LMenill

[Reprinted from the Journal of Physical Chemistry, **72**, 603 (1968).] Copyright 1968 by the American Chemical Society and reprinted by permission of the copyright owner.

JAN 23 1969

Thermodynamics of High-Temperature High-Pressure Solutions.

Argon in Molten Sodium Nitrate¹

by James L. Copeland and Lawrence Seibles

Department of Chemistry, Kansas State University, Manhattan, Kansas 66502 (Received July 24, 1967)

The solubility of Ar in molten NaNO₃ has been determined over a temperature range from 356 to 441° at pressures from 151 to 395 atm. Henry's law constants, $K_{\rm h}$, and distribution coefficients, $K_{\rm e}$, were found for the resulting six solubility-pressure isotherms. A plot of log $K_{\rm h}$ vs. 1/T yielded a value for the enthalpy of solution, ΔH , of -1.69 ± 0.21 kcal mole⁻¹. The standard entropy of solution, corresponding to a standard state of 1 M concentrations of gas in both the liquid and gaseous states, $\Delta S_{\rm e}^{\circ}$, resulted as -4.97 ± 0.32 eu from the intercept of a plot of $\log K_c vs. 1/T$. The results are compared to similar work in this laboratory involving N₂ in fused NaNO₃, where $\Delta H = -2.73 \pm 0.09$ kcal mol⁻¹ and $\Delta S_c^{\circ} = -6.78 \pm$ 0.18 eu, and with low pressure work in molten fluoride systems performed in other laboratories where ΔH values were endothermic. Calculations of ΔH 's of solution for both the Ar and N_2 work using approximate fugacities rather than pressures did not change the values appreciably, yielding -1.84 ± 0.21 kcal mol⁻¹ for Ar in NaNO₃ and $-2.69 \pm$ $0.08 \text{ kcal mol}^{-1}$ for N₂ in NaNO₃. Conclusions are drawn which compare the relative contributions of exothermic solvation effects and endothermic molecular cavity creation work in the liquid to the over-all heat of solution. It is seen that predictions based on such a simple model conceived for the N_2 work are, for the most part, reasonably confirmed in the present investigation.

Introduction

In a previous paper the authors reported the results of a study of the temperature and high-pressure dependences of the solubility of N_2 in fused NaNO₃.² The system was found to possess an exothermic heat of solution and a rather high negative entropy of solution. A tentative simple model was advanced which

(1) This work was presented in part at the Third Midwest Regional Meeting of the American Chemical Society, Columbia, Mo., Nov 1967,

Volume 72, Number 2 February 1968

conceived of exothermic solvation effects dominating over endothermic work of molecular cavity creation necessary to accommodate a solute particle. It was predicted that a molecule of comparable size to N_2 , but of less polarizability, such as Ar, should therefore be somewhat less soluble in NaNO₃ than is N_2 , and should have a somewhat less exothermic heat of solution (if indeed exothermic at all). In addition, a monatomic gas, such as Ar, would be expected to suffer a less negative entropy of solution than did the diatomic N_2 molecules. The present investigation serves to confirm these predictions to a large degree.

Experimental Section and Data Treatment

The apparatus and procedure were the same as previously described.² Four separate runs were completed, each at salt temperatures of 714, 701, 679.5, 663, 642, and 629°K to yield six solubility-pressure isotherms consisting of four points apiece. The maximum Ar pressure for any experiment was 395 atm, and the minimum pressure was 151 atm for any run.

As in previous work,^{2,3} the decrease in moles of the gas phase in the system, between a given high temperature and room temperature, was attributed to gas solubility in the melt. The density of liquid NaNO₃, $d_{t,p}$, at a given centigrade temperature, t, and piston pressure, P (atm), used for calculating the total volume of pure salt was obtained from the empirical equation

$$d_{t,p} = 2.134 - (7.03 \times 10^{-4})t + (3.9 \times 10^{-5})P \text{ g cm}^{-3}$$
 (1)

where the temperature coefficient is from the work of Bloom, Knaggs, Molloy, and Welch,⁴ and the pressure coefficient is based on the data of Owens.⁵ An error, which should be well within the experimental error of the over-all procedure, probably persists as the result of using such pure-salt densities as estimates of the actual solution densities.

