taste thresholds (+)- and (-)-nootkatone and (+)- and (-)- $\alpha$ -vetivone have been tasted in a soft drink base by several experienced flavor chemists. (+)-Nootkatone was perceptible at a concentration of approximately 0.3 ppm and still had the flavor character of grapefruit. (-)-Nootkatone was perceptible at 40 ppm (much lower than the odor threshold value for aqueous solutions) and at that concentration tasted bitter and sour without any flavor impression. (+)- $\alpha$ -Vetivone was perceptible at 1.6 ppm and at that concentration is slightly reminiscent of grapefruit. It also has a strong woody flavor, not appreciated by flavor chemists. (-)- $\alpha$ -Vetivone, perceptible at approximately 8 ppm, is weaker than the (+)-form but has an even stronger woody note. The odor profiles are shown in Figure 5. Apparently the enantiomeric forms of the five sesquiterpenoid ketones do not only differ significantly in odor strength but in odor character as well. The largest differences are found again between (+)- and (-)-nootkatone.

### ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Our thanks are due to Jan G. Spoor, Frans Dukers, and Anton de Boer for their able assistance in carrying out the odor evaluation experiments.

#### LITERATURE CITED

- Erdtman, H., Hirose, V., Acta Chem. Scand. **16**, 1311 (1962). Erdtman, H., Topliss, J. G., Acta Chem. Scand. **11**, 1157 (1957). Firmenich, Neth. pat. appl. 6,914,545 (Sept. 25, 1969). Friedman, L., Miller, J. G., Science **172**, 1044 (1971).

- Gen, A. van der, Linde, L. M. van der, Witteveen, J. G., Boelens,
- H., Recl. Trav. Chim. in press (1971). Haring, H. G., in Advances in Chemoreception, Vol. 2, Human Responses to Environmental Odors, Appleton-Century-Crofts, New York, in press (1971).
- Hunter, G. L., Brogden, W. B., J. Food Sci. 30, 876 (1965).
   Naves, Y. R., in Molecular Structure and Organoleptic Quality S.C.I., Monograph no. 1, page 39, Soc. Chem. Ind., London, 1957.

- Naves, Y. R., La France et ses Parfums 68, 160 (1969). Ohloff, G., Klein, E., Tetrahedron 18, 37 (1962). Randebrock, R. E., J. Soc. Cosmet. Chem. 21, 289 (1970). Russell, G. F., Hills, J. I., 158th ACS Meeting, New York, Sept. 1969.
- Stevens, K. L., Guadagni, D. G., Stern, D. J., J. Sci. Food Agr. 21, 590 (1970).
- Theimer, E. T., McDaniel, M. R., J. Soc. Cosmet. Chem. 22, 15 (1971). Wright, R. H., "The Science of Smell," Allan & Unwin, London,
- 1964, p 124.

Received for review July 14, 1971. Accepted September 30, 1971. Presented at the Symposium on Chemistry of Essential Oils and Related Products, 161st National ACS Meeting, Los Angeles, Calif., March 29, 1971.

End of Part II on the Symposium on The Chemistry of Essential Oils and Related Products.

# Volatile Components of Roasted Filberts

Thomas E. Kinlin,\* Ranya Muralidhara, Alan O. Pittet, Anne Sanderson, and John P. Walradt

Roasted filbert volatiles were isolated using the following techniques: steam distillation followed by solvent extraction; condensation of volatiles given off during steam distillation; and molecular distillation followed by fractionation using preparative gas chromatography. Extracts and fractions were analyzed by gc-ms using open tubular columns. 187 compounds are reported for the first time from

ilberts (Corylus avellana) are a thick-shelled, sweetflavored tree nut which may be consumed raw or, preferably, roasted. Little has been published concerning the flavor components of roasted filberts, except for the work of Sheldon (1969), who identified 41 compounds in the volatiles of roasted filberts. The use of modern analytical techniques, particularly the coupled gas chromatograph-mass spectrometer (gc-ms), has revealed the complexity of such heat-processed foods as coffee (Friedel et al., 1971), cocoa (van Praag et al., 1968) and peanut (Walradt et al., 1971). Our objective, in a more detailed investigation of the roasted filbert volatiles, was to provide a qualitative comparison with other roasted products. Our gc-ms identifications were greatly assisted by the recent availability of additional reference data, particularly for the nitrogen-containing compounds (Friedel et al., 1971; Pittet et al., 1971). This paper reports the comroasted filbert volatiles including alkyl, alkenyl, oxygenated, and alicyclic pyrazines; pyrroles; pyridines; thiols, thiazoles, thiophenes, and sulfides; pyrroles; furans; phenols; acids; lactones; esters; terpenes; aromatic aldehydes, alkanals, 2-alkenals, and 2,4-alkadienals; aliphatic and olefinic alcohols and ketones; and aliphatic and aromatic hydrocarbons.

pounds which were obtained from roasted filberts by four different isolation techniques and identified by gc-ms.

