TABLE VII Crystallization of Lipid Glycerides of V. anthelmintica Seed Oil at -60C for Removal of Unsaponifiable Material

	Quantity	Oxirane oxygen	FFA as epoxy- oleic	Iodine value (Wijs)	Unsaponi- fiable material
	g	%	%		%
Oil	1698	3.85	0.86	104.1	6.67
Precipitate	1511	4.39	0.52	87.8	1.20
Filtrate	188	0.29	2.4	190.0	53.0

of flaking dry seed at room temp, followed by rapid handling in the extraction steps, was not satisfactory from the standpoint of producing an oil with a low free fatty acid content. Even when the flaked seed was allowed to fall directly from the rollers of the mill into the solvent this was not successful in holding down lipolysis.

The process of autoclaving the seed to inhibit lipolysis prior to flaking also was a successful procedure in oil production as illustrated by the fractional extraction data obtained. The slight variation in the free fatty acid content and oxirane oxygen composition of the 10 extracts may have been due to selective extraction of the epoxy fatty components. When the seed was autoclaved no haste was necessary in carrying out extraction operations.

In situations where trivernolin was the desired end-product (Tables V and VI) the rapid technique offered several advantages over the autoclaved seed treatment: the yield of good-quality trivernolin was

higher; less coloring material was extracted; and it was not necessary to concn the solvent before crystallization in order to obtain the product in good yield. The solubility of trivernolin has previously been reported (4) as ca. 5 g/gal at -20C,

No plastic formulation data are available on the evaluation of Vernonia oil where the major portion of the unsaponifiable material has been removed. As this process appreciably elevated the oxirane oxygen percentage, reduced the I.V., and removed color and odor, it may have resulted in an improved product for the purpose stated.

Since the quantity of oil extracted by Waring Blendor technique, 27.9%, is in close agreement with the analytical figure of 27.2% obtained by tedious, exhaustive Soxhlet extraction (1) the former method is now recommended for estimation of the quantity of oil in Vernonia seed. Additional experiments have confirmed the utility of this procedure.

### **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

Consultation with R. W. Riemenschneider; outstanding technical assistance and performance in these studies by Fred J. Oelshlegel, Jr., student trainee.

## REFERENCES

- Krewson, C. F., J. S. Ard, and R. W. Riemenschneider, JAOCS 39, 334-40 (1962).
   Gunstone, F. D., J. Chem. Soc., 1611 (1954).
   Scott, W. E., C. F. Krewson, F. E. Luddy, and R. W. Riemenschneider, JAOCS 40, 587-589 (1963).
   Krewson, C. F., and F. E. Luddy, JAOCS 41, 134-136 (1964).

[Received November 18, 1963—Accepted January 23, 1964]

# Physical Properties of Fatty Acid Methyl Esters. II. Refractive Index and Molar Refraction.

# T. H. GOUW and J. C. VLUGTER, Department of Chemical Engineering, Technological University, Delft, The Netherlands.

## Abstract

The refractive indices of methyl oleate, linoleate, linolenate, erucate, and the saturated fatty acid methyl esters from acetate to nonadecanoate have been measured at 20C and 40C for the  $Na_{D}$ .  $H_{\alpha}$ ,  $H_{\beta}$ , and  $H_{\gamma}$  lines. The values for the saturated series have been correlated with the Smittenberg relation. Molar refractions have been computed and checked for additivity. The limiting refractive indices obtained from the Smittenberg relation are compared to those obtained from the molar refraction.

## Introduction

THE REFRACTIVE INDEX, which may be determined I with relative ease, is an important aid for identification and for a test of purity of organic compounds. For constitutive studies, however, it is in the molar refraction, which is directly related to structural and physical properties of the molecule, that the value of the refractive index is most apparent. For our investigations on the relationships between various physical and chemical properties of fatty oils and their derivatives (13,37) these two physical properties are, therefore, eminently suited to occupy a central place in our considerations. Pure model com-

pounds, such as the fatty acid methyl esters, may be used as basis for obtaining the accurate data requisite to the computation of reliable molar refractivity increments. There is already an abundance of data available on  $n_D^{20}$ , the refractive index of the Na<sub>D</sub> line at 20C, of fatty acid methyl esters. In 1954 Hammond and Lundberg published a paper on the molar refraction, molar volume, and refractive index of fatty acid esters and related compounds in the liquid state (15), which presented a comprehensive review of the subject as of that date. A noticeable drawback was that the cited data, which have been obtained from several sources, vary widely for some compounds. An additional deficiency is the scarcity of data at wavelengths and temp other than  $n_{\rm D}^{20}$ .

