187. Anatolioside E: A New Acyclic Monoterpene Glycoside from *Viburnum orientale*¹)²)

by Ihsan Calis* and Aysen Yürüker

Department of Pharmacognosy, Faculty of Pharmacy, Hacettepe University, TR-06100 Ankara

and Heinz Rüegger

Swiss Federal Institute of Technology Zurich (ETHZ), Laboratory of Inorganic Chemistry, CH-8092 Zürich

and Anthony D. Wright and Otto Sticher

Swiss Federal Institute of Technology Zurich (ETHZ), Department of Pharmacy, CH-8057 Zürich

(3.V.93)

A new open-chain monoterpene glycoside, anatolioside E (1), was isolated from the leaves of *Viburnum* orientale in addition to three known acyclic monoterpene glycosides, betulalbusides A (2) and B (3), and 2(*E*)-2,6-dimethyl-2,7-octadien-1,6-diol-6-*O*- β -D-glucopyranoside (4). The structure of anatolioside E (1) was elucidated on the basis of chemical and spectral data as 6-*O*-[β -D-glucopyranosyl-(1^{""} \rightarrow 6^{""})-2(*E*), 6(*R*), 2,6-dimethyl-6-hydroxy-2,7-octadienoyl-(1^{""} \rightarrow 4["])- α -L-rhamnopyranosyl-(1^{""} \rightarrow 2["])- β -D-glucopyranosyl-(1^{""} \rightarrow 6^{""})-2(*E*), 6(*R*), 2,6-dimethyl-6-hydroxy-2,7-octadienoyl-(1^{""} \rightarrow 4["])- α -L-rhamnopyranosyl-(1^{""} \rightarrow 2["])- β -D-glucopyranosyl]inalool.

1. Introduction. – In the course of investigations into the chemical constituents of *Viburnum orientale* PALLAS (Caprifoliaceae), the isolation and identification of an ester iridoid glycoside, viborientoside [2], as well as of five acyclic monoterpene glycosides, anatolioside and anatoliosides A–D, have been reported [3]. As a result of a continuing investigation into the same plant, it is now possible to report the isolation and structure elucidation of a new acyclic monoterpene glycoside, anatolioside E (1), as well as of betulalbusides A (2) [4] [5] and B (3) [4], and (2*E*)-2,6-dimethyl-2,7-octadien-1,6-diol-6- $O-\beta$ -D-glucopyranoside (4).

2. Results and Discussion. – Compound 1 was obtained as a colourless, amorphous optically active powder of molecular formula $C_{54}H_{86}O_{24}$ (FAB-MS: 1141 ([M + Na]⁺). The IR spectrum showed absorptions characteristic of OH (3500 cm⁻¹) and α,β -unsaturated-ester (1690 and 1630 cm⁻¹) functions, the latter being also supported by the UV spectrum (λ_{max} 217.5 nm). The ¹H-NMR spectrum of 1 exhibited resonances for *i*) three vinyl groups in the form of *ABX* systems, *ii*) three additional olefinic protons, *iii*) seven tertiary Me groups, and *iv*) four sugar moieties (*Table 1*). The signals arising from the anomeric protons of the sugars were assigned to one rhamnose (5.48, br. s) and three glucose units (4.49, 4.59, 4.41; each d, J = 7.5, 8.0, 7.8 Hz, respectively). Two-dimen-

This paper was presented at the poster session of the '40th Annual Congress on Medicinal Plant Research', Trieste, Italy, September 1-5, 1992; see [1].

²) Dedicated to Prof. Dr. *Mekin Tanker* on the occasion of his 40th academic year.



Anatolioside (6)

6-O-(β-D-Glucopyranosyl)menthiafolic acid (7)

sional homo- and heteronuclear correlations led to the identification of the remaining carbohydrate resonances. From these, the signals observed at 5.03 (t, J = 9.8 Hz) and 4.85 (dd, J = 8.0, 9.6 Hz) were attributed to H–C(4^{*m*}) of rhamnose and H–C(2^{*m*}) of one of the glucose units, respectively, indicating two sites of acylation.