### EXPERIMENTAL

The methods of isolation used in our work were (A) headspace analysis, (B) collection of volatiles emitted during roasting, (C) steam distillation, and (D) molecular distillation.

Roasting conditions were identical for all methods. Oregon-grown filberts were roasted in a solid-shell roaster (Probat-Werke, Germany) to 200°C and held for 5 min or until a medium to dark brown color was obtained.

(A) The headspace analysis was of uncondensed volatiles emitted during an atmospheric pressure steam distillation. Roasted filberts (1 kg) were ground to a fine slurry in an industrial Waring blender with 21. of deionized water and steam distilled for 20 min. The bulk of the water vapor was condensed in a cold water condenser (15°C) and collected in a wet ice cooled receiver. The uncondensed volatiles were passed into a 4-in.  $\times$  <sup>1</sup>/<sub>8</sub>-in. o.d. stainless steel tube packed with

International Flavors & Fragrances, Union Beach, New Jersey 07735.

Table I.	Table I. Compounds Identified from Roasted Filbert Volatiles						
			Retention index				
Pyrazines	First reported	Isolate	CBW	SF-96	Ms data		
Pyrazine	х	B, D	5.77	3.75	80-53-26-52		
Methylpyrazine		B, C, D	6.411	4.38	94-67-39-40-53		
Ethylprazine		A, B, C, D	7.061	5.211	107-108-80-53-52-39		
Isopropylpyrazine	х	D	7.341		107-122-94-27-52		
Propylpyrazine	х	D	7.751	6.19	94-107-122-39		
2,5-Dimethylpyrazine		A, B, C, D	6.861	5.171	108-42-39-40-81-28		
2,6-Dimethylpyrazine	х	A, B, C, D	6.981		108-42-40-39-38-67		
2,3-Dimethylpyrazine		B, C, D	7.101	5.26	67-108-80-42-40-26		
2-Ethyl-6-methylpyrazine	х	B, C, D	7.53 <sup>1</sup>	6.06	121-122-39-94-56-40		
2-Ethyl-5-methylpyrazine		C, D	7.571	6.07	121-122-39-56-94		
2-Ethyl-3-methylpyrazine	х	В	7.671	6.17	121-122-67-94-39		
2,6-Diethylpyrazine	Х	D	8.141		135-136-39-108-53		
2,5-Diethylpyrazine	х	D	8.181	6.93	136-121-135-39-27		
2,3-Diethylpyrazine	х	D	8.241	6.88	136-121-27-135-39		
2-Methyl-5-pentylpyrazine	х	D	10.46 <sup>1</sup>		108-121-39-109-135-164		
Trimethylpyrazine	х	B, C, D	7.681	6.07	42-122-39-81		
2-Ethyl-3,6-dimethylpyrazine		C, D	8.101	6.83	135-136-42-56-39-108		
2-Ethyl-3,5-dimethylpyrazine		C, D	8.271		136-135-39-108-53-56		
2,3-Diethyl-5-methylpyrazine	х	С	8.65		150-149-135-56-39		
2,5-Diethyl-3-methylpyrazine	х	D	8.70		149-150-39-135		
2,6-Diethyl-3-methylpyrazine		С	8.87	7.64	149-150-39-122-53-135		
Dimethyl isobutylpyrazine	х	D	8.83		122-42-133-149-164		
Triethylpyrazine	х	D	9.06		164-149-163-39-56-136		
Tetramethylpyrazine	х	D	8.461	6.91	54-136-42-27-39-53		
Diethyldimethylpyrazine	х	D	9.10		149-164-163		
Vinylpyrazine	Х	D	8.081		106-52-79-53-71		
2-Methyl-6-vinylpyrazine	х	C, D	8.581		120-52-39-54-94-51		
2-Methyl-5-vinylpyrazine	х	C, D	8.631		120-52-54-39-93-79		
Acetylpyrazine	х	D	9.921	6.31	43-122-80-79-52-53		
2-Methyl-5-acetylpyrazine	х	D	10.431		136-94-39		
Ethylacetylpyrazine	Х	D	10.90		150-107-108		
6,7-Dihydro-5H-cyclopentapyrazine	Х	D	10.251		120-119-39-41-66-65		
2-Methyl-6,7-dihydro-5H-cyclopentapyrazine	Х	D	10.731		134-133-39-66-40-107		
5-Methyl-6,7-dihydro-5H-cyclopentapyrazine	Х	D	9.931		119-134-133-39-52-78		
2-Ethyl-6,7-dihydro-5H-cyclopentapyrazine	Х	D	$11.42^{1}$		147-148-39-120-65-66		
2,5-Dimethyl-6,7-dihydro-5 <i>H</i> -cyclopenta- pyrazine	х	D	10.261		133-1 <b>48-39-</b> 147		
3,5-Dimethyl-6,7-dihydro-5 <i>H</i> -cyclopenta- pyrazine	x	D	10.391		* 133-148-39-147		
2,3-Dimethyl-6,7-dihydro-5 <i>H</i> -cyclopenta- pyrazine	х	D	11.541		148-43-147-66-107 *		
Quinoxaline	х	D	12.71		130-76-103-50-75-51		
5,6,7,8-Tetrahydroquinoxaline	Х	D	11.141		134-133-52-39-106-41 *		
2-Methyl-5,6,7,8-tetrahydroquinoxaline	Х	D	11.301		148-147-52-39-120-79-133		
(2'-Furyl)pyrazine	Х	D	13.71		146-93-63-64-38		

