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## FOREWORD

Structure, propulsion, and guidance of new or improved weapons delivery systems are dependent in crucial areas of design on the availability of accurate thermodynamic data. Data on high-temperature materials, new rocket propellant ingredients, and combustion products (including exhaust ions) are, in many cases, lacking or unreliable. This broad integrated research program at the National Bureau of Standards supplies new or more reliable thermodynamic properties essential in several major phases of current propulsion development and application. Measured are compounds of those several chemical elements important in efficient propulsion fuels; those substances most affecting ion concentrations in such advanced propulsion concepts as ion propulsion; and the transition and other refractory metals (and their pertinent compounds) which may be suitable as construction materials for rocket motors, rocket nozzles, and nose cones that will be durable under extreme conditions of high temperature and corrosive environment. The properties determined extend in temperature up to 6000 degrees Kelvin. The principal research activities are experimental, and involve developing new measurement techniques and apparatus, as well as measuring heats of reaction, of fusion, and of vaporization; specific heats; equilibria involving gases; several properties from fast processes at very high temperatures; spectra of the infrared, matrix-isolation, microwave, and electronic types; and mass spectra. Some of these techniques, by relating thermodynamic properties to molecular or crystal structures, make it possible to tabulate reliably these properties over far wider ranges of temperature and pressure than those actually employed in the basic investigations. Additional research activities of the program involve the critical review of published chemical-thermodynamic (and some chemical-kinetic) data, and the generation of new thermochemical tables important in current chemical-laser research.

## ABSTRACT

This report presents recent results of the NBS research program. The nature and scope of the subjects covered may be inferred from the detailed Table of Contents to be found on the following pages. The most significant results may be summarized as follows, under four main headings. (1) Thermodynamic properties of molybdenum compounds-As a necessary preliminary to later measurement of the standard heat of formation of $\mathrm{MoF}_{5}$, that of $\mathrm{MoF}_{6}$ ( $\ell$ ) was determined by solution calorimetry and found to be $\Delta H f^{\circ}=-376.43 \pm 0.52 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}^{-1}$. The related standard heat of formation of $\mathrm{F}^{-}(\mathrm{aq})$ and heat of solution of $\mathrm{NaF}(\mathrm{c})$ are discussed critically. Fifteen new transpiration measurements on $\mathrm{MoF}_{5}(\ell)$ at $70^{\circ}, 90^{\circ}$, and $110^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ are reported. To enable determination of the individual partial pressures of monomer and dimer vapor species, a second vapor-pressure method was developed which reproduced known vapor pressures of iodine to within 1 to $2 \%$. Assuming the $\mathrm{MoF}_{5}$ molecule to have $\mathrm{D}_{3 \mathrm{~h}}$ symmetry, a complete vibrational assignment was made on the basis of new studies (infrared spectra of the matrixisolated vapor, using double-boiler techniques to enhance the monomer; and Raman spectra of the crystal and the liquid). The heat capacity of what is approximately $\mathrm{Mo}_{2} \mathrm{C}$ was measured from 273 to 1475 K using two drop-type calorimeters; these results are consistent among themselves and with two published low-temperature heat-capacity sets of data, and extension of the measurements to well above a first-order transition (at about 1675 K ) is planned. (2) Thermophysical properties of refractory metals and alloys--The subsecond-duration pulse-heating technique previously developed and applied was used to measure simultaneously the specific heat, electrical resistivity, and hemispherical total emittance of two alloys, Ta-10(weight \%) W(1500-3200 K) and $\mathrm{Nb}-1$ (weight \%) Zr (1500-2700 K), with estimated accuracies comparable to those obtained on other samples previously. The specific heats show small departures from the additive values based on the pure components. The electrical resistivity of the former alloy shows significant departure from Mattiessen's law, and that of the latter alloy is $0.5 \%$ lower than for pure Nb . The pulse-technique melting point of $W$ was found to be 3695 K , and that of Nb , 2750 K (both IPTS-68), with estimated uncertainties of 15 K and 10 K , respectively; the electrical resistivities of both metals also were measured above their melting points, and the normal spectral emittance of Nb remained constant at 0.348 ( $\pm 3 \%$ ) during melting. The feasibility of a pulse-heating technique for measuring the heats of fusion of refractory metals was demonstrated by preliminary experiments on Nb ; and the feasibility of another such technique for solid-solid phase transformations at high temperatures was demonstrated by the rate of surface radiance-temperature variation in the gamma-to-delta transformation of Fe , during which the electrical resistivity increased by $0.3 \%$. (3) Chemical kinetics of simple-gas reactions--On the basis of a critical examination of the data (especially shock-tube), suggested thermal rate constants are tabulated for the six
dissociation and recombination reactions (a) $\mathrm{NH}_{3} \rightleftarrows \mathrm{NH}_{2}+\mathrm{H}(0-100 \mathrm{~atm}$, and $200-4000 \mathrm{~K}$ ), (b) $\mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{H}_{4} \rightleftarrows 2 \mathrm{NH}_{2}\left(10^{-5}-100 \mathrm{~atm}\right.$, and $\left.200-3000 \mathrm{~K}\right)$, and (c) $\mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{~F}_{4} \rightleftarrows 2 \mathrm{NF}_{2}\left(10^{-5}-100 \mathrm{~atm}\right.$, and 200-1800 K). The best fit of (a) appears to require external rotation. A satisfactory data correlation of (b) was made using RRKM unimolecular rate theory, and the results are consistent with $\triangle H f_{298}^{\circ}=45.5 \pm 1.5 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}{ }^{-1}$ for $\mathrm{NH}_{2}$ (g) (incorporate in a new thermochemical table) instead of the JANAF-table value of $40.1 \pm 3$. The $R R K M$ data correlation of (c) requires 18.0 kcal ( 0 K ) for the $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{N}$ bond energy (JANAF value, 20.8 kcal ). In addition, a bibliography (1934-June 1972) covers the chemical kinetics of 60 gas-phase reactions of fluorides of $\mathrm{Cl}, \mathrm{N}$, and 0 based on 51 papers, with emphasis on the processes occurring during the thermal decompositions of these fluorides. (4) New ideal-gas thermochemical tables--Based on a critical review and correlation of the up-to-date heat-of-formation and molecular-constant data, new ideal-gas thermochemical tables and texts of the JANAF-Table format are given for 31 simple gas species containing $\mathrm{H}\left(\mathrm{or}^{1} \mathrm{H}\right), \mathrm{D}\left(\right.$ or $\left.^{2} \mathrm{H}\right), \mathrm{F}, \mathrm{C} \ell, 0, \mathrm{~S}$, and/or N . Included are $(H F)_{n}$ with $n=1$ to 7 , and texts (but no tables) for $F$ and $\mathrm{H}_{2} 0$.
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## NEW IDEAL-GAS THERMOCHEMICAL TABLES



## Chapter 1

THE HEAT OF FORMATION OF $\operatorname{MoF}_{6}(\ell)$ BY SOLUTION CALORIMETRY

R. L. Nuttall, K. L. Churney, M. V. Kilday

## 1. Introduction

This laboratory is currently engaged in a program to determine the heats of formation of the lower fluorides (and the oxy-fluorides) of molybdenum. Since it was deemed unlikely that the compound currently of interest, $\mathrm{MoF}_{5}(\mathrm{c})$, could be formed in reasonable quantities by direct reaction of $F_{2}(g)$ with $M o(c)$, two other reaction schemes are being used which involve either $\mathrm{MoF}_{6}(\mathrm{~g})$ or $\mathrm{MoF}_{6}(\ell)$. The first, the method of choice, is the reaction of $\operatorname{MoF}_{5}(c)$ with $\mathrm{F}_{2}(\mathrm{~g})$ to form $\mathrm{MoF}_{6}(\mathrm{~g})$. Because the available quantity of $\mathrm{MoF}_{5}(\mathrm{c})$ and the heat of reaction 1 / were expected to be small, a second, more sensitive, scheme was deemed necessary either as a che ck or as an alternative route. The method selected was the heat of solution of $\mathrm{MoF}_{6}(\ell)$ in base and $\mathrm{MoF}_{5}$ (c) in base containing an oxidant, based on the apparent success of this method with $\mathrm{MoCl}_{5}$ (c) [3], for example. Both methods require an accurate value for the heat of formation of $\mathrm{MoF}_{6}(\ell)$ or $\mathrm{MoF}_{6}(\mathrm{~g})$. Unfortunately, the heat of formation of $\mathrm{MoF}_{6}(\mathrm{~g})$
$\underline{1} /-24 \pm 15$ kcal per mol $\mathrm{MoF}_{5}$ (c) based on an estimated heat of formation of $\mathrm{MOF}_{5}$ (c) [2] and the heat of formation of $\mathrm{MoF}_{6}(\mathrm{~g})$ [1].
derived by solution calorimetry differs from that determined by direct combination of the elements.

Settle et al [l] obtained $-372.35 \pm 0.22 \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}$
for the reaction

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{Mo}(\mathrm{c})+3 \mathrm{~F}_{2}(\mathrm{~g})=\operatorname{MoF}_{6}(\mathrm{~g}) \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

by burning molybdenum sheet suspended on a nickel rod in 14-15 atm of $\mathrm{F}_{2}(\mathrm{~g})$ in a nickel combustion bomb. Correction for unburned molybdenum ( $\leq 4 \%$ of initial sample weight) could be made unambiguously and accurately. While the corrections for the formation of $\mathrm{MoF}_{5}$ (c) (typically $0.10 \pm$ $0.05 \%$ of molybdenum burned), $\mathrm{NiF}_{2}$ (c) formed due to corrosion, and impurities in the original sample were somewhat uncertain, all made relatively small contributions to the resulting value of $\Delta H_{f}^{\circ}\left[\operatorname{MoF}_{6}(\mathrm{~g})\right](0.003 \%, 0.059 \%$, and $0.087 \%$ on the average, respectively). Recalculation of the latter two corrections using newer selected values for heats of formation (see [2,4]) yielded a value of -372.29 kcal [5] for reaction (1).

The only other determination of the heat of formation of $\mathrm{MoF}_{6}(\ell)$ was made by Myers and Brady [6] by measuring the heats of solution of $\mathrm{MoF}_{6}(\ell)$ and $\mathrm{MoO}_{3}(c)$ in 0.531 N aqueous NaOH and of $\mathrm{NaF}(\mathrm{c})$ in 0.531 N aqueous NaOH containing molybdate. These authors calculated their results according to the reaction scheme given by:
$\mathrm{MoF}_{6}(\ell)+8 \mathrm{NaOH}($ soln $)=\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{MoO}_{4}($ soln $)+6 \mathrm{NaF}(\mathrm{c})+4 \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}($ soln $)$
to obtain $-388.6 \pm 4 \mathrm{kcal}$ for the heat of formation of $\operatorname{MoF}_{6}(\ell)$. Recalculation of their results using newer selected values $[2,4]$ of the heat of formation $[\mathrm{NaOH}$. $\left.515 \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right](\mathrm{soln}), \mathrm{MoO}_{3}(\mathrm{c})$, and $\mathrm{NaF}(\mathrm{c})$ yields a value of $-393.2 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}^{-1}$. Using the selected value of 6.66 $\mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}$ for the heat of vaporization of $\operatorname{MoF}_{6}(\ell)$ [5] (based on the measurements of Ruff and Ascher [7], Cady and Hargreaves [8], and Osborne et al [9]), one obtains $-386.6 \pm 4 \mathrm{kcal}$ for reaction (1). The uncertainty in this result greatly exceeds any error due to the failure of Myers and Brady to maintain rigid stoichiometry. The result is $14.2 \pm 4 \mathrm{kcal}$ more negative than that obtained by Settle et al.

Because of this discrepancy and particularly because solution calorimetry involving $\operatorname{MoF}_{6}(l)$ is also to be used to determine the heat of formation of $\operatorname{MoF}_{5}(c)$, it was considered necessary to repeat the measurements of Myers and Brady. We considered it more likely that the error lay in their work than in that of Settle et al.

In the following three sections an outline of the reaction scheme for the solution experiments is given, a summary of experimental method, and a summary and discussion of results.

## 2. Reaction Scheme of Solution Experiments

The actual reaction scheme involves the following five reactions:

$$
\begin{align*}
& \mathrm{MoF}_{6}(\ell)+\left[(8+x) \mathrm{NaOH}+\mathrm{yH}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right](\operatorname{soln})=  \tag{2}\\
& {\left[\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{MOO}_{4}+6 \mathrm{NaF}+\mathrm{xNaOH}+(4+\mathrm{y}) \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right](\text { soln })-\Delta \mathrm{H}_{2}} \\
& \mathrm{MoO}_{3}(\mathrm{c})+\left[(2+x) \mathrm{NaOH}+(3+y) \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right](\mathrm{soln})=  \tag{3}\\
& {\left[\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{MoO}_{4}+\mathrm{xNaOH}+(4+y) \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right](\text { soln })-\Delta \mathrm{H}_{3}} \\
& 6 \mathrm{NaF}(\mathrm{c})+\left[\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{MoO}_{4}+\mathrm{xNaOH}+(4+\mathrm{y}) \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right](\text { soln })=  \tag{4}\\
& {\left[\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{MOO}_{4}+6 \mathrm{NaF}+x \mathrm{NaOH}+(4+y) \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right](\text { soln })-\Delta \mathrm{H}_{4}} \\
& 6 \mathrm{NaF}(\mathrm{c})=6 \mathrm{NaF}(\mathrm{aq})-\Delta \mathrm{H}_{5}  \tag{5}\\
& {\left[(2+x) \mathrm{NaOH}+(3+y) \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right](\text { soln })+6 \mathrm{NaOH}(\mathrm{aq})=}  \tag{6}\\
& 3 \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(\ell)+\left[(8+x) \mathrm{NaOH}+\mathrm{yH}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right](\text { soln })-\Delta \mathrm{H}_{6}
\end{align*}
$$

Adding reactions (2) $-(3)-(4)+(5)+(6)$, one obtains:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{MoF}_{6}(\ell)+60 \mathrm{H}^{-}(\mathrm{aq})=\mathrm{MoO}_{3}(\mathrm{c})+6 \mathrm{~F}^{-}(\mathrm{aq})+3 \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(\ell) \\
& -\Delta \mathrm{H}_{7}
\end{aligned}
$$

Thus, the heat of reaction (7), $\Delta \mathrm{H}_{7}$, is given by

$$
\Delta \mathrm{H}_{7}=\Delta \mathrm{H}_{2}-\Delta \mathrm{H}_{3}-\Delta \mathrm{H}_{4}+\Delta \mathrm{H}_{5}+\Delta \mathrm{H}_{6}
$$

The heat of formation of $\operatorname{MoF}_{6}(l), \Delta \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{f}}^{\circ}\left[\operatorname{MoF}_{6}(l)\right]$, would then be given by the heats of formation of the other species in reaction (7) and $\Delta H_{7}$ :

$$
\begin{align*}
& \Delta \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{f}}^{\mathrm{o}}\left[\mathrm{MoF}_{6}(\ell)\right]=\Delta \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{f}}^{\mathrm{o}}\left[\mathrm{MoO}_{3}(\mathrm{c})\right]+3 \Delta \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{f}}^{\mathrm{o}}\left[\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(\ell)\right]+  \tag{8}\\
& 6 \Delta \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{f}}^{\circ}\left[\mathrm{F}^{-}(\mathrm{aq})\right]-6 \Delta \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{f}}^{o}\left[\mathrm{OH}^{-}(\mathrm{aq})\right]-\Delta \mathrm{H}_{7}
\end{align*}
$$

Apart from experimental uncertainties, the uncertainty in the assumed value for heat of formation of $\mathrm{F}^{-}$(aq) will cause the largest systematic error in the heat of formation of $\mathrm{MoF}_{6}(\ell)$.

Experimental determinations of the heat of reactions (2) through (5) were made; (4) and (5) were done to eliminate possible uncertainties due to the state and impurities of the $\mathrm{NaF}(\mathrm{c})$ sample.

### 3.0 Materials

$\mathrm{MoF}_{6}$ was purchased from Ozark-Mahoning Company. It was purified by trap-to-trap distillation in an all-metal system and was then transferred by distillation into Kel-F (polychlorotrifluoroethylene) bulbs for introduction into the calorimeter. Samples of $\mathrm{MoF}_{6}$ which had received similar treatment were analyzed by freezing point lowering by Krause [10] who found an impurity of .03 mol percent. The nature of the impurity was not determined.

The $\mathrm{MoO}_{3}$ (c) was CP grade and used without further purification. It was examined spectroscopically by the Analytical Chemistry Division, NBS, for metals. The only ones detected in amounts greater than 0.001 percent were Magnesium and Silicon which were in the range 0.001 to 0.01 percent. From the weight change on drying, the percent of water was estimated to be of the order of $0.02 \%$.

NaF was CP grade used without further purification and was not analyzed for impurities. From the weight change on drying, the percent of water was estimated to be of the order of $0.12 \%$.

### 3.1 Sample Bulbs for $\mathrm{MoF}_{6}(\ell)$

The sample bulbs for the $\operatorname{MoF}_{6}(\ell)$ were made from $1 / 2$ inch lengths of $3 / 8$ inch I.D. tubing by sealing on end windows of 0.005 inch film and a $1 / 8$ inch O.D. tube sidearm. The bulbs were filled through the sidearm which was then sealed off. Each bulb was tested for leakage by using a helium leak detector. The thin end windows were all permeable to the helium. A suitable maximum leak rate was chosen that corresponded to bulb leakage and bulbs were rejected if the leak rate exceeded this maximum value.

Some experiments were carried out to test the suitability of $\mathrm{Kel-F}$ capsules for containing the $\operatorname{MoF}_{6}(\ell)$ in a NaOH solution as follows: (1) a bulb was weighed and then soaked in NaOH solution for nineteen hours. It was then washed, dried, and weighed. The change in weight was less than $0.1 \mathrm{mg} ;(2)$ a weighed bulb was filled with $\operatorname{MoF}_{6}(l)$, sealed, and the bulb and remainder of the sidearm were weighed. This bulb was then soaked in NaOH solution for nineteen hours. It lost 5.1 mg of weight. The bulb was
then allowed to sit in the laboratory for ten days. During this time blue (later turning yellow) material formed on the outside of the bulb and small white crystals formed on the inside walls of the bulb above the liquid. The weight of the bulb increased by at least 14.6 mg over the period of ten days. The bulb was then opened under a solution of ammonium hydroxide, allowing the $\mathrm{MoF}_{6}$ to react. The washed and dried bulb had gained 12.6 mg in weight; (3) a sample bulb was made with $1 / 32$ inch thick end windows (instead of the usual 0.005 inch). Leakage through the se windows could not be detected with the helium leak detector. After a period of three weeks this bulb also showed blue colored material on the outside of the windows and white crystals on the inside. It appears from the results of the se experiments that Kel-F does not react with or absorb NaOH solution at room temperature; that it is permeable to moisture, oxygen, and/or $\mathrm{MoF}_{6}$. The consequences of this permeability are discussed further in the section on experimental results.

### 3.2 Calorime ter

The platinum-lined calorimeter used in this work is the precise adiabatic solution calorimeter developed by E. J. Prosen and M. V. Kilday which has been described previously in earlier stages of development [11,12] and in more detail in its present state [13]. The calorimeter has
a solution capacity of $300 \pm 15 \mathrm{~cm}^{3}$ and, when filled with $300 \mathrm{~cm}^{3}$ of $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$, an energy equivalent of approximately 1700 $J \cdot K^{-1}$. The stirring speed of the liquid for most of the experiments was 350 r.p.m. For the experiments involving $\mathrm{NaF}(c)$ and $\mathrm{MoO}_{3}(c)$, the regular platinum sample holder of the calorimeter was used. It has a volume of approximately $2.7 \mathrm{~cm}^{3}$, an opening energy of $0.00 \pm 0.02 \mathrm{~J}$, and is described in detail in ref. [13].