At the higher temperatures and pressures employed in this work (much above 600°K and 200 atm), use of the best $P-\bar{V}-T$ data available (those compiled by Din⁶) would entail too extensive extrapolations for reasonably accurate estimates of the molar volumes of Ar. Therefore, the Beattie-Bridgeman equation was employed to find \bar{V} at all temperatures and pressures used, for consistency. This equation is usually a quartic in \bar{V}^7

$$0 = P \bar{V}^4 - RT \bar{V}^3 - (RTB_0 - Rc/T^2 - A_0) \bar{V}^2 + (RcB_0/T^2 - aA_0) \bar{V} - RcbB_0/T^2$$
(2)

However, with numerical values for the constants for Ar of ${}^{.8}$ $A_0 = 1.2907$, a = 0.02328, $B_0 = 0.03931$, b = 0, and $c = 5.99 \times 10^4$, the equation reduces to a cubic in \overline{V} for Ar since b = 0

$$f(\bar{V}) = P \bar{V}^3 - RT \bar{V}^2 - (RTB_0 - Rc/T^2 - A_0) \bar{V} + (RcB_0/T^2 - aA_0) = 0 \quad (3)$$

The Journal of Physical Chemistry

 \overline{V} (in l. mole⁻¹) was found for every P-T pair employed in this work by programming an IBM-1410 to calculate \overline{V} from eq 3 by the Newton-Raphson method. Ideal gas values for \overline{V} were used as beginning trial values. Generally, only four iterations were required by the computer to produce an acceptable value of \overline{V} , but in a very few cases five such iterations were necessary. (An acceptable value of \overline{V} was taken to have been attained when the absolute value of $[f(\overline{V})/(df(\overline{V})/d)\overline{V}]/\overline{V}$ was less than 10^{-5} .) To test the accuracy of solutions so obtained for the high-temperature and pressure region, some calculated \overline{V} values were compared to Din's literature values⁶ at the upper end of his table. Table I compares these calculated \overline{V}

Table I:	Comparison of Some \overline{V}_{lit}^6 and \overline{V}_{calcd} Values for	
Argon Ob	tained by Computer Solutions of the	
Beattie-B	ridgeman Equation	

P, atm	<i>Т</i> , °К	\bar{V}_{calcd} , l. mole ⁻¹	\bar{V}_{lit} , l. mole ⁻¹	% diff
180	550	0.2630	0.2622	0.305
180	600	0.2877	0.2864	0.454
200	550	0.2381	0.2371	0.422
200	600	0.2605	0.2590	0.580

quantities with their corresponding literature values. It is seen from this table that the agreement of the \vec{V} values is good. We assumed, therefore, that the Beattie-Bridgeman calculations of \vec{V} for Ar would satisfy our needs in this work.

Average Henry's law constants, $K_{\rm h}$, and distribution coefficients, $K_{\rm c}$, where

$$K_{\rm h} = C_{\rm d}/P \text{ mol of gas cm}^{-3} \text{ atm}^{-1} \qquad (4a)$$

$$K_{\rm c} = C_{\rm d}/C_{\rm g}$$
 (unitless) (4b)

 $(C_{\rm d} = \text{concentration of gas in dissolved phase}, C_{\rm g} = \text{concentration of gas in gaseous phase})$ were calculated for each solubility-pressure isotherm.

Results

Table II summarizes the experimental temperatures, pressures, solubilities, Henry's law constants, and distribution coefficients. Theoretical values of the latter

(2) J. L. Copeland and L. Seibles, J. Phys. Chem., 70, 1811 (1966).

(4) H. Bloom, I. W. Knaggs, J. J. Molloy, and D. Welch, Trans. Faraday Soc., 49, 1458 (1953).

(5) B. B. Owens, J. Chem. Phys., 44, 3918 (1966).

(6) F. Din, "Thermodynamic Functions of Gases," Vol. 2, Butterworth and Co., Ltd., London, 1962, pp 192–193.

(7) C. E. Holley, Jr., W. J. Worlton, and R. K. Zeigler, Project LA-2271, Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory of the University of California, Los Alamos, N. M., 1959.

(8) J. R. Partington, "An Advanced Treatise on Physical Chemistry," Vol. 1, Longmans, Green and Co., Ltd., London, 1949, p 726.

⁽³⁾ J. L. Copeland and W. C. Zybko, *ibid.*, **69**, 3631 (1965).

