Alteration of the Relative Volatility of *n*-Hexane-1-Hexene

by Oxygenated and Chlorinated Solvents

DONALD O. HANSON¹ and MATTHEW VAN WINKLE University of Texas, Austin, Tex.

> Vapor-liquid equilibrium data at 60° C. are reported for the binary systems 1-hexenen-hexane and these hydrocarbons with 2-butanone (methyl ethyl ketone), 2-butanol, 1,1,1-trichloroethane, 1,1,2-trichloroethane, 1,1,2,2-tetrachloroethane, tetrachloroethylene, and trichloroethylene.

 ${f M}_{{
m EASUREMENTS}}$ were made in a glass and Teflon vapor-circulating still equipped with three guard heaters for adiabatic operation. Data were also recorded for the systems n-hexane-benzene at 1-atm. pressure and heptanebenzene at 60° C. to verify the experimental procedure with well known systems. Activity coefficients were corrected for vapor phase imperfections and pressure effects on liquid phase fugacity and were tested for thermodynamic consistency by the Redlich-Kister (13) integral test. The selectivity of the solvents was correlated with fair success by an adaptation of the polar solubility parameter method of Weimer and Prausnitz (17). The nonpolar, symmetrical tetrachloroethylene shows a definite selectivity for the pair but less than that expected from its calculated polar solubility parameter. The selectivity of the alcohol is much less than predicted from its large polar solubility parameter but about the same as an ether of the same molecular weight.

A program was initiated to determine the effect of oxygenated and chlorinated solvents on the relative volatility of *n*-hexane and 1-hexene. Vapor-liquid measurements were made over the full composition range at 60° C. for binary mixtures of the hydrocarbons with 2-butanone, 2-butanol, and five chloroethanes and chloroethylenes. The alcohol and ketone are similar in structure but the alcohol is strongly intermolecularly hydrogen-bonded. The chlorine compounds were chosen to show the effect of chlorine substitution and "active hydrogens" on solvent selectivity. The selectivity of the solvents for the *n*-hexane with respect to 1-hexene was reasonably well correlated by the polar solubility parameter method of Weimer and Prausnitz (17).

EQUIPMENT AND METHOD

The vapor-circulating equilibrium still used throughout the investigation was an adaptation of the still described by Stephenson (14). Three guard heaters were added to improve the approach to adiabatic operation, and a Teflonstemmed valve replaced the greased stopcock. Details of the experimental apparatus and technique are given in the original work (9).

Thermocouples were calibrated from 25° to 130° C. against a set of National Bureau of Standards certified mercuryin-glass thermometers. Pressure measurement was by mercury manometer and a cathetometer with a reading precision of ± 0.05 mm. Pressure was controlled manually to ± 0.2 mm. of Hg with the aid of a temperature-controlled ballast. Analysis of the liquid and vapor phases was either by refractive index (Bausch and Lomb Precision Refractometer Style 33-45-03) or by gas-liquid chromatography (Beckman Instruments Type GC-2). Precision of the analytical methods was ± 0.002 mole fraction or better.

MATERIALS

The hydrocarbons were Phillips pure grade materials used without further purification except for *n*-heptane, which was dried by refluxing over silica gel and then distilled to obtain an overhead product. Commercially available solvents were dried by refluxing over silica gel and then distilled in at least a 15-plate Oldershaw column at high reflux ratios. The refractive indices and typical vapor pressures (measured in the equilibrium still) are listed in Table I.

EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS

The binary liquid phase activity coefficients referred to the pure liquids at the temperature and pressure of the system were obtained by Equation 1 (written for component 1), as presented by Van Ness (16)

$$\ln \gamma_1^L = \ln \frac{y_1 P}{x_1 P_1'} + \frac{(B_{11} \times V_1^L)(P - P_1')}{RT} + \frac{P \delta_{12} y_2^2}{RT}$$
(1)

where subscripts 1 and 2 refer to components 1 and 2 of the binary, γ_1^L is the liquid phase activity coefficient, x_1 and y_1 are liquid and vapor phase compositions, respectively, P is the total pressure, P_1' is the vapor pressure at temperature T, and V_1^L is saturated liquid volume. The term $\delta_{12} = 2B_{12} - B_{11} - B_{12}$, where B_{11} and B_{22} are pure component second virial coefficients and B_{12} is the interaction virial coefficient. The second virial coefficients for the pure compounds were obtained from PVT or latent heat of vaporization measurements except for the chlorinated compounds, for which very few data were found. Some data for trichloroethylene and *cis*- and *trans*-dichloroethylene (6) were correlated by the law of corresponding states and the second virial coefficients for the remaining chlorinated compounds obtained from this correlation.

The interaction second virial coefficient, B_{12} , was set equal to the arithmetic average of the pure component second virials for hydrocarbon-hydrocarbon and hydrocarbonchlorocompound mixtures, implying that $\delta_{12} = 0$. This assumption is supported for the latter mixtures by measurements of virial coefficients in the *n*-hexane-chloroform (7) and the *n*-pentane-methyl bromide and the *n*-pentane-ethyl bromide systems (12). The assumption does not, however, hold for the hydrocarbon-ketone and hydrocarbon-alcohol systems where the vapor mixtures show positive deviations from the simple arithmetic averaging rule. In these systems, the interaction second virial coefficient was set equal to

¹ Present address: Phillips Petroleum Co., Bartlesville, Okla.