For the $\mathrm{MoF}_{6}$ solution experiments, the regular sample holder was replaced with a Monelframe which held a sample bulb wi th its end windows aligned horizontally. A Monel cutter was provided which cut out the end windows so that solution could flow freely through the bulb during the solution reaction. The energy required to open the bulbs in this way was normally about 0.44 J .

### 3.3 Experimental Procedures

The amount of sample introduced into the calorimeter was determined by weight. The $\mathrm{MoO}_{3}$ and NaF samples were weighed as crystalline solids directly in the sample holder. The weight of $\operatorname{MoF}_{6}(\ell)$ was determined by two weighing schemes, A and B. The empty bulb with its sidearm was weighed (Wl). It was then filled wi th sample and the sidearm sealed off. The filled bulb was weighed (W2). The remaining sidearm was weighed (W3). The sample weight (WA) is then given by: $W A=W 2+W 3-W 1$. After the calorimetric experiment was
complete the now empty sample bulb (with its end windows) was cleaned and weighed (W4). The sample weight (WB) is given by: WB = W2 - W4. In general, the sample weights WA and WB do not agree, WA was always found to be greater than WB. We have used as the weight of sample the average value and have weighted experimental results and assigned uncertainties based on the difference between WA and WB.

The operation of the calorimeter is discussed in detail in reference [13]. Basically the operation consists of measuring a temperature-time curve for four rating (drift) periods, two electrical heating (calibration) periods and the reaction period.

The energy equivalent of the initial calorimetric system is determined from the first rating period, first electrical heating period, and the second rating period, taken in that order. The solution reaction is started after the second rating period by opening the sample container. It is followed by the third rating period. A second electrical heating period is then carried out and is followed by the fourth rating period and an energy equivalent for the final calorimetric system is determined. The temperature rise due to the solution reaction is determined from rating periods two and three and the reaction period. It is combined with the average energy equivalent to determine the enthal py change for the solution reaction.
*After correcting for the opening energy of the sample container and, if added, electrical energy (Eit of Table 6).

The experiments were carried out in six sets. Sets 1,2 , and 3 were for reaction (2) in which $\operatorname{MoF}_{6}(\ell)$ was dissolved in NaOH solution. The primary division between these sets is time but they also may have some procedure changes such as a different tolerance on sample bulb leakage rate. Set 4 is for measurements on reaction (3) where $\mathrm{MoO}_{3}$ (c) is dissolved in NaOH solution. Set 5 and 6 are for measurements on reactions (4) and (5) where $\mathrm{NaF}(\mathrm{c})$ is dissolved in a solution of $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{MoO}_{4}$ and NaOH , and in water, respectively.
4. Experimental Results
4.1 Reaction (2)

The calorimetric data for reaction (2) is presented in Table l. Columns (1) and (2) are set and experiment numbers. Column (3) is the weight of $\mathrm{MoF}_{6}(\ell)$ sample introduced into the calorimeter and is the average of weights WA and WB. Column (4) is the uncertainty in the sample weight given by (WA - WB)/2. Columns (5) and (6) give the electrical energy equivalent of the initial and final calorimetric systems, $E E E_{i}$ and $E E E E_{f}$, respectively. Column (7) gives the temperature rise of the calorimeter due to the reaction, $\Delta R_{c}$, in ohms resistance increase of the platinum thermometer. Column (8) gives $\overline{\mathrm{T}}$, the mean temperature of the reaction. Column (9) gives the concentration of the

NaOH solution initially in the calorimeter. Column (10) gives $\Delta H(\bar{T})$, the enthalpy change for the reaction at the mean temperature, $\bar{T}$.

The experiments in set (1) are considered preliminary. They have two possible sources of error: prereaction and incomplete reaction. If the permeability of the windows of the sample bulb is too great a significant amount of reaction can occur before the bulb is opened to start the solution reaction. This situation can be detected by observing a blue color on the bulb windows before placing the sample in the calorimeter or by observing a larger than normal drift rate during the first rating period. If insufficient time is allowed for the reaction period, the reaction may not be complete before the third rating period is started. This can be detected by a larger than normal drift rate in the third rating period.

Table 2 shows the drift rates and the time allowed for the reaction period for experiments on reaction (2). Columns (8) and (9) are comments on observations concerning the experiment and conclusions drawn from analyses of the drift rate differences, respectively. In the "obs" column, P means possible prereaction; $W$ means a weighing error; W(A) means sample weight by method A was not possible; Sp means that splashing of solution occurred in the calorimeter
as indicated by spots of blue around the top of the calorimeter above the solution (the sample in this experiment was much larger than in the other experiments) ; and St means that there were variations in stirring energy which would invalidate analysis of drift rate differences. In the "Drift" column, $P$ means prereaction and an I means incomplete reaction. Previous experience with this calorimeter indicates that a difference in successive drift rates (D.R.) of greater than $3 \times 10^{-6}$ ohm min ${ }^{-1}$ is significant so we have set the criteria that: P means D.R. (1) -D.R. (3) $\geq 6 \times 10^{-6} \mathrm{ohm} \mathrm{min}^{-1}$ or D.R. (2) -D.R.
(3) $\geq 3 \times 10^{-6} \mathrm{ohm} \mathrm{min}^{-1}$.

I means D.R. (3) -D.R. (4) $\geq 3 \times 10^{-6} \mathrm{ohm} \mathrm{min}^{-1}$.
Based largely on our observations and these criteria, we have rejected some of the experiments and not considered them further in calculations of results. These experiments are marked with an asterisk in Tables 1 and 2.

Table 3 gives the results of calculations of the enthalpy change for reaction (2), $\Delta \mathrm{H}_{2}$. As shown in column (3), the experiments are arranged in order of concentration of base. Columns (4), (5), and (6) give the molar ratios of NaOH to $\mathrm{MoF}_{6}$ (which equals (8+x) in eq (2); $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ to $\mathrm{MoF}_{6}$ (which equals y in eq (2); and $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ to NaOH . A temperature coefficient for $\Delta H_{2}$ of $+0.613 \mathrm{~kJ} \mathrm{~mol}^{-1} \mathrm{~K}^{-1}$ was derived from experiment 584 and the mean of experiments 586 and 588.

This has been used to calculate the values of $\Delta \mathrm{H}_{2}(25)$ given in columns (7) and (8). The uncertainties given in column (9) are derived from the sample weight uncertainties given in Table 1.

### 4.2 Reaction (3)

Table 4 gives the calorimetric data for reaction (3), the solution of $\mathrm{MoO}_{3}$ (c) in NaOH (soln). The column headings have the same meaning as in Table $l$.

Table 5 gives the results of calculations for $\Delta H_{3}$. A value of $\Delta C_{p}=+93.6 \mathrm{~J} \mathrm{~mol}^{-1} \mathrm{~K}^{-1}$ was derived from run 636 and the mean of runs 557,561 , and 634 . It was used to calculate the values of $\Delta \mathrm{H}_{3}(25)$ given in columns (6) and (7).
4.3 Reactions (4) and (5)

Table 6 gives the calorimetric data for reactions (4) and (5), the solution of $\mathrm{NaF}(\mathrm{c})$ in $\mathrm{a} \mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{MoO}_{3}-\mathrm{NaOH}$ solution (set 5) and in $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ (set 6), respectively.

Table 7 gives the results for calculation of $\Delta H_{4}$. $A$ temperature coefficient of $+0.192 \mathrm{~kJ}(6 \mathrm{~mol} \mathrm{NaF})^{-1} \mathrm{~K}^{-1}$ was derived from experiments 635 and 637.

Table 8 gives the results of calculations of $\Delta \mathrm{H}_{5}$. The values of ${ }_{\Phi}$ used to extrapolate to infinite dilution were taken from Parker's compilation [14]. A value of $\Delta C_{p}=$ $-102.37 \mathrm{~J} \mathrm{~mol}^{-1} \mathrm{~K}^{-1}$ was derived from runs 641-642, 647-649, and 643-645 was used to calculate $\Delta \mathrm{H}_{5}^{\prime} / 6$ at 298 K .

Table 9 gives the results of calculating $\Delta H_{7}$ from the data on the previous tables. The uncertainty given in column (9) is that given in Table 1 for $\Delta H_{2}$. The experiments are weighted as shown in column (l0) by giving a weight of 1 if the uncertainty is less than 0.3 kcal and a value of $0.2 /(u n c e r t a i n t y)$ if the uncertainty is greater than 0.3 kcal . The values of $\Delta H_{4}$ for experiments 628 to 633 were obtained by extrapoling data from runs 635, 637 and 565 correlated with respect to base concentration. For experiment 584 to 588 the value of $\Delta H_{4}$ was the average of runs 635 and 637.

The dependence of $\Delta \mathrm{H}_{7}$ on base concentration is small and cannot be determined accurately from the data. We have therefore assumed it to be zero and have calculated a weighted mean value of $-\Delta \mathrm{H}_{7}=153.78 \mathrm{kcal}_{\mathrm{kcl}} \mathrm{mol}^{-1}$ with a standard deviation of the mean of 0.16 kcal . Combining twice this value with our estimates of systematic errors we estimate an uncertainty of 0.50 kcal giving a value of $-\Delta \mathrm{H}_{7}=153.78 \pm 0.50 \mathrm{kcal}$ over the concentration range of the experiments.
8.0 Discussion of Results
8.1 Enthalpy of Formation of $\mathrm{MoF}_{6}(\ell)$ and $\mathrm{F}^{-}(\mathrm{aq})$

In accordance with equation (8) the enthalpy of formation of $\mathrm{MoF}_{6}(\ell)$ can be calculated from $\Delta \mathrm{H}_{7}$ and en thalpy
of formation data for the other species in reaction (7). The needed auxiliary data are:

$$
\begin{align*}
\Delta \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{f}}^{\mathrm{o}}\left[\mathrm{MoO}_{3}(\mathrm{c})\right] & =-178.08 \pm 0.08 \mathrm{kcal}  \tag{5}\\
3 \Delta \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{f}}^{\mathrm{o}}\left[\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(\mathrm{l})\right] & =-204.945 \pm 0.030 \mathrm{kcal}  \tag{4}\\
6 \Delta \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{f}}^{\circ}\left[\mathrm{F}^{-}(\mathrm{aq})\right] & =-477.0 \mathrm{kcal}  \tag{4}\\
6 \Delta \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{f}}^{\mathrm{o}}\left[\mathrm{OH}^{-}(\mathrm{aq})\right] & =-329.82 \pm 0.14 \mathrm{kcal} \tag{4}
\end{align*}
$$

The heat of formation of $\mathrm{MoO}_{3}$ (c) is that selected by Parker [5] of -178.08 kcal to which we assign an uncertainty of 0.08 kcal. The latter value is based on the work of Staskiewiczet al [15] (-177.99 $\pm 0.10 \mathrm{kcal})$ and Mah [16] (178.15 $\left.5^{\dot{\star}} \pm 0.11 \mathrm{kcal}\right)$ rather than the earlier work of Delepine [17] (-167 kcal), Mixter [18] (-185 kcal), Moose and Parr [19] (-175.6 kcal) or Neumann et al [20] (-180.4 kcal). Combining these enthalpies of formation values with the value of $\Delta \mathrm{H}_{7}$ we get for the enthalpy of formation of $\mathrm{MoF}_{6}(\ell)$ :

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Delta \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{f}}^{\mathrm{o}}\left[\mathrm{MoF}_{6}(\ell)\right] & =-376.43 \pm 0.52 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{~mol}^{-1} \\
& =-1574.98 \pm 2.18 \mathrm{~kJ} \mathrm{~mol}^{-1}
\end{aligned}
$$

This value can be compared to the value of $-378.95 \pm 0.22$ kcal mol ${ }^{-1}$ for the enthalpy of formation of $\mathrm{MoF}_{6}(\ell)$ obtained from the recalculated value of the results of Settle et al [1]. The selected value for the heat of formation of $\mathrm{F}^{-}$(aq) [4], $-79.50 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}{ }^{-1}$, has been the subject of considerable controversy. A brief summary of the problem as of 1969 is
given by Armstrong [21] and in 1971 by Vanderzee and Rodenburg [22]. The latter determined a value of -14.72 $\pm 0.10 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}^{-1}$ for the reaction at 25 C .

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{HF}(\mathrm{~g}, \text { ideal })=\mathrm{H}^{+}(\mathrm{aq})+\mathrm{F}^{-}(\mathrm{aq}) \tag{10}
\end{equation*}
$$

This value supports the value selected by Parker [10] of $-14.70 \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}$. Recently, Smith et al [23] determined a value of $-7.691 \pm 0.030 \mathrm{kcal}_{\mathrm{mol}}{ }^{-1}$ for the reaction at 25 C

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{HF}(\ell)=\mathrm{H}^{+}(\mathrm{aq})+\mathrm{F}^{-}(\mathrm{aq}) \tag{ll}
\end{equation*}
$$

Using the value of $7.231 \pm 0.025 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}^{-1}$ for the heat of vaporization of $\mathrm{HF}(\ell)$ to $\mathrm{HF}(\mathrm{g}, \mathrm{ideal})$ in its standard state determined by Vanderzee and Rodenburg [24], one obtains from the previous work of Vanderzee and Rodenburg on reaction (10) an alternative value for reaction (ll) of $-7.49 \pm 0.10 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}^{-1}$. Recently, Settle et al [25] have completed a study of the heat of formation of $H F(l)$ for which they obtain $-72.57 \pm 0.09 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}^{-1}$. In conjunction with the two more recent values for the enthalpy of reaction (1l), this yields values for the en thalpy of formation of $\mathrm{F}^{-}(\mathrm{aq})$ of $-80.26 \pm 0.09 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}^{-1}$ (Smith et al) and $-80.06 \pm 0.14 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}^{-1}$ (Vanderzee and Rodenburg). If we combine the value of enthalpy of formation of $\mathrm{MoF}_{6}(\ell)$ from the results of Settle et al [l] with our value of $\Delta \mathrm{H}_{7}$ and the other auxiliary data given previously, we obtain a value for the enthalpy of formation of $\mathrm{F}^{-}(\mathrm{aq})$ of -79.92 $\pm 0.09 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}^{-1}$.

The heat of solution of $\operatorname{NaF}(c)$ at infinite dilution, $\Delta \mathrm{H}_{5} / 6=+0.221 \pm 0.004 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}^{-1}$, confirms the value of $+0.218 \pm 0.010 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}^{-1}$ selected by Parker [14] (see p. 26) on the basis of very few experimental measurements. The lack of a marked trend of calculated values of $\Delta H_{5} / 6$ with the concentration of $\mathrm{NaF}(\mathrm{c})$ supports Parker's estimates [14] (see p. 56) of $\Phi_{L}$ for aqueous NaF solutions.
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Table 1. Calorimetric Data for Reaction (2)

| Set | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Exp. } \\ & \text { No. } \end{aligned}$ | Sample Mass, g . | (vacuo) <br> Uncert. <br> g. | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{EEE}_{\mathrm{i}} \\ & -17,000 \\ & \mathrm{~J} \text { ohm} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{EEE}_{\mathrm{f}} \\ -17,000 \\ \mathrm{~J} \text { ohm} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \Delta R_{c} \\ & \times \quad 10 \\ & \text { ohm } \end{aligned}$ | $\overline{\mathrm{T}}$, <br> React. <br> ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | [ NaOH ] Moles/ liter | $\begin{gathered} \Delta \mathrm{H}_{2}(\overline{\mathrm{~T}}) \\ -3000 \\ \mathrm{Jg}^{-1} \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 559* | . 5060 | . 0005 | 220.67 | 254.26 | 100413 | 25.549 | . 706 | 419.8 |
| do | 560* | . 3395 | . 0010 | 251.25 | 263.60 | 65751 | 24.783 | . 643 | 340.9 |
| do | 562* | . 1999 | . 0012 | 252.33 | 256.50 | 39160 | 24.627 | . 643 | 377.9 |
| do | 563* | . 2359 | . 0009 | 250.30 | 260.43 | 45603 | 24.666 | . 643 | 333.9 |
| do | 564* | . 2536 | . 0033 | 306.81 | 305.73 | 47590 | 29.620 | . 643 | 245.9 |
| 2 | 583* | . 3542 | . 0028 | 303.83 | 318.18 | 64954 | 35.325 | . 694 | 173.3 |
| do | $584{ }^{1}$ | . $3698{ }^{1}$ | -- | 261.63 | 266.36 | 73648 | 30.155 | . 694 | 434.2 |
| do | 585* | . 5530 | . 0009 | 202.19 | 214.38 | 105552 | 24.470 | . 694 | 283.8 |
| do | 586 | . 5116 | . 0007 | 179.33 | 218.27 | 102591 | 24.410 | . 694 | 448.0 |
| do | 587* | . 8100 | . 0008 | 189.17 | 214.16 | 160735 | 24.363 | . 694 | 412.9 |
| do | 588 | . 2289 | . 0016 | 202.47 | 196.85 | 46008 | 23.993 | . 694 | 455.1 |
| do | 589 | . 2714 | . 0012 | 436.25 | 440.96 | 53369 | 24.905 | . 302 | 427.6 |
| 3 | 611 | . 4266 | . 0008 | -- | 239.30 | 85551 | 25.169 | . 653 | 456.1 |
| do | 612 | . 3348 | . 0000 | -- | 303.22 | 63301 | 25.076 | . 653 | 425.3 |
| do | 628 | . 3610 | . 0016 | 178.75 | 194.81 | 72359 | 24.939 | . 718 | 443.7 |
| do | 629 | . 3963 | . 0007 | 180.57 | 196.00 | 79788 | 24.961 | . 718 | 459.5 |
| do | 630 | . 2353 | . 0009 | 169.30 | 198.51 | 47309 | 24.758 | . 718 | 453.1 |
| do | 632 | .4015 | . 0006 | 161.87 | 147.25 | 80670 | 24.930 | . 718 | 445.6 |
| do | 633 | .4102 | . 0008 | 165.00 | 199.34 | 82372 | 24.945 | . 718 | 449.3 |

## *Preliminary experiments

${ }^{1}$ Mass, Method $B$, the opening energy was 1.5 J rather than 0.44 J

Table 2. Drift Rate Data for Reaction (2)

| Set | Exp. No . | Drift Rate |  |  |  | ReactionTime | Comments |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1 | $2$ | 3 | 4 |  | obsv. | Drift |
|  |  |  | - | $\Omega \mathrm{mi}$ | - | min. |  |  |
| 1 | 559* | 17.4 | 22.0 | 16.9 | 8.9 | 40 | P | P, I |
| do | 560* | 19.2 | 21.4 | 10.1 | 8.3 | 40 | P | P |
| do | 562* | 11.8 | 15.2 | 13.3 | 9.2 | 40 | P | I ? |
| do | 563* | 17.7 | 20.0 | 11.1 | 9.0 | 40 | P | P |
| do | 564* | 22.8 | 29.0 | 16.2 | 8.6 | 40 | P | P,I |
| 2 | 583* | 67.6 | 74.0 | 22.8 | 19.9 | 60 | P, W | P |
| do | 584 | 24.9 | 26.7 | 26.3 | 23.4 | 55 | W (A) |  |
| do | 585* | 48.8 | 49.3 | 23.4 | 24.3 | 25 | P | P |
| do | 586 | 24.1 | 22.5 | 19.6 | 18.7 | 35 |  |  |
| do | 587* | 31.5 | 31.7 | 23.5 | 22.9 | 30 | Sp | P |
| do | 588 | 23.0 | 25.9 | 26.7 | 26.8 | 55 |  |  |
| do | 589 | 24.9 | 24.3 | 24.0 | 23.0 | 45 |  |  |
| 3 | 611 | -- | 10.3 | 12.6 | 10.8 | 55 |  |  |
| do | 612 | -- | 8.1 | 6.7 | 5.3 | 35 |  |  |
| do | 628 | 40.9 | 40.2 | 34.7 | 32.5 | 70 | St |  |
| do | 629 | 36.1 | 35.0 | 34.5 | 32.0 | 85 |  |  |
| do | 630 | 14.0 | 13.0 | 14.3 | 12.9 | 70 |  |  |
| do | 632 | 14.6 | 13.9 | 14.3 | 13.1 | 45 |  |  |
| do | 633 | 14.0 | 13.7 | 10.9 | 9.9 | 75 | St |  |