			<b>Retention index</b>		
Pyrroles	First reported	Isolate	CBW	SF-96	Ms data
2-n-Pentylpyrrole	х	D	12.4		80-137-53
2-Isobutylpyrrole	Х	D	10,44		80-123-53-81
1-Methylpyrrole	Х	А	5.09	3.41	* 81-80-39-53-66
1-Acetylpyrrole	Х	D	9.031		67-109-39-43-41-40
2-Acetylpyrrole		B, C, D	13.71		94-109-66-39-43
2-Propionylpyrrole	Х	D	13.71		94-123-39-66-37
1-Methylpyrrole-2-carboxaldehyde		D	9.861		* 109-108-80-78-53-39
5-Methylpyrrole-2-carboxaldehyde	Х	B, D	14.41		109-108-80-53-29
Pyrrole-2-carboxaldehyde		B, C, D	13.51		<b>95-94-39-</b> 66
1-Furfurylpyrrole		A, D	11.891	7.931	81-147-53-27-39-51
1-Methyl-2-pyrrolidinone	Х	D		7.25	<b>44-99-42-98-27-71-70-5</b> 6
Indole	Х	D	17.61		11 <b>7-90-89-63-39-</b> 118-116
Pyridines					
2- <i>n</i> -Pentylpyridine	х	D	<b>9</b> .381		93-106-120-27-149
2-Acetylpyridine	Х	D	9.73 <sup>1</sup>		79-78-121-43-51-52
3-Acetylpyridine	Х	D	12.00		78-106-51-121-43-50
Methyl nicotinate	х	D	11.441	7.62	106-78-137-51-50-29
Sulfur compounds					
Methanethiol	х	A, D	0.381		47-48-45-15-44
Methyl disulfide		A, B, D	4.471	3.301	94-79-45-46-47-61
Ethyl disulfide	X	С	6.051	5.30	29-27-122-66-94-45
Methyl trisulfide	Х	A, C	7.74 <sup>1</sup>	5.90	126-45-79-47-64-46
3-Methylthiopropionaldehyde	х	D	8.141	5.13	48-47-27-104-45
Dihydro-1H-thiophen-3-one	х	D	9.291		46-102-45-27-26-60
Thiophene-2-carboxyaldehyde	х	B, C, D	10. <b>59</b> 1		111-112-39-29-45-83
4-Methyl-5-vinylthiazole	Х	D	8.94		125-97-45-58-39-98
Benzothiazole	X	B, C	13.01		135-108-69-63-45-82
3,5-Dimethyl-1,2,4-trithiolan	Х	А	9.50 <sup>1</sup>		152-45-59-92-88-64
Dimethyltrithiolan (isomer)	Х	А			
Furans					
Furan	х	А	0.821		39-68-67
2-Methylfuran	Х	Α, Β	1.871		53-39-82-81
2-Ethylfuran	Х	Α, Β	3.00	3.06	81-39-96-41
2-Butylfuran	Х	В	5.001		81-82-124-54
2-Pentylfuran		A, B, C, D	5.931	5.981	81-82-138-53
Phenylfuran	Х	D	11.83		144-115-143
2-Hexylfuran	х	A, D	7.00		81-82-152
2-Heptylfuran	Х	A, D	8.00		81-82-166
2-Octylfuran	Х	D	9.001		81-82-180
Dimethylfuran	Х	Α	2.63		53-96-95-81
Dimethylfuran	Х	А			96-95-43-81
2-Vinylfuran	Х	Α			94-65-66-39
2-Furfural		A, B, C, D	8.241	4.621	39-96-95-66