	Refracti	ve Index, $n_{\rm D}^{25}$	Normal (760 Mm. Hg) Boiling Point, °C.		
Material	Observed	Literature	Observed	Literature	
Heptane	1.38524	1.38511 (5)	98.44	98.43 (5)	
Benzene	1.4980	1.4979 (4)	80.03	80.10 (4)	
1,1,1-Trichloroethane	1.43525	1.4352 (5)	74.05	74.1 (5)	
1,1,2-Trichloroethane	1.4689	1.4687 (5)	113.63	113.77 (5)	
			Vapor Pressure at 60° C. Mm. Hg		
1-Hexene	1.3851	1.3850 (5)	679.7	679.7 (5)	
n-Hexane	1.3724	1.37226 (5)	573.4	572.2 (5)	
2-Butanone	1.3762	1.3761 (3)	389.9	389.9 (3)	
2-Butanol	1.39525	1.3950 (1)	136.1	136.6 (1)	
1,1,2,2-Tetrachloroethane	1.4981	1.4915° (15)	34.3	ь	
Tetrachloroethylene	1.5032	1.5028 (5)	94.4	96.6° (5)	
Trichloroethylene	1.4748	1.4746 (5)	312.6	311.6° (5)	
"Estimated "Not known "(alculated				

Table I. Refractive Indices and Boiling Points of Materials

the arithmetic average of the hydrocarbon second virial coefficient and the second virial coefficient of the nonpolar homomorph of the alcohol or ketone, determined at the same temperature. In effect, we say that the interaction between the hydrocarbon and polar molecule is merely the interaction between nonpolar molecules, with methyl or methylene groups substituted for the polar groups of the alcohol or ketone. This is an empirical method which gave better agreement with experiment than the true homomorphic method (homomorph at the same reduced temperature as the polar compound) when tested with mixture virial coefficients for the acetone-cyclohexane system reported by Lambert, Murphy, and Sanday (10).

The size of the imperfection correction is indicated in Table II where the sum of the two rightmost terms of Equation 1, evaluated at the boundaries and raised to the power e, is listed for the 15 systems containing either *n*-hexane or 1-hexene. This number is a multiplier which corrects the apparent limiting activity coefficient, $[yP/xP']^0$, to the true limiting liquid phase activity coefficient. The corrections cannot be ignored in many cases and consequently have been applied for all cases. The effect of these corrections on the apparent consistency of the data will be discussed.

To test the thermodynamic consistency of each data set and to obtain the limiting activity coefficients, the function $\ln (\gamma_1/\gamma_2)$ was fitted by least squares to the empirical equation

$$\ln (\gamma_1/\gamma_2) = \sum_{n=0}^{N} A_n (x_1 - 0.5)^n$$
 (2)

The systems containing 2-butanone, 2-butanol, 1,1,1-trichloroethane, and 1,1,2-trichloroethane were treated by regression analysis to obtain the power series of maximum degree at which all variables were significant. Variables were tested at the 95% confidence level by the *t* test and removed one at a time if shown to be nonsignificant. The degree of the power series is indicated in Table III where regression coefficients and standard deviations for each system are listed for all systems. The remaining systems were not subjected to analysis but were adjudged by inspection to be adequately fitted by the quadratic form of Equation 2.

The function $\ln (\gamma_1/\gamma_2)$ was integrated over the limits of concentration to provide a measure of consistency by the well known Redlich-Kister test (13). A consistency index, defined as

$$C.I. = \frac{I_p + I_m}{|I_p| + |I_m|}$$
(3)

where I_p is the positive integrated area and I_m the negative integrated area, less in magnitude than 0.05 was considered excellent evidence of thermodynamic consistency. Of the 17 systems measured, |C.I.| for 12 was 0.05 or less, for

Tuble II. Dize of Impertection Correction to Emining Activity Coefficient								
System	$\exp\left[\frac{(B_{11}-V_{1}^{L})(P_{2}'-P_{1}')}{RT}\right]$	$\frac{1}{1+P_2'\delta_{12}}] \qquad \exp\left[\frac{(B_{22})}{1+P_2'\delta_{12}}\right]$	$\frac{-V_{2}^{L}(P_{1}^{\prime}-P_{2}^{\prime})+P_{1}^{\prime}\delta_{12}}{RT}$					
1-Hexene- <i>n</i> -hexane	1.0072		0.9922					
1-Hexene-2-butanone	1.0556		0.9925					
<i>n</i> -Hexane–2-butanone	1.0443		1.0027					
1-Hexene–2-butanol	1.0946		0.9455					
<i>n</i> -Hexene–2-butanol	1.0784		0.990					
1-Hexene-1,1,1-trichloroethane	1.0136		0.988					
n-Hexane-1.1.1trichloroethane	1.0068		0.9945					
1-Hexene-1.1.2-trichloroethane	1.0391		0.9565					
n-Hexane-1.1.2-trichloroethane	1.0342		0.965					
1-Hexene-1.1.2.2-tetrachloroethane	1.0449		0.932					
<i>n</i> -Hexane-1.1.2.2-tetrachloroethane	1.0405		0.943					
1-Hexene-trichloroethylene	1.0253		0.975					
<i>n</i> -Hexane-trichloroethylene	1.0194		0.982					
1-Hexene-tetrachloroethylene	1.0406		0.944					
<i>n</i> -Hexane-tetrachloroethylene	1.0360		0.954					
2								

Table	11.	Size	of	Imperfection	Correction	to	Limiting	Activity	 Coefficient
-------	-----	------	----	--------------	------------	----	----------	----------	---------------------------------