The ¹³C-NMR spectrum of 1 (*Table 2*) contained 54 C-signals arising from three monoterpene and four sugar units. The chemical-shift values attributed to the monoterpene units were in good accordance with the data given for linalool [4] and (2E)-6-hy-droxy-2,6-dimethylocta-2,7-dienoic acid (= menthiafolic acid) [6]. The number of carbonyl C-signals (168.8 and 169.5) was consistent with the presence of two monoterpene acid residues. The C(6) resonances of these monoterpene units were observed at 82.0, 81.3, and 81.1 ppm; each being *ca.* 9 ppm down-field when compared to the equivalent resonances in linalool [4] and menthiafolic acid [6], and this clearly indicated three sites of glycosidations.

	1	5 ^a)	
$\begin{array}{l} Me-C(2) \\ H-C(3) \\ H-C(4) \\ H-C(5) \\ H-C(7) \\ H_a-C(8) \\ H_b-C(8) \\ Me-C(2) \\ Me-C(6) \end{array}$	1.61 $(s, J = 0.9)$ 5.04 $(dt, J = 6.7, 1.4)$ 2.00–2.40 ^b) 1.50–1.80 ^b) 6.00 $(dd, J = 11.0, 17.7)$ 5.24–5.29 ^b) 5.33 $(dd, J = 17.7, 1.2)$ 1.67 $(d, J = 1.0)$ 1.41 (s)	1.48 (s) 4.90 (br. $t, J = 7.0$) 1.90 ^b) 1.40–1.63 ^b) 5.84 (dd, $J = 10.9, 17.6$) 5.25 (dd, $J = 10.9, 0.7$) 5.17 (br. $d, J = 17.6$) 1.55 (s) 1.30 (s)	
$\begin{array}{l} H-C(1') \\ H-C(2') \\ H-C(3') \\ H-C(4') \\ H-C(5') \\ H_a-C(6') \\ H_b-C(6') \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{l} 4.49 \ (d, J = 7.5) \\ 3.32 \ (dd, J = 7.5, 9.8) \\ 3.49 \ (t, J = 9.8) \\ 3.42 \ (dd, J = 9.0, 9.8) \\ 3.19 \\ -3.34^{\mathrm{b}}) \\ 3.70 \ (dd, J = 12.0, 4.7) \\ 3.88 \ (dd, J = 12.0, 2.4) \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{l} 4.51 \ (d, J=7.5) \\ 3.68 \ (dd, J=7.5, 9.8) \\ 5.19 \ (t, J=9.8) \\ 4.84 \ (dd, J=9.0, 9.8) \\ 3.56\text{-}3.62^{\text{b}} \\ 4.14 \ (dd, J=12.0, 5.7) \\ 4.02 \ (dd, J=12.0, 2.3) \end{array}$	
H-C(1'') H-C(2'') H-C(3'') H-C(4'') H-C(5'') H-C(6'')	5.48 (br. s) 3.96^{b}) 3.95 (dd, J = 3.4, 9.8) 5.03 (t, J = 9.8) 4.43 (dq, J = 6.2, 9.8) 1.12 (d, J = 6.2)	$\begin{array}{l} 4.98 \ (d, J = 1.6) \\ 4.96^{\rm b}) \\ 5.29 \ (dd, J = 3.4, \ 10.0) \\ 5.06 \ (t, J = 10.0) \\ 4.30 \ (dq, J = 6.2, \ 10.0) \\ 1.10 \ (d, J = 6.2) \end{array}$	
$\begin{array}{l} H-C(3''') \\ H-C(4''') \\ H-C(5''') \\ H-C(7''') \\ H_a-C(8''') \\ H_b-C(8''') \\ Me-C(2''') \\ Me-C(6''') \end{array}$	6.89 (dt, J = 7.5, 1.5) $2.00-2.40^{b}$ $1.50-1.80^{b}$ 5.99 (dd, J = 11.0, 17.7) $5.24-5.29^{b}$ 5.30 (dd, J = 17.7, 1.1) 1.84 (d, J = 1.3) 1.45 (s)	$\begin{array}{l} 6.55 \ (dt, J = 7.3, 1.3) \\ 1.90-2.00^{\rm b}) \\ 1.40-1.63^{\rm b}) \\ 5.55 \ (dd, J = 11.0, 17.6) \\ 5.23 \ (dd, J = 11.0, 0.7) \\ 5.17 \ (br. \ d, J = 17.6) \\ 1.67 \ (br. \ s) \\ 1.29 \ (s) \end{array}$	
$\begin{array}{l} H-C(1^{m'}) \\ H-C(2^{m'}) \\ H-C(3^{m'}) \\ H-C(4^{m'}) \\ H-C(5^{m'}) \\ H_{a}-C(6^{m''}) \\ H_{b}-C(6^{m''}) \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{l} 4.59 \ (d, J = 8.0) \\ 4.85 \ (dd, J = 8.0, 9.5) \\ 3.52 \ (t, J = 9.5) \\ 3.57 \ (dd, J = 9.0, 9.5) \\ 3.19 \\ -3.34^{\text{b}} \\ 3.68 \ (dd, J = 12.0, 5.9) \\ 3.86 \ (dd, J = 12.0, 2.5) \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{l} 4.52 \ (d, J = 8.0) \\ 5.01 \ (dd, J = 8.0, 9.5) \\ 5.13 \ (t, J = 9.5) \\ 4.94 \ (dd, J = 9.0, 9.5) \\ 3.56 - 3.62^{\rm b}) \\ 4.13 \ (dd, J = 12.0, 5.9) \\ 4.015 \ (dd, J = 12.0, 2.3) \end{array}$	
$\begin{array}{l} H-C(3''''') \\ H-C(4'''') \\ H-C(5'''') \\ H-C(7'''') \\ H_a-C(8'''') \\ H_b-C(8'''') \\ Me-C(2''''') \\ Me-C(6''''') \end{array}$	6.75 (dt, J = 7.5, 1.5) $2.00-2.40^{b}$ $1.50-1.80^{b}$ 5.75 (dd, J = 17.9, 10.8) $5.24-5.29^{b}$ 5.27 (dd, J = 17.9, 1.1) 1.89 (d, J = 1.3) 1.44 (s)	$\begin{array}{l} 6.61 \ (dt, J = 7.3, 1.2) \\ 2.1 \ (m) \\ 1.40 - 1.63^{\rm b}) \\ 5.64 \ (dd, J = 17.6, 11.0) \\ 5.15 \ (dd, J = 11.0, 0.7) \\ 5.11 \ (br. d, J = 17.6) \\ 1.71 \ (br. s) \\ 1.26 \ (s) \end{array}$	

