ON THE RELATION BETWEEN ELECTROLYTIC CONDUCTION, SPECIFIC INDUCTIVE CAPACITY AND CHEMICAL ACTIVITY OF CERTAIN LIQUIDS

A CORRECTION

BY JOSEPH HOWARD MATHEWS

Dr. Herman Schlundt has kindly called attention to certain typographical errors which appear in my recent paper¹ bearing the above title. The errors referred to occur in the last column of Table VIII, page 665, and are the result, apparently, of a downward shift of the type of the last five lines. Here the table should read as follows:

Substance	Maker	D. C.	Resonance	Temp.	B. P.	Remarks
Diethylamine	Schuchardt	3.7	Good	23°	—	Schlundt, 3.58
Dibenzylamine	"	3.6	"	23°	—	" 3.55
Diphenylmethane	Trommsdorf	{ 2.5 2.45	{ " " { 18° 18°	{ 243°-44 245°		New sample
Dipropylamine	Schuchardt	2.9	"	18°	110?	Schlundt, 2.9
Dimethylaniline	"	5.0	"	18°	189.5-90	" 5.07

Thus it will be seen, as it was my purpose to show, that our results are satisfactorily concordant. Dr. Schlundt has also called attention to the fact that for tin-tetrachloride he obtained the value 3.20. On page 658 it will be noted that I obtained precisely the same value as was obtained by Schlundt. The value 2.0 given in the table is not correct.

I wish to thank Dr. Schlundt for his kindness in calling attention to these errors.

*Laboratory of Physical Chemistry,
Harvard College, December, 1905.*

¹ Jour. Phys. Chem., 9, 641 (1905).