Table III. Coefficients of Equation 2

						Standard Deviation of
System	A_{0}	A_1	A_2	A_3	A_4	Correlation
Hexane-benzene	-0.039595	-0.852177	0.499219			0.0056
Hexane-benzene ^a	-0.041674	-0.862399	0.551323			0.0160
Benzene-heptane	0.045420	-0.822371	-0.694080			0.0088
Benzene-heptane ^b	0.031051	-0.807114	-0.731529			0.0107
Hexene-hexane	0.001599	-0.055782	-0.017090			0.0044
Hexene–MEK	0.028361	-1.613355	-0.250400	-1.235992		0.0106
Hexene-MEK	0.041389	-2.158113	-0.363789	-1.641533		0.0119
Hexene-butanol	0.094692	-2.3360	-0.51786	-3.5123	-4.9428	0.0076
Hexane-butanol	0.15526	-2.5383	-0.89723	-4.0023	-4.8580	0.0120
Hexene–1,1,1-trichloroethane	-0.000664	-0.348935	0.094489			0.0061
Hexane-1,1,1-trichloroethane	-0.007546	-0.603861	-0.125751			0.0064
Hexene-1,1,2-trichloroethane	-0.034799	-1.24616	0.438318			0.0080
Hexane-1,1,2-trichloroethane	-0.046000	-1.98362	0.498931			0.0219
Hexene-1,1,2,2-tetrachloroethane	-0.012311	-1.11862	-0.017350			0.0244
Hexane-1,1,2,2-tetrachloroethane	-0.043042	-1.89118	0.218279			0.0172
Hexene-trichloroethylene	-0.004518	-0.352921	0.114399			0.0036
Hexane-trichloroethylene	-0.012711	-0.658315	0.237759			0.0044
Hexene-tetrachloroethylene	-0.007230	-0.557856	0.083491			0.0005
Hexane-tetrachloroethylene	-0.028439	-0.717746	0.211123			0.0017

^a Data of Myers (11). ^b Data of Brown (2).

16 systems, |C.I.| was 0.06 or less, and for all systems, |C.I.| was 0.083 or less (Table IV).

The experimental data are divided into two sections: binary systems measured for comparison with the results of other investigators to serve as a check on the technique, and new binary systems among the hydrocarbons and the seven solvents.

The experimentally observed temperatures, pressures, and compositions plus the calculated activity coefficient, and difference between the observed and back-calculated ln (γ_1/γ_2) function are listed for the 19 binary systems (Tables V and VI). The consistency indices, limiting activity coefficients, and volumetric data used in calculating activity coefficients are also listed (Table IV).

Systems Measured for Comparison. Our *n*-hexane-benzene data are very smooth and consistent and are fitted extremely well by quadratic form of Equation 2 (Tables III, IV,

and V). The data of Myers (11) are also smooth and consistent (same tables) and the agreement between the two sets of data is good, as shown by the common plot (Figure 1). The system benzene-heptane (Tables III and V) was measured at 60° C. to check against the measurements of Brown (2). Our data are smooth but show a consistency index (Table IV) larger in absolute value (0.060) than our hexane-benzene system (0.009). Brown's data (2) were recalculated by Equation 1 (Tables III and V) and show a consistency index of -0.147 (Table IV). The common plot (Figure 2) shows disagreement of the benzene activity coefficients at low benzene concentration. On the basis of a smaller absolute value of consistency index, our data are the more accurate of the two sets.

New Binary Systems. Numerical data for the 15 new binary systems are listed (Tables III, IV, and VI). The *n*-hexane-1-hexene activity coefficients, despite rather small deviations

Table IV. Consistency Index, Limiting Activity Coefficients, and Volumetric Data

System	Consistency Index ^a			_			
	Corrected	Uncorrected	$\gamma_1^{L^\circ}$	$\gamma_2^{L^\circ}$	$B_{11} - V_1^T$ Cc./Mole	$B_{22} - V_2^2$ Cc./Mole	$\operatorname{Cc.}/\operatorname{Mole}^{\delta_{12}}$
<i>n</i> -Hexane–benzene	0.009		1.667	1.406	c	c	0
n -Hexane–benzene $^{\flat}$	0.020		1.694	1.398	c	с	0
Benzene-heptane	-0.060		1.327	1.715	-1212	-2202	0
Benzene-heptane ^d	-0.147		1.286	1.743	-1212	-2202	0
1-Hexene- <i>n</i> -hexane	0.013	-0.5	1.02255	1.031	-1413	-1530	0
1-Hexene–2-butanone	0.017	-0.023	2.527	2.706	-1413	-1990	1079
n-Hexane–2-butanone	0.019	0.000	3.436	3.795	-1530	-1990	1079
1-Hexene–2-butanol	-0.015	-0.061	3.537	7.034	-1413	-2530	1564
n-Hexane–2-butanol	0.026	-0.008	4.042	8.517	-1530	-2530	1564
1-Hexene–1,1,1-trichloroethane	0.083	-0.06	1.218	1.164	-1413	-1249	0
<i>n</i> -Hexane–1,1,1-trichloroethane	0.019	-0.019	1.385	1.321	-1530	-1249	0
1-Hexene-1,1,2-trichloroethane	0.006	-0.126	2.009	1.730	-1413	-1640	0
<i>n</i> -Hexane–1,1,2-trichloroethane	-0.009	-0.086	2.917	2.492	-1530	-1640	0
1-Hexene-1,1,2,2-tetrachloroethane	-0.049	-0.250	1.721	1.779	-1413	-2280	0
n-Hexane-1,1,2,2-tetrachloroethane	-0.052	-0.159	2.604	2.545	-1530	-2280	0
1-Hexene–trichloroethylene	0.057	-0.220	1.222	1.165	-1413	-1407	0
<i>n</i> -Hexane–trichloroethylene	0.043	-0.068	1.456	1.326	-1530	-1407	0
1-Hexene-tetrachloroethylene	-0.002	-0.331	1.340	1.304	-1413	-2042	0
n-Hexane–tetrachloroethylene	-0.060	-0.278	1.467	1.397	-1530	-2042	0

^aListed both for apparent activity coefficient (uncorrected) and activity coefficient corrected for vapor phase imperfection. ^bData of Myers (11). ^cThis data listed for constant temperature systems only. ^dData of Brown (2).