[^0]Table 3. Calculation of $\mathbb{H}_{2}$

| Set | Exp No . | [ NaOH ] mole/ liter | $\frac{[\mathrm{NaOH}]}{\left[\mathrm{MoF}_{6}\right]}$ | $\begin{gathered} \frac{[\mathrm{H}}{[\mathrm{Mo}} 2 \frac{\mathrm{O}}{\left.\mathrm{~F}_{6}\right]} \\ (\mathrm{y}) \end{gathered}$ | $\frac{[\mathrm{H}}{[\mathrm{Na}} 2 \frac{\mathrm{O}]}{}$ | $<-\Delta H_{2}(25) \longrightarrow$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | kJ mol | kcal mo1-1 | Uncert. <br> kcal mol-1 |
| 3 | 628 | . 718 | 126.54 | 9,806 | 77.49 | 722.90 | 172.78 | 0.77 |
| do | 629 | . 718 | 115.21 | 8,932 | 77.53 | 726.23 | 173.57 | 0.24 |
| do | 630 | . 718 | 194.05 | 15,044 | 77.53 | 724.65 | 173.20 | 0.33 |
| do | 632 | . 718 | 111.31 | 8,628 | 77.51 | 723.30 | 172.87 | 0.05 |
| do | 633 | . 718 | 107.03 | 8,297 | 77.52 | 724.80 | 173.06 | 0.24 |
| 2 | 584 | . 694 | 119.44 | 9,579 | 80.20 | 724.10 | 173.06 | -- |
| do | 586 | . 694 | 86.34 | 6,922 | 80.17 | 723.48 | 172.92 | 0.24 |
| do | 588 | . 694 | 192.96 | 15,477 | 80.21 | 724.72 | 173.21 | 1.22 |
| 3 | 611 | . 653 | 97.58 | 8,318 | 85.24 | 725.64 | 173.43 | 0.31 |
| do | 612 | . 653 | 124.34 | 10,595 | 85.21 | 719.12 | 171.87 | 0.03 |
| 2 | 589 | . 302 | 72.01 | 13,253 | 184.04 | 719.50 | 171.96 | 0.73 |

Table 4. Calorimetric Data for Reaction (3)

| Set | Exp. No. | Sample <br> (vacuo) <br> g | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{EEE}_{\mathbf{i}} \\ -17,000 \\ \mathrm{~J}^{\mathrm{ohm}} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \operatorname{EEE}_{\mathrm{f}} \\ & -17,000 \\ & \mathrm{~J} \text { ohm } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \Delta \mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{c}_{7}} \\ \times 10 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \overline{\mathrm{T}} \\ (\text { React.) } \\ { }^{\circ} \mathrm{C} \end{gathered}$ | [ NaOH ] mole/ 1iter | $\begin{array}{r} -\Delta \mathrm{H}_{3}(\overline{\mathrm{~T}}) \\ \mathrm{J} \mathrm{~g}^{-1} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -\Delta \mathrm{H}_{3}(\overline{\mathrm{~T}}) \\ & \mathrm{kJ} \cdot \mathrm{~mol}^{-1} \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4 | 556 | . 606753 | 101.41 | 119.53 | 192645 | 24.891 | . 706 | 543.26 | 78.196 |
| do | 557 | . 256518 | 361.08 | 365.63 | 79712 | 24.933 | . 304 | 539.56 | 77.663 |
| do | 634 | . 218740 | 117.89 | 122.31 | 68991 | 25.035 | . 694 | 539.97 | 77.722 |
| do | 636 | . 236135 | 223.61 | 219.18 | 73276 | 34.950 | . 694 | 534.40 | 76.921 |
| do | 561 | . 226222 | 139.72 | 147.86 | 71694 | 24.879 | . 643 | 543.32 | 78.205 |

Table 5. Calculation of $\Delta H_{3}$

| Exp. <br> No. | [ NaOH ] moles/ Iiter | $\frac{[\mathrm{NaOH}]}{\left[\mathrm{MoO}_{3}\right]}(2+X)^{3}$ | $\begin{aligned} & {\left[\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right]} \\ & {\left[\mathrm{M} 0 \mathrm{O}_{3}\right]} \\ & (3+y) \end{aligned}$ | $\frac{\left[\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right]}{[\mathrm{Na}} \frac{0}{0 \mathrm{H}]}$ | $-\Delta \mathrm{H}_{3}(25 \mathrm{C})$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | $\mathrm{kJ} \cdot \mathrm{mol} \mathrm{I}^{-1}$ | kcal mol ${ }^{-1}$ |
| 556 | . 706 | 50.77 | 4,000 | 78.80 | 78.182 | 18.687 |
| 557 | . 304 | 52.6 | 9,479 | 180.3 | 77.657 | 18.560 |
| 634 | . 694 | 138.44 | 11,104 | 80.21 | 77.725 | 18.577 |
| 636 | . 694 | 128.31 | 10,288 | 80.18 | 77.852 | 18.607 |
| 561 | . 643 | 124.26 | 10,757 | 86.57 | 78.194 | 18.689 |
|  |  | Mean |  | $=$ | 77.923 | 18.624 |
|  |  | 2 xSdm |  | = | 0.226 | 0.054 |

Table 6. Calorimetric Data for $\Delta H_{4}$ (Set 5) and $\Delta H_{5}$ (Set 6)

| Set <br> No. | Exp. <br> No. | $\begin{gathered} \text { Sample } \\ \text { (vacuo) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & E E E_{i} \\ & -17,000 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & E E E_{F} \\ & -17,000 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \Delta R_{G} \\ \times \quad 10^{7} \end{gathered}$ | Eit | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{T} \\ (\text { React }) \end{gathered}$ | $+\triangle H_{4}(T)$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5 | 565 | $\frac{\mathrm{g}}{.386751}$ | $\frac{\text { Johm }^{-1}}{102.29}$ | $\frac{\text { Johm }^{-1}}{109.84}$ | Ohm 273441 | ${ }_{476.26}$ | ${ }^{\circ}{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | $\frac{\mathrm{J} \mathrm{~g}^{-1}}{22.00}$ |
| do | 635 | . 379646 | 89.75 | 102.23 | 501280 | 863.66 | 25.056 | 17.56 |
| do | 637 | . 383307 | 186.77 | 195.49 | 499182 | 861.99 | 34.969 | 10.02 |
| do | 639 | . 392711 | 337.13 | 332.51 | 493965 | 865.47 | 25.058 | 23.41 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\Delta H_{5}^{\prime}(\mathrm{T})^{*}$ |
| 6 | 641 | . 383806 | 588.39 | 581.82 | 483354 | 861.23 | 25.047 | 28.436 |
| 6 | 642 | . 382450 | 654.37 | 645.02 | 487644 | 862.12 | 35.246 | 3.781 |
| do | 643 | 1.635741 | 610.02 | 568.69 | 460108 | 862.69 | 25.026 | 32.632 |
| do | 644 | . 997894 | 603.59 | 566.16 | 474028 | 863.36 | 25.525 | 29.854 |
| do | 645 | 1.592839 | 653.68 | 631.80 | 486120 | 871.16 | 35.269 | 8.485 |
| do | 646 | 1.600157 | 567.27 | 529.12 | 495350 | 872.95 | 25.089 | 33.266 |
| do | 647 | 1.035573 | 624.92 | 598.69 | 516696 | 863.65 | 35.309 | 5.136 |
| do | 648 | . 633079 | 557.71 | 545.16 | 509222 | 862.26 | 25.091 | 30.682 |
| do | 649 | . 797662 | 558.84 | 540.49 | 506911 | 863.70 | 25.100 | 31.070 |
| do | 650 | . 212321 | 585.81 | 584.69 | 487202 | 862.49 | 25.048 | 27.002 |

*Uncorrected for heat of dilution
***Aded electrical energy

Table 7. Calculation of $\Delta_{4}$

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Exp } \\ & \text { No. } \end{aligned}$ | Init. Soln. | $\begin{gathered} {[\mathrm{NaOH}]} \\ {[6 \mathrm{NaF}]} \\ (\mathrm{x}) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & {\left[\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right]} \\ & {[6 \mathrm{NaF}]} \\ & (4+\mathrm{y}) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & {\left[\mathrm{MoO}_{3}\right]} \\ & {[6 \mathrm{NaF}]} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & {\left[\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right]} \\ & {[\mathrm{NaOH}]} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \Delta \mathrm{H}_{4} \quad \Delta \mathrm{H}_{4}(25) \\ \left.\mathrm{kJ}(6 \mathrm{Mol})^{-1} \mathrm{kcal}_{(6 \mathrm{~mol})}^{6}\right) \end{gathered}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 565 | 561 | 124.97 | 10,820 | 1.00583 | 8658 | 5.538 | 1.324 |
| 635 | 634 | 139.29 | 11,171 | 1.00609 | 80.20 | 4.413 | 1.055 |
| 637 | 636 | 137.90 | 11,059 | 1.07495 | 80.20 | 4.438 | 1.061 |
| 639 | 638 | 60.91 | 11,138 | 1.12673 | 182.86 | 5.887 | 1.407 |

Table 8. Calculation of $\Delta H_{5}$

| Expt. No. | $\frac{\left[\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right]}{[\mathrm{NaF}]}$ | $\begin{gathered} \leftarrow \frac{\Delta H_{5}^{\prime}(2)}{6} \\ \mathrm{~kJ} \mathrm{~mol}^{-1} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -\longrightarrow \\ & \leftarrow \mathrm{kcal} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \varphi_{\mathrm{L}} \\ & \mathrm{~mol}^{-1} \end{aligned}$ | $\xrightarrow{\frac{\Delta \mathrm{H}_{5}}{6}}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 641 | 1898 | 1.1988 | . 2865 | . 066 | . 221 |
| 642 | 1904 | 1.2049 | . 2886 | . 066 | . 223 |
| 643 | 445 | 1.3728 | . 3281 | . 107 | . 221 |
| 644 | 730 | 1.3073 | . 3124 | . 093 | . 219 |
| 645 | 457 | 1.4074 | . 3364 | . 106 | . 230 |
| 646 | 419 | 1.4059 | . 3360 | . 109 | . 227 |
| 647 | 647 | 1.2709 | . 3038 | . 097 | . 207 |
| 648 | 1058 | 1.2942 | . 3093 | . 083 | . 226 |
| 649 | 670 | 1.3148 | . 3143 | . 096 | . 218 |
| 650 | 3431 | 1.1386 | . 2721 | . 052 | . 220 |
|  |  |  | Average $=$ |  | . 221 |
|  |  |  | $2 \mathrm{x} \operatorname{Sdm}=$ |  | . 004 |
| Uncorrected for heat of dilution |  |  |  |  |  |

## Table 9. Ca1culation of $\mathrm{AH}_{7}$

Exp. $\begin{array}{ccccccc}{\left[\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right]} & -\Delta \mathrm{H}_{2} & -\Delta \mathrm{H}_{3} & \Delta \mathrm{H}_{4} & \Delta \mathrm{H}_{5} & \Delta \mathrm{H}_{6}{ }^{*} & -\Delta \mathrm{H}_{7}\end{array}$ Uncert. ${ }^{* *}$ Weight No. [ NaOH ]

| 628 | 77.49 | 172.78 | 18.624 | (0.951) | 1.326 | 0.259 | 153.52 | 0.77 | 0.260 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 629 | 77.53 | 173.57 | do | do | do | do | 154.31 | 0.24 | 1 |
| 630 | 77.53 | 173.20 | do | do | do | do | 153.94 | 0.33 | 1 |
| 632 | 77.51 | 172.87 | do | do | do | do | 153.61 | 0.05 | 1 |
| 633 | 77.52 | 173.06 | do | do | do | do | 153.80 | 0.24 | 1 |
| 584 | 80.20 | 173.06 | do | 1.058 | do | 0.271 | 153.90 | (1.06) | 0.189 |
| 586 | 80.17 | 172.92 | do | 1.058 | do | do | 153.76 | 0.24 | 1 |
| 588 | 80.21 | 173.21 | do | 1.058 | do | do | 154.05 | 1.22 | 0.165 |
| 611 | 85.24 | 173.43 | do | 1.324 | do | 0.340 | 154.47 | 0.31 | 1 |
| 612 | 85.21 | 171.87 | do | 1.324 | do | do | 152.91 | 0.03 | 1 |
| 589 | 184.04 | 171.96 | do | 1.407 | do | 0.636 | 152.78 | 0.73 | 0.274 |
| Mean $=153.78$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | $2 \mathrm{xSdm}=$ | 0.32 |  |  |

${ }^{*} 6 \cdot \overline{\mathrm{~L}}_{2}$ derived from $\varphi_{\mathrm{L}}$ values listed in ref. [14]
** Column 9, table 3

MOLYBDENUM PENTAFLUORIDE: VAPORIZATION PROPERTIES FROM TRANSPIRATION, AND DEVELOPMENT OF AN EXPERIMENTAL METHOD TO EVALUATE THE TRUE VAPOR PRESSURES
by Thomas B. Douglas and Ra1ph F. Krause, Jr.


#### Abstract

Using $\mathrm{MoF}_{6}(\mathrm{~g})$ to suppress sample disproportionation, 15 additional precise transpiration measurements were made on $\mathrm{MoF}_{5}(\ell)$ (purity, $>99.8 \%$ ) at $70^{\circ}, 90^{\circ}$, and $110^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The remaining disproportionation appears to be small ( $1 \%$ or 1ess), but will be tested in a few future measurements. Titration with permanganate was adopted as an accurate method to analyze the $\mathrm{MoF}_{5}$ in the presence of the hexavalent-molybdenum contaminants. A second method was developed to measure the small vapor pressures directly; later application and combination with the transpiration data will yield also the vapor densities of $\mathrm{MoF}_{5}$, which other evidence suggests will reflect considerable vapor association. The new method is as simple as the transpiration method, but the apparatus parameters were carefully chosen to minimize error. Preliminary tests reproduced a known pressure of argon (to 0.1 or $0.2 \%$ ) and known vapor pressures of iodine (to 1 or $2 \%$ ) and $\mathrm{MoF}_{6}$ (to 3 or $4 \%$ ).


## I. Introduction

The fluoride of molybdenum most stable near room temperature is $\mathrm{MoF}_{6}$, and its common chemical thermodynamic properties are now known with comparatively high accuracy. In contrast, the several known lower fluorides of molybdenum are much less stable, and only sketchy property data, often seriously inconsistent, have been published. A concerted effort is being made in the present program, at the National Bureau of Standards, to obtain reliable properties of these lower molybdenum fluorides, beginning with $\mathrm{MoF}_{5}$. The standard heat of formation of $\mathrm{MoF}_{5}(\mathrm{c})$ is being measured, and spectroscopic measurements recently formed the basis of a frequency assignment to the monomer molecule [1] ${ }^{1}$.

[^1]The work described in this chapter and designed to measure the vaporization properties is a continuation of that reported earlier [2], which included historical background, the methods of preparation, purification, elemental sample analysis, melting point, and cryoscopic purity, as well as preliminary transpiration results.

The transpiration method is accurately applicable to a substance such as $\mathrm{MoF}_{5}$ which has vapor pressures of a few torr in its temperature range of relative stability; but the method measures only vapor density (when the gaseous solutions are dilute) but without indicating the vapor pressure unless the effective molecular weight is unambiguous. Now $\mathrm{MoF}_{5}$ is an "odd" molecule (in the sense of containing at least one unpaired electron), so that it would be surprising if the simple molecules showed no appreciable tendency to associate. In fact, recent rough mass-spectrometric results at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory (sumnarized later in this chapter) suggest that saturated molybdenumpentafluoride vapor not only contains more dimer than mononer, but may contain appreciable proportions of trimer (and even snall amounts of higher polymers). For this reason we refined and tested a simple method to measure vapor pressures directly. When applied later to molybdenun pentafluoride, the data combined with the transpiration results should yield both the true vapor pressures and vapor densities of the saturated vapor.

In principle, such methods can be extended to unsaturated vapor to yield the proportions of more than two gas species (assuming gas ideality for each species). In practice, however, it is doubtful whether the accuracy would be sufficient to be meaningful--as exemplified by the well-known difficulties encountered in trying to discriminate among the several polymers in gaseous hydrogen fluoride. A mean degree of association should, however, lead to useful thermodynamic properties.

## II. Transpiration Measurements

## 1. Experimental Results

The sample of $\mathrm{MoF}_{5}(\ell)$ used was prepared and purified as described in the earlier report [2], which presented the results of eight
preliminary transpiration experiments that clearly showed the need to suppress disproportionation of the $\mathrm{MoF}_{5}$, during its vaporization, by shifting an equilibrium which may be

$$
\begin{equation*}
2 \mathrm{MoF}_{5}=\mathrm{MoF}_{6}+\mathrm{MoF}_{4} . \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

In the further transpiration experiments reported here, carefully dried helium was passed over thrice-distilled crystalline $\mathrm{MoF}_{6}$ in a bath thermostated at a suitable low temperature, the approximate partial pressures of $\mathrm{MoF}_{6}(\mathrm{~g})$ being calculated from published results [3]. (Owing to its much greater volatility, the $\operatorname{MoF}_{6}(g)$ is believed to have dissolved in the $\mathrm{MoF}_{5}(\hat{\ell})$ to less than $0.1 \%$.) These $\mathrm{He}-\mathrm{MoF}_{6}$ mixtures were passed over the $1 i q u i d \operatorname{MoF}_{5}$ sample contained in a cleansurface monel vessel in a stirred oil bath thermostated to $\pm 0.005^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ (see Fig. 1). The monel vessel replaced the glass vessel of the earlier experiments [2] in order to obviate what appeared to be slight reaction between the fluorides and the pyrex glass at the elevated temperatures. (While there is no evidence that any slight reaction with the monel surfaces introduced error, it was not proved that monel is better than glass in this respect.) The combined vapors were condensed at the DryIce temperature, with subsequent evacuation at room temperature to remove the $\mathrm{MoF}_{6}$ and any trapped helium.

The results of the additional transpiration experiments made are given in Table 1.

An important improvement over last year's analytical work [2] was the adoption of titration with permanganate to determine the total amount of $\mathrm{MoF}_{5}$ volatilized in each experiment. (Each distillate was weighed, then dissolved in an oxygen-free aqueous solution of $\mathrm{Fe}_{2}\left(\mathrm{SO}_{4}\right)_{3}$ and $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$, treated with $\mathrm{H}_{3} \mathrm{PO}_{4}$, and titrated colorimetrically with a standard solution of $\mathrm{KMnO}_{4}$.) Since complete exclusion of the element oxygen from the transpiration system was practically impossible, many of these distillates contained condensable oxyfluorides in much greater abundance than did the liquid sample, so that reliance on the distillate masses would be unreliable. On the other hand, the elemental analysis for molybdenum used previously is a more laborious and less sensitive method, whereas permanganate oxidizes molybdenum quantitatively from valence 5 to valence 6 without reflecting any hexavalent-molybdenum contaminants.