THERMODYNAMICS OF HIGH-TEMPERATURE HIGH-PRESSURE SOLUTIONS

	D	$C_{\rm d}$,		$K_{\rm h},$			
	P, atm	$\times 10^4$	mo	$\times 10^7$		$K_{c, expt} \times 10$	$K_{\rm c. theor} \times 10$
			,	$r = 714^{\circ}K$		or onpo	.,
	395	6.07		15.4		0 979	0.057
	306	4 75		15.5		0.963	0.001
-	226	4 25		18.8		1 14	
	175	3 05		17.4		1.03	
		0.00	Av	16.8 ± 1.3	Av	1.03 ± 0.06	
			,	70.0 ± 1.0	114	1.00 ± 0.00	
	202		2	= 701 K		1 10	0.051
	382	6.73		17.6		1.10	0.051
	299	4.86		16.3		0.990	
	223	4.04		18.1		1.08	
	170	3.22		19.0		1.09	
			Av	17.7 ± 0.9	Av	1.07 ± 0.04	
			T	$= 679.5^{\circ} K$			
	363	7.44		20.5		1.24	0.041
	285	5.13		18.0		1.06	
5	214	4.02		18.8		1.08	
	166	2.86		17.2		0.970	
			Av	18.6 ± 1.1	Av	1.09 ± 0.09	
			1	$'' = 663 ^{\circ} \mathrm{K}$			
:	353	7.34		20.8		1.22	0.034
-	276	5.48		19.9		1.14	
	207	4 19		20.3		1.14	
	162	2.73		16.9		0.925	
			Av	19.5 ± 1.3	Av	1.11 ± 0.10	
			1	$'' = 642^{\circ} K$			
	241	6.91	10	20.0		1 12	0.027
	041	5 20		10.6		1.15	0.027
	200	2 09		10.6		1.05	
1	156	9 73		17 5		0.032	
,	100	2.10	A	10.9.1.0.0	A	1.06 1.0.07	
			Av	19.2 ± 0.9	AV	1.00 ± 0.07	
			1	$r = 629^{\circ} K$			
5	333	6.65		20.0		1.11	0.023
2	255	5.78		22.7		1.23	
1	196	3.74		19.1		1.02	
1	151	2.86		18.9		0.983	
			Av	20.2 ± 1.3	Av	1.09 ± 0.08	
^a Tempe	eratures are those of t	he fused salt.					

Table II: Summary of Solubility-Temperature-Pressure Data for Argon in Fused Sodium Nitrate^a

quantity are included, as calculated from the naive model of Blander, Grimes, Smith, and Watson⁹

$$K_{\rm c, theor} = \exp(-18.08r^2\gamma/RT) \tag{5}$$

where r is taken as the close-packed radius of the Ar atom, 1.92 Å,⁹ and γ is the surface tension of molten NaNO₃, calculated as a function of temperature from the work of Addison and Coldrey.¹⁰ The errors in Table II are the probable errors for a single observation. Comparison of $K_{c,expt1}$ with $K_{c,theor}$ reveals $K_{c,expt1}$ to be from 18.1 (at 714°K) to 47.4 (at 629°K) times $K_{c,theor}$. Part of the increasingly poor agreement of these two values with lower temperatures stems from the fact that eq 5 conforms to endothermic heats of solution with positive temperature coefficients of solubility, while the present work indicates a negative temperature coefficient of solubility with an exothermic solution enthalpy.

To compare our results with those of workers experimenting on other systems at pressures from 0 to 1 or 2 atm, an enthalpy of solution was calculated from the relationship¹¹

(9) M. Blander, W. R. Grimes, N. V. Smith, and G. M. Watson, J. Phys. Chem., 63, 1164 (1959).

(10) C. C. Addison and J. M. Coldrey, J. Chem. Soc., 468 (1961).
(11) M. Blander in "Molten Salt Chemistry," M. Blander, Ed., Interscience Publishers, Inc., New York, N. Y., 1964 pp 230-233.

Volume 72, Number 2 February 1968

$$d \ln K_{\rm h}'/d(1/T) = -\Delta H/R \tag{6}$$

where $K_{\rm h}' = 10^3 K_{\rm h}$ mol l.⁻¹ atm⁻¹. This equation gives rise to a linear function¹²

$$\ln K_{\rm h}' = -(\Delta H/R)(1/T) + \Delta S_{\rm p}^{\circ}/R$$
(7)

in which $\Delta S_{\rm p}^{\circ}$ is a standard entropy corresponding to a standard state of the gas at 1 atm both inside and outside the melt. In the present work, a least-squares plot of log $K_{\rm h}$ vs. 1/T gives

$$\log K_{\rm h} = (370 \pm 45)(1/T) - (6.28 \pm 0.02) \quad (8)$$

This equation, modified to $\ln K_{\rm h}'$ in eq 7, yields

$$\Delta H = -1.69 \pm 0.21 \text{ kcal mol}^{-1} \tag{9}$$

$$\Delta S_{\rm p}^{\circ} = -15.0 \pm 0.1 \, {\rm eu}$$
 (10)