Table 1. ¹H-NMR Data (500.13 MHz) of Anatolioside E (1) (CD₃OD) and Anatolioside E Dodecaacetate (5) (CDCl₃: δ in ppm, J in Hz)

^a) Additional Ac signals: 1.87, 1.88, 1.93, 1.94, 1.947, 1.953, 1.98, 1.986, 1.998 (each 3 H), 2.00 (6 H), 2.06 (3 H).

^b) Signal pattern unclear due to overlapping.

Table 1 (cont.)

	1	5 ^a)
H-C(1""")	4.41 $(d, J = 7.8)$	4.52 (d, J = 8.0)
H-C(2""")	3.23 (dd, J = 7.8, 9.2)	4.94 (dd, J = 8.0, 9.7)
H-C(3""")	3.37(t, J = 9.2)	5.18(t, J = 9.7)
$H - C(4^{(m/n)})$	3.33(t, J = 9.2)	4.94(t, J = 9.7)
H-C(5""")	3.19-3.34 ^b)	3.56–3.62 ^b)
H ₂ C(6""")	3.67 (dd, J = 12.0, 5.9)	4.13 $(dd, J = 12.0, 5.9)$
$H_{b} - C(6'''')$	3.85 (dd, J = 12.0, 2.4)	3.98 (dd, J = 12.0, 2.3)
^a) Additional Ac signals	: 1.87, 1.88, 1.93, 1.94, 1.947, 1.953, 1.98, 1.986, 1.	.998 (each 3 H), 2.00 (6 H), 2.06 (3 H).