For these reasons we have prepared some fatty acid methyl esters in high purity and measured the refractive index for the Na<sub>D</sub> line ( $\lambda = 5892.6$  Å) and for the red (H<sub>a</sub>,  $\lambda = 6562.8$  Å), green (H<sub>b</sub>,  $\lambda = 4861.3$  Å), and violet (H<sub>\gamma</sub>,  $\lambda = 4340$  Å) hydrogen lines at 20C and 40C.

The investigated compounds were the saturated fatty acid methyl esters from acetate to nonadecanoate, methyl oleate, linoleate, linolenate, and erucate. The preparation, purity, and the density of these compounds have already been decribed in a previous communication (13).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Present address: California Research Corp., Richmond, Calif.

June, 1964

			TAB	LE I				
Refractive	Index	$\mathbf{of}$	Saturated	Fatty	Acid	Methyl	Esters,	200

C		Measure	d values		Literature values				
Compound	Ha	Nad	Hβ	$H_{\gamma}$	Ha	Nap	Hβ	$H_{\gamma}$	Kei
Acetate	1.35966	1.36139	1.36573	1.36915	$\begin{array}{r} 1.36015 \\ 1.35963 \\ 1.3600 \end{array}$	$1.36193 \\ 1.36133 \\ 1.3615$	$\begin{array}{r} 1.36629 \\ 1.36572 \\ 1.3661 \end{array}$	$1.36930 \\ 1.36840$	(44) (40) (16)
					1.3606	$1.3614 \\ 1.3619 \\ 1.3615 \\ 1.36143 \\$	1.3667	1.3693	$(9) \\ (14) \\ (17) \\ (11) \\ (24)$
Propionate	1.37499	1.37685	1.38130	1.38482	$\begin{array}{c} 1.37516 \\ 1.37494 \\ 1.37306 \end{array}$	1.87750 1.37683 1.37683 1.37683 1.37643 1.37724	$\begin{array}{c} 1.38132 \\ 1.38130 \\ 1.38130 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 1.38482 \\ 1.38500 \\ 1.38437 \end{array}$	(34) (41) (44) (48) (23)
Butyrate	1.38562	1,38754	1.39226	1.39605	1.38357 1.3854 1.28602	$1.38729 \\ 1.3878$	$1.39193 \\ 1.3919 \\ 1.00050$	$1.39528 \\ 1.3954 \\ 1.99749$	(44) (34)
Valerate	1.39546	1.39742	1.40227	1.40614	1.39493	1.39690	1.39359 1.40167	1.39742 1.40505	(21) (44)
Caproate	1.40330	1.40535	1.41030	1.41429	$1.40300 \\ 1.40298$	1.40494 $1.40536$ $1.40528$	$1.40996 \\ 1.40990$	1.41352	(1) (44) (39) (1) (31)
Oenanthate	1.40970	1.41178	1.41681	1.42084	$1.40946 \\ 1.40925$	$1.4052 \\ 1.41152 \\ 1.4113$	$1.41654 \\ 1.41649$	1.42010	(3) (44) (39) (29)
Caprylate	1.41504	1.41716	1.42227	1.42638	1.41486	$1.41180 \\ 1.41696 \\ 1.4170 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.41715 \\ 1.417$	1.42203	1.42574	(1) (44) (3) (1)
Pelargonate	1.41958	1.42173	1.42690	1.43107	1.4195	$1.41708 \\ 1.4216 \\ 1.40170$	1.4269		(31) (2)
Caprate	1.42350	1.42569	1.43093	1.43519	$\substack{1.42343\\1.4237}$	$\begin{array}{c} 1.42179 \\ 1.42556 \\ 1.4259 \\ 1.4256 \\ 1.4256 \\ 1.42539 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 1.43078\\ 1.4310\end{array}$	1.43456	(1) (44) (26) (3) (25)
Undecanoate Laurate	$1.42693 \\ 1.42991$	$\begin{array}{c} 1.42910\\ 1.43209\end{array}$	$1.43444 \\ 1.43750$	$1.43875 \\ 1.44185$	1.42971	$1.42573 \\ 1.42908 \\ 1.43188 \\ 1.43207 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43171 \\ 1.43$	1.43720	1.44114	(1) (1) (44) (1) (25)
Tridecanoate Myristate	$\begin{array}{c} 1.43247\\ 1.43480\end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 1.43470\\ 1.43701 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 1.44012\\ 1.44248\end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} \textbf{1.44451} \\ \textbf{1.44683} \end{array}$		$1.4318 \\ 1.4320 \\ 1.43470 \\ 1.43702 \\ 1.43683 \\ 1.4370$			(3) (22) (1) (1) (25) (3)
Pentadecanoate	1.43690	1.43914	1.44464	1.44902		$1.4368 \\ 1.4369 \\ 1.4390 \\ 1.43909$			(22) (46) (32) (1)