	Retention			on index	
Furans	First reported	Isolate	CBW	SF-96	Ms data
5-Methylfurfural		A, B, C, D	9.361	5.811	110-109-53-27-51
2-Methyltetrahydrofuran-3-one		B, C	6.301		43-72-100-29-45-27
2-Acetylfuran		B, C, D	8.701	5.291	95-110-39-43-96
5-Methyl-2-acetylfuran	х	D	9.761		109-124-53-43-39-51-81
Furfural acetate	х	B, D	8.971		81-43-98-52-53-140
Methyl furoate	х	B, D	9.381	5.90	53-126-27-109-81-51
Furfuryl alcohol		A, B, C, D	10.171	5.331	39-98-41-29-81-53
Aldehydes					
Acetaldehyde		B, C, D	0.441	0.61	29-44-15-43-14-26
Pentanal	х	A, B, C, D	3.261	2.861	44-29-58-41-5786
Hexanal		A, B, C, D	4.491	4.001	44-43-56-41-57100
Heptanal		A, B, C, D	5.551	5.011	44-43-70-41-55114
Octanal		A, B, D	6.581	6.03	44-41-57-56-84128
Nonanal	х	A, B, C, D	7.641	7.06	57-41-43-56-44142
Decanal	х	A, D	8.701	8.11	57-41-43-55-70 156
Isobutyraldehyde		A, C, D	0.941	1.281	43-41-72-27-29
Isovaleraldehyde		A, C, D	2.501	2.37	44-41-43-29-5886
2-Methylbutanal		A, D	2.431	2.47	57-29-41-5886
2-Methyl-2-butenal	х	D	4.611		55-29-84-27-39
2-Heptenal	х	A, B, D	6.941	5.57	41-83-55-57-56112
2-Octenal	х	<b>B</b> , <b>D</b>	8.001	6.60	41-29-27-55-39126
2-Nonenal	х	A, D	9.10	7.65	41-29-43-27-55-37140
2-Decenal	х	A, D	10.071	8.73	41-43-27-55154
2-Undecenal	х	Α		9.751	41-55-43-29-70168
Benzaldehyde		A, B, C, D	8.971	5.79	106-77-105-51-50
Phenylacetaldehyde		A, B, C, D	10.141	6.591	91-120-92-65-39
<i>p</i> -Tolualdehyde	Х	C	10.241		119-91-120-39-65-63
2,4-Nonadienal	х	D	10.661	8.24	81-41-27-49-67-138
2,4-Decadienal (two isomers)	х	A, D			81-27-41-29-39-67-152
trans-2, trans-4-Decadienal	х	A, B, C, D	11.691		81-27-41-29-39-67-152
2-Phenyl-2-butenal	Х	C, D	12.81		117-146-115-91-116
4-Methyl-2-phenyl-2-pentenal	Х	D			174-103-91-29-27-131
5-Methyl-2-phenyl-2-hexenal	х	С	14.21	11.02	117-115-103188
Phenols					
Phenol	х	D	13.41		94-66-39
2-Ethylphenol	х	В	14.01		107-122-77-39
m-Cresol	х	В	14.01		107-108-77-79
<i>p</i> -Cresol	х	В	14.11		107-108-79-77
o-Methoxyphenol	Х	D	12.21		109-124-81-53
Ketones					
Acetone		A, D	1.001	0.97	43-58-27-26-42-29
2-Butanone	х	A, C	2.211	1.74	43-29-27-72-42-57
2-Pentanone	х	Α	3.27		43-27-29-57-86-41