^b) Signal pattern unclear due to overlapping.

 Table 2. ¹³C-NMR Data (125.8 MHz) of Anatolioside E (1) (CD₃OD)

 and Anatolioside E Dodecaacetate (5) (CDCl₃)

	1	5 ^a)		1	5 ^a)
<i>Me</i> -C(2)	18.3(q)	16.7 (q)	C(1"")	98.5 (<i>d</i>)	95.2 (d)
C(2)	132.7(s)	130.6 (s)	C(2'''')	75.7 (d)	70.4 (<i>d</i>)
C(3)	125.9(d)	123.0 (<i>d</i>)	C(3"")	76.4 (<i>d</i>)	71.9 (d)
C(4)	24.0(t)	21.6(t)	C(4"")	72.2 (d)	67.8 (d)
C(5)	43.3 (t)	40.4(t)	C(5"")	78.1 (<i>d</i>)	70.3 (d)
C(6)	82.0 (s)	80.5 (s)	C(6"")	63.0 (<i>t</i>)	61.4 (<i>t</i>)
C(7)	144.8(d)	140.9 (d)			
C(8)	116.4(t)	115.9 (t)	C(1""")	168.8 (s)	164.9 (s)
Me-C(2)	22.9(q)	24.7(q)	C(2'''')	129.1 (s)	126.1(s)
Me - C(6)	26.4(q)	20.7(q)	C(3''''')	143.4 (<i>d</i>)	142.1 (<i>d</i>)
0(1))	08.0 (1)	05.9 (1)	C(4"")	24.8 (t)	22.0 (t)
C(1')	98.9 (d)	95.8(a)	C(5''''')	41.6 (<i>t</i>)	39.5 (t)
C(2)	80.3(a)	73.7(a)	C(6'''')	81.1 (s)	79.1 (s)
C(3')	77.2(a)	(4.1(a))	C(7"")	145.0 (d)	140.0 (<i>d</i>)
C(4')	72.1(d)	68.2(a)	C(8'''')	116.9 (t)	115.4 (t)
C(5')	(7.9(d))	70.0(a)	Me-C(2"")	13.1(q)	11.3 (q)
C(6')	63.0(t)	01.3(l)	Me-C(6"")	23.9 (q)	21.9 (q)
C(1")	101.4 (<i>d</i>)	96.1 (<i>d</i>)	C(1""")	98 D (d)	953 (J)
C(2")	72.5 (d)	67.7 (d)	C(1)	75.5(d)	70.6(d)
C(3″)	70.7 (d)	67.2 (<i>d</i>)	$C(2^{(2'')})$	78.6(d)	70.0(a) 71.9(d)
C(4″)	76.6 (d)	70.2 (<i>d</i>)	C(3'')	72.0(d)	69.4(d)
C(5")	67.6 (<i>d</i>)	65.9 (<i>d</i>)	C(-, -)	72.0(d)	70.2(d)
C(6″)	18.3(q)	16.3 (q)	C(5''')	63.1(t)	61.3(t)
C(1")	169.5 (s)	166.0 (s)		(-)	()
C(2")	129.0(s)	126.1 (s)			
C(3''')	144.3(d)	142.3 (<i>d</i>)			
C(4''')	24.4 (t)	22.0(t)			
C(5''')	42.5(t)	39.6 (t)			
C(6''')	81.3 (s)	79.2 (s)			
C(7 ^{""})	144.4(d)	140.2 (<i>d</i>)			
C(8''')	116.4 (<i>t</i>)	115.5 (<i>t</i>)			
Me - C(2''')	13.0(q)	11.2 (q)			
Me - C(6''')	24.3 (q)	21.9 (q)			
^a) Additiona	al signals: 169.6–	68.0 (COCH ₃); 19.9–1	9.6 (СО <i>С</i> Н ₃).		