Table 1. Transpiration of $\mathrm{MoF}_{5}(\ell)$ by Helium Containing $\mathrm{MoF}_{6}(\mathrm{~g})$
[The sample of $\mathrm{MoF}_{5}(\ell)$ (initial mass, 11.755 g ) was contained in monel, and its vapor was condensed in pyrex glass.]

| Temperature ${ }^{\text {a }}$ <br> (K) | Experiment No. ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | Flow <br> Rate | Distillate |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Partial Pressure } \\ \text { (torr)f } \end{gathered}$ |  | ```Deviation of P(MoF from Mean(%)``` |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\left(\mathrm{cm}^{3} \mathrm{sec}^{-1}\right)$ | Mass (g) ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | \% $\mathrm{MoF}_{5}{ }^{\mathrm{e}}$ | $\mathrm{MoF}_{6}$ (added) | $\mathrm{MoF}_{5}$ (found) ${ }^{\mathrm{g}}$ |  |
| 362.8 | 9 | 1.26 | 0.6749 | 96.65 | 0.6 | 2.832 | -1.18 |
|  | 10 | 1.18 | 0.4454 | 96.86 | 0.5 | 2.855 | -0.38 |
|  | 11 | 0.58 | 0.3647 | 97.49 | 0.5 | 2.871 | +0.18 |
|  | 12 | 1.23 | 0.4402 | 98.22 | 1.0 | 2.909 | +1.51 |
|  | 13 | 1.30 | 0.4867 | 98.03 | 0.5 | 2.862 | -0.13 |
|  |  |  |  |  | Mean | 2.866 |  |
| 382.9 | 14 | 1.34 | 0.8657 | 98.71 | 2.1 | 8.265 | 0.00 |
|  | 15 | 1.27 | 0.8791 | 99.13 | 2.1 | 8.249 | -0.19 |
|  | 16 c | 1.34 | 0.7273 | 99.17 | 2.1 | 8.292 | +0.33 |
|  | 17 | 0.67 | 0.5727 | 98.75 | 2.1 | 8.285 | +0.24 |
|  | 18 | 1.30 | 0.8424 | 99.02 | 1.0 | 8.234 | -0.37 |
|  |  |  |  |  | Mean: 8.265 |  |  |
| 343.2 | 19 | 1.28 | 0.2782 | 98.61 | 0.45 | 0.8999 | +0.09 |
|  | 20 | 1.36 | 0.2213 | 99.16 | 0.45 | 0.8951 | -0.44 |
|  | 21 | 1.58 | 0.3039 | 99.21 | 0.45 | 0.8979 | -0.13 |
|  | 22 | 1.75 | 0.2469 | 99.65 | 0.45 | 0.8962 | -0.32 |
|  | 23 | 1.57 | $0.2848$ | $100.09$ | 0.45 | 0.9063 | +0.80 |
|  |  |  |  |  | Mean: 0.8991 |  |  |

${ }^{\mathrm{a}}$ The actual temperatures of the individual experiments differed from those listed by an average of 0.025 kelvin, but the calculated pressures of $\mathrm{MoF}_{5}$ (penultimate column) have been corrected to the nominal temperatures using a temperature coefficient of $5.8 \%$ per kelvin.
${ }^{\mathrm{b}}$ This is a complete list of successive experiments in chronological order.
${ }^{\text {c }}$ A slight leak developed and was repaired before Experiment 16 began.
$\mathrm{d}_{\text {Excluding the }} \mathrm{MoF}_{6}$, which, being much more volatile, was condensed further downstream. ${ }^{\mathrm{e}}$ As determined by titrating the distillate with permanganate.
$\mathrm{f}_{1}$ torr $=(1 / 760) 101325 \mathrm{Nm}^{-2}$
gThe vapor pressure of $\mathrm{MoF}_{5}$ calculated assuming an ideal-gas vapor having a molecular weight equal to that of the monomer $\left(\mathrm{MoF}_{5}\right)$. At each temperature the true vapor pressure is smaller by the same factor by which the actual vapor density is greater. See Section III of this chapter.

The fact that the experiments are given in Table 1 in chronological order facilitates examination of the results for chronological trends. As the mass of the liquid sample (initially 11.755 g ) was successively reduced by what may be assumed to be the amounts in the fourth column, the percentage of $\mathrm{MoF}_{5}$ found in the distillate (fifth column) steadily increased from less than $97 \%$ to approximately $100 \%$. The simplest explanation is that a more volatile impurity was being distilled preferentially from the sample, and a "dilute solution" treatment of the first five experiments indicated a volatility ratio of greater than 5 (and so a concentration more than 5 times as great in the vapor as in the liquid). Some thin white films in the condenser in some experiments ( $\mathrm{MoF}_{5}$ is yellow) supports this explanation; the contaminant was likely MoOF $_{4}$, whose vapor pressures have been measured [4].

The values of vapor pressure of $\mathrm{MoF}_{5}$ listed in the penultimate column of Table 1 for the individual experiments were calculated on the basis of the titration results by assuming gas ideality and the molecular weight of molybdenum pentafluoride monomer, $\mathrm{MoF}_{5}$. That the last assumption, while convenient, is probably highly arbitrary is discussed in Section III.1. The last column of the table shows the percentage deviations of the calculated vapor-pressure values from the mean at each temperature.

The table may be examined further for evidence of other systematic errors. Turning to the sixth column, it is easy to realize that what could be considered an adequate partial pressure of $\mathrm{MoF}_{6}$ will probably vary widely from one temperature to another. However, making comparisons only at the same temperature, it will be noted that deliberately doubling the $\mathrm{MoF}_{6}$ in Experiment 12 led to the highest vapor-pressure value at 362.8 K , and deliberately halving the $\mathrm{MoF}_{6}$ in Experiment 18 1ed to the lowest value at 382.9 K . We would expect the subfluoride resulting from disproportionation of the $\mathrm{MoF}_{6}$ to be highly soluble in the liquid sample, so theoretically an infinite pressure of $\mathrm{MoF}_{6}$ would be required to prevent disproportionation completely. (A simple calculation from these data suggested, however, less than $1 \%$ disproportionated in these experiments.) The consideration of flow rates of the transpiring (carrier) gas is similar except that one seeks a sufficiently low rate. The only
variation in flow rate was halving it in Experiments 11 and 17, where the effects are small and virtually within the precision (see last column). A few more transpiration experiments are planned with the aim of providing small corrections to the present results for these systematic errors.

The various detailed precautions routinely appropriate in accurate work were observed. These included calibration of the individual measuring instruments (such as thermocouples), accurate buoyancy corrections in weighing, close thermostating of temperature baths, and accurate standardization of titrating solutions and application of blank corrections in their use. Details are not given because at this stage we are unprepared to make quantitative estimates of the composite uncertainties of the experimental values obtained.

The following equation represents the "least-squares" fit of the vapor-pressure values for molybdenum pentafluoride in the penultimate column of Table 1 , giving equal weight to each of the 15 values of $\log P$. ( $\underline{P}$ is in atm, $\underline{T}$ is the temperature in $K$, and the tolerances given are standard deviations.)

$$
\begin{equation*}
\log _{10} P(\mathrm{~atm})=6.3670( \pm 0.016)-3189.5( \pm 6) / \mathrm{T} \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Deviations of individual values from Eq(2) are shown in Fig. 2. The limitations peculiar to molybdenum pentafluoride on deriving thermodynamic properties from this equation are discussed in the following section.
2. Concerning the Molecular Weight of Molybdenum Pentafluoride in the

## Vapor State

The foregoing transpiration results give practically no information as to whether $\mathrm{MoF}_{5}$ is associated in the vapor state, but a recent massspectrometric study, at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory by C. F. Weaver and J. D. Redman on the various fluorides of molybdenum and niobium, does [5]. They studied molybdenum-pentafluoride vapor at a total pressure which they thought was between 0.001 and 0.1 torr, and presumably around $80^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. They reported finding under these conditions that the vapor was approximately $80 \%$ monomer $\left(\mathrm{MoF}_{5}\right), 20 \%$ dimer $\left(\mathrm{Mo}_{2} \mathrm{~F}_{10}\right)$,

and $<1 \%$ trimer $\left(\mathrm{Mo}_{3} \mathrm{~F}_{15}\right)$. In addition, they reported standard enthalpy changes as follows:

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\mathrm{Mo}_{2} \mathrm{~F}_{10}=2 \mathrm{MoF}_{5} ; & \Delta \mathrm{H}=28 \mathrm{kca1} \\
\mathrm{Mo}_{3} \mathrm{~F}_{15}=3 \mathrm{MoF}_{5} ; \quad \Delta \mathrm{H}=34 \mathrm{kcal} \tag{4}
\end{array}
$$

Though these data lack refinement that they hoped to achieve by improved calibration, they can easily be used to calculate for the composition of the saturated vapor at our temperatures (Table 1) considerably more dimer than monomer, as well as possibly a few percent of trimer.

Suppose for the sake of present argument we limit ourselves to monomer and dimer, and examine the consequences to transpiration results when the vapor consists of a mixture of substantial amounts of these two gas species. We can immediately dismiss gas nonideality as being small and essentially negligible at total pressures not greater than a few torr. The two (independent) vaporization reactions and the related all-gas reaction (with symbols defined for future reference) are:

$$
\begin{align*}
& \operatorname{MoF}_{5}(\ell)=\mathrm{MoF}_{5}(\mathrm{~g}): \quad \Delta \mathrm{H} \equiv \Delta \mathrm{H}_{1}, \Delta \mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{P}} \equiv \Delta \mathrm{C}_{1} ; \mathrm{p} \equiv \mathrm{P}_{1}  \tag{5}\\
& 2 \mathrm{MoF}_{5}(\mathrm{l})=\mathrm{Mo}_{2} \mathrm{~F}_{10}(\mathrm{~g}): \Delta \mathrm{H} \equiv \Delta \mathrm{H}_{2}, \Delta \mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{P}} \equiv \Delta \mathrm{C}_{2} ; \mathrm{p} \equiv \mathrm{P}_{2}  \tag{6}\\
& \mathrm{Mo}_{2} \mathrm{~F}_{10}(\mathrm{~g})=2 \mathrm{MoF}_{5}(\mathrm{~g}): \Delta \mathrm{H}=2 \Delta \mathrm{H}_{1}-\Delta \mathrm{H}_{2} \tag{7}
\end{align*}
$$

When (as in Table 1 and Eq (2)) transpiration data are treated as if the vapor is all monomer, then the calculated vapor pressure $\underline{P}$ measures the total available monomer units, so

$$
\begin{equation*}
P=P_{1}+2 P_{2}=(1+r) P_{1} \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\underline{r}$ is defined by

$$
\begin{equation*}
r \equiv 2 P_{2} / P_{1} \tag{9}
\end{equation*}
$$

Assuming $\Delta C_{1}$ and $\Delta C_{2}$ independent of temperature, one can combine the Clausius-Clapeyron equations for Reactions (5) and (6) with the above definitions to derive a Clausius-Clapeyron equation (and its derivative) for the transpiration process:

$$
\begin{gather*}
d \ln P / d(-1 / R T)=\left(\Delta H_{1}+r \Delta H_{2}\right) /(1+r)  \tag{10}\\
d^{2} \ln P / d(-1 / R T)^{2}=r\left[\left(\Delta H_{1}-\Delta H_{2}\right) /(1+r)\right]^{2}+\left(\Delta C_{1}+r \Delta C_{2}\right) R T^{2} /(1+r) \tag{11}
\end{gather*}
$$

Equations (10) and (11) show two significant things worth pointing out. Firstly, the right-hand side of (10) is the "molar heat of vaporization" which one would derive from transpiration results such as Eq (2). But if the ratio $\underline{\underline{x}}$ is not zero or infinity but well in between (as seems likely in the present case), the "transpiration data" heat of vaporization is neither $\Delta H_{1}$ nor $\Delta H_{2}$, but a function of them which is difficult to describe in simple terms (being a heat of vaporization to form an amount of vapor which is neither one actual mole nor one mole of "available" monomer). Secondly, the second term of Eq (11) cannot be negative, but the third ("heat-capacity") term ordinarily is, and in fact often overbalances the second term to give a negative curvature to a $\log \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{vs}-1 / \mathrm{T}$ plot (first term).

Using the present transpiration results for $80^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, values of $\Delta H_{1}, \Delta H_{2}$, and $\underline{r}$ were obtained by simultaneous solution of Eqs (10), (11), and Weaver and Redman's value of Eq (3) $\left(2 \Delta H_{1}-\Delta H_{2}=28 \mathrm{kcal}\right)$. One of the two possible solutions is reasonable, giving $\Delta H_{1}=21 \mathrm{kcal}, \Delta \mathrm{H}_{2}=$ $14 \mathrm{kcal}, \mathrm{P}_{2} / \mathrm{P}_{1}=7$ in the saturated vapor, and Weaver and Redman's value of $\mathrm{P}_{2} / \mathrm{P}_{1}(=1 / 4)$ if their total pressure were 0.008 torr, which is within their reported pressure range. Despite this rough agreement, these calculations should be considered quite uncertain, especially because the curvature of the "best" curve one could construct through the points of Fig. 2 is obviously highly uncertain. The results do suggest, however, that the saturated molybdenum pentafluoride vapor in our transpiration experiments was highly associated. Preliminary work on an attempt to measure the degree of association is described in the next section.

## III. Development of a Method to Measure the True Vapor Pressures

1. Brief Description of the Method

Because of the evidence discussed in Section II. 2 that molybdenum pentafluoride is extensively but incompletely associated, yet to an illdefined extent that leaves the thermodynamic interpretation of our precise transpiration data incomplete, we decided to adopt some additional type of measurement which, when combined with the transpiration results, will yield both the vapor density and the true vapor pressure--hopefully, with an accuracy of the order of $1 \%$. The chemical instability and corrosiveness of $\mathrm{MoF}_{5}$ impose serious limitations on the materials with which it can be in contact without serious error, and also dictate relatively low temperatures where the vapor pressures are only a few torr. We dismissed known vapor-density methods in favor of some method to measure the true vapor pressures, which can be combined with the transpiration data to yield the vapor densities.

Accurate pressure transducers have been developed and used which balance the vapor against a comparable known pressure of inert gas. However, because such transducer membranes, if sufficiently sensitive, are fragile and subject to calibration changes, we substituted for the membrane a valve which can be opened long enough to establish pressure equilibrium. In its simplest form the adopted method is essentially a null method, but in principle exact initial balance between vapor and gas pressures is unnecessary, since (assuming gas ideality) one can calculate the number of moles of vapor, knowing the moles of inert gas and their sum. The same type of method has been used previously--e.g., in measurements on sodium metal [6].

Obviously, pressure equilibrium must be established while the dissociable vapor is confined to a known volume. The following sections summarize the design details adopted to achieve this requirement, and preliminary measurements made on known cases to test their overall adequacy.

The apparatus is diagrammed schematically (not to scale) in Fig. 3. With the exception of two valves ( $\underline{a}$ and $\underline{f}$ ) and their short leads (stainless steel), all container parts were constructed of pyrex glass. Distinguishing gas spaces by their volumes, an excess of the condensed substance whose vapor pressure is to be measured is placed in degassed and evacuated $V_{A}$ and isolated by closed valves a and $\underline{f}$. After having evacuated the remaining gas spaces and sufficiently degassed the manometric fluid, valve c is closed, then high-purity argon is admitted through valve $\underline{b}$ until its pressure exceeds by a small amount the expected vapor pressure; the argon occupies $V_{B}$ at temperature $\mathrm{T}_{2}, \mathrm{~V}_{\mathrm{C}}$ at $\mathrm{T}_{1}$ (room temperature if sufficiently constant), and the newly created volume $V_{D}$ at $T_{1}--a l l$ at a pressure corresponding to the manometer depression, which at this stage will be labeled $\mathrm{x}_{1}$. After then waiting for a sufficient time to ensure a steady state with respect to the temperatures, the manometer displacement, and the slight solution of argon in the manometer fluid, valve a is then opened briefly two or more times until the new manometer depression $x_{2}\left(x_{2}<x_{1}\right)$ has ceased to change by more than can be attributed to diffusion of vapor through valve $\underline{a}$ and its subsequent condensation or absorption.

Assuming the ideal-gas law, the basic equation giving the vapor pressure $P\left(=\Sigma_{i} P_{i}\right.$ for all the vapor species) in terms of the data and apparatus constants is
$P=\rho g\left(1+\left[d_{1} / d_{2}\right]^{2}\right)\left(x_{2}-\left\{\left(x_{1}-x_{2}\right) / V_{A}\right\}\left\{V_{B}+\left[T_{2} / T_{1}\right]\left[V_{C}+\pi d_{1}{ }^{2}\left(x_{1}+x_{2}\right) / 4\right]\right\}\right)$,
where $\rho$ is the density of the manometric fluid and $g$ is the gravitional acceleration.

Di-n-butyl phthalate (vapor pressure, about 0.001 torr at room temperature) is used as the manometric fluid; its low density and visosity are obvious advantages. The adoption of unequal-bore manometer arms almost doubled the sensitivity of reading the small-bore arm alone and also almost halves the number of readings necessary, since the ratio $d_{1} / d_{2}$ was carefully measured at several different manometer levels.


The theoretical equal-pressure manometer-1evel inequality, 0.051 cm , was verified by observation. Precautions were taken in measuring the other apparatus constants accurately--e.g., the density of the sample of manometric fluid used was measured individually; the various volumes entering into Eq (12) were determined before assembly by filling with water and weighing; the half-meter calibrated Pt-Ir (in steel) manometer scale was read with a telescope; and the bath thermocouple was calibrated accurately. The thermomolecular pressure gradient due to the temperature difference $T_{2}-T_{1}$ is entirely negligible for work of about $1 \%$ accuracy. Having a "ballast" volume $V_{B}$ decreases the effect of uncertainty in temperature near the bath level, but too great a ratio $V_{B} / V_{A}$ would unduly decrease the overall sensitivity.

The rise in manometer level ( $\mathrm{x}_{1}-\mathrm{x}_{2}$ ) when the valve (a) to the vapor is opened must be positive and should not be too smal1, to prevent appreciable vapor from escaping from $V_{A}$ by flow and diffusion, respectively; however, a rise which is small (say, not greater than $10 \%$ of the initial manometer depression $x_{1}$ ) has the distinct advantages of minimizing the time required for virtual gas-pressure and manometer equilibration and of minimizing any error due to changing solubility of the argon in the manometer fluid.

The present apparatus constants are at room temperature as follows: $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{A}}=70.39 \mathrm{~cm}^{3} ; \mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{B}}=38.68 \mathrm{~cm}^{3} ; \mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{C}}=19.54 \mathrm{~cm}^{3} ; 1+\left(\mathrm{d}_{1} / \mathrm{d}_{2}\right)^{2}=1.0577$; $d_{1}=1.011 \mathrm{~cm} ; \rho=1.0415[1-.0007(\mathrm{t}-25)] \mathrm{g} \mathrm{cm}^{-3}$ at $\mathrm{t}^{\circ} \mathrm{C} ; \ell=5 \mathrm{~cm} ; \mathrm{d}=$ 0.15 cm . (Small corrections to these which have not been applied would change the vapor pressures calculated and listed in Section III. 3 by perhaps as much as $0.2 \%$, which is well within the overall uncertainties.)

Large erratic and systematic errors in vapor-pressure determination could occur if opening valve a does not result in final pressure and vaporization equilibrium while all the vapor remains in its vessel $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{A}}$. To optimize the chance of approximating this ideal fairly closely, the length $\underline{\ell}$ and inside diameter $\underline{d}$ of the "capillary" tube shown in Fig. 3 were selected after several kinetic-theory calculations of evaporation rate, wall adsorption, viscous flow, and gaseous interdiffusion.

If the rate of evaporation of the condensed vapor were comparatively slow, it is conceivable that after argon enters the vapor the vaporization equilibrium might be upset and be reestablished long after the valve (a) had been closed, producing unregistered pressure changes. A simple calculation showed that evaporation from each $1 \mathrm{~cm}^{2}$ of solid iodine at $80^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ (used for tests of the method-see Section III.3) is $99 \%$ complete in 0.05 sec if an accommodation coefficient of unity is assumed. The accommodation coefficient of the much more complexly oriented molecules in $\mathrm{MoF}_{5}(\ell)$ is apparently many times smaller, requiring a correspondingly longer time; however, a subsequent opening of the valve as a test of pressure equilibrium should obviate any error from this source. Incidentally, if a little vapor were to diffuse out of the vapor vessel $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{A}}$ but not be condensed or absorbed, any evaporation to replace the escaped vapor would produce a corresponding error.

Taking $\mathrm{MoF}_{6}$ as a typical vapor, it was estimated that the adsorption of a monolayer on the inside surface of the present vapor vessel ( $V_{A}$ ) would remove vapor equivalent to a pressure of 0.03 torr at $90^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. $\mathrm{Ad}-$ sorption should produce no systematic error if the vapor is maintained saturated by condensed phase, but obviously would (unless corrected for) if the measurements are extended to unsaturated vapor. One of the standard empirical procedures to enable correction for wall adsorption is to make measurements on an unsaturated vapor using two or more different surface-to-volume ratios. Here, some caution would be needed: it has been reported that the adsorptivity of "fire-polished" glass is increased manyfold (and unpredictably?) by a single washing with water[7].