			Retention index		
Ketones	First reported	Isolate	CBW	SF-96	Ms data
2-Hexanone	х	А	4.551	3.851	43-58-29-27-41100
2-Heptanone	х	A, B, C, D	5.491	4.95	43-58-71-29114
2-Octanone	х	A, B, C, D	6.551		43-58-71128
2-Nonanone	х	A, B, C, D	7.601		43-58-71142
2-Decanone	х	A, C	8.611	7.951	58-43-71-59-41-156
2-Undecanone	х	Α	9.62		58-43-71170
3-Methyl-2-pentanone	х	A, B, C, D	3.661		43-29-57-41-72100
5-Methyl-2-hexanone	х	С	5.001		43-58-27-41-57-39114
3-Penten-2-one		A, B, C, D	4.901	3.39	69-41-43-39-84-15
5-Methyl-3-hexen-2-one	х	D	6.061	5.04	43-41-97-69-112-39-53
2-Hepten-4-one	Х	D	6.421		69-41-39-97-84112
3-Hepten-2-one	Х	D	6.681	5.50	55-97-43-112-41
3-Octen-2-one	х	D	7.721		55-43-111-41-97-39-1 <sup>*</sup> 6
3-Hexanone	Х	А		3.80	43-57-29-27-71-41-100
2,3-Butanedione		A, B, C, D	3.171	1.69	43-86-42-44
2,3-Pentanedione	х	A, B, C, D	4.131	2.84	43-29-57-27-100
2,5-Hexanedione	Х	В	8.701		43-99-27-71-57-114
6-Methyl-3,5-heptadien-2-one	Х	D	9.61 <sup>1</sup>		109-81-43-124-39-41
p-Mentha-6,8-dien-2-one	Х	D	11.091		82-39-54-27-41150
2-Cyclopentenone	Х	B, D	7.30		39-82-27-54-53-26
2-Cyclohexenone	Х	В	8.15		68-39-9 <sup>*</sup> 6-40-27-42
3-Methyl-2-cyclohexen-1-one	X	B, C, D	9.661		82-39-110-54-27-41-67
3,5,5-Trimethyl-2-cyclohexen-1-one	Х	D	9.71		82-39-138-27-54
2-Hydroxy-3-methyl-2-cyclopentenone	Х	D	11.771		112-55-41-27-69-39-43
Acetophenone	Х	B, C, D	10.261	6.66	105-77-120-51
1-Phenyl-1-propanone	х	В	10.85		105-77-51134
1-Phenyl-2-propanone	Х	В	10.94		43-91-92-134-65-39
Alcohols					
Methyl alcohol		Α	0.401		31-32-29-28-18
Ethyl alcohol		B, C	2.441		31-45-46-27-29-43
1-Propyl alcohol	Х	В	3.71 <sup>1</sup>		31-27-29-59-4260
1-Butyl alcohol	х	B, C	4.911		56-31-41-43-4274
1-Pentyl alcohol	<b>X</b> .	A, B, C, D	6.001	3.881	42-31-29-41-55**8
1-Hexyl alcohol	х	A, B, D	7.001	4.871	56-43-55-41-31102
1-Heptyl alcohol	х	B, C, D	8.001	5.88	41-70-56-43-55-31-29116
1-Octyl alcohol	х	C, D	9.041		41-56-43-55-29-31-130
2-Methyl-1-butyl alcohol	х	D	5.541	3.50	29-57-41-56-318
2-Propyl alcohol	X	A, B, C	2.301		45-43-27-29-41-5960
2-Butyl alcohol	X	в	3,551	1.83	45-27-29-31-43-5974
2-Pentyl alcohol	x	B B, C, D	4.611	3.06	45-43-55-27-29-448
2-Heptyl alcohol	X	в, С, D D	4.01 <sup>-</sup>	5.00	45-43-55-27-29-41116
2-Methyl-1-propyl alcohol	x	B	4.36 <sup>1</sup>		43-41-42-31-3374
				2 40	
3-Methyl-1-butyl alcohol	х	B, C, D	5.551	3.48	31-41-55-57-70-5688