2566

Acetylation of 1 yielded the dodecaacetate 5, as judged from the ¹H-NMR spectrum, which contained resonances for twelve AcO Me groups (*Table 1*). This experiment also clarified the fourth glycosidation site to be on a glucose unit, as no down-field shift upon acetylation for H–C(2') (3.68 (*dd*, J = 7.5, 9.8 Hz)) was observed. These results also confirmed that four sugar and three monoterpene units are attached to each other *via* four glycosidic and two ester linkages, indicating a linear sequence. The FAB-MS of 5 confirmed the molecular weight to be 1622 (1645 ($[M + Na]^+$), calc. for C₇₈H₁₁₀O₃₆) and the fragment-ion peak at m/z 331 indicated a glucose unit to be the terminal sugar. Alkaline hydrolysis of 1 yielded 6 and 7 which were identified [3] as anatolioside (6) and 6-*O*-(β -D-glucopyranosyl)menthiafolic acid (7). These results suggested 1 to be 6"" -*O*-(β -D-glucopyranosyl)menthiafolic acid (7). These results suggested 1 to be 6"" -*O*-(β -D-glucopyranosyl)menthiafolic acid (7). These results suggested 1 to be 6"" -*O*-(β -D-glucopyranosyl)menthiafolic acid (7). These results suggested 1 to be 6"" -*O*-(β -D-glucopyranosyl)menthiafolic acid (7). These results suggested 1 to be 6"" -*O*-(β -D-glucopyranosyl)menthiafolic acid (7). These results suggested 1 to be 6"" -*O*-(β -D-glucopyranosyl)menthiafolic acid (7). These results suggested 1 to be 6"" -*O*-(β -D-glucopyranosyl)menthiafolic acid (7). These results suggested 1 to be 6"" -*O*-(β -D-glucopyranosyl)menthiafolic acid (7). These results suggested 1 to be 6"" -*O*-(β -D-glucopyranosyl)menthiafolic acid (7). These results suggested 1 to be 6"" -*O*-(β -D-glucopyranosyl)menthiafolic acid (7). These results of the relevant interfragment connectivities were clearly established from the results of this experiment and are summarized in the *Figure*.



Figure. Schematic representation of diagnostic heteronuclear multiple bond correlations found for anatolioside E dodecaacetate (5). Arrows point from carbon-to-proton resonances, whose shift values are given in Tables 2 and 1, respectively.

Compound 1 was thus established as 6-*O*-[β -D-glucopyranosyl-(1^{"""} \rightarrow 6^{"""})-(2*E*,6*R*)-6-hydroxy-2,6-dimethylocta-2,7-dienoyl-(1^{"""} \rightarrow 2^{""})- β -D-glucopyranosyl-(1^{""} \rightarrow 6^{""})-(2*E*, 6*R*)-6-hydroxy-2,6-dimethylocta-2,7-dienoyl-(1^{""} \rightarrow 4")- α -L-rhamnopyranosyl-(1^{""} \rightarrow 2')- β -D-glucopyranosyl]linalool, for which the trivial name *anatolioside E*, is proposed.

The ¹H-NMR spectrum of **3** showed the presence of a Me group (1.29), an allylic Me group (1.81 (d, J = 1.2 Hz)), an olefinic proton (5.44 (br. t, J = 7.0 Hz)), three olefinic protons of a terminal vinyl group (5.06, 5.23, and 5.95 ($J_{AB} = 1.6$, $J_{AX} = 10.8$, $J_{BX} = 17.4$ Hz)), and an anomeric proton of a β -D-glucose moiety (4.26 (d, J = 7.8 Hz)). The assignment of all proton resonances was based on a 2D-¹H, ¹H homonuclear COSY experiment. These results suggested **3** to be a monoterpene glucoside, whose proposed structure was confirmed from ¹³C-NMR spectral data which exhibited sixteen resonances, including six signals of β -D-glucose moiety, two Me, two CH₂ ¹³C signals, four olefinic ¹³C signals, and two O-bearing ¹³C signals of the terpene moiety. These spectral

data were identical with those of 1-hydroxylinalool $1-O-\beta$ -D-glucopyranoside (= betulalbuside B), which had been previously isolated from *Betula alba* and *Chaenomeles japonica* [4].