Rapid mixing of the argon entering the vapor is needed, and this is promoted by gravitation by introducing the argon near the bottom of the (heavier) vapor, as well as having the vapor vessel ( $V_{A}$ ) taller than its diameter (Fig. 3). Even so, it was desirable to know whether any appreciable fraction of the argon would rise to the top before time for its thorough horizontal interdiffusion with the vapor, or whether any argon reaching the top requires an undue length of time to mix by diffusing downward.

The interdiffusion of two gases in one dimension is given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\partial \mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{i}} / \partial \mathrm{t}=\mathrm{D}\left(\eta^{2} \mathrm{~N}_{\mathrm{i}} / \partial \mathrm{x}^{2}\right) \text {, } \tag{13}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $N_{i}$ is the concentration of either gas, $t$ is time, $x$ is distance, and $\underline{D}$ is the specific interdiffusion coefficient. Although series solutions of Eq (13) are known for specified boundary conditions, dimensionless numerical integration of the equation was readily performed by computer for the initial condition of one pure gas (argon) occupying one end ( $10 \%$ of the volume) of a closed cylinder and the other pure gas (the vapor) occupying the other end ( $90 \%$ of the volume), all of course at a uniform total pressure. Using 30 steps in $\Delta x, 1000$ steps in $\Delta t$, and a constant arbitrary value $\frac{\Delta N_{i}}{\Delta t} \left\lvert\, \frac{\left.\Delta N_{i}\right) D}{(\Delta x)^{2}}=0.25\right.$, the accuracy was checked by repetition using a coarser "grid". The interdiffusion coefficient D can be estimated [8] from

$$
\begin{equation*}
D=\left[8\left(1 / M_{1}+1 / M_{2}\right)\right]^{1 / 2}[R T / \pi]^{3 / 2} / 3 N_{A} P \sigma^{2} \tag{14}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $M_{1}$ and $M_{2}$ are the two molecular weights; $\underline{R}$ is the gas constant; T, the absolute temperature; $N_{A}$, Avogadro's number; $P$, the total pressure; and $\underline{\sigma}$, the mean collision diameter of the two kinds of molecules. For argon and molybdenum pentafluoride at $90^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and a total pressure of 3 torr, Eq (14) gave $D=25 \mathrm{~cm}^{2} \mathrm{sec}^{-1}$, and using this value the computer results indicated that the interdiffusion involving an original thickness of argon of 1 cm would be $99.7 \%$ complete in 2 sec .

The capillary (length $=t$ and $I D=\underline{d}$ in Fig. 3) should be of such dimensions that during the time the valve (a) is open to admit argon to the vapor, only a negligible amount of vapor diffuses out (of $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{A}}$ ) (favoring a small $\mathrm{d}^{2}$ ), yet the (viscous) flow of argon must be rapid enough to achieve virtual pressure equilibrium (favoring a large $d^{4}$ ). For the compromise capillary dimensions chosen, an integration of Poiseuille's equation for the volume rate of viscous flow,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{dV} / \mathrm{dt}=\pi \mathrm{Pd}^{4} / 128 \eta \mathrm{l} \tag{15}
\end{equation*}
$$

indicated $99.9 \%$ pressure equilibration in 8 sec for argon at a pressure of 3 torr. ( $\eta$ is the specific viscosity; and $\underline{P}$, the average pressure, is a function of V .)

In the following section are summarized the results of four test experiments in which a known vapor pressure of iodine of about 15 torr was consistently reproduced to $1 \%$ or better without applying any hypothetical corrections. As evidence of the importance of the foregoing design considerations, it may be mentioned that an earlier version of this apparatus consistently gave values of the same vapor pressure of iodine that were in error by about $10 \%$ (but a little better if corrected for obvious vapor diffusion). The principal improvements of the present design over the earlier one are: (1) argon replaces helium (reducing vapor diffusion by a factor of about 3); (2) the capillary now abuts the valve seat (eliminating a short large-diameter dead-space whose considerable amount of vapor probably escaped quickly); (3) the length of the capillary was considerably reduced (promoting viscous flow); (4) constrictions in the manometer were eliminated, and the less viscous manometer fluid di-n-butyl phthalate was substituted (greatly hastening manometer equilibration, and thereby obviating the need to correct for compression of argon by manometer fluid after the valve (a) was closed).

## 3. Tepsts of the Apparatus in Reproducing Known Values

The apparatus and procedure in their present form (described in detail in Section III.2) were used to measure known pressures of the following three substances in the simulation of unknown vapor pressures:

1. Argon at pressures of approximately 13 to 22 torr. (This simulates a vapor except that it omits testing the features associated with vapor diffusion and condensation.)
2. Iodine at vapor pressures of approximately 15 and 8 torr. (The volatility is comparable to that of $\mathrm{MoF}_{5}$ in the same temperature range; but iodine is completely stable, the monomer is entirely negligible at these temperatures, many observers have measured its vapor pressure, and the completeness of existing data has enabled tests of third-law consistency [9].)
3. $\mathrm{MoF}_{6}$ at a vapor pressure of approximately 7 torr. (MoF 6 simulates $\mathrm{MoF}_{5}$ (and its polymers) in type of molecule and chemical corrosiveness.

In addition, similar measurements will be needed on $\mathrm{MoF}_{6}$ in conjunction with future measurements on $\mathrm{MoF}_{5}$. Vapor pressures can be calculated from the Gibbs-energy functions of Osborne et al. [3], which are based on their low-temperature thermal and vapor-pressure data.)

The essential results of the measurements on the above three substances are given in Table 2. The valve between argon and the vapor cell (valve a in Fig. 3) was opened by an estimated one-half turn for 5 sec , and except in the case of Experiments $1-4$ this process was repeated one or more times at intervals of 5 to 10 min each, the manometer (and temperature) readings being taken while this valve was closed. (Error in the calculated vapor pressure had been estimated to be $<0.1 \%$ from diffusion during 5 sec .)

This procedure of successive openings provided an empirical test of whether equilibrium had been reached, and for each experiment one may examine the entries in the last five columns and take the last entry (or an estimated asymptotic value, particularly for Experiments 5 and 12) as the final value for that experiment. (In Experiments 1-4 no vapor was involved, so the valve was opened only once, but long enough to ensure pressure equilibrium.)

The agreement with the "accepted" values using argon (Experiments $1-4$ ) averages $0.1 \%$, and is entirely satisfactory, since this corresponds to the precision of reading pressures and temperatures in this apparatus. The agreement for iodine (Experiments 5-13) also is satisfactory, being essentially within the estimated uncertainty of the "accepted" value of $\pm 1.5 \%$ (especially for the higher pressure). While no estimate was made of the uncertainty of the "accepted" (published) vapor pressure of $\mathrm{MoF}_{6}$, this fact is irrelevant to the inferior reproducibility among different experiments (Nos. 14-16), and the need for further work on $\mathrm{MoF}_{6}$ is indicated. The inferiority of the $\mathrm{MoF}_{6}$ results may reflect some difficulty at that time in valve leakage, or the absence of condensed $\mathrm{MoF}_{6}$ in the vapor cell $\left(\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{A}}\right)$ may be a significant factor.

So far no application of the new apparatus to molybdenum pentafluoride has been made, but such experiments are planned for the near future.

Table 2. Measurement of "Known" Pressures of Argon and Vapor Pressures of Iodine and Molybdenum Hexafluoride

| Substance | Experiment | $\begin{gathered} \text { Temper- } \\ \text { ature } \end{gathered}$ | Accepted Pressure | Deviati after V | $\begin{aligned} & \text { (\%) } \\ & \text { lve-0 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { P found } \\ & \text { ing } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { rom } \\ & \text { vo. } e \end{aligned}$ | epted |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No. | (K) | (torr) |  |  | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Ar | 1 2 3 4 | 296.2 | $\begin{aligned} & 22.05^{\mathrm{b}} \\ & 13.47 \\ & 21.34 \mathrm{~b} \\ & 12.75 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} -0.22 \\ -0.12 \\ 0.00 \\ +0.06 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |
| $I_{2}$ | 5 | 352.75 | $14.72{ }^{\text {c }}$ | $\begin{array}{r} +7.7 \\ +10.4 \\ +8.3 \\ +6.3 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | +3.3 +3.3 | $\begin{aligned} & +1.6 \\ & +0.9 \\ & +0.8 \\ & +0.08 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.2 \\ & +1.1 \\ & -0.06 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | -0.3 |
|  | 7 | 352.67 | $14.65{ }^{\text {c }}$ |  | +2.3 <br> +2.0 |  |  |  |
|  | 9 | 342.88 | $8.04^{\text {c }}$ | +10.4 | +4.3 | +2.0 | $\begin{array}{r} +2.0 \\ +0.3 \\ +2.2 \\ +1.0 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |
|  | 10 |  |  | +12.0 | +3.8 | +1.1 |  |  |
|  | 11 |  |  | +6.4 | +3.8 | +2.9 |  |  |
|  | 12 |  |  | +2.1 | +1.7 +2.4 |  |  |  |
|  | 13 |  |  | $+5.1$ | +2.4 | +1.2 |  |  |
| $\mathrm{MoF}_{6}$ |  | $231.64{ }^{\text {a }}$ | $6.63{ }^{\text {d }}$ |  |  | -5.8 |  |  |
|  | 15 |  |  | +1.4 | -3.4 |  |  |  |
|  | 16 |  |  | -2.0 | -2.5 |  |  |  |

${ }^{\mathrm{a}}$ The $\mathrm{MoF}_{6}$ vapor was generated from the solid at 231.64 K , but measured in the apparatus at 392.6 K .
${ }^{\mathrm{b}}$ Pressures as measured by direct manometry in the apparatus.
${ }^{\mathrm{C}}$ Calculated from the values of Reference [10]. The values of Reference [9] give essentially identical values for these vapor pressures.
${ }^{\mathrm{d}}$ Calculated by interpolating the Gibbs-energy functions of Reference [3].
${ }^{e}$ The valve between argon and the vapor cell (valve a in Fig. 3) was opened by an estimated one-half turn for 5 sec , at intervals of 5 to 10 min .
[1] N. Acquista and S.Abramowitz, This Report, Chapter 3 .
[2] R. F. Krause, Jr., NBS Report 10481, July 1971, p. 97.
W. H. Rodebush and E. G. Walters, J. Amer. Chem. Soc. 52, 2654 (1930).
[7] L. A. Guildner, National Bureau of Standards, private communication.
[8] S. Glasstone, "Textbook of Physical Chemistry," 2nd ed., D. Van Nostrand, New York, 1946, p. 281.
[9] JANAF Thermochemical Tables, D. R. Stull and H. Prophet, Proj. Directors, 2nd ed., NSRDS--NBS 37, U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C. June 1971 [tables for $I_{2}$ (c), $I_{2}(g)$, and $\left.I(g)\right]$.
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## Chapter 3

THE VIBRATIONAL SPECTRA OF MOLYBDENUM PENTAFLUORIDL

Nicolo Acquista and Stanley Abramowitz

## Introduction

The vibrational spectra of the $\mathrm{MF}_{5}$ molecules have been interpreted either on the basis of $D_{3 h}$ (trigonal bipyramid) or $C_{4 v}$ structure. Recently the authors interpreted the observed infrared spectrum of matrix isolated $\mathrm{NbF}_{5}$ as possibly indicative of $\mathrm{C}_{4} \mathrm{v}$ symmetry for this species ${ }^{1}$. The apparent observation of three stretching modes and a feature at $513 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$ were taken as experimental proof of the $\mathrm{C}_{4 \mathrm{v}}$ structure. Recently a Raman spectrum of the vapors in equilibrium with $\mathrm{NbF}_{5}(\mathrm{~s})$ and $\mathrm{NbF}_{5}\left(\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{t}}\right)$ in the stretching region has been interpreted as indicating $D_{3 h}$ structure for the monomer. ${ }^{2}$ The pentafluorides of arsenic ${ }^{3}$, phosphorous ${ }^{4}$ and vanadium ${ }^{5}$ have been shown to have $D_{3 h}$ symmetry while $S b F_{5}$ has $C_{4 v}$ symmetry ${ }^{6}$. It should be noted that the Raman spectrum of gaseous $\mathrm{SbF}_{5}$ has recently been observed (and in a manner similar to $\mathrm{NbF}_{5}$ ) and has been interpreted on the basis of $\mathrm{D}_{3 \mathrm{~h}}$ symmetry for the monomeric species ${ }^{7}$. Since $\mathrm{MoF}_{5}$ is the next higher member to $\mathrm{NbF}_{5}$ in the transition metal series, it was thought worthwhile to investigate its vibrational spectra.
$\mathrm{MoF}_{5}$ has only recently been prepared ${ }^{8}$. Edwards et al, ${ }^{9}$ reported another method of preparation and studied the structure of the solid using $x$-ray single crystal techniques. They concluded that $\mathrm{MoF}_{5}$ crystallize to form square tetramers in which the four Mo atoms are joined thru fluorine bridges, and that it is isostructural with $\mathrm{NbF}_{5}$ and $\mathrm{TaF}_{5}$.

Quellette et a1, ${ }^{10}$ have reported the Raman and infrared spectra of liquid and polycrystaline $\mathrm{MoF}_{5}$. A vibrational assignment was proposed for molten $\mathrm{MoF}_{5}$ on the basis of $\mathrm{D}_{3 \mathrm{~h}}$ symmetry, but the polycrystaline spectrum was not interpreted.

Bates ${ }^{11}$ has remeasured the room temperature Raman spectrum of crystalline $\mathrm{MoF}_{5}$ observing essentially the same spectrum as Ouellette et al ${ }^{10}$. Using frequencies and assignments of the bands observed by Ouellette in molten $\mathrm{MoF}_{5}$, he assigned the Raman spectrum by a double correlation scheme which maps the symmetry species $D_{3 h}$ for $\mathrm{MoF}_{5}$ monomer into the factor group $\mathrm{C}_{2 \mathrm{~h}}$ in the solid. The lowest line found by Bates is at $180 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$. The lowest frequencies of $\mathrm{VF}_{5}{ }^{5}$, $\mathrm{AsF}_{5}{ }^{3}$ and $\mathrm{PF}_{5}^{4}$ appear at 109,138 , and $179 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$ respectively. It is therefore possible that $\mathrm{MoF}_{5}$ crystal will have a fundamental be $10 \mathrm{ow} 180 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$. The Raman spectrum of polycrystalline $\mathrm{MoF}_{5}$ was reinvestigated in this study using both $\mathrm{He} / \mathrm{Ne}$ and $\mathrm{Ar}^{+}\left(4880 \AA\right.$ ) excitation to within $30 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$ of the exciting line.

A molecular beam-mass spectrometer has been designed and constructed by Vasile et al ${ }^{12}$, to study reactive fluorides and similar molecules. The pentafluorides of $\mathrm{Nb}, \mathrm{Ta}, \mathrm{Mo}, \mathrm{Re}, \mathrm{Os}, \mathrm{Ir}, \mathrm{Ru}, \mathrm{Pr}$, Sb and Bi were $a 11$ found to be associated in the saturated vapor phase. Dimeric and trimeric species were dominant in the low temperature vapors ( $\sim 50^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ) and tetrameters were found for $\mathrm{MoF}_{5} \mathrm{NbF}_{5}$ and other pentafluorides. They observed that those pentafluorides found to be associated in the vapor phase in their study were also associated in the solid phase as tetramers or in infinite chains. They concluded, by implication, that the liquid is very likely associated.

Weaver et al ${ }^{13}$ reports similar results to Vasile et al, and finds that at $80^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ the vapor is $80 \% \mathrm{MoF}_{5}$ monomer. Ouellette ${ }^{10}$ also reports the presence of monomer at $70^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$.

There have been no reported structural studies of the vapors of $\mathrm{MoF}_{5}$. Infrared matrix isolation studies should be uniquely suited for a study of the vibrational spectrum. This is particularly true since the monomer polymer ratio in $\mathrm{MoF}_{5}$ vapor may be expected to be enhanced in high temperature unsaturated vapors. Therefore a systematic study of the matrix isolated vapors of $\mathrm{MoF}_{5}$ was initiated using double boiler techniques. Raman spectra of polycrystalline $\mathrm{MoF}_{5}$ and liquid $\mathrm{MoF}_{5}$ were also observed.

## Experimental

The experimental method used to observe the infrared spectrum of matrix isolated $\mathrm{MoF}_{5}$ monomer was essentially the same as in the $\mathrm{NbF}_{5}{ }^{1}$ study with only slight modification. An Air-Products cryotip operated at liquid hydrogen temperature, a Perkin-Elmer spectrophotometer 301 operated between 4000 to $50 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$ and a resistively heated furnace with a stainless steel tube were employed ${ }^{14}$. The stainless steel tube, which in the present apparatus performs as the upper crucible, is approximately $6^{\prime \prime}$ long. The first $3^{\prime \prime}$ of this tubing has $3 / 16^{\prime \prime}$ ID $x 1 / 4^{\prime \prime}$ OD and is located inside of a coiled tungsten heater. The remaining $3^{\prime \prime}$ is $1 / 8^{\prime \prime}$ tubing with a 1 mm hole. This tubing leads to a brassplate where it is brazed to a $1 / 4^{\prime \prime}$ quick-connector. The $\mathrm{MoF}_{5}$ sample was prepared by R. F. Krause ${ }^{15}$ of NBS. The cryoscopic impurity was estimated to be $0.15 \mathrm{~mol} \%$. His vaporation data was used to set the temperature of the sample tube to the desired vapor pressure. The $\mathrm{MoF}_{5}$ was sealed in vacuo in a pyrex sample tube and was never exposed to the atmosphere at any time during the experiments. The pyrex sample tube with teflon needle valve was connected to the stainless steel tube in the furnace. The temperature of the stainless steel tube was measured with a chromel-alumel thermocouple. It was the temperature of the stainless tube that was varied during the experiments from room temperature to $\sim 150^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The sample pyrex tube was maintained at room temperature, although a hot water bath could be used to change its temperature. During the course of the experiment, it was found that room temperature was adequate for developing sufficient vapor pressure in the lower-oven to obtain good intensity spectra in 3 to 4 hours.

The entire deposition system was thorough1y baked out before exposure to $\mathrm{MoF}_{5}$ vapors; $\mathrm{MoF}_{5}$ reacts with moisture adhering to the walls of the deposition system to form volatile oxyfluorides, which will codeposit in the matrices and give spurious bands.
$\mathrm{MoF}_{5}$ tends to disproportionate slowly at room temperature and more rapidly at higher temperatures to involatile $\mathrm{MoF}_{4}$ and to $\mathrm{MoF}_{6}(\mathrm{~g}) \quad 12,15$. Therefore, when an experiment was started, the first vapors were pumped away. This procedure also served to pickle the deposition
system, including the stainless steel furnace. After the first few experiments it was clear that the system was seasoned because the spectra become more and more reproducible. Temperatures above $150^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ were not used to form matrices because, we observed, the spectra became less reproducible probably because of increased disproportionation and decomposition.

The matrix gas used was argon. Some matrices were formed in nitrogen but yielded no new results and are not included in this report. The $M / R$ ratios, are estimated to be in the range of 5001000 。

Atmospheric water, $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ and $\mathrm{NH}_{3}$ were used to calibrate the spectra. Many of the bands were overlapped and are good to about $\pm 2 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$. The solid infrared spectral bands are very broad and the measurements are not as good.

Raman spectra of the polycrystalline $\mathrm{MoF}_{5}$ were observed with a Spex Ramalog 14 using a cooled photomultiplier. $\mathrm{He} / \mathrm{Ne}$ and argon ion ( $4880 \AA$ ) laser lines were used for excitation. Spectra were observed to within $30 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$ of the exciting line. Raman spectra of supercooled $\mathrm{MoF}_{5}$ liquid were also observed.