	Table I. (Continued)					
	<b></b>		Retention index			
Alcohols	First reported	Isolate	CBW	SF-96	Ms data	
1-Octen-3-ol	х	D	8.00		57-43-41-72-55-27-128	
Benzyl alcohol	х	B, D	12.21		79-108-107-77-51-91	
Phenethyl alcohol	x	D	12.6 <sup>1</sup>		91-92-122-65-39-41-51	
Lactones						
$\gamma$ -Butyrolactone		B, D	10.001		<b>*</b> 42-86-41-56	
$\gamma$ -Valerolactone	х	B, D	9.851	3.41	* 56-85-41100	
$\gamma$ -Hexalactone	х	B, C, D	10.781		<b>85-29-27-56-</b> 41114	
γ-Heptalactone	х	B, D	11.65 <sup>1</sup>		85-29-27-56-41128	
$\gamma$ -Octalactone	х	B, C	12.91		85-29-27-41-56142	
$\gamma$ -Nonalactone	x	B, D	14.0 <sup>1</sup>		85-29-27-41-42156	
δ-Valerolactone	х	D			42-41-56-27100	
δ-Octalactone	х	D			<b>*</b> <b>99-42-27-71-55</b> 142	
$\gamma$ -Crotonolactone	х	D			55-27-84-53-26	
Terpenes						
α-Pinene	х	D	4.001		* 93-92-91-77-41136	
$\beta$ -Pinene	х	D	4.931		<b>93-41-69-39-27136</b>	
Sabinene	х	D	5.001		<b>93-77-41-91-79</b> 136	
Myrcene	х	D	5.321		41 <b>-93-69-</b> 81136	
$\beta$ -Phellandrene	х	D	6.021		93-136-94-77-91	
$\alpha$ -Terpinene	Х	A, D	6.231		93-136-91-77-43-121	
<i>p</i> -Cymene	х	A, D	6.481		119-134-91-39-41-77	
4-Terpineol	х	С	9.681		71-43-111-93-154	
Limonene	х	A, D	6. <b>79</b> 1		* 68-67-93-94-78-121136	
Esters						
Ethyl formate	х	A, C	1.001	1.001	* 31-28-29-47-45-74	
Ethyl acetate		B, C, D	2.001	2.00	<b>43-29-45-61-88</b>	
Butyl acetate	х	C, D	4.341		43-56-87-41-116	
2-Methylbutyl 2-methylbutyrate	х	D	6.611		<b>70-57-85-43-41-29</b> 172	
Ethyl heptanoate	х	A, D	7.001	7.001	*	
Ethyl decanoate	х	D	10.001		<b>*</b> 88-27-41-101-45200	
Methyl undecanoate	x	D	11.63		74-87-43-41200	
Benzyl acetate	х	D	10.921		108-91-43-90-79150	
Dimethyl succinate	x	D	<b>9</b> .46 <sup>1</sup>		115-55-59-114-29146	
1-Hydroxy-2-propanone acetate	x	B, D	8.221		43-86-73-116	
Acids						
Acetic acid		В			43-45-60-15-42	
Valeric acid	х	D			<b>60-73-41-45102</b>	
Aromatic hydrocarbons						
Benzene		A, D	2.921	2.521	* 78-51-52-49-39-77	
Toluene		A, C, D	4.141	3.751	• 91-92-65	
<i>p</i> -Xylene		A, B, C, D	5.101	4.84	91-106-105	
<i>m</i> -Xylene		С	5.171		91-106-105	
o-Xylene	Х	C, D	5.611		<b>91-106-105</b>	

	-		innea)		
			Retentio	n index	
Aromatic hydrocarbons reader the second seco	First eported	Isolate	CBW	SF-96	Ms data
Propylbenzene	х	D	5.831		91-120-65
Styrene	х	A, D	6.321	4.491	104-103-78-51-77
1,2,4-Trimethylbenzene		A, D	6.611		105-120-119-39-27-77
Ethylbenzene	х	A, D	6.941	4.74	91-106-51-39
Butylbenzene	х	Α			91-92-134-27
2,3-Dihydroindene	х	D			117-118-115-39-91-116
Indene	х	D	8.611		116-115-63-39-89
Naphthalene	х	C, D	11.15 <sup>1</sup>		128-127-64
l-Methylnaphthalene	х	A, D	12.61		* 142-141-115-143-139
2-Methylnaphthalene	х	A, D	12.11		142-141-115-143-139
Ethylnaphthalene	х	D			141-156-115-142
Biphenyl	х	С	13.51		154-153-152-76-155-51
Methylethylbenzene	х	D			105-120-39-91
Miscellaneous					
Hexane	х	А			43-42-41-2786
Heptane	х	A, D		3.05	43-41-29-27100
Octane	x	Α			43-41-27-57114
Nonane	х	D	2.44		43-57-41-29-27128
Decane		D			43-57-41-29142
Undecane	х	Α			43-57-41-29-71156
Dodecane	х	D			43-57-41-71170
Tridecane	х	D			43-57-41-81184
+ Chloroform	х	А	3.661		83-85-47-87-48-49118
+ Dichlorobenzene (two isomers)	х	D			146-148-111-75
Benzonitrile	х	В	<b>9</b> .70		103-76-50-51-26
+ Ionol	Х	С	12.61	11.29	205-57-220-41
+ Diethyl phthalate	Х	D	16.81		* 149-177-29-150222
X = not previously reported in roasted filberts.	A = hea	dspace analysis.	$\mathbf{B} = \text{condensate}.$	C = steam of	distillate. D = molecular distill

X = not previously reported in roasted fiberts. A = headspace analysis. B = condensate. C = steam distillate. D = molecular distillate. <sup>1</sup> = retention index of unknown and known standard are in agreement. \* = molecular weight of compound. + = probable solvent artifact.

