	114.3	-0.30	114.0
121.5	-0.40	Cd4678	121.9	-0.90	121.0
127.0	-0.10	Li4603	127 - 1	+0.20	127.3
148.0	+1.80	Hg4358	146-2	+2.80	149.0

TABLE X

Camphorcarboxylic Acids in Benzene

$$[\alpha] = \frac{11 \cdot 40}{\lambda^2 - 0 \cdot 028}$$

$$\dot{\lambda_0}$$
 = 1673 Å.U.

	Dextro : 4.0000 gm./100 c.c.	[a]	Lævo Conc.: 4.0000 gm./100 c.c.		
[a] _{obs.} '	o-c	Wavelength	[a] _{cal} . (c)	o*-c	[a] _{obs.}
+27·25° 33·00 35·75 37·25 42·00 47·00 49·25 56·50 59·50 62·00 70·75	+0.23° -0.09 +0.03 ±0.00 -0.19 +0.14 -0.17 +0.18 -0.23 -0.01 +0.38	Li ₆₇₀₈ Cd ₆₄₃₈ Li ₆₁₀₄ Na ₅₈₉₃ Hg5780 Hg5461 Ag5209 Cd5086 Cd4800 Cd4678 Li ₄₆₀₃ Hg4358	±27.02° 29.49 33.09 35.72 37.25 42.19 46.86 49.42 56.32 59.73 62.01 70.37	+0.02° +0.16 -0.12 ±0.00 -0.19 +0.14 +0.08 -0.07 +0.02 -0.01 +0.13	-27.04 33.25 35.60 37.25 42.00 47.00 49.50 56.25 59.75 62.00 70.50

Table XI

Camphors in Ethyl Alcohol

$$[a] = \frac{21.91}{\lambda^2 - 0.087} - \frac{11.50}{\lambda^2 - 0.037} \qquad \begin{array}{c} \lambda_0 = 2950 \text{ Å.U.} \\ \lambda_0'' = 1924 \text{ Å.U.} \end{array}$$

Dextro onc.: =33.5415 gm./100 c.c.		No contract the same of the sa	[a] _{cal} .	Lævo Conc.: 33.5423 gm./100 c.c	
[a] _{obs} .	0-c	Wav e length	(c)	o'-c	[a] _{obs.}
+32·52° 36·41 42·11 46·93 49·87 59·61 70·10 75·98	$\begin{array}{c c} \pm 0 \cdot 00^{\bullet} \\ - 0 \cdot 01 \\ - 0 \cdot 34 \\ - 0 \cdot 20 \\ - 0 \cdot 07 \\ - 0 \cdot 06 \\ + 0 \cdot 28 \\ + 0 \cdot 24 \end{array}$	Li ₆ 708 Cd ₆ 438 Li ₆ 104 Na ₅ 893 Hg ₅ 780 Hg ₅ 461 Ag ₅ 209 Cd ₅ 086	±32.52° 36.42 42.45 47.13 49.94 59.67 69.82 75.74	+0·08° +0·18 -0·25 -0·28 -0·08 -0·18 +0·16 +0·36	-32.60 36.60 42.20 46.85 49.86 59.49 69.98 76.10

TABLE XII

1-Borneol in Benzene

$$[a] = \frac{11 \cdot 80}{\lambda^2 - 0 \cdot 03692}$$
 $\lambda_0 = 1921 \text{ Å.U.}$

Conc. = 6.9010 gm./100 c.c.

Wavelength	Wavelength [a] cal. (c)		0 —c	
Li ₆₇₀₈ Cd ₆₄₃₈ Li ₆₁₀₄ Na ₅₈₉₃ Hg ₅₇₈₀ Hg ₅₄₆₁ Ag ₅₂₀₉ Cd ₅₀₈₆ Hg ₄₈₅₈	28.56° 31.25 35.18 38.03 39.70 45.16 50.35 77.09	-29·34° 31·88 35·13 38·11 39·70 45·21 50·28	+0.78° +0.63 -0.05 +0.08 ±0.00 +0.05 -0.07 ±0.00	

rotatory power for Li 6708 is glacial acetic acid > chloroform > water > ethyl alcohol > acetone > methyl alcohol > pyridine > benzene. Here acetic acid, chloroform and methyl alcohol do not follow the sequence of their dielectric constants.

TABLE XIII

1-Borneol in Ethyl Alcohol

$$[\alpha] = \frac{11.40}{\lambda^2 - 0.03767}$$
 $\lambda_0 = 1940 \text{ Å.U.}$

Conc. = 10.6015 gm./100 c. c.