## Experimental Results

Fig 1 shows the infrared spectrum of MoF $_{5}$ vapors isolated in argon matrices at liquid hydrogen temperature. The pyrex sample tube was maintained at room temperature for all these experiments except for one, while the upper stainless steel tube was varied from room temperature to $150^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Curve a shows the spectrum resulting when MoF ${ }_{5}$ effuses from the double-oven when both lower and upper boilers are at room temperature. Since the saturated vapors at this temperature contains mostly dimers and trimers ${ }^{12}$, the infrared spectrum is representative of these species. These bands appear at 768,716 , and $704 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$. Curve $b$ is the spectrum of vapors of $\mathrm{MoF}_{5}$ in equilibrium with room temperature heated to $50^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The spectrum is essentially the same as a; a weak feature appears at $735 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$ which coincides with a matrix band of $\mathrm{MoF}_{6} / \mathrm{Ar}$. Curve c shows the spectrum obtained when the upper crucible is at $100^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ (the sample is at room
temperature). The spectrum continues to change with temperature. The polymer bands intensities have decreased, while new features are beginning to appear at 713,695 and $683 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$. The $\mathrm{MoF}_{6}$ has also increased and broadened, suggesting its growth with temperature and a possible new feature at about $733 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$.

At a temperature of $140^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, curve d, the polymeric features, at 768,704 and $716 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$ have diminished to a greater extent. The decreased intensity of the $716 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$ feature is obscured by the growth of a new feature at $713 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$. It is clear that the band at $683 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$ has grown considerably. The band at $695 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$ has not grown, suggesting it is not due to the same species causing the bands at 733,713 , and $683 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$.

A final experiment was carried out, in which the lower $\mathrm{MoF}_{5}$ sample temperature was raised to $50^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and the S.S. upper crucible was operated at $150^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The spectrum, curve e, is a combination of polymers, and monomers; the bands are broadened. When the lower crucible is heated, above room temperature, the vapors effuse more rapidly, there is little time for equilibrium in the upper crucible, allowing more polymeric species to effuse, and possibly, also leading to poor isolation in the matrix.

To check the presence of oxyfluoride in our spectra, $\mathrm{MoF}_{5}$ was effused at $140^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ (the sample $\mathrm{MoF}_{5}$ at room temperature) and codeposited with an $\mathrm{Ar} / \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O},(=100)$ sample at liquid hydrogen temperature. The spectrum showed a decrease of all bands except the $695 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$, which grew. Therefore this $695 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$ feature is most likely due to an oxyfluoride.

Our experiments suggest three bands that should be considered when assigning bands to $\mathrm{MoF}_{5}$ monomer. We prefer the bands at 713 and $683 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$ as due to monomeric $\mathrm{MoF}_{5}$. The two bands have grown most consistently together in intensity. The band at $733 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$ is weak, masked by $\mathrm{MoF}_{6}$ and has shown some uncertain intensity variations which could be due to variable amounts of $\mathrm{MoF}_{6}$ in the matrix. Because of these uncertainties, we feel this feature may be due to $\mathrm{MoF}_{4}$ which, although having a low vapor pressure at the temperatures of our experiments probably is deposited in the matrix with $\mathrm{MoF}_{6}$ and monomeric $\mathrm{MoF}_{5}$. The solid phase Raman spectrum of $\mathrm{MoF}_{4}$ has recently been reported by Bates ${ }^{16}$.

Fig 2 shows the far infrared spectrum from 300 to $100 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$ when the $\mathrm{MoF}_{5}$ vapors were heated to $140^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ (the sample at room temperature), curves a, c. Three bands appear here. The bands at 261 and $112 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$ were assigned to monomers because they grew in together under conditions favorable to monomeric $\mathrm{MoF}_{5}$. The band at $231 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$ did not appear consistently with these two bands and was considered a species other than $\mathrm{MoF}_{5}$ monomer.

Curve "b" shows a spectrum of $\mathrm{MoF}_{5}$ vapors in argon when the upper crucible is at $150^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ anc the lower at $50^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Both the monomer feature at $261 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$ and the $231 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$ feature have grown. It is clear here that the relative intensities of these two bands are different that those in curve a.

These experiments suggest four features as due to monomeric $\mathrm{MoF}_{5}$ : 713, 683, 261 and $112 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$. The frequencies are listed in Table I.

Fig 3 shows the infrared spectrum of solid $\mathrm{MoF}_{5}$ at liquid hydrogen temperatures effused at $50^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ from 750 to $400 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$. The spectrum was scanned to $200 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$. The bands shown are the only ones observed. They appear at about $725,700,660$ and $525 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$, are very broad and are suggestive of a polymer spectrum. The frequencies are approximate because of the uncertainty in finding the band centers. In contrast the bands in the matrices of Argon are relatively sharp. These frequencies are also in Table I.

Several diffusion experiment were performed on a $\mathrm{MoF}_{5} / \mathrm{Ar}$ matrices. The resulting spectrum of $\mathrm{MoF}_{5}$ residue after the argon had boiled away, was very similar to the solid spectrum of Fig 3.

The Raman spectrum of solid $\mathrm{MoF}_{5}$ is shown in Figure 4. These results are essentially equivalent with those of Bates ${ }^{11}$ and 0 uellette et. al. ${ }^{10}$ except in the low frequency region. The band at about $120 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$ which is also present in the liquid corresponds to the $112 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$ found in an argon matrix for monomeric $\mathrm{MoF}_{5}$. The bands at displacements of abcut 90 and $60 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$ from the exciting line are only present in solid $\mathrm{MoF}_{5}$ and may be due to vibrations of the tetrameric unit. These features were observed with both the helium-neon and argon ion lasers. The power of the argon ion laser at $4880 \AA$ had to be kept rather low ( 22 milliwatts) in order to avoid melting the yellow sample.

## Discussion

The infrared spectra of the vapors over solid $\mathrm{MoF}_{5}$ have been observed in argon matrices at liquid hydrogen temperatures. By varying the temperature of the upper boiler in the double oven, significant changes in the composition of the vapors were effected. The low temperature spectrum of the saturated vapors produced bands at 768,716704 , and $231 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$ (Fig 1, curves a, andFig 2), which were interpreted as due to polymers. ${ }^{12}$ At high temperatures, the unsaturated vapors are known to contain a larger proportion of monomer relative to polymers. The spectra reflect these changes. New bands appear at $713,683,261$ and $112 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$ while aggregate band intensities decrease. Our experiments suggest that these bands are due to monomeric $\mathrm{MoF}_{5}$.

A study of $\mathrm{MF}_{5}$ spectra has shown these molecules to have a $D_{3 h}$ (trigonal bipyramid or $C_{4 v}$ (tetragonal pyramid) structure. The vibrational representation of a $D_{3 h}$ molecule is $2 a_{d}{ }^{\prime}+2 a_{2}^{\prime \prime}+3 e^{\prime}+$ $e^{\prime \prime}$ with $a_{2}{ }^{\prime \prime}$ and $e^{\prime}$ infrared active and the $a_{1}{ }^{\prime}$, $e^{\prime}$, and $e^{\prime \prime}$ modes Raman active. For a $C_{4 v}$ molecule, the vibrational representation is $3 a_{1}+2 b_{1}+b_{2}+3 e\left(a_{1}+e\right.$ are infrared active) ; $a_{1}, b_{1}{ }^{2} b_{2}$, and e are Raman active.) $\mathrm{D}_{3 \mathrm{~h}}$ requires the presence of 5 infrared ative bands while $C_{4 v}$ requires six. Four infrared bands have been found in these experiments. Depositions lasting longer than 6 hours have produced no other bands.

The assignment of $\mathrm{MoF}_{5}$ to a symmetry species is rather difficult. The absence of a band at $500 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$ suggests that $\mathrm{MoF}_{5}$ does not possess $C_{4 v}$ symmetry. (although this band could be very weak). Such a band is found in the interhalogens. ${ }^{17}$ Tetramers of $\mathrm{MoF}_{5}$ are associated thru Mo-F-Mo bridge bands, a connection favored by $\mathrm{C}_{4 \mathrm{v}}$ monomer structure.

Bates has described the Raman spectra of the solid assuming $\mathrm{D}_{3 \mathrm{~h}}$ symmetry for the basic structure of $\mathrm{MoF}_{5}$ tetramer while Quellette favors $D_{3 h}$ also for the structural unit in molten $\mathrm{MoF}_{5}$.

Our spectra show only 2 bands at the high frequency region of the infrared (ie. 713 and $683 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$ ). This favors $D_{3 h}$ symmetry. Three bands are required for $C_{4 v}$ symmetry.

Additional experimental evidence is needed before the structure of $\mathrm{MoF}_{5}$ can be conclusively determined. We have assigned $\mathrm{MoF}_{5}$ assuming it is a $D_{3 h}$ molecule in analogy with $\mathrm{PF}_{5}, \mathrm{AsF}_{5}, \mathrm{VF}_{5}$ which are known to possess this symmetry. The assignments of all the bands found are listed in Table I with the data of Bates and Ouellette.

In polycrystaline $\mathrm{MoF}_{5}$, the infrared band appearing at $525 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$ is not present in the matrix spectrum. This band is probably due to the Mo-F-Mo bridge that exists in the tetramer. These frequencies are also in Table 1.
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Table I

## Vibrational Assignment of $\mathrm{MoF}_{5}$

|  | Me It (a) | Crystal, | Raman, (b) | IR | Crystal present work | $\begin{gathered} \text { Matrix } \\ \text { IR } \end{gathered}$ | Assignment |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 747 |  | 759 | Ag |  |  | 768 | polymer |
|  |  | 738 | Ag |  |  | 735 | $\mathrm{MoF}_{6}\left(\nu_{3}\right)$ |
| 730 | IR | 747 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 733 | $\mathrm{MoF}_{4}(?)$ |
|  |  |  |  |  | 725 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 716 | polymer |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 713 | $\mathrm{MoF}_{5}\left(\mathrm{E}^{\prime}\right) \mathrm{v}_{5}$ |
| 703 |  | $\begin{aligned} & 706 \\ & 696 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{Ag} \\ & \mathrm{Ag} \end{aligned}$ |  |  | 704 | polymer |
|  |  |  |  |  | 700 |  |  |
| 685 | IR | 684 |  |  |  | 683 | $\mathrm{MoF}_{5}\left(\mathrm{~A}_{2}^{\prime \prime}\right) \cup_{3}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  | 660 |  |  |
| 500 | IR | 494 |  |  | 525 |  | bridge-bond |
| 440 |  | 436 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 402 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 332 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 282 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 250 |  |  |  |  |  | 261 | $\mathrm{MoF}_{5}{ }_{6}{ }_{6}\left(\mathrm{E}^{\prime}\right)$ |
|  | IR | 252 | Ag |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 239 | Ag |  |  |  |  |
| 231 |  |  |  |  |  | 231 | polymer |
| 201 |  | 199 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 181 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 120 | (c) |  |  | 112 | $\mathrm{MoF}_{5} \nu_{7}$ ( $\mathrm{E}^{\prime}$ ) |
|  |  | 90 | (c) |  |  |  | polymer |
|  |  | 60 | (c) |  |  |  | polymer |

(a) Frequencies and assignments of molten $\mathrm{MoF}_{5}$ were taken from reference 10. The frequencies are from the Raman spectrum except where noted otherwise.
(b) Bates assignment of solid, reference 11.
(c) Present Raman results.
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FIGURE 2. The far infrared spectrum of $M o F_{5}$ trapped in Argon
matrices at liquid hydrogen temperature. Curve a and c
the lower crucible at room temperature the upper at
$140^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; Curve b, the lower crucible at $50^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, the upper
at $150^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$.

FIGURE 3. The infrared spectrum of solid $\mathrm{MoF}_{5}$ at $20^{\circ} \mathrm{K}$.


FIGURE 4. The Raman spectrum of solid $\mathrm{MoF}_{5}$.

## PRELIMINARY REPORT ON THE

MEASUREMENT OF THE RELATIVE ENTHALPY OF MO 2 C
FROM 273.15 TO 1475 K
D. Ditmars and S. Ishihara

## 1. Introduction

The molybdenum carbide Mo 2 C is one of the refractory metal carbides currently being studied in a joint effort of the Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory and the NBS. The Los Alamos work, with Dr. E. K. Storms as principal investigator, has concentrated mainly on elucidating the phase behavior of this compound (and others in the Mo-C system) by DTA techniques as well as high-temperature $x$-ray and neutron diffraction analysis. Recently, evidence has been found for the existence of an order-disorder transition in $\mathrm{Mo}_{2} \mathrm{C}$ in the vicinity of $1400^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ [2,3] ${ }^{\text {a }}$. The NBS contribution to this effort, a preliminary report on which follows, has been planned to eventually provide through high-temperature calorimetric measurements, additional information on this transition as well as to derive improved thermodynamic functions for $\mathrm{Mo}_{2} \mathrm{C}(\mathrm{s})$.
$\mathrm{Mo}_{2} \mathrm{C}$ belongs to the class of "defect compounds", so-called because they can exist over a considerable range of composition with a high concentration of defects in the non-metal sub-lattice. $\mathrm{Mo}_{2} \mathrm{C}$ can, for instance, exist with anywhere from 26 to 36 atomic percent carbon, depending on the temperature. Melting near $2500^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, it has

[^2]an attractive potential for high-temperature applications. Yet, certain thermodynamic data on it are either lacking or seem inadequate [1].

The complete phase diagram for the portion of the Mo-C system of greatest interest has been given in a previous report [1]. Figure 1 of the present work, taken from reference [4], depicts an enlarged portion of that diagram and summarizes present knowledge on the phase relationships of compounds near to and including the one of which this work treats.

There exist two low-temperature calorimetric studies on $\mathrm{Mo}_{2} \mathrm{C}$ [5,6] and two series of enthalpy measurements extending above room temperature to $2500 \mathrm{~K}[6,7]$. These investigations were carried out with compounds with compositions differing from the one available in the current study. This can be significant for the interpretation of the $\mathrm{Mo}_{2} \mathrm{C}$ enthalpy and specific heat data as it has been observed $[2,3]$ that the speed with which this compound completes its orderdisorder transition in cooling through $1400^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ is remarkably sensitive to the concentration of non-metal, as little as half a weight percent difference in the carbon content considerably retarding the process.

## 2. Sample

The sample of $\mathrm{Mo}_{2} \mathrm{C}$ used in the experiments reported below was obtained on loan from the Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory of the University of California where it was fabricated to a specific composition and partially anaylzed by Dr. E. K. Storms. This composition was chosen as one which would ensure rapid completion of the anticipated transition at $1400^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. It was achieved by taking advantage of the fact that $\mathrm{Mo}_{2} \mathrm{C}$ vaporizes congruently near MoC.49 [2]. High-purity Mo and $C$ powders in approximately this proportion were mixed and cold-pressed into cylindrical shape with a binder which was subsequently driven off in a vacuum. This cylinder was heated to $2400^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and held there to achieve the congruently vaporizing composition, losing in the process approximately ten percent of its weight. It was later annealed at $1900^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for $1 / 2$ hour and at $1100^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 2 hours.

Preliminary chemical analyses of portions of the sample have indicated a carbon content of 5.75 weight percent (corresponding to a formula of MoC.4873) and an oxygen content of about 50. ppm. X-ray analysis has indicated that it is single-phase $\alpha-\mathrm{Mo}_{2} \mathrm{C}$.

The sample was received in the form of a cylinder approximately $3 / 8 \mathrm{in}$. O.D. and 1 in. long, weighing 26.6274 grams.


Figure 1. A portion of the Mo-C phase diagram. Shaded bars at top denote composition ranges for which order-disorder transition proceeds slowly [2,3]. Arrows indicate compositions investigated by other workers and by NBS. Dashed boxes surrounding joining points indicate temperature and composition uncertainties. Diagram adapted from [4].

Two different calorimeters were used to complete the enthalpy measurements over the range 273.15 K to 1475 K . The techniques used are described below with reference to the temperature range in which they were employed.
a. 273.15 K to 1173.15 K

In this temperature range, relative enthalpies were measured with a Bunsen ice calorimeter. Briefly, the procedure, more complete details of which are contained in other publications [8,9], is as follows: The sample, enclosed in a suitable container, is suspended in a resistance furnace until it attains the constant furnace temperature. It is then dropped into the ice calorimeter beneath the furnace and the heat given off is measured as the container and sample cool to $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The enthalpy of the container and the heat lost during the fall into the calorimeter are accounted for by subtracting from the enthalpy of the container plus sample, that of the container alone, measured in a separate experiment. In the present study, a series of enthalpy measurements on an empty Pt10Rh container similar to the one used to contain the sample had already been made and reported [8]. The smoothing equation which was chosen to represent these previous measurements (equation 1, below) was used to calculate the empty container enthalpy values needed for the measurements on $\mathrm{Mo}_{2} \mathrm{C}$ after making corrections for the small differences in the container masses.

$$
\begin{align*}
\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{t}}-\mathrm{H}_{0}{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}= & (4.529744) 10^{-8} \mathrm{t}^{3}+(8.068654) 10^{-5} \mathrm{t}^{2} \\
& +(1.901653) \mathrm{t}-(34.94647)\left(\frac{\mathrm{t}}{\mathrm{~T}}\right) .  \tag{1}\\
\mathrm{H}, \mathrm{~J} ; \mathrm{T}, \mathrm{~K}= & \mathrm{t},{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}+273.15^{\mathrm{b}}
\end{align*}
$$

For measurements in this temperature range, the complete sample, as received from the producer, was encapsulated in a .008 in. wall Pt10Rh capsule sealed under approximately 100. torr absolute helium pressure. Prior to making the measurements on the $\mathrm{Mo}_{2} \mathrm{C}$ sample, check measurements on a specimen of $\alpha-\mathrm{Al}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$, a calorimetric heat-capacity standard, were made which verified the correct functioning of the calorimetric system.
$\overline{\mathrm{b}} \mathrm{A11}$ temperatures are to be expressed on the scale IPTS-68.

In this temperature range, enthalpy relative to 298.15 K for this molydenum carbide sample was measured with the adiabatic "drop" apparatus which was comprehensively described in a previous report [10]. This temperature interval is sufficiently below any known transition to $B$ phase for this sample so a check can be made on the accuracy of the apparatus at 1173.15 K with the results obtained from the Bunsen calorimeter and the smoothness in fit of the relative enthalpy and heat-capacity measurements of the two methods can be inspected.

The principle of operation in this method is similar to that of the Bunsen ice calorimeter. A hot capsule is "dropped" from an RF induction furnace maintained at a constant temperature into an adiabatic calorimeter operating near room temperature. The heat energy added to the calorimeter is measured by the rise in the calorimeter temperature and a calculation of the energy equivalent necessary for this rise. A minimum of two drop experiments, one on an empty capsule and the other on a capsule loaded with sample is required at each furnace temperature. The difference in energy supplied to the calorimeter is the change in enthalpy of the sample after a small correction is applied to account for the difference between the final calorimeter temperatures inherent in an adiabatic calorimeter.

For this series, three drops were made for each furnace temperature, the first and third drops on an empty capsule and the second drop on a capsule filled with the sample. The agreement of the results of the first and third drops gives a check that no serious change in the optical, physical or chemical properties of the container had occurred and, therefore, that the result is valid for that furnace tempera ture.

The same brittle $\mathrm{Mo}_{2} \mathrm{C}$ sample, described in section 2 , above, was used for this portion of the work. Only the shape was altered by crushing part of the sample between two $1 / 8$ in. sheets of Teflon on the jaws of a vise, so that the "Poco" graphite capsule could accomodate the resulting granules of $\mathrm{Mo}_{2} \mathrm{C}$. The Teflon sheet was sufficient in thickness that the abrasive sample did not rupture the sheet nor scratch the steel surface of the vise.

All high temperature measurements of the furnace were determined using an $L$ and $\mathbb{N}$ automatic optical pyrometer focused on the bottom surface of the capsule through a diaphragm with a $1 / 8$ in. hole at blackbody conditions. Since the first measurementis made at least $41 / 2 \mathrm{hrs}$. after the
furnace is heated, the thermal gradients along the graphite core of the furnace as well as the solid state and electronic circuitry of the temperature measuring system settle down sufficiently to give precise results. The automatic pyrometer was periodically calibrated by the NBS optical radiation laboratory.

