Elmer Alpert in coördinating the clinical investigations.

FUNDAMENTAL RESEARCH GLEN E. ARTH
MERCK SHARP & DOHME JOHN FRIED
LABORATORIES DIVISION DAVID B. R. JOHNSTON
MERCK & CO., INC. DALE R. HOFF
RAHWAY, NEW JERSEY LEWIS H. SARETT
ROBERT H. SILBER
MERCK INSTITUTE FOR HERBERT C. STOERK
THERAPEUTIC RESEARCH CHARLES A. WINTER
RECEIVED MAY 12, 1958

CONDUCTANCE OF IONOPHORES

Sir:

Recently,[1-3] equations were presented which permit calculation of conductance for 1-1 electrolytes in terms of three arbitrary parameters: Λ_0, the limiting equivalent conductance, a, the center-to-center distance at contact of cation and anion and K_A, the association constant. These equations have since been revised; the final results, given below, are much more convenient for practical computations. The algebraic form of the equations has been rearranged. The dilemma regarding the Stokes radius in the velocity term of the relaxation field has been resolved. A virtual force arising from asymmetry of osmotic pressure has been included. When association is slight, the $c^{1/2}$ terms are negligible for $\kappa a < 0.2$; when association is not negligible, the $c^{1/2}$ term in activity completely swamps the J_2 term; hence the latter has been dropped. In order to save space, all symbols not explicitly defined here will have the meanings given in refs. 1-3.

Define $\Lambda_\eta \equiv (1 + Fc)$ where $Fc = 5\phi/2$. This is the observed conductance, corrected for *volume* viscosity (see first column, p. 3309[3]). This becomes the dependent variable if viscosity data are available; if not, the viscosity effect is approximated by moving $(-F\Lambda_0 c)$ to the right as before. Then for negligible association, $\Lambda_\eta = (\Lambda_0 - Sc^{1/2} + Ec \log c + Jc)$, where $J = (\sigma_1 \Lambda_0 + \sigma_2)$ replaces the former J_1. Here

$$\sigma_1 = (\kappa^2 a^2 b^2/12c)[h(b) + 0.9074 + \ln (\kappa a/c^{1/2})] \quad (1)$$

$$\sigma^2 = \alpha\beta + (11\beta\kappa a/12c^{1/2}) - (\kappa ab\beta/8c^{1/2})[1.0170 + \ln (\kappa a/c^{1/2})] \quad (2)$$

$$h(b) = (2b^2 + 2b - 1)/b^3. \quad (3)$$

Define $\Lambda_\eta' \equiv (\Lambda_\eta + Sc^{1/2} - Ec \log c)$. For the Owen and Zeldes[4] data on potassium halides at 25°, a plot of Λ_η' against c is accurately linear. The intercept at $c = 0$ evaluates Λ_0 and the slope gives J. The $\dot{a}$ — values found are: KCl, 3.07; KBr, 3.26; KI, 3.50. These values agree well with the sums of the corresponding crystallographic radii.

When association is not negligible, γ_0 is computed as before. Then Λ_η' becomes $(\Lambda_\eta + Sc^{1/2} \gamma_0^{1/2} - Ec \gamma_0 \log c \gamma_0)$ where

$$\Lambda_\eta = \Lambda_0 - Sc^{1/2}\gamma_0^{1/2} + Ec\gamma_0 \log c\gamma_0 + Jc\gamma_0 - K_A c\gamma_0 f^2 \Lambda_\eta \quad (4)$$

The quantities $\Delta\Lambda$, y and x are *redefined* as follows: $\Delta\Lambda \equiv (\Lambda_\eta' - \Lambda_0) = (Jc\gamma_0 - K_A c\gamma_0 f^2 \Lambda_\eta)$; $y = \Delta\Lambda/c\gamma_0$ and $x = f^2\Lambda_\eta$. Again trial values of Λ_0

are used until the one is found which linearizes the y-x plot. The slope gives K_A; then from $y(0) = (J - K_A\Lambda_0)$, J and hence a are evaluated. If K_A is known (*e.g.*, by extrapolation of log K_A *vs.* $1/D$), define $\Lambda_J \equiv (\Lambda_\eta' + K_A c\gamma_0 f^2 \Lambda_\eta)$. A plot of Λ_J against $c\gamma_0$ is linear with slope and intercept equal to J and Λ_0, respectively. Alternatively, if a is known, define $\Lambda_K \equiv (\Lambda_\eta' - Jc\gamma_0)$. Then a plot of Λ_K against $c\gamma_0 f^2 \Lambda_\eta$ determines Λ_0 and K_A. Equation 4 applied to the Mercier and Kraus[5] data for Bu$_4$NBr in dioxane–water lead to a-values $4.8 \leq a \leq 5.4$. The spread is much less than that reported before; we therefore believe the present equations represent a better approximation. Details will be presented later.

(5) P. Mercier and C. A. Kraus, *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci.*, **41**, 1033 (1955).

INSTITUTO DI CHIMICA-FISICA
UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DI ROMA RAYMOND M. FUOSS
ROME, ITALY
RECEIVED MAY 1, 1958

RETARDATION OF EXCHANGE PROCESSES BY MOLECULAR ASSOCIATION: METHYL ALCOHOL

Sir:

In high resolution nuclear magnetic resonance studies of liquids, exchange processes frequently preclude the observation of spin–spin multiplets.[1] In specific cases one can reduce the rate of exchange by carefully purifying the sample.[2-4] In some instances, however, an alternative procedure can be employed which provides information concerning exchange processes and molecular complexes in liquid systems. This is achieved by adding to the sample a complexing agent which preferentially forms a stable molecular complex with the sample under study and, consequently, decreases the rate of exchange.

As an example, consider the proton magnetic resonance spectrum of methyl alcohol. The spin–spin multiplets which should be observable in the spectrum of this molecule have long eluded detection, presumably because of exchange effects. On the other hand, in solutions containing sufficient quantities of acetone, hydrogen bonding increases the lifetime of –OH group protons in enough molecules to reveal the fine structure. Figure 1 shows the spectrum of methyl alcohol as observed at 40 Mc. in a solution of acetone containing 25% CH$_3$OH by volume. The theoretical spectrum for the special case of $J/\delta = 0.21$ is added for comparison. The experimental trace gives $J = 4.8$ sec.$^{-1}$ and $\delta = 22.8$ sec.$^{-1}$. It should be noted that two of the lines in the observed –OH multiplet are not predicted theoretically. One of these has been shown to be water; the other is attributed to an additional impurity.

Supplementary experiments with methanol and other molecules have shown that (a) by varying the acetone concentration the internal chemical shift can be changed and the concomitant alterations in fine structure observed and compared

(1) H. S. Gutowsky, D. W. McCall and C. P. Slichter, *J. Chem. Phys.*, **21**, 279 (1953).
(2) R. A. Ogg, *ibid.*, **22**, 560 (1954).
(3) I. Weinberg and J. R. Zimmerman, *ibid.*, **23**, 748 (1955).
(4) J. T. Arnold, *Phys. Rev.*, **102**, 136 (1956).

(1) R. M. Fuoss and L. Onsager, *J. Phys. Chem.*, **61**, 668 (1957).
(2) R. M. Fuoss, THIS JOURNAL, **79**, 3301 (1957).
(3) R. M. Fuoss and C. A. Kraus, *ibid.*, **79**, 3304 (1957).
(4) B. B. Owen and H. Zeldes, *J. Chem. Phys.*, **18**, 1083 (1950).