		Refractive Inc	T. lex of Saturat	ABLE II ed Fatty Acid	l Methyl Este	rs; 40C			
Compound		Measure	d values		Literature values				
Compound	Ha	NaD	Hβ	$H_{\gamma}$	Ha	Nap	Hβ	$H_{\gamma}$	- Ref
Acetate	1,34943	1.35116	1.35532	1.35859		1.35193			(40)
Propionate	1.36499	1.36681	1.37119	1.37467	1.36494	1.36680	1.37130		(41)
Butyrate	1.37599	1.37786	1.38239	1.38597		100000	1.01100		(41)
Valerate	1.38621	1.38814	1.39284	1.39663					
Caproate	1.39432	1.39631	1,40115	1.40504					
Oenanthate	1.40099	1.40301	1.40796	1.41189					
Caprylate	1.40650	1.40857	1.41358	1.41762					
Pelargonate	1.41128	1.41336	1.41842	1.42256					
Caprate	1.41531	1.41741	1,42256	1.42669		1.4174			(25)
Undecanoate	1.41881	1.42095	1.42616	1.43034					(20)
Laurate	1.42186	1.42401	1.42924	1.43346		1.4239			(25)
						1.4238			(27)
Tridecanoate	1.42447	1.42665	1,43192	1.43615	:				(21)
Myristate	1.42684	1.42905	1.43436	1.43867		1.4290			(25)
Pentadecanoate	1.42902	1.43122	1.43659	1.44092					(20)
Palmitate	1.43094	1.43318	1.43856	1.44286	}	1.4330			(25)
						1.43314			$1 \left( \frac{7}{7} \right)$
Heptadecanoate	1.43269	1.43492	1.44033	1.44460					
Stearate	1.43426	1.43651	1.44195	1.44632		1.43649			(7)
						1.4365			(25)
						1.4370			(28)
Nonadecanoate	1.43570	1.43796	1,44342	1.44786	l				(10)

		Refra	ctive Index	of Some U	ABLE III nsaturated [	Fatty Acid I	Methyl Este	ers			
				Measure	ed values				Liter	ature	
Compound	200				40C				20C	40C	Ref
	Ha	Nad	Hβ	$H_{\gamma}$	Hα	Nad	Hβ	$H_{\gamma}$	N	ар	
Oleate	1.44962	1.45214	1.45834	1.46339	1.44203	1.44450	1.45052	1.45549	$1.45195 \\ 1.4522 \\ 1.45214 \\ 1.4521$	$1.4443 \\ 1.44460 \\ 1.4445$	$(25) \\ (45) \\ (7) \\ (28) \\ (19)$
Linoleate	1.45871	1.46150	1.46841	1.47404	1.45109	1.45385	1.46060	1.46615	$1.4523 \\ 1.4612 \\ 1.4613 \\ 1.4618$		(20) (30) (36, 43)
Linolenate	1,46825ª	1.47133	1.47896	1.48530	1,46074	1.46381	1.47130	1.47752	1.4616 1.4709		(25) (43)
Erucate	1.45332	1.45583	1.46200	1.46709	1.44581	1.44828	1.45435	1.45940	$1.4711 \\ 1.4558 \\ 1.45558$	1.44812	$(25) \\ (42) \\ (7)$

\* Contains 27.5% trans double bonds.