## 4. Results

The NBS enthalpy measurements on $\mathrm{Mo}_{2} \mathrm{C}$ completed to date are presented in Tables 1. and 2. In Table 1, column 1 gives the equilibrium sample temperature before dropping. Column 2 gives the total measured heat for container plus sample. Column 3 was derived by subtracting from column 2 the appropriate empty container heats derived from eq. (1), including a small correction for the difference in mass of the actual sample container and the container to which eq. (1) is applicable. The net heat so obtained was then expressed per gram formula weight of specimen, MoC.4873. The data of column 3 were fit by eq. (2), the constants determined using the method of least squares. ${ }^{\text {c }}$ The NBS enthalpy data above 1173.15 K was not included in this fit as measurements in this region will be extended to about $2000^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and are not yet complete.

$$
\begin{array}{rl}
H_{T}-H_{T_{0}}=A\left(T^{3}-T_{0}^{3}\right)+B\left(T^{2}-T_{0}^{2}\right)+C\left(T-T_{0}\right)+D\left(\frac{1}{T}-\frac{1}{T_{0}}\right)  \tag{2}\\
A=-1.10268 E-06 & \\
B=+6.23370 E-03 & T_{0}=273.15 \mathrm{~K} \\
C=+3.20199 E+01 & H_{T}=\mathrm{J} / \mathrm{GFW} ; G F W=101.793 \\
D=+4.94170 \mathrm{E}+05 & T, K(I P T S-68)
\end{array}
$$

Preliminary results of the enthalpy measurements on $\mathrm{Mo}_{2} \mathrm{C}$ for the temperature range 1173.15 to 1475 K are listed in table 2. Although the results were not included in the least squares fit in determining eq. (2), the agreement at 1173 K is good and the remaining data points can be expected to merge smoothly by revising eq. (2). This can be best dealt with after enthalpy measurements beyond 1475 K have been completed.

[^3]Table 1
NBS enthalpy measurements on MoC .4873 to 1173.15 K

| Furnace Temperature | Gross Measured Heat | $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{t}}-\mathrm{H}_{0}{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ |  | ObservedSmooth |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Net Heat Observed | Net Heat Smooth ${ }^{\text {c }}$ |  |
| ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | J | J/GFW ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | J/GFW ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | \% |
| 100.00 | 989.66 | 3088.9 | 3085.2 | +. 12 |
| 200.00 | 2061.58 | 6470.0 | 6475.4 | -. 08 |
| 300.00 | 3192.24 | 10060.1 | 10056.6 | +. 03 |
| 400.00 | 4358.70 | 13773.8 | 13778.6 | -. 03 |
| 500.00 | 5563.71 | 17622.1 | 17614.0 | +. 04 |
| 500.00 | 5561.60 | 17614.0 | 17614.0 | . 00 |
| 600.00 | 6790.06 | 21539.0 | 21544.6 | -. 02 |
| 700.00 | 8047.05 | 25559.9 | 25557.2 | +. 01 |
| 800.00 | 9323.06 | 29638.5 | 29640.9 | -. 01 |
| 900.00 | 10620.50 | 33784.4 | 33786.3 | -. 01 |
| 900.00 | 10621.78 | 33789.3 | 33786.3 | +. 01 |

a IPTS-68
b $\mathrm{GFW}=101.793$, Specimen mass $=26.6274 \mathrm{~g}$
c Calculated from eq. (2).

Table 2
NBS enthalpy measurements on MoC. 4873 to 1476.87 K

| Furnace Temperature | Heat from sample to calorimeter at 298.15 K | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{T}}-\mathrm{H}_{298}{ }_{\text {(observed) }}{ }^{15} \end{gathered}$ | Deviation from Eq. (2) ${ }^{c}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| K | (J) | (J/GFW) | (obs-calc., \%) |
| 1173.15 | 1520.43 | 33069.6 | +. 04 |
| 1277.72 | 1711.52 | 37503.9 | +. 15 |
| 1377.04 | 1909.32 | 41854.3 | +. 45 |
| 1476.87 | 2108.47 | 46251.4 | +. 67 |

a IPTS-68
b $\quad$ GFW $=101.793$; theoretical density $=9.18 \mathrm{gm} / \mathrm{cm}^{3}$. Sample mass was slightly different for each run since small loose particles which separated were not included in subsequent runs.
c Enthalpy data in this table was not used for determining eq. (2).

The present NBS enthalpy measurements up to 1173.15 K are believed to have an accuracy of 0.2 percent. They lie on the average about . 5 percent above the earlier measurements of Pankratz et al [6] (see fig. 2), and show improved precision. These differences might be though to arise from frozen-in disorder in the sample of Pankratz. However, a preliminary comparison of the present NBS thermal data with the low-temperature specific heat measurements of Pankratz et al [6] and Paukov et al [5] indicates a correct merging both with respect to magnitude and to slope of the specific heat curves in their region of overlap.

The enthalpy data of Neel et al [7], which up to $1400^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ consists of three points, have not been included in the comparison of fig. (2) as they differ by two or three percent from eq. (2) and could not agree with any reasonable extrapolation of the low-temperature data.

Pankratz et al [6] and Paukov et al [5] have derived from their low-temperature data, values for $\mathrm{S}_{298} .15$ of $15.74 \pm .09$ and $15.74 \pm .03 \mathrm{cal} / \mathrm{mole}, \mathrm{K}$ respectively (based on the composition $\mathrm{Mo}_{2} \mathrm{C}_{1} .0180$ ) a1though Paukov's heat capacity data are one to two percent higher than the Pankratz data below 125 K . As soon as the combined low-temperature data have been re-analyzed and the complete NBS high-temperature data become available, more reliable thermodynamic functions for $\mathrm{Mo}_{2} \mathrm{C}(\mathrm{s})$ will be generated.

In Figure 3 a plot of the average heat capacity from a base temperature of 298.15 K is shown. The smoothness of the experimental points indicates that the sample has probably not undergone a transition in the range of measurement. The plot also indicates that the enthalpy determinations of Mo2C with the two different calorimeters of this study are consistent with one another.



Figure 3. Comparison of the average heat capacity of $\mathrm{Mo}_{2} \mathrm{C}$ calculated from the base temperature of 298.15 K for the two NBS calorimeters of this study.
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## Chapter 5

> HIGH-SPEED (SUBSECOND) SIMULTANEOUS MEASUREMENT OF SPECIFIC HEAT, ELECTRICAL RESISTIVITY, AND HEMISPHERICAL TOTAL EMITTANCE OF TANTALUM - 10 (WT. $\%$ ) TUNGSTEN ALLOY IN THE RANGE 1500 to $3200 \mathrm{~K} *$

Ared Cezairliyan
National Bureau of Standards
Washington, D. C. 20234


#### Abstract

Simultaneous measurements of specific heat, electrical resistivity, and hemispherical total emittance of tantalum - 10 (wt. \%) tungsten alloy in the temperature range 1500 to 3200 K by a subsecond duration pulse heating technique are described. Estimated inaccuracy of measured properties are: $3 \%$ for specific heat and hemispherical total emittance, and $0.5 \%$ for electrical resistivity. Properties of the alloy are compared with the properties of the constituent elements. The values of measured specific heat are approximately $2 \%$ higher than the values computed according to Kopp's additivity law. However, this difference is within the combined estimated errors. The electrical resistivity results indicate a significant departure from Mathiessen's law. Like tantalum, the alloy showed a negative departure from linearity in the curve of electrical resistivity versus temperature.


[^4]
## 1. Introduction

A high-speed technique was developed in this laboratory for the measurement of selected thermophysical properties of refractory metals at high temperatures. In this paper, application of this technique to the simultaneous measurements of specific heat, electrical resistivity, and hemispherical total emittance of the alloy tantalum - 10 (wt. \%) tungsten in the temperature range 1500 to 3200 K is described.

The method is based on rapid resistive self-heating of the specimen from room temperature to any desired high temperature (up to its melting point) in less than one second by the passage of electrical currents through it; and on measuring, with millisecond resolution, experimental quantities such as current through the specimen, potential drop across the specimen, and specimen temperature.

Current through the specimen is determined from the measurement of the potential difference across the standard resistance placed in series with the specimen. Potential difference across the middle two thirds of the specimen is measured using spring-loaded, knife-edge times probes. Specimen temperature is measured at the rate of 1200 per second with a high-speed photoelectric pyrometer (Foley, 1970). A small hole in the wall at the middle of the tubular specimen provides an approximation to blackbody conditions. The experimental quantities are recorded with a digital data acquisition system, which has a time resolution of 0.4 ms and a full-scale signal resolution of one part in 8000 . Details regarding the construction and operation of the measurement system, the methods of measuring experimental quantities, and other pertinent
information, such as formulation of relations for properties, etc. are given in earlier publications (Cezairliyan et al., 1970; Cezairliyan, 1971).

## 2. Measurements

The specimen was a tube fabricated from a tantalum - 10 (wt. \%) tungsten rod ${ }^{(1)}$ by removing the center portion by an electro-erosion technique. The outer surface of the specimen was polished to reduce heat loss due to thermal radiation. The nominal dimensions of the specimen were: length, 102 mm ; outside diameter, 6.3 mm ; and wall thickness, 0.5 mm .

Tungsten content of the specimen was $9.45 \%$ by weight. The total amount of impurities was less than $0.1 \%$. Photomicrographs of the specimen, shown in Figure 1, indicate that considerable grain growth took place as the result of pulse heating to high temperatures.

The measurements were performed in the temperature interval 1500 to 3200 K . To optimize the operation of the pyrometer, this interval was divided into seven ranges. One experiment was performed in each range. Before the start of the experiments, the specimen was annealed by subjecting it to 30 heating pulses (up to 3000 K ). All the experiments were conducted with the specimen in a vacuum environment of approximately $10^{-4}$ torr.

To optimize the operation of the measurement system, the heating rate of the specimens was varied depending on the desired temperature
(1) The specimen in rod form was furnished by the U. S. Air Force Materials Laboratory, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio.
range by adjusting the value of a resistance in series with the specimen. Duration of current pulses in the experiment ranged from 400 to 470 ms ; and the heating rate ranged from 4400 to $6700 \mathrm{~K} \mathrm{~s}^{-1}$. Radiative heat loss from the specimen amounted to approximately $1 \%$ at $1500 \mathrm{~K}, 7 \%$ at 2500 K , and $20 \%$ at 3200 K of the input power.

Data on voltage, current, and temperature were used to obtain third degree polynomial functions for each quantity in terms of time, which then provided the input information for the determination of properties.

## 3. Experimental Results

This section presents the thermophysical properties determined from the measured quantities. All values are based on the International Practical Temperature Scale of 1968 (1969). In all computations, the geometrical quantities are based on their room temperature (298 K) dimensions. The experimental results for properties are represented by polynomial functions in temperature obtained by least squares approximation of the individual points. The final values on properties at 100 degree temperature intervals computed using the functions are presented in Table 1. Results obtained from individual experiments, by the method described previously (Cezairliyan et al., 1970), are given in the Appendix (Tables A-1 and A-2). Each number tabulated in these tables represents results from over fifty original data points.

### 3.1. Specific Heat

Specific heat was computed from data taken during the heating period. A correction for power loss due to thermal radiation was made using the

Tab1e 1
Specific heat, electrical resistivity, and hemispherical total emittance of the alloy tantalum -10 (wt.\%) tungsten

| Temp K | $\mathrm{J}_{\mathrm{g}}^{\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{P}}} \mathrm{~K}_{\mathrm{K}}-1$ | $\begin{gathered} \rho^{*} \\ 10^{-8} \Omega \mathrm{~m} \end{gathered}$ | $\varepsilon^{*}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1500 | 0.1662 | 61.60 |  |
| 1600 | 0.1683 | 64.96 |  |
| 1700 | 0.1704 | 68.27 | 0.199 |
| 1800 | 0.1726 | 71.52 | 0.213 |
| 1900 | 0.1748 | 74.73 | 0.226 |
| 2000 | 0.1771 | 77.88 | 0.239 |
| 2100 | 0.1796 | 80.97 | 0.251 |
| 2200 | 0.1825 | 84.02 | 0.263 |
| 2300 | 0.1857 | 87.01 | 0.275 |
| 2400 | 0.1893 | 89.95 | 0.286 |
| 2500 | 0.1934 | 92.83 | 0.296 |
| 2600 | 0.1981 | 95.66 | 0.307 |
| 2700 | 0.2035 | 98.45 | 0.316 |
| 2800 | 0.2095 | 101.17 | 0.326 |
| 2900 | 0.2163 | 103.85 | 0.335 |
| 3000 | 0.2240 | 106.47 | 0.343 |
| 3100 | 0.2326 | 109.04 |  |
| 3200 | 0.2422 | 111.56 |  |

*Based on ambient temperature (298 K) dimensions.
results on hemispherical total emittance. The function for specific heat (standard deviation $=1 \%$ ) that represents the results in the temperature range 1500 to 3200 K is:

$$
\begin{equation*}
c_{p}=7.769 \times 10^{-2}+1.221 \times 10^{-4} \mathrm{~T}-5.972 \times 10^{-8} \mathrm{~T}^{2}+1.176 \times 10^{-11} \mathrm{~T}^{3} \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $T$ is in $K$, and $c_{p}$ is in $J^{-1} K^{-1}$.

### 3.2. Electrical Resistivity

The electrical resistivity was determined from the same experiments that were used to calculate the specific heat. The function for electrical resistivity (standard deviation $=0.1 \%$ ) that represents the results in the temperature range 1500 to 3200 K is:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\rho=4.863+4.178 \times 10^{-2} \mathrm{~T}-2.637 \times 10^{-6} \mathrm{~T}^{2} \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $T$ is in $K$, and $\rho$ is in $10^{-8} \Omega \mathrm{~m}$. In the computations of the specimens cross-sectional area, that is needed for the computations of electrical resistivity, the density of the specimen was taken as $16.968 \times 10^{3} \mathrm{~kg} \mathrm{~m}^{-3}$ (Taylor et al., 1971). The measurement, before the pulse experiments, of the electrical resistivity of the specimen at 293 K with a Kelvin bridge yielded a value of $17.6 \times 10^{-8} \Omega \mathrm{~m}$.

### 3.3. Hemispherical Total Emittance

Hemispherical total emittance was computed using data taken during both heating and initial free radiative cooling periods. The function for hemispherical total emittance (standard deviation $=0.8 \%$ ) that represents the results in the temperature range 1700 to 3000 K is:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\varepsilon=-9.765 \times 10^{-2}+2.108 \times 10^{-4} \mathrm{~T}-2.129 \times 10^{-8} \mathrm{~T}^{2} \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $T$ is in $K$.

## 4. Estimate of Errors

The details for estimating errors in measured and computed quantities in high-speed experiments using the present measurement system are given in an earlier publication (Cezairliyan et al., 1970). In this paper, the specific items in the error analysis were recomputed whenever the present conditions differed from those in the earlier publication. The results for imprecision ${ }^{(2)}$ and inaccuracy ${ }^{(3)}$ in the properties are: $1 \%$ and $3 \%$ for specific heat, $0.1 \%$ and $0.5 \%$ for electrical resistivity, $0.8 \%$ and $3 \%$ for hemispherical total emittance.

## 5. Discussion

The specific heat, electrical resistivity, and hemispherical total emittance of the tantalum - 10 tungsten alloy measured in this work are presented graphically in Figures 2, 3, and 4, respectively. For comparison purposes, similar results for tantalum and tungsten metals, measured and reported earlier (Cezairliyan et al., 1971; Cezairliyan and McClure, 1971) are also included in the figures.

A comparison of the electrical resistivity results of this work with those reported by Taylor et al. (1971) on a similar specimen up to 2400 K indicates that the present results are higher by approximately 0.3\% at $1500 \mathrm{~K}, 0.6 \%$ at 2000 K , and $0.8 \%$ at 2400 K . The average absolute difference between the two results, in the temperature interval 1500 to 2400 K ,
(2) Imprecision refers to the standard deviation of an individual point as computed from the difference between measured value and that from the smooth function obtained by the least squares method.
(3) Inaccuracy refers to the estimated total error (random and systematic).
is approximately $0.6 \%$. However, this difference is less than the combined estimated errors. When the present measurement of electrical resistivity at 293 K is extrapolated to 300 K a value of $18.0 \times 10^{-8} \Omega \mathrm{~m}$ is obtained that compares favorably with the value $17.9 \times 10^{-8} \Omega \mathrm{~m}$ reported by Taylor et al. (1971).

A comparison of the hemispherical total emittance results of this work with those of Taylor et al. (1971) up to 2700 K indicates that the present results are higher by approximately $4 \%$ at 1700 K , and $1 \%$ at 2200 K, and are lower by approximately $2 \%$ at 2700 K. Some of this difference may be attributed to the differences in specimen surface conditions.

According to Kopp's law, specific heat of a binary alloy, $c_{12}$ (on mass basis), may be expressed as

$$
\begin{equation*}
c_{12}=x_{1} c_{1}+x_{2} c_{2} \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $x_{1}$ and $x_{2}$ are mass fractions of the constituent elements 1 and 2 , and $c_{1}$ and $c_{2}$ are their respective specific heats.

Departure of the measured specific heat of this work from Kopp's law was computed using the data on tantalum and tungsten reported in earlier publications (Cezairliyan et al., 1971; Cezairliyan and McClure, 1971). The results are presented graphically in Figure 5. It may be seen that in the temperature interval 2000 to 3000 K the measured values are approximately two percent higher than the computed values. Above 3000 K , the difference between measured and computed values decreases, changes sign and then increases (in the negative direction). A sharp increase in tantalum specific heat above 3000 K may account for this trend. However, one should not place too much significance to the
difference between measured and computed specific heat values since its magnitude is less than the combined estimated errors in the measurements of specific heat of the alloy and its two constituents.

According to Matthiessen's law (as presented by Gerritsen, 1956), electrical resistivity of a binary alloy, $\rho_{12}$, may be expressed as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\rho_{12}=X_{1} \rho_{1}+X_{2} \rho_{2}+\rho_{0} \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $X_{1}$ and $X_{2}$ are atomic fractions of the constituent elements 1 and 2, and $\rho_{1}$ and $\rho_{2}$ are their respective electrical resistivities. The quantity $\rho_{0}$ is considered to be constant (temperature independent) for a given alloy.

Rearrangement of Equation (5) yields

$$
\begin{equation*}
\rho_{0}=\rho_{12}-\left(X_{1} \rho_{1}+X_{2} \rho_{2}\right) \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

Departure of the electrical resistivity of the tantalum - 10 tungsten alloy from Matthiessen's law is determined using Equation (6). The measured values for the alloy are substituted for $\rho_{12}$ and data on tantalum and tungsten reported in earlier publications (Cezairliyan et al., 1971; Cezairliyan and McClure, 1971) are used for $\rho_{1}$ and $\rho_{2}$. The results are presented graphically in Figure 6 in terms of the quantity $\rho_{0}$. According to the law, $\rho_{0}$ should be constant, however computations show that it decreases with increasing temperature and undergoes sign reversal at high temperatures. The dashed line in Figure 6 was obtained by fitting the high temperature points to a linear function, using the least squares method, and forcing the function to pass through the room temperature value. Average absolute difference of the points from the linear function is $0.1 \times 10^{-8} \Omega \mathrm{~m}$. This is considerably less than the estimated uncertainty
of the individual points $\left(0.8 \times 10^{-8} \Omega \mathrm{~m}\right.$ which is obtained from the combination of estimated errors in the electrical resistivity of the alloy and its two constituents.

Departure from Matthiessen's law may also be determined by comparing temperature derivatives of measured and computed electrical resistivities, namely derivatives of Equations (2) and (5), respectively. The advantage of this approach is that the quantity $\rho_{0}$ is eliminated during the differentiation. The results are shown graphically in Figure 7. Difference between the two derivatives, which may be a measure of the departure from Matthiessen's law, is approximately $4 \%$ at 2000 K and increases to approximately $6 \%$ at 3000 K .