Table V. S	ystems Measured	to	Verify	/ Exp	perimental	Technique
------------	-----------------	----	--------	-------	------------	-----------

\boldsymbol{x}_1	y_1	<i>T</i> , ° C.	γ_1^L	γ_2^L	$\Delta \ln \gamma_1^L / \gamma_2^L$	\boldsymbol{x}_1	\mathbf{y}_1	<i>T</i> , ° C.	γ_1^L	γ_2^L	$\frac{\Delta \ln}{\gamma_1^L/\gamma_2^L}$
	n-Hexane (1) and Benz	zene (2) at	760 Mm. H	σ	n	-Hevane (1) and Benz	ene (2) at 7	60 Mm Ha	
		-/ unu 2011			ъ		iteratic (1		CHC (2) at 1	00 Milli. 11g	
		This	work					Data of N	1 yers (11)		
$0.052 \\ 0.055$	$\substack{0.108\\0.112}$	77.9 77.9	$1.584 \\ 1.565$	$1.004 \\ 1.004$	$0.014 \\ 0.006$	$0.338 \\ 0.352$	$0.439 \\ 0.454$	$72.3 \\ 72.0$	$1.173 \\ 1.172$	$1.076 \\ 1.079$	-0.026 -0.015
0.122	0.216	75.9	1.436	1.013	-0.005	0.390	0.486	71.6	1.147	1.094	-0.013
0.125	0.220	75.8	1.434	1.013	-0.003	0.451	0.539	70.9	1.120	1.111	0.005
0.128	0.222	75.8	1.417	1.015	-0.012	0.511	0.586	70.5	1.089	1.137	0.007
0.219	0.334	73.8	1.313	1.032	0.001	0.532	0.603	70.3	1.082	1.146	0.011
0.234	0.347	73.6	1.288	1.040	-0.008	0.566	0.629	70.2	1.066	1.160	0.011
0.311	0.422	72.4	1.218	1.060	-0.001	0.608	0.661	69.8	1.052	1.180	0.009
0.312	0.422	72.4	1.210	1.062	-0.004	0.600	0.092	69.6	1.039	1.210	0.000
0.312	0.424	72.4	1 209	1.055	-0.003	0.000	0.725	69.9	1.034	1.224	0.016
0.323	0.432	72.2	1 207	1.000	-0.004	0.795	0.815	69.0	1 017	1 271	0.010
0.381	0.483	71.5	1.168	1.086	0.004	0.872	0.878	68.6	1.013	1.362	-0.010
0.387	0.487	71.5	1.162	1.088	0.002	0.920	0.921	68.8	0.999	1.400	-0.030
0.499	0.577	70.4	1.101	1.137	0.006	0.960	0.961	68.8	1.001	1.384	-0.003
0.503	0.579	70.4	1.096	1.141	0.002						
0.603	0.657	69.7	1.060	1.191	0.005		Ber	izene (1) an	id <i>n</i> -Heptai	ne (2)	
0.606	0.659	69.7	1.058	1.195	0.002			This	work		
0.717	0.746	69.1	1.030	1.260	-0.001				, nom		
0.720	0.749	69.1	1.030	1.261	0.001	0.087	0.187	237.6	1.316	1.003	0.005
0.793	0.809	68.9	1.016	1.306	-0.004	0.088	0.188	237.9	1.313	1.004	0.001
0.198	0.014	00.0 69.7	1.017	1.304	0.001	0.180	0.340	265.2	1.286	1.011	0.003
0.057	0.902	68.7	1.007	1.362	-0.003	0.280	0.463	290.8	1.232	1.022	-0.005
0.000	0.939	68.6	1.007	1.368	0.009	0.404	0.578	317.5	1.167	1.059	-0.021
0.940	0.942	68.6	1.006	1.386	-0.003	0.475	0.639	332.8	1.149	1.074	0.002
	•••					0.479	0.642	333.0	1.145	1.076	0.000
		Data of	'Myers (11))		0.018	0.736	368.7	1.000	1.144	0.011
0.015	0.033	79 G	1 639	0.997	-0.010	0.715	0.150	377.8	1.033	1.220	0.005
0.023	0.051	79.2	1.696	0.997	0.036	0.193	0.922	387.2	1.026	1.517	-0.006
0.020	0.100	78.3	1.585	0.999	0.001	0.908	0.923	388.2	1.008	1.522	-0.007
0.078	0.153	77.3	1.520	1.002	-0.003	0.000	010 20	000.	21000	1.00	
0.082	0.156	77.2	1.490	1.003	-0.019		E	ata of Brov	vn (2) at 60	0° C.	
0.088	0.168	77.0	1.504	1.001	-0.000						
0.098	0.184	76.7	1.491	1.002	0.004	0.018	0.042	216.4	1.317	1.004	0.022
0.102	0.191	76.7	1.486	1.000	0.007	0.045	0.100	224.9	1.276	1.007	-0.010
0.108	0.197	76.5	1.468	1.002	0.000	0.093	0.193	239.7	1.285	1.011	0.002
0.112	0.205	76.3	1.470	1.004	0.006	0.188	0.342	266.9	1.249	1.023	-0.013
0.123	0.223	76.1	1.467	1.001	0.021	0.293	0.472	294.4	1.216	1.038	-0.008
0.141 0.177	0.243	70.7	1.400	1.007	-0.006	0.387	0.003	313.0	1,170	1.000	-0.008
0.148	0.200	74.5	1 315	1.012	-0.001	0.400	0.040	350.8	1 099	1 140	0.003
0.215	0.330	74.2	1 308	1.023	-0.003	0.580	0.709	351.0	1.098	1.140	0.002
0.241	0.353	73.8	1.265	1.031	-0.014	0.684	0.776	365.9	1.063	1.212	0.010
0.268	0.392	73.3	1.280	1.021	0.038	0.791	0.843	378.1	1.030	1.330	0.010
0.274	0.385	73.2	1.231	1.046	-0.018	0.896	0.914	387.6	1.010	1.501	0.007
0.308	0.416	72.7	1.204	1.059	-0.016	0.943	0.949	390.3	1.004	1.602	0.003
0.310	0.418	72.6	1.204	1.060	-0.015	0.979	0.980	391.5	1.001	1.722	-0.019

Table VI. New Binary Systems at 60° C.