Although compounds 2 and 4 were only obtained as a mixture, 2D-NMR experiments made it possible to determine unambiguously their structures. The intensity of ¹H and ¹³C resonances were consistent with the presence of 2 and 4 in a molar ratio of *ca*. 3:1. The ¹³C and ¹H resonances for both compounds were assigned by means of 2D homo- and heteronuclear correlation experiments, indicating the presence of closely related structures similar to 3. The ¹H resonances and related ¹³C signals attributed to 2 differed from 3 for the chemical-shift values of the CH₂OH group (2 H–C(1): 4.02, 4.19 ($J_{AB} = 11.4$ Hz); 75.9 (*t*)) and of the Me group attached to C(2) (Me–C(2): (1.67 (*d*, J = 1.2 Hz); 14.1 (*q*)). These shift differences can be explained by the conformation of the glycosylated primary OH group attached to C(1). The derived ¹H- and ¹³C-NMR data of 2 were in good accordance with those of 9-hydroxylinalool 9-O- β -D-glucopyranoside (= betulalbuside A) [4].

The ¹H- and ¹³C-NMR resonances of 4 (see *Exper. Part*) were also similar to those of 2 and 3 with some important exceptions. The CH_2OH protons were observed at 3.89 ppm as a 2-H br. *singlet*, and showed correlation with the ¹³C signal at 69.0, assigned to C(1). The signal attributed to C(6) of the monoterpene moiety appeared at 81.4 ppm, with *ca.* + 7.3 ppm downfield shift when compared to that of 2. This shift is due to the α -effect of glycosidation, indicating the site of attachment of glucose to the monoterpene unit. These results suggested a similar structure of that of 2 differing only in the site of glycosidation. The NMR spectral data obtained for 4 showed similarity with the data given for 9-hydroxylinalool 6-*O*- β -D-glucoside isolated from *Pluchea indica* [7]. Thus, the structure of 4 was established as (2*E*)-2,6-dimethyl-2,7-octadien-1,6-diol-6-*O*- β -D-glucopyranoside.

The authors thank Mrs. C. Oertel for optical-rotation and R. Häfliger for FAB-MS measurements.

Experimental Part

General. See [3].

Plant Material. Viburnum orientale PALLAS was collected from N.E. Anatolia, Rize, Pazar, July 1989. A voucher specimen has been deposited in the Herbarium at the Pharmacognosy Department, Faculty of Pharmacy, Hacettepe University (HUEF 89–045).

Extraction and Isolation of Glycosides. The air-dried leaves (500 g) were extracted with MeOH at *ca.* 40°. The H₂O-soluble part of the MeOH extract was partitioned successively with Et₂O, AcOEt, and BuOH (Et₂O extract, 23.4 g; AcOEt extract, 27.7 g; BuOH extract, 44.4 g). The BuOH extract (15 g) was chromatographed over silica gel (220 g) with CHCl₃/MeOH/H₂O (80:20:2, 70:30:3, and 60:40:4), and the fractions were combined into ten main fractions, A-J (A, 290 mg; B, 580 mg; C, 375 mg; D, 840 mg; E, 780 mg; F, 460 mg; G, 660 mg; H, 455 mg; I, 470 mg; J, 3.5 g). Fr. H and I were subjected separately to MPLC (*Sepralyte* 40 µm, MeOH/H₂O gradient, 40–65% MeOH) to give 1 (200 mg). Another part of the BuOH extract (14 g) was chromatographed over polyamide eluting with H₂O and with increasing amount of MeOH in H₂O to give six fractions, I-6. Fr. I (3.9 g) was further applied to a series of chromatographic methods to yield 3 (7.5 mg) and a mixture 2/4 (6.5 mg).

Anatolioside E (1). White amorphous powder. $[\alpha]_{20}^{20} = -49.9$ (c = 0.40, MeOH). UV: 217.5. IR: 3360, 2950, 2900, 1690, 1630, 1260 and 1060. ¹H-NMR (500.13 MHz, CD₃OD): see *Table 1*. ¹³C-NMR (125.8 MHz, CD₃OD): see *Table 2*. FAB-MS: 1141 (61, $[M + Na]^+$); calc. for C₅₄H₈₆O₂₄, 1622.