Porapak Q (Schultz *et al.*, 1971) and held at room temperature. This process was facilitated by the application of slightly reduced pressure at the exit end of the Porapak trap. After collection, the Porapak trap was removed from the distillation apparatus and connected to a stainless steel 6-in.  $\times$  0.03in. i.d. U-tube held in liquid nitrogen. The Porapak trap was wrapped with heating tape and heated to 130°C while the volatile compounds were back-flushed with helium (10 ml/ min) into the U-tube. With the carrier gas shut off, the U-tube was coupled between the injection port and a 500-ft  $\times$ 0.03-in. i.d. SF-96 open tubular column in the gc-ms system. The temperature program of 60–190°C @ 2°C per min was begun when the carrier gas flow was started after a 2-min equilibration period at 60°C.

The gc-ms system consisted of a Hewlett-Packard 5750 gas chromatograph coupled to a Hitachi RMU-6E mass spectrometer by means of a porous glass separator (Watson and Biemann, 1965). The effluent from the open tubular column was split, with 5 ml per min being directed through the separator to the mass spectrometer and the remaining 5 ml per min to the flame ionization detector of the gas chromatograph.

(B) Five kilograms of filberts were roasted and the vapors emanating from the roaster were directed by means of a negative pressure gradient through a series of cold traps [cold water (15°C), ice water and 2-propanol-dry ice]. Upon completion of roasting, the traps were rinsed with 300 ml of distilled water. The aqueous solution obtained was subjected to two successive extractions with different solvents, a procedure found to be more efficient than the use of either solvent exclusively. The initial extraction was with  $2 \times 250$ ml of redistilled Ucon 11 (trichloromonofluoromethane, Union Carbide) followed by 2  $\times$  250 ml of diethyl ether (Matheson Coleman & Bell, ACS reagent grade). The two separate solvent extracts, after drying over sodium sulfate, were initially concentrated in a Kuderna-Danish concentrator (Kontes Glass Co., Vineland, N.J.) to about 5 ml and, finally, to about 1 ml using a stream of nitrogen. The extracts were then combined and analyzed by gc for the presence of sulfur-

and/or nitrogen-containing compounds. The instrument used was a Tracor MT 220 modified in our laboratory as follows. One side of the Tracor dual flame ionization detector was modified by the addition of a rubidium sulfate bead (Craven, 1970) for detection of nitrogen-containing compounds; the column effluent was split between the alkali flame and a Melpar flame photometric detector, which also incorporated a flame ionization output. Thus, with the addition of a third electrometer and appropriate recorders, simultaneous sulfur, nitrogen, and flame ionization detection signals could be monitored.

After sulfur- and nitrogen-containing compounds were located, the gc-ms system was used to complete identifications. A 1000-ft  $\times$  0.03-in. i.d. Carbowax 20M open tubular column was used with a temperature program of 70 to 190°C (a)  $1^{\circ}C/\min$  after a 30-min post-injection hold at  $70^{\circ}C$ .

(C) 1.5 kilograms of roasted filberts were ground to a fine slurry in an industrial Waring blender with 3 l. of deionized water and the resulting slurry was steam distilled at atmospheric pressure. The distillate (11.) was extracted with  $4\times125$  ml of redistilled Ucon 11 and then with  $4\times125$  ml of diethyl ether. The samples were concentrated and analyzed as described above.