		PT,			∆ ln			PT,			Δ ln
\boldsymbol{x}_1	y_1	Mm. Hg	$\boldsymbol{\gamma}_{1}^{L}$	γ_1^L	$oldsymbol{\gamma}_1^L/oldsymbol{\gamma}_2^L$	\mathbf{x}_1	\mathcal{Y}_1	Mm. Hg	γ_{1}^{L}	γ_2^L	$oldsymbol{\gamma}_1^L/oldsymbol{\gamma}_2^L$
	1-H	Hexene (1) a	nd n-Hexai	ne (2)			1-He	xene (1) and	2-Butano	ne (2)	
$\begin{array}{c} 0.121 \\ 0.123 \\ 0.148 \\ 0.245 \\ 0.248 \\ 0.391 \\ 0.515 \\ 0.666 \\ 0.007 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 0.142\\ 0.143\\ 0.173\\ 0.281\\ 0.283\\ 0.431\\ 0.556\\ 0.698\\ 0.045\end{array}$	588.3 588.1 591.2 602.5 602.7 619.2 632.4 648.2	$1.022 \\ 1.015 \\ 1.018 \\ 1.020 \\ 1.020 \\ 1.008 \\ 1.007 \\ 1.002 \\ 1.00$	$\begin{array}{c} 1.000\\ 1.001\\ 1.000\\ 0.999\\ 0.999\\ 1.006\\ 1.005\\ 1.015\\ 1.015\end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 0.001 \\ -0.006 \\ -0.002 \\ 0.007 \\ 0.006 \\ -0.005 \\ 0.001 \\ -0.005 \end{array}$	0.633 0.714 0.788 0.903 0.905	0.710 0.757 0.796 0.886 0.886 <i>n</i> -H 0.282	697.6 705.5 709.9 705.2 704.3 exane (1) an 501.8	1.152 1.102 1.054 1.017 1.015 d 2-Butan 2.647	1.399 1.521 1.742 2.125 2.149 one (2) 1.012	-0.000 0.017 -0.015 0.005 -0.003
0.825 0.874 0.877	0.845 0.889 0.891 1-H	662.7 668.3 668.5 exene (1) an	1.000 1.001 1.000 id 2-Butan	1.016 1.019 1.026 one (2)	0.002 0.004 0.003	$\begin{array}{c} 0.098 \\ 0.197 \\ 0.282 \\ 0.395 \\ 0.479 \end{array}$	$0.288 \\ 0.419 \\ 0.484 \\ 0.550 \\ 0.597$	502.7 569.1 605.9 635.0 648.3	2.632 2.133 1.824 1.545 1.409	$1.009 \\ 1.044 \\ 1.102 \\ 1.195 \\ 1.270$	$\begin{array}{c} 0.002 \\ 0.007 \\ -0.008 \\ -0.009 \\ 0.017 \end{array}$
$\begin{array}{c} 0.094 \\ 0.094 \\ 0.201 \\ 0.284 \\ 0.395 \\ 0.523 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 0.267 \\ 0.264 \\ 0.417 \\ 0.499 \\ 0.572 \\ 0.651 \end{array}$	484.5 485.8 559.1 602.5 642.2 677.6	$\begin{array}{c} 2.079\\ 2.053\\ 1.740\\ 1.579\\ 1.380\\ 1.245\end{array}$	$1.000 \\ 1.005 \\ 1.034 \\ 1.068 \\ 1.151 \\ 1.257$	$\begin{array}{c} 0.008 \\ -0.010 \\ -0.001 \\ 0.013 \\ -0.014 \\ 0.000 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 0.556 \\ 0.716 \\ 0.803 \\ 0.872 \\ 0.916 \\ 0.961 \end{array}$	0.626 0.697 0.748 0.804 0.854 0.917	$\begin{array}{c} 656.9 \\ 661.2 \\ 654.4 \\ 641.5 \\ 625.8 \\ 602.3 \end{array}$	$1.289 \\ 1.121 \\ 1.058 \\ 1.028 \\ 1.014 \\ 1.000$	1.399 1.788 2.132 2.510 2.793 3.347 (Continued	-0.001 -0.009 -0.008 0.003 0.024 -0.016 d on page 323)