Measurements of the refractive index were carried out on a Pulfrich refractometer. Distilled water was used as the calibrating agent and the values presented by Tilton and Taylor (38) accepted as standards. Purified benzene was used as a secondary check for which the values of Barbaudy (4) and of Campbell and Miller (6) were applied. Temp readings were carried out with a calibrated thermometer and the obtained values corrected for the protruding mercury thread. In general, three readings were made of each point. More readings were usually necessary for the  $H_{\gamma}$  line. Due to the very weak character of the band, readings could not be effected with a high degree of precision, and in comparison to the other measurements the accuracy of the  $H_{\gamma}$  values is, therefore, much lower.

The obtained values show in Tables I, II, and III, and compared with some values from the literature. Large differences are sometimes noted. In many cases, however, it is generally possible to doubt the purity of these compounds. Values which deviate significantly from the average values have been deleted.

A good concurrence is generally observed with data with a high degree of reliability, e.g., with the values of Adriaanse (1), whose compounds are purer than 99.6% as derived from melting graphs.

The Smittenberg Relations. The relation was first proposed by Smittenberg and Mulder (35)

$$\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{y}_{\infty} + \mathbf{A}/(\mathbf{B} + \mathbf{n})$$
[1]

and can be applied to the eight series obtained for the saturated fatty acid methyl esters. In this relation:

- y = physical constant, in this particular case the refractive index,
- $y_{\infty}$  = the limiting value of this physical constant,
- n = the number of C-atoms in the fatty acid chain, A and B are constants.

 $\mathbf{y}_{\mathbf{x}}$ , A, and B have been calculated assuming two alternatives:

- 1) All measured terms are taken into consideration.
- 2) The lower members are neglected and only those terms from methyl caproate and higher are considered. For the Na<sub>D</sub>-series at 20C the values of A and B have also been calculated assuming  $n_{D,\infty}^{20}$  to be 1.4752, the limiting value of the hydrocarbons (35). The obtained values are presented in Table IV.

Assuming the Smittenberg relation to be essentially correct, an estimate of the contribution of error from the measurements and from the impurities in the samples may be obtained from the variance estimate

$$\sigma^2 = \delta^2 / (m - 3)$$
 [2]

 $\sigma =$ standard deviation,

- $\delta = \text{difference}$  between measured and computed values,
- m = number of terms considered.

The data obtained from this relation can be applied to an analysis of variance for the resolution of errors.

To compare the relative merits of the obtained numerical values it will be necessary to apply the Variance Ratio Test to any two alternative type relations. Reference is made to the previous communication where the density has been subjected to

TABLE IV Numerical Values for the Smittenberg Relation for Saturated Fatty Acid Methyl Esters

Temp	n	Line	уz	A	В	σ
20C	$\geq 2$	Ha	1.47701	-0.78793	4.6948	0.000278
		Nad	1.47941	-0.79053	4.6783	0.000286
		Hβ	1.48572	-0.80742	4.7089	0.000269
		$H_{\gamma}$	1.49058	-0.81600	4.6970	0.000266
40C	$\geq 2$	$H_a$	1.46910	-0.78185	4.4874	0.000363
		Nap	1.47163	-0.78852	4.4999	0.000363
		Ha	1.47762	-0.80114	4.5052	0.000370
		$H_{\gamma}$	1.48237	-0.80937	4.4923	0.000385
20C	$\geq 6$	Ha	1.47472	-0.72332	4.1238	0.000025
		Nap	1.47706	-0.72436	4.0969	0.000021
		He	1.48348	-0.74438	4.1662	0.000034
		H <sub>2</sub>	1.48799	-0.74259	4.0645	0.000060
40C	$\geq 6$	Ha	1.46721	-0.72159	3.8979	0.000030
		Nap	1.46977	-0.72922	3.9252	0.000025
		Hø	1.47579	-0.74318	3.9550	0.000029
		H	1.48057	-0.75210	3.9560	0.000042
20C	$\geq 5$	Nad	1.4752	-0.67417	3.6358	0.000081

this test. It will be also apparent that for the refractive index significant deviations are observed if the lower members of the homologous series are included in the calculations. Geelen (12) described the relation of Smittenberg as a transformation of the function

$$y = y_{x} + A/n + B/n^{2} + C/n^{3} + D/n^{4} + [3]$$

in which the fourth and consecutive terms are neglected. It will be apparent that for the higher homologs this assumption is generally quite permissible, but that for the first members of the series appreciable deviations may occur. This phenomenon has been observed in the densities and in other physical constants under investigation.