Wavelength	[a] cal.	[a] _{Obs.}	o-c
Li ₆₇₀₈ Cd ₆₄₃₈ Li ₆₁₀₄ Na ₅₈₉₃ Hg ₅₇₈₀ Hg ₅₄₆₁ Ag ₅₂₀₉ Cd ₅₀₈₆ Hg ₄₃₅₈	30·28 33·82 36·42 38·25 43·45 49·24 51·71	27.64° 30.25 34.04 36.81 38.46 43.76 48.77 51.58 74.90	$ \begin{array}{c} \pm 0 \cdot 00^{\circ} \\ + 0 \cdot 03 \\ - 0 \cdot 22 \\ - 0 \cdot 39 \\ - 0 \cdot 21 \\ - 0 \cdot 31 \\ + 0 \cdot 47 \\ + 0 \cdot 13 \\ \pm 0 \cdot 00 \end{array} $

In view of the contradictory results which are obtained with different wavelengths as in the above discussion, it becomes necessary for a strict comparison that the effects of dispersion should be eliminated. This elimination is easy and fairly accurate in the case of compounds showing "simple" rotatory dispersion. In the Drude equation, if we make $\lambda^2 - \lambda_0^2 = 1$ square micron, the angle of rotation becomes numerically, though not dimensionally, equal to k_0 , the 'rotation constant'. This value of specific rotation refers to a wavelength not much greater than 10,000 Å.U., in the infra-red. The longest wavelength for which our observations have been made, Li 6708, is not far removed from this wave-length, and an extrapolation to this value where $\lambda = \sqrt{1 + \lambda_0^2}$ is permissible in view of the linear nature of the dispersion equations. Then the value of the rotation constants may be taken as a measure of the absolute rotatory power of the substances at "corresponding" wavelengths. A comparison may then be made of these constants with the dielectric constants of the solvents.

The values of the absolute rotatory power and the dielectric constant are given in Table I. Only glacial acetic acid and chloroform present anomalous behaviour, whereas the other solvents roughly follow the sequence of their dielectric constants.

CASE OF GLACIAL ACETIC ACID

The anomalous behaviour of camphor carboxylic acid in glacial acetic acid may be explained in the following way: It was found in an earlier investigation² that the specific rotation of camphor carboxylic acid in water

increases with concentration. On the electrolytic dissociation hypothesis, the acid at higher concentrations is less dissociated. If the undissociated acid molecule has a higher specific rotation than the acid ion, the specific rotation would rise with concentration. On the basis of this assumption, the increase in specific rotation of camphor carboxylic acid in water at higher concentrations is explained. In an acid medium, the rotation should be higher due to the suppression of ionisation. Camphor carboxylic acid in glacial acetic acid solution shows the highest rotatory power of all the solvents, in conformity with the above assumption.

PHYSICAL IDENTITY OF ENANTIOMERS

The rotatory powers of d- and l-forms of camphor carboxylic acid are identical in all the solvents examined, and this lends further support to Pasteur's Principle of Molecular Dissymmetry. Out of 187 observations recorded in this paper, in as many as 151 cases, the difference in the numerical values of the specific rotatory power of the optically active and opposite isomers corresponds to an angle of less than 0.01° in the observed angle of rotation and in 30 cases the corresponding angle lies between 0.01° and 0.02° which is within the limits of experimental error allowed in these measurements. In the remaining six cases this difference corresponds to about 0.03° , mostly for Hg violet line which is difficult to read. All these differences are, however, of the nature of casual experimental errors.

ROTATORY DISPERSION EQUATIONS FOR CAMPHORS AND 1-BORNEOL

The rotatory dispersion of Camphors in alcoholic solution (conc. 33.5415 gm./100 c.c.) has been recorded by Singh and Mahanti in an earlier paper. The dispersion formula is, however, wrongly recorded. We have re-calculated the two-term Drude equation and find it to be

$$[a] = \frac{21.91}{\lambda^2 - 0.087} - \frac{11.50}{\lambda^2 - 0.037}$$

This gives 2 values for the dominant absorption bands at λ 1924 Å.U. and λ 2950 Å.U. One of these at λ 1924 Å.U. has been identified with λ 1912 Å.U. derived from refractive dispersion equation³ and the other at λ 2950 Å.U. corresponds to λ 2874 Å.U. and λ 2890 Å.U. determined from direct absorption measurements by Baly *et al.*⁴ and Hartley⁵ respectively.

The differences between the calculated and observed values of rotatory power of the d- and l-camphors are shown in Table XI.