A more satisfactory form for the standard entropy of solution is obtainable from the intercept of an equation of the form of eq 7 using $\ln K_c$ rather than $\ln K_{\rm h}'^{11,13}$. The ΔS_c° so obtained corresponds to a standard state of the gas at 1 mol $1.^{-1}$ in both phases. A least-squares plot of $\log K_c vs. 1/T$ for this work gives

$$\log K_{\rm c} = (78 \pm 46)(1/T) - (1.08 \pm 0.07) \quad (11)$$

From this

$$\Delta S_{\rm c}^{\circ} = -4.97 \pm 0.32 \, {\rm eu}$$
 (12)

All errors are least-squares probable errors.

Minor errors persist as a result of the use of gas pressures rather than fugacities. In a recalculation of ΔH and ΔS_p° using eq 7, all pressures were converted into fugacities by use of the approximation

$$f = P^2 \bar{V} / R T_g \tag{13}$$

where $T_{\rm g}$ is the gas temperature, and all $K_{\rm h}$ values were accordingly recomputed. The revised values of the thermodynamic properties then resulted as

$$\Delta H = -1.84 \pm 0.21 \text{ kcal mol}^{-1} \tag{14}$$

$$\Delta S_{\rm p}^{\circ} = -15.4 \pm 0.3 \, {\rm eu}$$
 (15)

When these values are taken with their probable errors and are compared to eq 9 and 10, it is obvious that the two set of results, one based on pressures and the other on fugacities, overlap with their probable error brackets.

The results of this work are to be compared to those for N_2 in NaNO₃,² for which

$$\Delta H = -2.73 \pm 0.09 \text{ kcal mol}^{-1} \tag{16a}$$

 $(-2.69 \pm 0.08 \text{ using fugacities})$

$$\Delta S_{\rm p}^{\circ} = -16.6 \pm 0.1 \, {\rm eu}$$
 (16b)

 $(-16.8 \pm 0.1 \text{ using fugacities})$

$$\Delta S_{\rm c}^{\circ} = -6.78 \pm 0.18 \, {\rm eu}$$
 (16c)

It is apparent from Table II, ref 2, and eq 14 and 16a that the temperature dependence of Ar solubility is

The Journal of Physical Chemistry

much less that that for N₂. Indeed, the Ar solubility temperature dependence is so slight that at 642°K the probable error in the average K_h causes it to fall slightly below that for 663°K, when the trend is for gently increasing K_h values with decreasing temperature. The scatter of such data about a small slope is even more pronounced for the average K_c values at different temperatures. Measurements in this work were not carried above 441° and 395 atm because of safety limitations on the equipment at such high temperaturepressure combinations.

A single solubility isotherm at 642°K for Ar in NaNO₃ was determined earlier by Copeland and Zybko³ with the result: $K_{\rm h} = (17.2 \pm 1.7) \times 10^{-7} \text{ mol cm}^{-3} \text{ atm}^{-1}$. The present work value at 642°K of (19.2 ± 0.9) × 10⁻⁷ is seen to overlap with the earlier value when the probable error brackets are considered.

Discussion

Although experimental errors are sizable, some tenuous comparisons and conclusions can still be made. Comparison of the ΔH 's of solution for Ar and N₂ from relations 14 and 16a shows that Ar in NaNO₃ is only about 0.68 times as exothermic as is N_2 in the melt. As pointed out earlier, the temperature dependence of Ar solubility is but very slight. This was predicted by Copeland and Seibles.² In the latter paper, endothermic work of molecular cavity creation against surface tension, to accommodate a solute molecule in the liquid (the basic model of Blander, Grimes, Smith, and Watson⁹), was deemed smaller in magnitude than exothermic solvation effects for N₂ and probably Ar. This was a result of the relatively low surface tension of NaNO₃. Furthermore, the cavity creation work was thought to be about the same for N_2 and Ar, in view of their similar molecular radii (2.00 Å for N_2 , 1.92 Å for Ar). On the basis of this model, Ar was predicted to be somewhat less soluble in NaNO₃ and less exothermic in its enthalpy of solution than is N_2 , basically as a result of the smaller molecular polarizability of Ar (1.734 \times 10⁻²⁴ cm³ molecule⁻¹ for N₂, $1.626 \times 10^{-24} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ for Ar}$).² This would lead to somewhat less ion-induced dipole interactions for Ar than for N₂, giving slightly less Ar solubility and exothermic solution heat, all other factors being considered equal. Actually, Table II compared to the N_2 data of ref 2 indicates that the absolute solubilities of Ar in NaNO₃ (as exemplified by the K_h values) are not significantly different from those of N₂ in the solvent after all. The main difference appears in the relative ΔH values for these gases.

