38. Molecular Polarisability: The Molar Kerr Constants and Conformations of Acrylic, Crotonic, Methacrylic, and Tiglic Aldehydes, as Solutes in Benzene.

By C.-Y. Chen and R. J. W. Le Fèvre.

For the aldehydes named above, molar Kerr constants ( $\times 10^{12}$ ) at infinite dilution in benzene are reported as $385,738,299$, and 716 , respectively. By reference to anisotropic bond polarisabilities, redetermined dipole moments, molecular refractions, etc., the ${ }_{\mathrm{m}} K^{\prime} \mathrm{s}$ and $\mu^{\prime} \mathrm{s}$ can be reconciled if the solutes exist at $25^{\circ}$ as s-trans-s-cis mixtures as follow: $\mathrm{CH}_{2}: \mathrm{CH} \cdot \mathrm{CHO} 4: 1$, $\mathrm{Me} \cdot \mathrm{CH}: \mathrm{CH} \cdot \mathrm{CHO}, 23: 1, \mathrm{CH}_{2}: \mathrm{CMe} \cdot \mathrm{CHO}, 1: 1$, and $\mathrm{Me} \cdot \mathrm{CH}: \mathrm{CMe} \cdot \mathrm{CHO}, 18: 1$.

Predicted and observed dipole moments (D) for the four aldehydes named in the title were given by Bentley, Everard, Marsden, and Sutton ${ }^{1}$ as:

|  | $s$-cis | s-trans | obs. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{CH}_{2}: \mathrm{CH} \cdot \mathrm{CHO}$ | $2 \cdot 44$ | $2 \cdot 78$ | $2 \cdot 90$ (in benzene ${ }^{1}$ ) |
| $\mathrm{Me} \cdot \mathrm{CH}: \mathrm{CH} \cdot \mathrm{CHO}$ | $2 \cdot 74$ | $3 \cdot 45$ | 3.54 (in $\mathrm{CCl}_{4}{ }^{1}$ ) |
| $\mathrm{CH}_{2}$ : $\mathrm{CMe} \cdot \mathrm{CHO}$ | $2 \cdot 85$ | $2 \cdot 38$ | 2.72 (in benzene ${ }^{2}$ ) |
| $\mathrm{Me} \cdot \mathrm{CH}: \mathrm{CMe} \cdot \mathrm{CHO}$ | $3 \cdot 10$ | 3.09 | 3.39 ( ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |

[^0]Thus from polarity considerations they concluded " that acraldehyde and crotonaldehyde adopt the s-trans-configuration, but that it is impossible to say with certainty that methacraldehyde and tiglaldehyde do so."

Since such rotational isomers should differ in their anisotropies of polarisability we calculated the molar Kerr constants to be expected for the s-cis- and the $s$-trans-extremes and found them to be separated sufficiently in each case to justify comparison with direct measurements.

## Experimental

Solutes, Methods, etc.-Commercial acraldehyde (from B.D.H.) was dried $\left(\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}\right)$ and distilled through a short column; the fraction of b. p. $53^{\circ} / 765 \mathrm{~mm}$. was collected for measurement. Crotonaldehyde (also from B.D.H.), after similarly drying and fractionation under nitrogen, had b. p. $102^{\circ} / 762 \mathrm{~mm}$. and $n_{\mathrm{D}}{ }^{25} 1 \cdot 4348$. Methacraldehyde was synthesised as described by Marrel, Myers, and Sanders, ${ }^{3}$ refluxing being continued for 4 hr .; the specimen used had b. p. $66 \cdot 2-66 \cdot 8^{\circ} / 752 \mathrm{~mm}$. and $n_{\mathrm{D}}{ }^{25} 1 \cdot 4053$. Tiglaldehyde was prepared as directed by Green and Hickinbottom; ${ }^{4}$ successive fractionations (in a nitrogen atmosphere) provided material with b. p. $118 \cdot 5-119 \cdot 5^{\circ} / 760 \mathrm{~mm}$. and $n_{\mathrm{D}}{ }^{25} 1 \cdot 4437$.

