Pressure (atmos) 1% n-BuOH i	O-H abs maximum (cm ⁻¹) in 2, 3 DMB	Pressure (atmos) 3% n-BuO	O-H abs maximum (cm ⁻¹) H in <i>n</i> PrBr
$\begin{array}{c} 1 \\ 1050 \\ 2100 \\ 3200 \\ 4250 \\ 5300 \\ 7000 \\ 8700 \\ 9525 \end{array}$	3648 3646 3645 3643 3642 3639 3638 3638 3638 3637	$\begin{array}{c}1\\2100\\3700\\5300\\7000\\8600\\10\500\end{array}$	3602 3594 3588 3587 3585 3582 3582 3581
2% n-BuOH in CS2		3% n-BuOH in nPrI	
1 2590 5840 8200 11 330	3624 3618 3609 3603 3600	1 2600 5840 8280 11 550	3594 3582 3563 3558 3553
1% n-BuOH	l in toluene		
1 2250 5300 7150 8500	3606 3598 3592 3587 3584		
1% MeOH in CS1		1% t-BuOH in CS2	
$1 \\ 2420 \\ 5840 \\ 8000 \\ 10 900$	3630 3621 3615 3609 3604	1 2100 5300 8450	3607 3602 3597 3593
2% n-BuC	OH in CS ₂		
$1 \\ 2350 \\ 5450 \\ 8500 \\ 10 200$	3616 3608 3603 3599 3596		

TABLE I. Experimental frequency shifts.

Bridgman's compressibility data¹¹ for the pure solvents we have plotted the frequency shifts against the relative density squared $(\rho/\rho_0)^2$ in Fig. 2. Here ρ_0 is the density at 1 atmos and 25°C. The linearity of these plots strongly suggests that the interaction energy of solute and solvent follows a $1/R^6$ law, where R is the intermolecular distance. In order to corroborate this finding about the density dependence some experiments were run at atmospheric pressure and varying temperature. In the low-temperature runs we observed that the formation of polymeric alcohol rapidly decreased the intensity of the monomer band in favor of the broad polymer band. When the temperature had been lowered to 0°C, the monomer band was completely obscured in the atmospheric water background and the slight frequency shift predicted could not be accurately found. On the high-temperature side, only the higher-boiling solvents could be run and the observations obtained are included in Fig. 2 and Table II as extensions below the $(\rho/\rho_0)^2 = 1$ line.

In the first place the change in temperature varies the

density. One would anticipate additional orientation effects of temperature, however the nPrBr and nPrI curves are seen to extend the pressure data fairly well. The toluene curve on the other hand, breaks sharply in a direction indicating decreased coupling with the alcohol molecules as the temperature is raised. It is interesting to note that an extension of the highpressure toluene data was obtained by raising the temperature of a benzene solution. This possibly indicates a specific interaction between the toluene and the butanol. The relatively small effect with the benzene indicates that the interaction may possibly be with the methyl group in addition to that with the ring. Coulson¹² reports a slight electron deficiency on the methyl group, which could account for this special effect. Unfortunately pressure data with benzene were unobtainable due to its low freezing pressure.

The spectrophotometer traces of the CS₂ solution at three different pressures and the atmospheric water vapor are presented in Fig. 3. The high-pressure curves have been corrected for the increased amount of solution in the light path resulting from the density increase using Beer's law correction. It is possible that an additional correction should be included for the increased window separation due to the expansion of the bomb; however this would be a small effect whose exact magnitude it would be difficult to determine. The shift in the position of the absorption maximum of the sharp peak is the one which we have tabulated and will discuss subsequently, but there is a notable change in the shape, intensity, and position of the polymer peak. (This band is only clearly observable in the CS₂ solutions.) Other authors¹³ have attempted to divide this band into regions attributable to dimer, trimer, tetramer, etc. Since each higher n-mer would involve a lower molar volume, high pressures would favor the higher polymers; thus the shift in the peak of



FIG. 2. Shift from atmospheric pressure frequency in monomer O-H Band $\frac{3}{4}$ % n-BuOH Solutions vs $(\rho/\rho_0)^2$ of solvent. (Origin shifted for each solvent.)

12 C. A. Coulson, Valence (Oxford University Press, London, 1952), p. 313. ¹⁸ R. Mecke, Discussions Faraday Soc. 9, 161 (1950).

¹¹ P. W. Bridgman, Proc. Am. Acad. Arts Sci. 49, 1 (1913); 66, 185 (1930); 68, 1 (1933).