(D) The fourth method of isolation, similar to that used by Sheldon (1969), was a molecular distillation of oil expressed from roasted filberts. The oil was obtained from 5 kg of roasted filberts using a Model C Carver Press with a cage assembly (F. S. Carver, Summit, N.J.). The oil was filtered through glass wool and centrifuged to obtain 1500 ml of a clear golden oil. The aroma of the oil was substantially reduced in four or five repeated passes through a falling film molecular still (Nester-Faust Corp., Newark, Del.) at a rate of 300 ml per day. Volatiles were collected in two liquid nitrogen cooled traps. The first pass was made at a pressure of 1 mm to degas the oil and removed most of the moisture, with the following passes made at  $10^{-4}$ - $10^{-5}$  mm. The jacket temperature of the still was held at 60-65°C. The contents of the cold traps were extracted each day with 4  $\times$  50 ml of Ucon 11 and  $4 \times 50$  ml of diethyl ether. After extracting the trap contents, the solvent layer was concentrated in the Kuderna-Danish system and the solvent recovered for re-use the following day. In this manner the possibility of solvent impurities in the final total extract was minimized. The final accumulated and concentrated extract was subjected to preparative gc on a stainless steel 13-ft  $\times$   $^{1/8}$ -in. column packed with 12% SF-96 + 0.6\% Igepal CO-880 on 100–120 mesh Chromosorb W. Effluent fractions were collected in Dry Icecooled glass tubes. The contents of each trap were then further resolved in the gc-ms system using a 1000-ft  $\times$  0.03-in. Carbowax 20M open tubular column with a program rate of 70-190°C @ 1°C/min.

## IDENTIFICATION

Identification was accomplished by matching mass spectra and gas chromatographic retention indices,  $I_E$  values, relative to ethyl esters (van den Dool and Kratz, 1963) of the unknowns with those of known standards on Carbowax and/or SF-96 columns. Mass spectral interpretation was simplified by knowing which compounds contained sulfur and/or nitrogen. As a result, there was greater confidence in the designation of such compounds as being "postively identified."

## DISCUSSION AND RESULTS

The use of a cold-water condenser and an ice trap in conjunction with the Porapak trap during the headspace analysis enabled the collection of sufficient volatiles for good mass spectra without the interference of large amounts of water.

Suggested pathways for the formation of some of the identified components were discussed in a previous paper on roasted peanuts (Walradt et al., 1971) and the synthesis and spectral properties of alicyclic pyrazines have been summarized (Pittet et al., 1971) and will be submitted for publication.

Three compounds reported by Sheldon (1969) from packed column gc-ms work were not found in the present investigation. They were: 2,5-dimethyl-4-hydroxy-3(2H)-furanone; 3-hydroxy-2-methyl-4-pyrone (maltol); and hexanoic acid. It has been our experience that these compounds and the higher carboxylic acids usually do not elute as discernible peaks from the 500-ft and 1000-ft open tubular columns within a reasonable time. Observations of this type should serve to remind the researcher that no single method of isolation or analysis can be expected to provide a complete picture of the components of a particular natural product.

Only those compounds considered to be positively identified are listed in Table I. The table is a composite of compounds from all four methods of isolation. Also given for each compound is its retention index on Carbowax 20M and SF-96 columns, when available, and the major mass spectral fragments listed in decreasing order of intensity.

### SUMMARY

As a result of our work, 229 compounds have been identified and 187 are reported for the first time as roasted filbert constituents. As has been the case with other roasted products (peanut and coffee for example), many of the components identified were considered to contribute to the overall flavor but none was isolated which could be considered to have the typical roasted filbert character.

### LITERATURE CITED

- Craven, D. A., Anal. Chem. 42(13), 1679 (1970).
- Friedel, P., Krampl, V., Radford, T., Renner, J. A., Shephard, F. W., Gianturco, M. A., J. AGR. FOOD CHEM. 19, 530 (1971).
  Pittet, A. O., Walradt, J. P., Muralidhara, R., Kinlin, T. E., presented at 162nd ACS National Meeting, Washington, D.C., Sept 12-17, 1971.
- Schultz, T. H., Flath, R. A., Mon, T. R., J. AGR. FOOD CHEM. 19, 1060 (1971)
- Sheldon, R. M., Ph.D. Thesis, Oregon State University, Corvallis, Oregon, 1969. Since this manuscript was prepared, the major portion of the work of Sheldon (1969) has been published and portion of the work of Shetdon (1909) has been published and the reader is referred to that paper: Sheldon, R. M., Lindsay, R. C., Libbey, L. M., J. Food Sci. 37, 313 (1972). van den Dool, H., Kratz, P. D., J. Chromatogr. 11, 463 (1963). van Praag, M., Stein, H. S., Tibbetts, M. S., J. AGR. FOOD CHEM. 16, 1005 (1968).

- Walradt, J. P., Pittet, A. O., Kinlin, T. E., Muralidhara, R., Sanderson, A., J. AGR. FOOD CHEM. **19**, 972 (1971). Watson, J. T., Biemann, K., Anal. Chem. **37**, 844 (1965).

Received for review March 10, 1972. Accepted April 17, 1972.