Details of apparatus, procedures, symbols, etc. have been given before. ${ }^{5}$

## Table 1.

Incremental Kerr effects, refractive indexes, dielectric constants, and densities for solutions containing weight fractions $w_{2}$ of solute in benzene $*$ at $25^{\circ}$.

| Solute: Acraldehyde |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & 10^{5} w_{2} . \\ & 10^{11} \Delta B . \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 380 \\ 1532 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 517 \\ 2056 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 827 \\ 3363 \end{array}$ | 10694379 | $\begin{aligned} & 1250 \\ & 4898 \end{aligned}$ | 1516 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 5895 |  |  |  |
|  |  | whence $\Sigma \Delta B / \Sigma w_{2}=39 \cdot 80 \times 10^{-7}$. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Solute: Crotonaldehyde |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $10^{5} w_{2}$ | 158 | 279 | 301 | 384 | $\check{504}$ | 526 | 633 | 724 | 932 |
| $10^{11} \Delta B$ | 932 | 1629 | 1880 | 2301 | - | 3083 | 3820 | 4477 | 5581 |
| $10^{4} \Delta \varepsilon$ | - | 508 | - | 697 | 910 | 968 | 1168 | 1314 | 1720 |
| $-10^{4} \Delta d$ | - | 1 | - | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| $10^{5} w_{2}$ | 386 | 761 | 1180 | 1572 | 3205 |  |  |  |  |
| $-10^{4} \Delta n$ | , | 2 |  | 10 | 21 |  |  |  |  |
| whence | 60.21 | $10^{-7}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \Delta \varepsilon / \sum w \\ & \mathrm{~d} \sum \Delta n \end{aligned}$ | $18.30$ | $\begin{gathered} \Delta d / \sum 2 \\ 0.162 \end{gathered}$ | $=-0 .$ | $\sum \Delta x$ | $w_{2}=$ | $\cdot 054$ |

Solute: Methacraldehyde

| $10^{5} w_{2} \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots$ | 138 | 333 | 521 | 943 | 2067 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $10^{11} \Delta B \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots$ | 348 | 814 | 1293 | 2361 | - |
| $10^{4} \Delta \varepsilon \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots$ | 154 | 375 | 584 | 1066 | 2351 |
| $-10^{4} \Delta a \cdots \cdots \cdots \cdots$ | - | 1 | 2 | 4 | 9 |
| $-10^{4} \Delta n$ | $\ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots$ | - | 2 | 4 | 6 |

whence $\Sigma \Delta B / \Sigma w_{2}=24.89 \times 10^{-7}, \Sigma \Delta \varepsilon / \sum w_{2}=11.32, \Sigma \Delta d / \Sigma w_{2}=-0.041, \Sigma \Delta n / \sum w_{2}=-0.067$, and $\Sigma \Delta n^{2} / \sum w_{2}=-0.201$.


[^1]${ }^{4}$ Green and Hickinbottom, $J ., 1957,3267$.
${ }^{5}$ Le Fèvre and Le Fèvre, (a) Rev. Pure Appl. Chem., 1955. 5, 261; (b) Ch. XXXVI in "Physical Methods of Organic Chemistry," ed. Weissberger, Interscience Publ. Inc., New York, 3rd edn., Vol. I, p. 2459.