In the same paper by Singh and Mahanti the rotatory dispersion of *l*-Borneol in benzene and ethyl alcohol has been recorded, but no dispersion equations had been worked out. We have now calculated the one-term

Drude equations which fit the data (Tables XII and XIII). The value of λ_0 the dominant absorption band in alcohol (λ 1940 Å.U.) deduced from the rotatory dispersion equation agrees with that obtained from refractive dispersion data (λ 1962 Å.U.).

CHEMICAL CONSTITUTION AND OPTICAL ROTATORY POWER

The effect of the structure of a molecule on rotatory power is well illustrated by comparing the specific rotation $[a]_{5461}^{35\circ}$ of the six compounds camphor, borneol, camphor carboxylic acid, iso-nitroso camphor (stable and unstable), camphorquinone and oxymethylenecamphor (Table II). The replacement of a hydrogen atom of the methylene group of camphor (1) by an -OH group in borneol (2) lowers rotation from 59.6° to 43.45°. In camphor-quinone the methylene group is converted to a keto group producing an ortho diketone in which the two -C = O groups are in complete conjugation. This has raised the rotation to a much higher value (165.5°). The introduction of the oximino group = N-OH for the two atoms of hydrogen in the methylene group of the camphor molecule as in iso-nitroso camphors, (4) has also brought about a complete conjugation between the keto and the = N-OH groups, accompanied by a still larger rise in rotatory power from 59.6° to 241.2° (stable) and to 214.8° (unstable). In the case of camphor carboxylic acid, the conjugation of the keto group with the -c < c > O group is however broken by two consecutive single bonds, thus c > C > O The resulting increase in rotation is accordingly small c > O OH $(59.6^{\circ} \text{ to } 72.5^{\circ}).$

Oxymethylene camphor has been represented by formula I

The aldehydic formula II is very similar to that of camphor carboxylic acid III, the only difference being the replacement of —OH group by a hydrogen atom. On this formulation and on the above-mentioned analogy and comparison of the rotatory power of borneol and camphor, where the replacement of one hydrogen atom for one hydroxy group raises the rotation by about 16°, the value of rotatory power of oxymethylene camphor should be only slightly higher for formula II than that of camphor carboxylic acid, namely 72.5°. But the observed rotatory power of oxymethylene camphor⁶

is the highest of all the compounds given in Table II, namely, 243.35°. This strongly supports formula I for oxymethylene camphor as this shows a complete conjugation between the keto and the ethylenic bonds which is however not the case with formula II. This is in harmony with previous work by one of us⁷ in which oxymethylene camphor was given formula I, but in solution was found to undergo mutarotation with an equilibrium value of \pm 229.5° between the two modifications I and II.

EXPERIMENTAL

Camphorcarboxylic acids, d-, l-, and dl-, were prepared and purified by the method of Bredt.8

The rotatory power determinations were carried out in a 2-dcm. jacketed tube at 35° C. The values of the λ_0 calculated from the dispersion formulæ are given in the tables and stated in A.U.

SUMMARY

- 1. The rotatory dispersion of d- and l-camphorcarboxylic acids in 8 solvents is described. The dispersion is simple and obeys the one-term Drude equation.
 - 2. The effect of solvents on the rotatory power is discussed.
- 3. The effect of constitution on rotatory power of camphorcarboxylic acid is also discussed.
- 4. The d- and l-forms give identical rotation within the limits of experimental error and thus support Pasteur's Law of Molecular Dissymmetry.
- 5. The formula for the complex dispersion of d- and l-camphors in ethyl alcohol has been recalculated. The simple rotatory dispersion formulæ for l-borneol in ethyl alcohol and benzene have also been calculated.

We wish to make grateful acknowledgements to the University of Allahabad for providing research facilities and for the award of the Empress Victoria Readership to one of us (B. K. K. N.).

REFERENCES

- 1. Singh, B. K., and Mahanti, I. Proc. Ind. Acad. Sci., A, 1935, 2, 378. 2. ____ and Nayar, B. K. K. Ibid., 1947, 26, 271. .. Ibid., 1947, 26, 261. 4. Baly, Marsden and Stewart J. C. S., 1906, 89, 979. .. Ibid., 1908, 93, 961. 5. Hartley 6. Singh, B. K., and Bhaduri, B. J. C. S., 1930, 7, 771. 7. and Srinivasan, M. K. Proc. Ind. Acad. Sci., A, 1940, 12, 21.
- .. Ber., 1891, 24, 3382. 8. Bredt