The Molar Refraction. The molar refraction according to Lorentz-Lorenz,

$$R_m = (n^2 - 1)M/(n^2 + 2)d$$
 [4]

has been computed for the investigated compounds. In this equation n is the refractive index, M the molecular weight, and d the density.  $CH_2$  increments have been computed as differences between consecutive members of the saturated series. Except for the lower members, where (as already noted by Eykman in 1895) appreciable deviations occur, this value is constant for the whole investigated range.

A closer look at the increments, however, indicates the existence of a slight trend of  $R_{CH_2}$  decreasing with increasing chain length. The inconsistency of  $R_{CH_2}$ , the CH<sub>2</sub> increment, has been noted before. Weber et al. (33) demonstrated that  $R_{CH_2}$  is not completely independent of the molecular weight. Although the noted deviations are still within the limits of experimental error it seems advisable that for precise determinations one should avail oneself of the more general relation

$$\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{m}} = \mathbf{A} + \mathbf{n} \mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{CH}_2} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{n})$$
 [5]

Assuming that  $CH_2$  increment to be constant (which will only introduce a small error) use can be made of the relation

$$\mathbf{R}_{\mathrm{m}} = \mathbf{A} + \mathbf{n}\mathbf{R}_{\mathrm{CH_2}}$$
 [6]

to correlate the values of the molar refraction.

From the observed data the eight regression equations have been computed. To obviate the effect of the primary terms only methyl caproate and the higher terms are taken into consideration. Numerical values for the regression equations show in Table V. The product moment correlation coefficient is practically 1 for all observed series.  $R_{CH_2}$  is, therefore, the statistical average of the computed  $CH_2$  increments. Some comparative data are presented in Table VI. Due to the abundance of available values a rather random selection has been made.

TABLE V Numerical Values in Regression Equations for Saturated Fatty Acid Methyl Esters

Temp	Line	A	RCH2	σ
20C	Ha	8.228	4.6203	0.0040
	Nap	8.267	4.6407	0.0046
	Ha	8.345	4.6920	0.0040
	$\mathbf{H}_{\gamma}$	8.413	4.7324	0.0070
40C	$H_{a}$	8.278	4 6262	0.0108
	Nan	8.311	4.6473	0.0100
	$\mathbf{H}_{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$	8.398	4.6977	0.0097
	н <sup>′</sup>	8.468	4 7380	0.0088

Assuming a linear behaviour in the investigated range the temperature dependence of the  $CH_2$  increment may be assessed from

> $H_a: R_{CH_2} = 4.614 + 0.0003$  t [7]

 $Na_{D}: R_{CH_2} = 4.634 + 0.00033 t$ [8]

 $H_{\beta}: R_{CH_2} = 4.686 + 0.0003$  t [9]

$$H_{\gamma}: R_{CH_2} = 4.727 + 0.00028 t$$
 [10]

where t is the temperature in degrees C.

Unsaturation. An estimate of the increment of the double bond, R<sub>f</sub>, may be obtained from the molar refractions of the unsaturated compounds in our investigations and from methyl stearate and behenate. Molar refractions of these saturated esters can be obtained from the regression equations, numerical values for which are presented in Table V. Rf was computed as the difference between the molar refractions of stearate and oleate, oleate and linoleate, and behenate and erucate. Due to the high percentage of trans double bonds in methyl linolenate the difference between this compound and methyl linoleate may not be applied for computing R<sub>f</sub>. This value is also significantly different in comparison to the other observed Rf values.

As already noted previously (13,15) it seems that the increment of the first double bond is not equal to the contribution of additional non-conjugated double bonds in the same chain.