Acetylation of Anatolioside E (1). Treatment of 1 (30 mg) with Ac₂O (1 ml), pyridine (1 ml), and 4-dimethylaminopyridine (10 mg) at r.t. overnight followed by column chromatography over silica gel using C_6H_6/Me_2CO 9:1 gave a dodecaacetate, 5. ¹H-NMR (500.13 MHz, CDCl₃): see *Table 1*. ¹³C-NMR (125.8 MHz, CDCl₃): see *Table 2*. FAB-MS: 1645 (3, $[M + Na]^+$), 1469 (3, $[M - linalool]^+$), 1181 (11, $[M - glucosyl - linalool - (Ac)_3]^+$), 785 (35, $[glucopyranosyl - menthiafolioyl - glucopyranosyl - (Ac)_7]^+)$, 497 (6, $[glucopyranosyl - menthiafolioyl - (Ac)_4]^+)$, 331 (6, $[tetraacetyl] - glucoseoxonium]^+)$.

Alkaline Hydrolysis of Anatolioside E (1). Compound 1 (5 mg) was heated in aq. 5% KOH (1 ml) at 80° for 2 h. After neutralization with aq. 5% HCl, the soln. was evaporated to dryness. Residues were controlled by TLC, and the compounds 6 and 7 were found in the hydrolysate. These were identified as anatolioside and 6-O-(β -D-glucopyranosyl)menthiafolic acid, respectively, according to TLC comparison with authentic samples [3].

Betulalbuside A (2). ¹H-NMR (500.13 MHz, CD₃OD): 4.02, 4.19 (*AB*, $J_{AB} = 11.4$, $H_a - C(1)$, $H_b - C(1)$, resp.); 5.46 (*dt*, J = 1.3, 7.3, H-C(3)); 2.09 (*m*, 2 H-C(4)); 1.53 (*m*, 2 H-C(5)); 5.90 (*dd*, J = 17.4, 10.8, H-C(7)); 5.19 (*dd*, J = 17.4, 1.6, $H_a - C(8)$); 5.03 (*dd*, J = 10.8, 1.6, $H_b - C(8)$); 1.67 (*d*, J = 1.2, Me-C(2)); 1.24 (*s*, Me-C(6)); 4.23 (*d*, J = 7.8, H-C(1')); 3.18 (*dd*, J = 7.8, 9.3, H-C(2')); 3.32 (*t*, J = 9, H-C(3')); 3.26 (*t*, J = 8.7, H-C(4')); 3.18 (*m*, H-C(5')); 3.65 (*dd*, J = 11.9, 5.4, $H_a - C(6')$); 3.85 (*dd*, J = 11.9, 2.4, $H_b - C(6')$). ¹³C-NMR (125.8 MHz, CD₃OD): 75.9 (*t*, C(1)); 132.9 (*s*, C(2)); 130.1 (*d*, C(3)); 23.5 (*t*, C(4)); 42.9 (*t*, C(5)); 73.8 (*s*, C(6)); 146.2 (*d*, C(7)); 112.1 (*t*, C(8)); 14.1 (*q*, Me-C(2)); 27.7 (*q*, Me-C(6)); 102.6 (*d*, C(1')); 75.1 (*d*, C(2')); 78.2 (*d*, C(3')); 71.7 (*d*, C(4')); 77.9 (*d*, C(5')); 62.9 (*t*, C(6')).