Reiss, Frisch, Helfand, and Lebowitz¹⁴ recognize

(12) J. H. Shaffer, W. R. Grimes, and G. M. Watson, J. Phys. Chem., 63, 1999 (1959).

(13) G. M. Watson, R. B. Evans, III, W. R. Grimes, and N. V. Smith, J. Chem. Eng. Data, 7, 285 (1962).

(14) H. Reiss, H. L. Frisch, E. Helfand, and J. L. Lebowitz, J. Chem. Phys., 32, 119 (1960).

three contributions to the isothermal reversible work, $W_{\rm c}$, required to transfer a gas molecule to the interior of a liquid phase

$$W_{\rm c} = Y_1 + Y_2 + Y_3 \tag{17}$$

 Y_1 is the molecular cavity creation work which may be roughly approximated as

$$Y_1 \simeq 4\pi \gamma r^2 + 4\pi P r^3/3$$
 (18)

(where r is the radius of the created hole) if the microscopic surface tension, γ , can be considered curvature independent. Y_2 is a complicated term for the energy of interaction, involving pair correlation functions acting in the molten salt between solute molecules and ions, and neglecting polarization forces. It is predominantly exothermic. The term Y_3 is the exothermic polarization energy involving the solute molecule of polarizability α and the mean-square electric field, $\langle E^2 \rangle$, it experiences.

$$Y_3 = -(1/2) \ \alpha \langle E^2 \rangle \tag{19}$$

Blander, Grimes, Smith, and Watson⁹ ignored the exothermic Y_2 and Y_3 terms in comparison to the large Y_1 work necessary to accommodate a gas molecule against the high surface tensions of their fluoride melts. They also neglected the second term in Y_1 , since the pressures, P, that they used were small, and they tacitly assumed γ to be curvature independent, as well as to be approximately the same as the macroscopic surface tension. Thus, eq 5 was conceived.

In the present work with Ar, it is apparent that the Y_2 and Y_3 excenergetic terms are not insignificant in comparison to Y_1 , as was found also in the N₂ solubility work.² Thus, choosing as an example from Table II a pressure of 395 atm and a temperature of 714°K, the Y_1 term results as approximately 7.65 kcal mol⁻¹. From the observed heat of solution of Ar of -1.84 kcal mol⁻¹, we conclude that the $Y_2 + Y_3$ exothermic sum

should exceed Y_1 in magnitude by about 1.84 kcal mol⁻¹. Of the Y_2 and Y_3 terms, it is apparent from eq 19 that the Y_3 polarization energy should be larger the greater the α of a solute molecule in the given solvent presenting a fixed $\langle E^2 \rangle$. Thus, at least Y_3 correlates with the observed greater exothermic heat of solution for the more polarizable N₂ molecule in fused NaNO₃ than for the less polarizable Ar molecule in the same solvent. Again, the endothermic Y_1 term should be nearly the same for both molecules in this system. At this point, it is still impossible to draw any quantitative conclusions as to the relative contributions of the extremely complex Y_2 interaction term applied to these two solutes.

As in the N₂ work, the $\Delta S_{\rm e}^{\circ}$ value for solution of -4.97 eu for Ar indicates an unusual environment and set of interactions for the Ar molecule in NaNO₃. This is not quite so pronounced as the -6.78 eu for N₂ in the system. However, as mentioned earlier,² rotational degrees of freedom exist for N₂, and these may be affected in solution, whereas such cannot be the case for atomic Ar. While the value -4.97 eu for Ar is certainly unusually large in magnitude for such a gas, it is not without precedent, since Watson, Evans, Grimes, and Smith¹³ did observe an unusual standard solution entropy of -4.2 eu for both Ar and Ne in a 64-36 mol % LiF-BeF₂ molten solvent. Helium and Xe in the same solvent gave rise to values of -3.4 and -3.1 eu, respectively.

Acknowledgment. The authors gratefully acknowledge support of this work by the National Science Foundation, Grants GP-4274 and GP-7012. They are also extremely grateful to Dr. William H. Honstead and the Department of Chemical Engineering, Kansas State University, for graciously providing laboratory space and facilities for the performance of this work while the normal facilities of the Department of Chemistry were undergoing extensive remodeling.