The averaged values and some comparative data show in Table VII. Due to the small number and due to the low precision of these measurements no values are suggested for  $H_{\gamma}$ .

Limiting Value of the Refractive Index. The molar refraction of the members of a homologous series may be represented by the relation:

$$R_{\rm m} = A + nR_{\rm CH_2}$$
[11]

The mol wt may be represented by a relation identical to this, i.e.,

$$M = C + 14.026 n$$
 [12]

The specific refraction may be obtained by combing these two relations, i.e.,

$$r_{sp} = R_m/M = (A + nR_{CH_2})/(C + 14.026 n)$$
 [13]

From this relation the limiting value of the specific refraction is obtained as

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} r_{sp} = R_{CH_2}/14.026 = (n_{\infty}^2 - 1)/(n_{\infty}^2 + 2) d_{\infty} [14]$$

TABLE IV CH<sub>2</sub> Increments at 20C

Author		Rc	N7	D.(		
Author	Hα	NaD	Hβ	$H_{\gamma}$	rear	Ker
Eisenlohr Fajans and Knorr Wibaut and Langedijk Vogel Teis et al Adriaanse	4.598 4.624	$\begin{array}{r} 4.618 \\ 4.64 \\ 4.639 \\ 4.648 \\ 4.643 \\ 4.643 \\ 4.641 \end{array}$	4.668 4.695	4.710 4.735	1910 1926 1940 1946 1958 1960	$(8) \\ (10) \\ (47) \\ (18,44) \\ (37) \\ (1) $

TABLE VII Increment of the Double Bond at 20C

Author	Hα	Nad	Hβ	$H_{\gamma}$	Year	Ref
Eisenlohr Fajans & Knorr	0.498	$0.467 \\ 0.47$	0.406	0.351	1910 1926	(8)
Vogel Hammond & Lundberg	0.507	0.481	0.413	0.360	$1948 \\ 1954$	(44) (15)
Tels et al This work	0.40	$0.24 \\ 0.35$	0.27		1958	(37)

The limiting values of the density of the saturated fatty acid methyl esters, i.e., 0.85407 at 20C and 0.84225 at 40C, have already been reported previously (13). Substitution of these values in equation 14 yields the limiting refractive index.

	20C	$40\mathrm{C}$
$H_a$	1.47460	1.46764
Na <sub>D</sub>	1.47704	1.47010
$H_{\beta}$	1.48323	1.47607
$H_{\gamma}$	1.48810	1.48085

Comparison of these values with the data obtained from the Smittenberg relation (Table IV) indicates a large degree of agreement although two different approaches have been applied. Especially the values at 20C demonstrate a remarkable concurrence, but the excellent fit is probably fortuitous.

### REFERENCES

- Adriaanse, N., Thesis Amsterdam, (1960).
   Albert, O., Z. Phys. Chem. 1824, 423 (1938).
   Althouse, P. M., G. W. Hunter, and H. O. Triebold, JAOCS 24, 7 (1947).

- Althouse, P. M., G. W. Hunter, and H. O. Triebold, JAOCS 24, 257 (1947).
   Barbaudy, J., J. Chim. Phys. 23, 289 (1926).
   Barbaudy, J., J. Chim. Phys. 23, 289 (1926).
   Booys, C. L. de, Thesis Delft (1955).
   Campbell, A. N. and S. T. Miller, Can. J. Res. 25B, 228 (1947).
   Craig, B. M., Can. J. Chem. 31, 499 (1953).
   Eisenlohr, F., Z. Phys. Chem. 75, 585 (1910).
   Eykman, J. F., Rec. Trav. Chim. 14, 185 (1895); 15, 52 (1896);
   Chem. Weekblad 4, 41, (1906); 6, 699, (1909).
   Io. Fajans, K. and C. A. Knorr, Ber. deut. chem. Ges. 59, 249 (1926). (1926)