• -

	Table VI. New Binary Systems at 60° C. (Continued)										
x ,	\mathbf{v}_1	<i>PT</i> , Mm, Hg	γ_1^L	γ_2^L	$\Delta \ln \gamma_1^L/\gamma_2^L$	x 1	\mathbf{v}_1	<i>PT</i> , Mm. Hg	γ_1^L	$\boldsymbol{\gamma}_2^L$	$\Delta \ln \gamma_1^L / \gamma_2^L$
~1	J. 1.H	Iovene (1) an	d 2-Butanc), 1 (2)			n-Hexane	(1) and 1.1	2-Trichlor	oethane (2)	,-
	1-1.	leache (1) an	u z-Dutan)I (2)			n Hexane	(1) und 1,1	,2 111011101	(2)	
0.070	0.522	273.4	3.117	1.020	0.002	0.093	0.542	232.4	2.420	1.001	0.039
0.070	0.524	274.3	3.102	1.020	-0.001	0.094	0.522	233.4	2.320	1.051	-0.049
0.139	0.668	368.9	2.671	1.030	0.001	0.185	0.670	302.6	1.951	1.040	0.002
0.253	0.761	477.4	2.141	1.103	-0.010	0.107	0.561	245.3	2.310	1.026	0.000
0.395	0.817	559.5	1.719	1.215	0.010	0.106	0.560	244.3	2.316	1.023	0.003
0.482	0.839	595.3	1.535	1.326	0.009	0.192	0.681	307.3	1.947	1.028	0.026
0.584	0.858	626.9	1.360	1.535	-0.012	0.285	0.738	355.3	1.635	1.098	-0.005
0.696	0.879	653.5	1.218	1.855	-0.005	0.381	0.776	393.1	1.415	1.192	-0.025
0.799	0.899	671.8	1.113	2.427	0.004	0.484	0.813	426.5	1.267	1.300	-0.012
0.897	0.924	685.4	1.038	3,630	0.007	0.558	0.837	449.2	1.185	1.382	0.006
0.901	0.925	685.5	1.036	3.710	0.004	0.688	0.876	484.9	1084	1.606	0.009
0.938	0.942	687.6	1.016	4.618	-0.009	0.779	0.907	510.4	1.042	1.786	0.021
0.000	0.012	00110	11010	1.010	01000	0.912	0.958	546.3	1.005	2.179	0.003
	n-I	Hexane (1) an	nd 2-Butan	ol (2)		0.955	0.977	560.1	1.000	2.369	-0.017
0.094	0.579	302.4	3.313	1.020	0.005		1-Hexene (1	l) and 1,1,2	,2-Tetrachl	oroethane (2)	I.
0.097	0.585	306.2	3.289	1.022	0.004						
0.186	0.700	398.8	2 651	1.062	-0.024	0.098	0.758	134.4	1.608	1.056	-0.015
0.100	0.779	477.5	2 108	1 103	0.023	0.125	0.807	160.9	1.576	1.021	0.030
0.310	0.110	591.0	1 726	1.105	-0.003	0.180	0.855	204.8	1.476	1.044	0.003
0.430	0.011	562.0	1.720	1.240	-0.003	0.331	0.918	309.8	1.294	1.080	0.004
0.007	0.047	503.9	1.070	1.079	-0.000	0.338	0.916	313.4	1.280	1.128	-0.042
0.700	0.862	577.9	1.242	1.912	-0.003	0.483	0.946	395.5	1.161	1.156	-0.002
0.795	0.877	591.5	1.138	2.004	0.002	0.674	0.970	495.2	1.063	1.249	0.046
0.888	0.899	596.2	1.052	3.858	0.009	0.686	0.970	500.8	1.056	1.332	-0.012
0.897	0.902	597.0	1.046	4.078	0.005	0.897	0.990	616.7	1.006	1.590	0.001
0.931	0.918	596.3	1.024	5.104	-0.010	0.908	0.991	623.2	1.005	1.634	-0.015
	1-Hexer	ne (1) and 1,1	.1-Trichlor	oethane (2)		1,000	1-Hexane (1) and 1,1,2	2-Tetrachle	proethane (2)	0.010
0.040	0.070	406.0	1 107	0.000	0.005	0.081	0 754	137.5	2 314	1 064	~0.011
0.049	0.079	496.9	1.197	0.999	0.005	0.001	0.783	150.7	2.014	1.031	0.030
0.049	0.079	497.0	1.197	1.000	0.003	0.181	0.100	224 1	1 906	1.096	0.029
0.113	0.170	515.4	1.104	1.001	-0.006	0.101	0.000	309.9	1.500	1 1 3 6	0.008
0.199	0.279	539.4	1.125	1.004	0.001	0.001	0.010	974 9	1.020	1.100	0.000
0.305	0.394	565.0	1.081	1.019	-0.013	0.491	0.937	4400	1.200	1.250	0.002
0.412	0.502	588.6	1.062	1.031	-0.001	0.003	0.909	442.0	1.090	1.000	0.003
0.520	0.601	609.5	1.042	1.045	0.005	0.902	0.985	526.5	1.008	2.100	0.008
0.605	0.676	625.0	1.031	1.057	0.012	0.902	0.985	527.0	1.008	2.194	-0.010
0.682	0.737	637.5	1.017	1.084	-0.003		1 11		T-1-1-1+	$\mathbf{h}_{\mathrm{ell}} = \mathbf{h}_{\mathrm{ell}} (0)$	
0.806	0.840	655.2	1.007	1.112	-0.001		1-Hexe	ene (1) and	I richioroet	nylene (2)	
0.895	0.913	667.3	1.003	1.139	-0.004	0.100	0.916	258.0	1 160	0.997	0.004
0.948	0.957	673. 9	1.002	1.149	0.001	0.100	0.210	401.6	1 1 2 2	1.006	-0.005
		(.). •				0.130	0.500	459.1	1.122	1.000	-0.000
	n-Hexa	ne (1) and 1,	1,1-Trichlo	roethane (2)		0.325	0.524	510.0	1.075	1.017	-0.000
0.001	0.004	400.4	1 005	1 000	0.000	0.400	0.007	599.9	1 012	1.043	-0.001
0.021	0.034	488.4	1.365	1.002	-0.000	0.705	0.020	649.4	1.013	1.000	0.000
0.051	0.078	496.8	1.330	1.003	-0.006	0.901	0.944	646.4	1.002	1.141	-0.002
0.105	0.154	511.2	1.304	1.003	0.012		n-Heve	ne (1) and	Trichloroet	hvlene (2)	
0.203	0.266	531.8	1.218	1.016	-0.002		// IICAU	ne (1) und	1 1101101000	iiyiciic (2)	
0.291	0.354	546.4	1.164	1.031	-0.003	0.106	0.222	360.4	1.332	1.001	0.002
0.430	0.480	563.1	1.099	1.063	-0.003	0.205	0.361	396.4	1.234	1.014	-0.006
0.504	0.543	570.5	1.073	1.088	-0.004	0.336	0.504	438.1	1.157	1.038	0.007
0.597	0.622	576.4	1.048	1.116	0.002	0.493	0.634	477.0	1.077	1.090	-0.004
0.716	0.724	580.5	1.023	1.166	0.002	0.692	0.780	518.3	1.025	1.166	0.002
0.789	0.789	580.8	1.013	1.201	0.002	0.902	0.928	557.5	1.003	1.273	-0.000
0.913	0.908	578.5	1.003	1.269	0.000						
0.920	0.916	578.6	1.004	1.256	0.014		1-Hexer	ne (1) and 7	Fetrachloro	ethylene (2)	
0.952	0.947	577.0	1.001	1.303	-0.009						
0.975	0.972	575.7	1.001	1.312	-0.005	0.097	0.484	167.5	1.270	1.007	0.001
						0.196	0.666	233.6	1.203	1.014	0.000
	1-Hexe	ene (1) and 1	,1,2-Trichlo	roethane (2)	0.363	0.807	334.3	1.120	1.047	-0.003
						0.539	0.886	429.7	1.057	1.093	-0.004
0.085	0.473	209.4	1.760	1.027	-0.018	0.703	0.936	517.5	1.024	1.141	0.009
0.088	0.487	211.2	1.782	1.010	0.014	0.886	0.977	616.3	1.004	1.244	-0.004
0.186	0.657	289.5	1.541	1.032	0.002						
0.264	0.728	339.4	1.409	1.056	0.004		n-Hexa	ne (1) and '	Fetrachlor	ethylene (2)	
0.388	0.798	405.3	1.251	1.120	0.000					J ()	
0.484	0.838	450.5	1.167	1.179	0.004	0.113	0.497	170.4	1.340	1.015	-0.002
0.573	0.868	489.4	1.105	1.256	-0.005	0.196	0.638	217.1	1.267	1.025	0.003
0.714	0.913	551.0	1.045	1.389	-0.002	0.346	0.771	292.1	1.161	1.063	0.001
0.803	0.940	588.6	1.020	1,485	-0.004	0.478	0.840	350.9	1.094	1.108	-0.001
0.898	0.969	632.1	1.006	1.596	0.000	0.678	0.913	434.5	1.033	1.201	-0.001
0.898	0.969	632.0	1.007	1.588	0.005	0.882	0.971	521.4	1.005	1.318	0.001
								-			