Measurements and Results.--These follow under the usual headings ${ }^{5}$ as Tables 1 and 2. Equations used in passing from Table 1 to Table 2 have recently been summarised. ${ }^{6}$

Table 2.
Polarisations, molar Kerr constants, dipole moments, etc., calculated from Table 1.

| Solute | $\alpha \varepsilon_{1}$ | - $\beta$ | . $\mathrm{H}-\gamma$ | $\delta$ | $10^{12}{ }_{\infty}\left({ }_{m} K_{2}\right)$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Acraldehyde | 15.80* | $0 \cdot 066$ * | $0.069_{5}$ * | $97 \cdot 07$ | 385•1 |
| Crotonaldehyde | 18.30 | 0.034 | $0.036{ }^{\text {s }}$ | $146 \cdot 8_{5}$ | $738 \cdot 1$ |
| Methacraldehyde | 11-32 | $0 \cdot 047$ | 0.045 | 60.70 | $299 \cdot 4$ |
| Tiglaldehyde | 14.74 | 0.021 | 0.033 | 118.5 | $715 \cdot 8$ |
| Solute | $\infty \mathrm{P}_{2}$ (c.c.) | $R_{\text {D }}$ (c.c.) | $\Delta R_{\text {D }}($ c.c. $) ~ \dagger ~$ | $\mu$ (D) $\ddagger$ |  |
| Acraldehyde | 187.0 | 16.69 | $1 \cdot 20$ | $2 \cdot 88$ |  |
| Crotonaldehyde | $266 \cdot 0$ | 22.28 | $2 \cdot 14$ | 3.44 |  |
| Methacraldehyde | $174 \cdot 2$ | 21.91 | 1.77 | $2 \cdot 72$ |  |
| Tiglaldehyde | 262.5 | 26.96 | $2 \cdot 19$ | $3 \cdot 38$ |  |

* Calc. from data in ref. 1. $\dagger \Delta R_{\mathrm{D}}=R_{\mathrm{D}}$ observed minus $R_{\mathrm{D}}$ calc. from bond refractions of Vogel et al. ${ }^{8} \quad \ddagger$ Calc. by assuming ${ }_{\mathrm{D}} P=1 \cdot 05 R_{\mathrm{D}}$.

The dipole moments now found confirm those recorded in refs. 1 and 2; the fact that for crotonaldehyde $\mu$ appears to be 0.1 D lower in benzene than in carbon tetrachloride is reasonably explicable as due to solvent effects. ${ }^{7}$ No previous data on the electric double refractions of these aldehydes can be found in the literature.

## Discussion

Prediction of Molar Kerr Constants of s-cis- and s-trans-Conformations of Structures of type CHR':CR•CHO.-Calculations proceed by two stages: (a) deduction of the principal semi-axes of the molecular polarisability ellipsoids for species (I) and (II), and (b) evaluation

(I) $s$-trans

(II) s-cis
of the appropriate molar Kerr constants therefrom. Through lack of information, certain assumptions must be made. We take the CCC and CCO angles in the four aldehydes to be as reported ${ }^{9}$ in acraldehyde and crotonaldehyde, viz., $120^{\circ}$, and use bond polarisabilities as listed in ref. 10 for $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{H}, \mathrm{C}-\mathrm{C}, \mathrm{C}=\mathrm{C}$, and $\mathrm{C}=\mathrm{O}$. Exaltations of polarisability (evaluated as $9 \Delta_{\mathrm{R}} P / 4 \pi N$, with $\Delta_{\mathrm{E}} P$ taken as $0.95 \Delta R_{\mathrm{D}}$, from Table 2) are applied along the $\mathrm{C}=\mathrm{C}$ or $\mathrm{C}=0$ axes in the s-trans-forms, and along the $\mathrm{C}-(\mathrm{CO})$ axes in the $s$-cis-forms (these directions being probably close to those of the conjugative displacements in the two conformations; cf. ref. $5 a$, p. 301 ). Results of computations for stage ( $a$ ) are summarised in Table 3. Principal axes $b_{1}, b_{2}$, and $b_{3}$ (in $10^{-23}$ c.c.) are located in (I) or (II) by reference to the arbitrary axes $X, Y$, and $Z$, the first two of which are in the molecular planes, as shown (such calculations are briefly outlined in ref. $5 b$, p. 2486, more fully in ref. 11). Molar Kerr constants predicted at stage (b) are given in Table 4; these depend, of course, on the dipole moments assumed for the pure species (I) and (II).