- (1926).
  11. French, C. M., Trans. Farad. Soc. 43, 356 (1947).
  12. Geelen, H., Thesis Delft (1956).
  13. Gouw, T. H. and J. C. Vlugter, JAOCS 41, 142 (1964).
  14. Grignard, V., G. Dupont and R. Locquin., Traitè de Chimie Organique. Masson et Cie. Paris 1939. Tome IX.
  15. Hammond, E. G., and W. O. Lundberg, JAOCS 31, 427 (1954).
  16. Hanotte, Th., Bull. Soc. Chim. Belge 35, 96 (1926).
  17. Hofmann, H. E. and E. W. Reid, Ind. Eng. Chem. 21, 957 (1920).
- (1929)

- Hormann, H. E. and E. W. Keid, Ind. Eng. Chem. 21, 954 (1929).
   18. Jeffery, G. H. and A. I. Vogel, J. Chem. Soc., 658 (1948).
   Khan, N. A., JAOCS 30, 40 (1953).
   Khan, N. A., JAOCS 30, 40 (1953).
   Khan, N. A., JAOCS 40, 40 (1953).
   Knan, Y. C. Boelhouwer, M. Tels and H. I. Waterman, Ibid. 34, 336 (1957).
   Landolt, H., Ann. Phys. u. Chem. 122, 552 (1864).
   Magnusson, J. R. and E. G. Hammond, JAOCS 36, 339 (1959).
   Mathews, J. H., J. Franklin Inst. 177, 673 (1914).
   Mathews, J. H., J. Am. Chem. Soc. 48, 571 (1926).
   Mattil, K. F. and H. E. Longenecker, Oil & Soap 21, 16 (1944).
   Naves, Y. R., Helv. Chim. Acta 32, 2306 (1949).
   Neves, Y. R., Helv. Chim. Acta 32, 2306 (1949).
   Raiston, A. W., "Fatty Acids and Their Derivatives," John Wiley and Sons, New York, 1948, p. 502.
   Riemenschneider, R. W., S. F. Herb and P. L. Nichols Jr., JAOCS 26, 371 (1949).
   Rose, A., J. A. Acciari, C. Johnson and W. W. Sanders, Ind. Eng. Chem. 49, 104 (1957).
   Ruhoff, J. R. and E. E. Reid, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 55, 3827 (1933).
   Schenk P. A. B. H. Vervoorn H. I. Waterman and A. B. B.

- 32. KU1001, J. K. and D. M. 2011, 1933.
  (1933).
  33. Schenk, P., A. B. H. Vervoorn, H. I. Waterman and A. B. R. Weber, J. Inst. Petr. 42, 205 (1956).
  34. Schjänberg, E., Z. Phys. Chem. 172A, 197 (1935).
  35. Smittenberg, J. and D. Mulder, Rec. Trav. Chim. 67, 813

- (1948).
  36. Swift, C. E., W. G. Rose and G. S. Jamieson, Oil & Soap 20, 249 (1943).
  37. Tels, M., A. J. Kruidenier, C. Boelhouwer and H. I. Waterman, JAOCS 35, 163 (1958).
  38. Tilton, L. W. and J. K. Taylor, J. Res. Nat. Bur. Stand. 20, 419 (1938).
- 38. 1000, D. W. and D. A. Physico-chemical Constants of Pure Organic Compounds," Elsevier (1950).
  40. Timmermans, J. and Mme Hennaut-Roland., J. Chim. Phys. 52, 223 (1955).
  41. Timmermans, J. and Mme Hennaut-Roland., *Ibid.* 56, 984
- 41. Timmermans, J. and Mine Reinder 1997.
  (1959).
  42. Toyama, Y., J. Chem. Ind. Japan 25, 1503 (1922).
  43. Vandenheuvel, F. A. and E. H. Farmer, JAOCS 28, 512 (1951).
  44. Vogel, A. I., J. Chem. Soc. 133, (1946); 634, (1948).
  45. Wheeler, D. H. and R. W. Riemenschneider, Oil & Soap 16, 207 (1939).
  46. Whitmore, F. C. L. H. Sutherland and J. N. Cosby, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 64, 1362 (1942).
  47. Wibaut, J. P. and S. L. Langedijk, Rec. Trav. Chim. 59, 1220 (1940). Timmermans, J. and Mme Hennaut-Roland., Ibid. 56, 984

- (1940). 48. Zincke, Th. and A. Franchimont., Lieb. Ann. 164, 338 (1872).

[Received July 19, 1963-Accepted January 2, 1964]