from ideality, are seen to be symmetrical and consistent. The use of Equation 1 in calculating activity coefficients was essential for a meaningful Redlich-Kister consistency test. Table III lists three constants for the function $\ln(\gamma_1/\gamma_2)$ but the data can be as well represented by a single constant, as follows:

$$\ln (\gamma_1/\gamma_2) = -0.056 (x_1 - 0.5)$$
(4)

The solvents 2-butanone, 2-butanol, 1,1,1-trichloroethane, and 1,1,2-trichloroethane were studied thoroughly, but the minimum of points were taken in the final six systems to describe the function $\ln (\gamma_1/\gamma_2)$ adequately. The consistency indices are 0.060 or less in absolute value for all but one system, 1-hexene-1,1,1-trichloroethane. The data are, therefore, of satisfactory thermodynamic consistency. A comparison is made (Table IV) between consistency indices of activity coefficient sets calculated by Equation 1 and of sets calculated by the first term of this equation only (apparent activity coefficient). Of the 15 new systems reported, the absolute value of C.I. of 11 systems decreased upon correction, one C.I. remained unchanged, and three increased in magnitude.

Correlation of Selectivity with Polar Solubility Parameter. Weimer and Prausnitz (17) have recently correlated a large number of hydrocarbon activity coefficient data at infinite dilution in a variety of polar solvents. Their expression for limiting hydrocarbon activity coefficient is

$$RT \ln \gamma L^{L^{*}}_{i} = V^{L}_{i} \left[(\lambda_{S} - \lambda_{i})^{2} + \tau^{2}_{S} - 2\psi_{Si} \right] + RT \left[\ln \frac{V^{L}_{i}}{V^{L}_{S}} + 1 - \frac{V^{L}_{i}}{V^{L}_{S}} \right]$$
(5)

where $\gamma^{L,s}$ is the hydrocarbon activity coefficient at infinite dilution, V^L is liquid molar volume, λ is the nonpolar part of the solubility parameter, τ_S is the solvent polar solubility parameter, and ψ_S is the energy term for interaction between a polar and a nonpolar substance. The second term on the right-hand side of Equation 5 arises from the Flory-Huggins excess free energy term for mixtures of polymers. This term has been deleted. The term $V_i^L (\lambda_S - \lambda_i)^2$, which is $RT \ln \gamma^{L,s}$ calculated from regular solution theory, is transferred to the right-hand side of the equation.

The logarithm of limiting selectivity of a solvent for a pair of hydrocarbons is obtained by taking the difference of Equation 5 for the hydrocarbons

$$\ln (\gamma_{1}^{L^{\circ}}/\gamma_{2}^{L^{\circ}}) - \frac{1}{RT} [V_{1}^{L}(\lambda_{s} - \lambda_{1})^{2} - V_{2}^{L}(\lambda_{s} - \lambda_{2})^{2}] = \ln (\gamma_{1}^{L^{\circ}}/\gamma_{2}^{L^{\circ}}) - \ln S_{R} = \frac{1}{RT} [\tau_{s}^{2}(V_{1}^{L} - V_{2}^{L}) - 2V_{1}^{L}\psi_{s1} + 2V_{2}^{L}\psi_{s2}]$$
(6)

where S_R = selectivity predicted by regular theory.

Weimer and Prausnitz (17) found that the ψ_{Si} were constant fractions of τ_S^2 for a given class of hydrocarbons. Thus the right-hand side of Equation 6 becomes a linear function of τ_S^2 . Because of the limited number of data, no attempt was made to evaluate the parameters, except to fit the data points to a straight line passing through the origin. The polar solubility parameters of the solvents were calculated by the formula

$$\tau^{2} = \left(\frac{\Delta U}{V}\right)_{T} - \left(\frac{\Delta U}{V}\right)_{\text{Homomorph, }T.}$$
(7)

that is, τ^2 is the difference between the cohesive energy density of the solvent and the cohesive energy density of its polar homomorph at the same reduced temperature.



To obtain the homomorph, a methyl group was substituted for a chlorine or -OH group and a methylene for a =Ogroup. The CED's of solvents and homomorphs and the polar solubility parameters are listed in Table VII.