[^2]Table 3.
Polarisability semi-axes and their locations.

| Direction cosines with |  |  |  |  | Direction cosines with |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Semi-axes | $s \text {-trans-isomeI }$ | $Y$ | $Z$ | Semi-axes | $\underset{s-c i s \text {-isor }}{X}$ | $Y$ | $Z$ |
| Acraldehyde, $\Delta b=0.136$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $b_{1}=0.949$ | $+0.996$ | $-0.100$ | 0 | $b_{1}=0.790$ | +-0.922 | $-0.387$ | 0 |
| $b_{2}=0.549$ | $+0 \cdot 100$ | $+0.996$ | 0 | $b_{2}=0.710$ | $+0.387$ | $+0.922$ | 0 |
| $b_{3}=0 \cdot 406$ | 0 | 0 | 1 | $b_{3}=0.406$ | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Crotonaldehyde, $\Delta b=0.242$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $b_{1}=1.233$ | +0.992 | $-0.129$ | 0 | $b_{1}=0.862$ | +0.751 | $-0.660$ | 0 |
| $b_{2}=0.752$ | $+0 \cdot 129$ | +0.992 | 0 | $b_{2}=1 \cdot 124$ | $+0 \cdot 660$ | $+0.751$ | 0 |
| $b_{3}=0.561$ | 0 | 0 | 1 | $b_{3}=0.561$ | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Methacraldehyde, $\Delta b=0.200$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $b_{1}=1.183$ | 1 | 0 | 0 | $b_{1}=1.021$ | $+0.750$ | $-0.661$ | 0 |
| $b_{2}=0.760$ | 0 | 1 | 0 | $b_{2}=0.925$ | $+0.661$ | $+0.750$ | 0 |
| $b_{3}=0.561$ | 0 | 0 | 1 | $b_{3}=0.561$ | 0 | 0 | , |
| Tiglaldehyde, $\Delta b=0.247$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $b_{1}=1.407$ | +0.997 | $+0.077$ | 0 | $b_{1}=1.294$ | $0 \cdot 817$ | $-0.576$ | 0 |
| $b_{2}=0.968$ | $-0.077$ | $+0.997$ | 0 | $b_{2}=1.083$ | $0 \cdot 576$ | $0 \cdot 817$ | 0 |
| $b_{3}=0.716$ | 0 | 0 | 1 | $b_{3}=0.716$ | 0 | 0 | 1 |

Table 4.
Moment components * and predicted molar Kerr constants.

| $\begin{gathered} \text { Assumed } \\ \mu(s-\text { trans }) \end{gathered}$ | Moment components | $\begin{aligned} & 10^{12}{ }_{\mathrm{m}} K \\ & \text { (calc.) } \end{aligned}$ | Assumed $\mu$ (s-cis) | Moment components | $\begin{gathered} 10^{12}{ }_{\mathrm{m}} K \\ \text { (calc. } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Acraldehyde, $\infty\left({ }_{\mathrm{m}} K_{2}\right)=385$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2.78 | $\mu_{1}=+2.77, \mu_{2}=+0.28$ | $+393$ | $2 \cdot 44$ | $\mu_{1}=-1.94, \mu_{2}=+1.48$ | +119 |
| $2 \cdot 90$ | $\mu_{1}=+2.89, \mu_{2}=+0.29$ | +449 | 2.56 | $\mu_{1}=-2.04, \mu_{2}=+1.55$ | $+142$ |
| Crotonaldehyde, $\infty\left({ }_{\mathrm{m}} K_{2}\right)=738 \times 10^{-12}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| $3 \cdot 45$ | $\mu_{1}=+3.41, \mu_{2}=+0.44$ | + 768 | $2 \cdot 74$ | $\mu_{1}=-2.595, \mu_{2}=+0.878$ | $+61 \cdot 0$ |
| Methacraldehyde, $\infty\left({ }_{\mathrm{m}} K_{2}\right)=299$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| $2 \cdot 38$ | $\mu_{1}=+2 \cdot 38, \mu_{2}=0$ | +342 | 2.85 | $\mu_{1}=-2.7001, \mu_{2}=+0.9116$ | $+244.5$ |
| Tiglaldehyde, $\infty\left({ }_{\mathrm{m}} K_{2}\right)=716 \times 10^{-12}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3.09 | $\mu_{1}=+3.08, \mu_{2}=-0.24$ | +614 | $3 \cdot 10$ | $\mu_{1}=-2.81, \mu_{2}=+1.30$ | +372 |
| $3 \cdot 38$ | $\mu_{1}=+3.37, \mu_{2}=-0.26$ | +731 | $3 \cdot 39$ | $\mu_{1}=-3.07, \mu_{2}=+1.42$ | +442 |