Betulalbuside B (3). ¹H-NMR (300.13 MHz, CD₃OD): 4.24, 4.37 (*AB*, $J_{AB} = 11.4$, $H_a-C(1)$, $H_b-C(1)$, resp.); 5.44 (*dt*, J = 1.3, 7.0, H–C(3)); 2.15 (*m*, 2 H–C(4)); 1.56 (*m*, 2 H–C(5)); 5.95 (*dd*, J = 17.4, 10.8, H–C(7)); 5.06 (*dd*, J = 17.4, 1.6, $H_a-C(8)$); 5.23 (*dd*, J = 10.8, 1.6, $H_b-C(8)$); 1.81 (*d*, J = 1.2, Me–C(2)); 1.29 (*s*, Me–C(6)); 4.26 (*d*, J = 7.8, H–C(1')); 3.22 (*dd*, J = 7.8, 9.3, H–C(2')); 3.38 (*t*, J = 9, H–C(3')); 3.34 (*t*, J = 8.7, H–C(4')); 3.26 (*m*, H–C(5')); 3.73 (*dd*, J = 11.9, 5.4, $H_a-C(6')$); 3.92 (*dd*, J = 11.9, 2.4, $H_b-C(6')$). ¹³C-NMR (75.5 MHz, CD₃OD): 67.8 (*t*, C(1)); 132.7 (*s*, C(2)); 131.4 (*d*, C(3)); 23.5 (*t*, C(4)); 43.6 (*t*, C(5)); 73.8 (*s*, C(6)); 146.3 (*d*, C(7)); 112.1 (*t*, C(8)); 21.9 (*q*, *Me*–C(2)); 27.6 (*q*, *Me*–C(6)); 102.5 (*d*, C(1')); 75.1 (*d*, C(2')); 78.2 (*d*, C(3')); 71.7 (*d*, C(4')); 77.9 (*d*, C(5')); 62.8 (*t*, C(6')).

(2E)-2,6-Dimethylocta-2,7-dien-1,6-diol-6-O-β-D-glucopyranoside (4). ¹H-NMR (500.13 MHz, CD₃OD): 3.89 (br. s, $H_a-C(1)$, $H_b-C(1)$); 5.38 (dt, J = 1.3, 7.3, H-C(3)); 2.10 (m, 2 H–C(4)); 1.62 (m, 2 H–C(5)); 5.93 (dd, J = 17.4, 10.8, H–C(7)); 5.23 (dd, J = 17.4, 1.6, $H_a-C(8)$); 5.21 (dd, J = 10.8, 1.6, $H_b-C(8)$); 1.63 (d, J = 1.2, Me–C(2)); 1.38 (s, Me–C(6)); 4.34 (d, J = 7.8, H–C(1')); 3.18 (dd, J = 7.8, 9.3, H–C(2')); 3.32 (t, J = 9, H–C(3')); 3.26 (t, J = 8.7, H–C(4')); 3.15 (m, H–C(5')); 3.62 (dd, J = 11.9, 5.4, $H_a-C(6')$); 3.80 (dd, J = 11.9, 2.4, $H_b-C(6')$). ¹³C-NMR (125.8 MHz, CD₃OD): 69.0 (t, C(1)); 135.9 (s, C(2)); 126.9 (d, C(3)); 23.3 (t, C(4)); 42.3 (t, C(5)); 81.4 (s, C(6)); 144.5 (d, C(7)); 115.8 (t, C(8)); 13.7 (q, Me–C(2)); 31.1 (q, Me–C(6)); 99.6 (d, C(1')); 75.2 (d, C(2')); 78.3 (d, C(3')); 71.7 (d, C(4')); 77.6 (d, C(5')); 62.8 (t, C(6')).

REFERENCES

- [1] I. Çalış, A Yürüker, H. Rüegger, A. D. Wright, O. Sticher, Planta Med. 1992, 58 (Suppl. 1), A714.
- [2] I. Çalış, A. Yürüker, O. Sticher, in 'Proceedings of the 9th Symposium on Plant Drugs', Eskişehir, Turkey, May 16-19, 1991, Ed. H. C. Başer, Eskişehir, 1992, pp. 428-436.
- [3] I. Calış, A. Yürüker, H. Rüegger, A. D. Wright, O. Sticher, Helv. Chim. Acta 1993, 76, 416.
- [4] R. Tschesche, F. Ciper, E. Breitmaier, Chem. Ber. 1977, 110, 3111.
- [5] Y. Matsubara, A. Sawabe, Y. Iizuka, K. Okamoto, J. Jpn. Oil Chem. Soc. (Yukagaku) 1988, 37, 13.
- [6] M. Nicoletti, M. Serafini, L. Tomassini, A. Bianco, P. Passacantilli, Planta Med. 1987, 53, 295.
- [7] T. Uchiyama, T. Miyase, A. Ueno, K. Usmanghani, Phytochemistry 1989, 28, 3369.