Using this scheme alone, it was not possible to correlate the alcohol selectivity with that of the other solvents, the actual selectivity being far less than that expected on the basis of the alcohol polar solubility. The alcohols are strongly intermolecularly hydrogen-bonded in the pure state. A study by Gerster, Gorton, and Eklund (8) of the selectivity of a large number of both polar and hydrogenbonded solvents toward the *n*-pentane-1-pentene pair showed the hydrogen-bonded to be inferior in selectivity. The high cohesive energy density of the hydrogen-bonded substances is not effective in creating selectivity among paraffin-olefin pairs.

The selectivity function for the seven solvents is plotted against the polar solubility parameter (Figure 3). A straight line passing through the origin was fitted to the data, tetrachloroethylene and 2-butanol omitted, by least squares. The standard deviation of the correlated points is ± 0.045 with a maximum deviation of 0.062. The selectivity of the chlorinated solvents is well correlated with polar solubility parameter, indicating polar interaction with the olefinic double bond rather than a specific interaction of the active hydrogens with the double bond. The tetrachloroethylene is an exception, with a selectivity 0.104 unit less than that expected from the general correlation. This solvent is unique in that it has no hydrogens and a zero dipole moment. The low selectivity is probably due to the zero dipole moment and resulting reduced inductive effect on the π -electron of the olefinic double bond.

Table VII. (Cohesive	Energy	and Its	Polar
Part (τ^2) for the	Solvents	s at 60°	C.

	(U/V)	
Solvent-Homomorph	Cal./Cc.	τ^2 (Polar)
2-Butanone	76.2	22.8
2-Methyl-1-butene	53.4	
2-Butanol	108.0	60.0
Methyl <i>n</i> -propyl ether	60.6	12.6
2-Methylbutane	48.0	
1,1,1-Trichloroethane	62.6	17.2
neo-Pentane	45.4	
1,1,2-Trichloroethane	87.2	32.7
2-Methylbutane	54.5	
1,1,2,2-Tetrachloroethane	91.3	35.0
2,3-Dimethylbutane	56.3	
Trichloroethylene	75.3	15.5
2-Methyl-2-butene	59.8	
Tetrachloroethylene	78.9	14.7
2,3-Dimethyl-2-butene	64.2	





By substituting the observed selectivity function for 2-butanol into the linear equation for the nonhydrogenbonded solvents (Figure 3), a polar solubility parameter of 13.5 is calculated. The polar solubility of n-propyl ether, structurally similar to the alcohol, but not hydrogen-bonded, is 12.6 (Table VII). In this case, the alcohol has nearly the same selectivity toward the olefin as the structurally similar ether. If generally true, this observation would be a useful method for predicting the selectivity of hydrogenbonded substances using the Weimer-Prausnitz method.

NOMENCLATURE

- A_{a} = empirical coefficient
- B_{11} component 1 second virial coefficient, cc./mole
- $B_{22} =$ component 2 second virial coefficient
- $B_{12} =$ interaction virial coefficient
- ln logarithm to base e
- Ρ total pressure, mm. Hg =
- P'= vapor pressure, mm. Hg
- R = gas law constant
- selectivity calculated by regular theory S_R =
- U=
- internal energy, cal./mole V^L =
- liquid volume, cc./mole
- x = mole fraction, liquid phase
- γ^{L}_{L} mole fraction, vapor phase =
- = liquid phase activity coefficient
- $\gamma^{L^{\circ}}$ = activity coefficient in limit of zero concentration =
- δ_{12} =
- $2B_{12} B_{11} B_{22}$ nonpolar part of solubility parameter τ =
- polar part of the solubility parameter =
- energy interaction term V
- $\Delta \ln \gamma_1^L / \gamma_2^L = \ln (\gamma_1^L / \gamma_2^L)_{\text{obsd.}} \ln (\gamma_1^L / \gamma_2^L)_{\text{calcd.}}$

Subscripts

- S = solvent
- 1 *n*-hexane =
- 2 = 1-hexene

LITERATURE CITED

- American Petroleum Institute Research Project 44, "Selected Values of Properties of Hydrocarbons and Related Compounds."
- (2)Brown, I., Australian J. Sci. Res. 5A, 530-40 (1952).
- Dow Chemical Co., "Physical Properties of Chemical (3)Substances," unbound data sheets, 1952 ff.
- Dreisbach, R.R., Advan. Chem. Ser., No. 15 (1955). (4)
- Ibid., No. 22 (1959). (5)
- (6)Fogg, P.G.T., Lambert, J.D., Proc. Roy. Soc. (London) A232, 537-47 (1955).
- (7)Fox, J.H.P., Lambert, J.D., Ibid., A210, 557-64 (1951).
- Gerster, J.A., Gorton, J.A., Eklund, Rolf-Bertil, J. CHEM. (8)Eng. Data 5, 423-9 (1960).
- (9) Hanson, D.O., Ph.D. dissertation, University of Texas, Austin, Tex., 1966.
- (10)Lambert, J.D., Murphy, S.J., Sanday, A.D., Proc. Roy. Soc. (London) A226, 394-9 (1954).
- (11)Myers, H.S., Ind. Eng. Chem. 47, 2215-19 (1955).
- Ratzsch, M., Bittrich, H.-J., Z. Physik. Chem. (Leipzig) 228, (12)81-9 (1965).
- Redlich, O., Kister, A.T., Ind. Eng. Chem. 40, 345 (1948). (13)
- Stephenson, R.L., Ph.D. dissertation, University of Texas, (14)Austin, Tex., 1962.
- Timmermans, J., "Physico Chemical Constants of Pure (15)Organic Compounds," Elsevier, New York, 1965. Van Ness, H.C., "Classical Thermodynamics of Non-
- (16)Electrolyte Solutions," p. 122, Macmillan, New York, 1964.
- Weimer, R.F., Prausnitz, J.M., Hydrocarbon Process. Petrol. (17)Refiner 44, No. 9, 237-42 (1965).

RECEIVED for review November 7, 1966. Accepted March 27, 1967. Part of the experimental work was carried out under a NSF grant. The junior author (DOH) also received fellowships from the Humble Oil and Refining Co. (1963-64) and the Koppers Co. (summer 1963).