* The directions of action of the resultant dipole moments are assumed to be parallel to the $\mathrm{C}=\mathrm{O}$ axes.

In each case the $\mu$ 's forecast in ref. l are used first, but since with acraldehyde and tiglaldehyde the observed polarities are in fact greater than these, we also show the ${ }_{m} K$ 's expected when higher moments are taken for the two aldehydes in question.

Solute Conformations.-On the basis of Table 4, and the larger moments just mentioned, present measurements are consistent with a view that the solutes are mixtures of planar $s$-trans- and $s$-cis-isomers in proportions as follow:

| Aldehyde | Proportions <br> s-trans: s-cis | $\begin{aligned} & 10^{12_{\mathrm{m}}} K \\ & \text { (calc) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10^{12}{ }_{\mathrm{m}} K \\ \text { (obs) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mu(\mathrm{D}) \\ & \text { (calc) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mu(\mathrm{D}) \\ & \text { (obs) } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Acraldehyde * | 4:1 | 387 | 385 | $2 \cdot 84$ | $2 \cdot 88$ |
| Crotonaldehyde | 23:1 | 738 | 738 | $3 \cdot{ }_{3}$ | $3 \cdot{ }_{4}$ |
| Methacraldehyde | 1:1 | 293 | 299 | $2 \cdot 6$ | $2 \cdot 72$ |
| Tiglaldehyde | 18:1 | 716 | 716 | $3 \cdot 38$ | $3 \cdot 38$ |

* Were the moments of s-trans- and $s$-cis-acraldehyde closer than assumed in Table 4, conclusions would not be greatly affected; e.g., with $\mu=s$-cis 2.70 and s-trans 2.90 (D), the calculated ${ }_{\mathrm{m}} K$ and $\mu_{\text {apparent }}$ for a 4:1 s-trans : s-cis mixture are $391 \times 10^{-12}$ and 2.86 (D), respectively.

From their molar Kerr constants, therefore, acraldehyde, crotonaldehyde, and tiglaldehyde appear to adopt predominantly the s-trans-conformations; qualitatively such a conclusion is in harmony with most of the previous relevant work. Acraldehyde vapour is reported ${ }^{12}$ as $98 \%$ s-trans from its microwave spectrum, while from electron-diffraction studies Mackle and Sutton ${ }^{13}$ suggested that at $35^{\circ}$ the s-trans : s-cis ratio lay between $3: 1$ and $6: 1$; by the last-named technique, however, crotonaldehyde at $70^{\circ}$ seemed ${ }^{13}$ to show a ratio of $c a .1: 1$, in contrast to the indications (dipole moment, ${ }^{1}$ ultraviolet spectra, ${ }^{14,15}$ ultrasonic absorption, ${ }^{16}$ etc.) afforded by solutions at room temperatures. Tiglaldehyde, on spectroscopic ${ }^{15}$ and dipole-moment ${ }^{17}$ evidence, has been considered as $s$-trans. Estok and Dehn ${ }^{17}$ listed methacraldehyde as s-trans, but Forbes and Shilton ${ }^{15}$ thought it existed to an appreciable extent in $s$-cis- and/or non-planar s-trans-conformations, citing infrared absorption intensities in support.
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