At 293 K , electrical resistivity of the alloy ( $17.6 \times 10^{-8} \Omega \mathrm{~m}$ is higher than the resistivity of either one of its constituents (14.0 x $10^{-8} \Omega$ for tantalum, and $5.45 \times 10^{-8} \Omega m$ for tungsten). However, at high temperatures (Figure 3) the resistivity of the alloy is lower than that of tantalum. Like tantalum, at high temperature the alloy showed a negative departure from linearity in the curve of electrical resistivity versus temperature.
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Table A-1
Experimental results on specific heat and electrical resistivity of the alloy tantalum- 10 (wt.\%) tungsten

| T K | $\begin{gathered} c_{P} \\ \mathrm{~J}^{-1} \mathrm{~K}^{-1} \end{gathered}$ | $\Delta_{\%} c_{p}^{*}$ | $10^{-8} \Omega \mathrm{~m}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \Delta 0^{*} \\ & \% \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1500 | 0.1656 | -0.30 | 61.75 | +0.25 |
| 1550 | 0.1683 | +0.64 | 63.36 | +0.12 |
| 1600 | 0.1709 | +1.52 | 64.98 | +0.03 |
| 1650 | 0.1671 | -1.37 | 66.65 | +0.04 |
| 1700 | 0.1714 | +0.61 | 68.23 | -0.05 |
| 1750 | 0.1690 | -1.44 | 69.88 | -0.02 |
| 1800 | 0.1728 | +0.17 | 71.44 | -0.11 |
| 1850 | 0.1760 | +1.35 | 73.01 | -0.16 |
| 1900 | 0.1714 | -1.91 | 74.73 | +0.01 |
| 1950 | 0.1742 | -0.96 | 76.25 | -0.07 |
| 2000 | 0.1769 | -0.09 | 77.77 | -0.12 |
| 2050 | 0.1796 | +0.72 | 79.30 | -0.16 |
| 2100 | 0.1822 | +1.44 | 80.83 | -0.17 |
| 2150 | 0.1785 | -1.37 | 82.56 | +0.08 |
| 2200 | 0.1812 | -0.71 | 84.04 | +0.04 |
| 2250 | 0.1838 | -0.08 | 85.52 | +0.01 |
| 2300 | 0.1866 | +0.50 | 87.00 | 0.00 |
| 2350 | 0.1894 | $+1.04$ | 88.47 | -0.01 |
| 2400 | 0.1888 | -0.26 | 90.01 | +0.08 |
| 2450 | 0.1911 | -0.07 | 91.44 | +0.06 |
| 2500 | 0.1936 | +0.08 | 92.86 | +0.04 |
| 2550 | 0.1961 | +0.22 | 94.28 | +0.03 |
| 2600 | 0.1988 | +0.33 | 95.68 | +0.02 |
| 2650 | 0.2016 | +0.44 | 97.07 | +0.02 |
| 2700 | 0.2046 | +0.54 | 98.46 | +0.02 |
| 2750 | 0.2078 | +0.66 | 99.83 | +0.02 |
| 2800 | 0.2112 | +0.81 | 101.18 | +0.02 |
| 2850 | 0.2150 | +1.02 | 102.53 | +0.02 |
| 2900 | 0.2110 | -2.55 | 103.96 | +0.12 |
| 2950 | 0.2164 | -1.70 | 105.23 | +0.07 |
| 3000 | 0.2219 | -0.96 | 106.50 | +0.04 |
| 3050 | 0.2275 | -0.31 | 107.77 | +0.01 |
| 3100 | 0.2331 | +0.21 | 109.01 | -0.02 |
| 3150 | 0.2388 | +0.61 | 110.22 | -0.07 |
| 3200 | 0.2443 | +0.84 | 111.38 | -0.15 |

The quantities $\Delta c_{p}$, and $\Delta \rho$ are percentage deviations of the individual results from the smooth functions represented by Equations (1) and (2), respectively.

Experimental results on hemispherical total emittance of the alloy tantalum -l0 (wt.\%) tungsten

| $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{T} \\ & \mathrm{~K} \end{aligned}$ | $\varepsilon$ | $\begin{aligned} & \Delta \epsilon^{*} \\ & \% \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1708 | 0.198 | -0.95 |
| 1708 | 0.200 | +0.01 |
| 1708 | 0.202 | +0.67 |
| 1708 | 0.203 | +1.44 |
| 1873 | 0.223 | +0.37 |
| 1873 | 0.222 | -0.45 |
| 1873 | 0.221 | -0.69 |
| 1874 | 0.224 | +0.77 |
| 2059 | 0.244 | -0.86 |
| 2059 | 0.244 | -1.09 |
| 2059 | 0.244 | -0.90 |
| 2060 | 0.244 | -1.01 |
| 2312 | 0.278 | +0.71 |
| 2313 | 0.278 | +0.74 |
| 2313 | 0.279 | +1.05 |
| 2315 | 0.279 | +1.00 |
| 2656 | 0.312 | -0.07 |
| 2658 | 0.312 | -0.06 |
| 2658 | 0.311 | -0.46 |
| 2661 | 0.311 | -0.36 |
| 2960 | 0.340 | +0.01 |
| 2964 | 0.341 | +0.13 |
| 2964 | 0.340 | -0.13 |
| 2969 | 0.341 | +0.04 |

*The quantity $\triangle c$ is percentage deviation of the individual results from the smooth function represented by equation.
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Figure 1.
Photomicrographs of the tantalum - 10 tungsten specimen. Upper photograph, specimen as received; lower photograph, specimen after the entire set of experiments.


Figure 2.
Specific heat of tantalum - 10 tungsten alloy, and tantalum and tungsten metals.







Chapter 6
SIMULTANEOUS MEASUREMENT OF SPECIFIC HEAT, ELECTRICAL RESISTIVITY, AND HEMISPHERICAL TOTAL EMITTANCE OF NIOBIUM - 1 (WT. \%) ZIRCONIUM ALLOY IN THE RANGE 1500 TO 2700 K BY A TRANSIENT (SUBSECOND) TECHNIQUE*

Ared Cezairliyan
National Bureau of Standards Washington, D. C. 20234


#### Abstract

Simultaneous measurements of specific heat, electrical resistivity, and hemispherical total emittance of niobium - 1 (wt. \%) zirconium alloy in the temperature range 1500 to 2700 K by a subsecond duration pulse heating technique are described. Estimated inaccuracy of measured properties are: $3 \%$ for specific heat and hemispherical total emittance, and $0.5 \%$ for electrical resistivity. Properties of the alloy are compared with the properties of pure niobium. It was found that specific heat and emittance of the alloy were approximately $0.5 \%$ and $1.5 \%$, respectively, higher than those of pure niobium. Electrical resistivity of the alloy was $0.5 \%$ lower than that of pure niobium. Like niobium, the alloy showed a negative departure from linearity in the curve of electrical resistivity versus temperature.
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## 1. Introduction

In this paper, application of a transient technique to the simultaneous measurements of specific heat, electrical resistivity, and hemispherical total emittance of the alloy niobium - 1 (wt. \%) zirconium in the temperature range from 1500 to 2700 K is described.

The method is based on rapid resistive self-heating of the specimen from room temperature to any desired high temperature (up to its melting point) in less than one second by the passage of electrical currents through it; and on measuring, with millisecond resolution, experimental quantities such as current through the specimen, potential drop across the specimen, and specimen temperature. Details regarding the construction and operation of the measurement system, the methods of measuring experimental quantities, and other pertinent information, such as formulation of relations for properties, etc. are given in earlier publications $[1,2]^{1}$.
2. Measurements

The specimen was a tube of the following nominal dimensions: length, 102 mm ; outside diameter, 6.3 mm ; and wall thickness, 0.5 mm . Zirconium content of the specimen was $1.05 \%$ by weight. The total amount of impurities was less than $0.17 \%$; the major impurity was tantalum with $0.09 \%$. Photomicrographs of the specimen, shown in Figure 1, indicate that considerable grain growth took place as the result of pulse heating to high temperatures.

[^6]To optimize the operation of the high-speed pyrometer, the temperature interval (1500 to 2700 K ) was divided into six ranges. One experiment was performed in each range. Before the start of the experiments, the specimen was annealed by subjecting it to 30 heating pulses (up to $2500 \mathrm{~K})$. The experiments were conducted with the specimen in a vacuum environment of approximately $10^{-4}$ torr.

To optimize the operation of the measurement system, the heating rate of the specimen was varied depending on the desired temperature range by adjusting the value of a resistance in series with the specimen. Duration of current pulses in the experiment ranged from 360 to 410 ms ; and the heating rate ranged from 4500 to $6600 \mathrm{~K} \mathrm{~s}^{-1}$. Radiative heat loss from the specimen amounted to approximately $1 \%$ at 1500 K , and $9 \%$ at 2700 K of the input power.
3. Experimental Results

The thermophysical properties reported in this paper are based on the International Practical Temperature Scale of 1968 [3]. In all computations, the geometrical quantities are based on their room temperature ( 298 K ) dimensions. The experimental results for properties are represented by polynomial functions in temperature obtained by least squares approximation of the individual points. The final values on properties at 100 degree temperature intervals computed using the functions are presented in Table 1. Results obtained from individual experiments, by the method described previously [2], are given in the Appendix (Tables A-1 and A-2). Each number tabulated in these tables represents results from over fifty original data points.

Table 1

Specific heat, electrical resistivity, and hemispherical total emittance of the alloy niobium -1 (wt.\%) zirconium

| Temp <br> $K$ | $\mathrm{c}_{\mathrm{p}} \mathrm{g}^{2} \mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{K}}-1$ | $\rho^{*}$ <br> $10^{-8} \Omega \mathrm{~m}$ | $\epsilon^{*}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1500 | 0.3207 | 57.36 |  |
| 1600 | 0.3263 | 60.13 |  |
| 1700 | 0.3322 | 62.87 | 0.218 |
| 1800 | 0.3385 | 65.59 | 0.232 |
| 1900 | 0.3455 | 68.27 | 0.245 |
| 2000 | 0.3535 | 70.93 | 0.257 |
| 2100 | 0.3627 | 73.56 | 0.268 |
| 2200 | 0.3735 | 76.16 | 0.278 |
| 2300 | 0.3861 | 78.74 | 0.287 |
| 2400 | 0.4007 | 81.29 | 0.295 |
| 2500 | 0.4177 | 83.81 | 0.303 |
| 2600 | 0.4373 | 86.30 | 0.309 |
| 2700 | 0.4598 | 88.76 |  |

*Based on ambient temperature (298K) dimensions.

Specific Heat. Specific heat was computed from data taken during the heating period. A correction for power loss due to thermal radiation was made using the results on hemispherical total emittance. The function for specific heat (standard deviation $=1 \%$ ) that represents the results in the temperature range 1500 to 2700 K is:

$$
\begin{equation*}
c_{p}=7.073 \times 10^{-2}+3.783 \times 10^{-4} \mathrm{~T}-2.091 \times 10^{-7} \mathrm{~T}^{2}+4.532 \times 10^{-11} \mathrm{~T}^{3} \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $T$ is in $K$, and $c_{p}$ is in $J_{g^{-1}} K^{-1}$.
Electrical Resistivity: The electrical resistivity was determined from the same experiments that were used to calculate the specific heat. The function for electrical resistivity (standard deviation $=0.06 \%$ ) that represents the results in the temperature range 1500 to 2700 K is:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\rho=12.50+3.199 \times 10^{-2} \mathrm{~T}-1.387 \times 10^{-6} \mathrm{~T}^{2} \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $T$ is in $K$, and $\rho$ is in $10^{-8} \Omega \mathrm{~m}$. The measurement, before the pulse experiments, of the electrical resistivity of the specimen at 293 K with a Kelvin bridge yielded a value of $16.2 \times 10^{-8} \Omega \mathrm{~m}$.

## Hemispherical Total Emittance: Hemispherical total emittance was

 computed using data taken during both heating and initial free radiative cooling periods. The function for hemispherical total emittance (standard deviation $=1 \%$ ) that represents the results in the temperature range 1700 to 2600 K is:$$
\begin{equation*}
\varepsilon=-1.647 \times 10^{-1}+3.056 \times 10^{-4} \mathrm{~T}-4.749 \times 10^{-8} \mathrm{~T}^{2} \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $T$ is in $K$.

## 4. Estimate of Errors

The details for estimating errors in measured and computed quantities in transient experiments using the present measurement system are given in
an earlier publication [2]. In this paper, the specific items in the error analysis were recomputed whenever the present conditions differed from those in the earlier publication. The results for imprecision ${ }^{2}$ and inaccuracy ${ }^{3}$ in the properties are: $1 \%$ and $3 \%$ for specific heat, $0.06 \%$ and $0.5 \%$ for electrical resistivity, $1 \%$ and $3 \%$ for hemispherical total emittance.

## 5. Discussion

The specific heat, electrical resistivity, and hemispherical total emittance of the niobium-1 zirconium alloy measured in this work are presented in Figure 2. A comparison of the present results for the alloy with those for pure niobium [4] obtained using the same method is given in Figure 3. It may be seen that specific heat and hemispherical total emittance of the alloy were approximately $0.5 \%$ and $1.5 \%$, respectively, higher than those of pure niobium. The difference in specific heat cannot be accounted for by the additivity law. Electrical resistivity of the alloy was $0.5 \%$ lower than that of pure niobium. However, one should not place too much significance to these differences since their magnitudes are less than the combined estimated errors in the measurements for the alloy and for the pure metal.

At 293 K , electrical resistivity of the alloy ( $16.2 \times 10^{-8} \Omega \mathrm{~m}$ )
is higher than the resistivity of pure niobium (15.9 $\times 10^{-8} \Omega \mathrm{~m}$ ) [4]. However, at high temperatures (Figure 3) the resistivity of the alloy

[^7]${ }^{3}$ Inaccuracy refers to the estimated total error (random and systematic).
is lower than that of niobium. A similar trend was also observed in the electrical resistivity of the alloy tantalum - 10 (wt. \%) tungsten [5]. Like tantalum, at high temperature the alloy showed a negative departure from linearity in the curve of electrical resistivity versus temperature.
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Table A-1

Experimental results on specific heat and electrical resistivity of the alloy niobium-1 (wt.\%) zirconium

| T <br> K | $\mathrm{J}^{\mathrm{c}} \mathrm{~g}^{-1} \mathrm{~K}^{-1}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \Delta c^{*} \\ \% \end{array}$ | $10^{-8} \Omega_{\mathrm{m}}$ | $\begin{gathered} \Delta \rho^{*} \\ \% \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1500 | 0.3198 | -0.24 | 57.37 | +0.01 |
| 1550 | 0.3206 | -0.87 | 58.75 | -0.01 |
| 1600 | 0.3275 | +0.37 | 60.13 | 0.00 |
| 1650 | 0.3344 | +1.57 | 61.53 | +0.03 |
| 1700 | 0.3311 | -0.31 | 62.90 | +0.04 |
| 1750 | 0.3392 | +1.19 | 64.27 | +0.05 |
| 1800 | 0.3339 | -1.34 | 65.59 | +0.01 |
| 1850 | 0.3416 | -0.06 | 66.92 | -0.02 |
| 1900 | 0.3480 | +0.74 | 68.26 | -0.03 |
| 1950 | 0.3419 | -2.14 | 69.58 | -0.03 |
| 2000 | 0.3505 | -0.82 | 70.88 | -0.07 |
| 2050 | 0.3587 | +0.26 | 72.19 | -0.09 |
| 2100 | 0.3666 | +1.08 | 73.50 | -0.09 |
| 2150 | 0.3739 | $+1.62$ | 74.81 | -0.08 |
| 2200 | 0.3700 | -0.91 | 76.25 | +0.10 |
| 2250 | 0.3779 | -0.42 | 77.51 | +0.06 |
| 2300 | 0.3859 | -0.00 | 78.77 | +0.03 |
| 2350 | 0.3943 | +0.33 | 80.03 | +0.01 |
| 2400 | 0.4030 | +0.60 | 81.28 | -0.01 |
| 2450 | 0.4024 | -1.59 | 82.68 | +0.16 |
| 2500 | 0.4217 | +0.98 | 83.79 | -0.02 |
| 2550 | 0.4228 | -1.01 | 85.11 | +0.07 |
| 2600 | 0.4426 | +1.24 | 86.28 | -0.02 |
| 2650 | 0.4461 | -0.43 | 87.52 | -0.02 |
| 2700 | 0.4594 | -0.07 | 88.69 | -0.08 |

*The quantities $\Delta c_{p}$ and $\triangle O$ are percentage deviations of the individual results from the smooth functions represented by equations (1) and (2), respectively.

Experimental results on hemispherical total emittance of the alloy niobium-1 (wt. \%) zirconium

| $T$ | $\varepsilon$ | $\Delta \varepsilon^{*}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| K |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| 1711 | 0.218 | -0.44 |
| 1711 | 0.223 | +1.71 |
| 1711 | 0.217 | -1.01 |
| 1712 | 0.223 | +1.76 |
| 1899 | 0.242 | -1.01 |
| 1899 | 0.242 | -0.93 |
| 1899 | 0.240 | -1.76 |
| 1900 | 0.241 | -1.50 |
| 2055 | 0.264 | +0.36 |
| 2056 | 0.265 | +0.62 |
| 2056 | 0.266 | +1.05 |
| 2322 | 0.266 | +1.22 |
| 2324 | 0.287 | -0.69 |
| 2324 | 0.289 | -0.11 |
| 2325 | 0.290 | +0.14 |
| 2667 | 0.291 | +0.64 |
| 2670 | 0.312 | -0.31 |
|  | 0.312 | -0.11 |
|  | 0.313 | +0.02 |
|  |  | +0.20 |

*The quantity $\triangle \epsilon$ is percentage deviation of the individual results from the smooth function represented by equation
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Figure 1. Photomicrographs of the niobium - 1 zirconium specimen. Upper photograph, specimen as received; lower photograph, specimen after the entire set of experiments.


# Chapter 7 <br> MEASUREMENT OF MELTING POINT AND ELECTRICAL RESISTIVITY (ABOVE 3600 K ) OF TUNGSTEN BY A PULSE HEATING METHOD* 

Ared Cezairliyan<br>National Bureau of Standards<br>Washington, D. C. 20234


#### Abstract

A subsecond duration pulse heating method is used to measure the melting point, and electrical resistivity of tungsten above 3600 K . The results yield a value of 3695 K (on the International Practical Temperature Scale of 1968) for the melting point with an estimated inaccuracy of 15 K . Estimated inaccuracy in electrical resistivity measurements is 1 percent.


[^8]
## 1. Introduction

Serious difficulties are encountered in the measurement of electrical resistivity and melting point of substances at temperatures above 2500 K by conventional steady-state and quasi steady-state methods. Most of the problems inherent in these methods are eliminated by using high-speed measurement techniques. An application of a high-speed (pulse heating) technique to the accurate measurement of the melting point and electrical resistivity (above 2940 K ) of molybdenum is described in the literature [1].

In the present study, the same pulse heating technique was used for the measurement of the melting point and electrical resistivity of tungsten above 3600 K . The tubular specimen was heated in vacuum ( $10^{-4}$ torr) from room temperature to its melting point in 0.7 s by a single heavy current pulse. During the heating period, current flowing through the specimen, potential difference across the specimen, and specimen temperature were measured. Temperature was measured with a high-speed photoelectric pyrometer [2] which permits 1200 evaluations of specimen temperature per second. The pyrometer's target was a rectangular hole ( $1 \times 0.5 \mathrm{~mm}$ ) in the wall at the middle of the specimen. Recordings of voltage, current, and temperature were made with a high-speed digital data acquisition system [3], which is capable of recording data with a full-scale signal resolution of approximately one part in 8000 and a time resolution of 0.4 ms. Details regarding the construction and operational characteristics of the entire measurement system are given in earlier publications [3, 4].

## 2. Measurements

Measurements were performed on two specimens designated as tungsten-1 and tungsten-2. Each specimen was a tube fabricated from a tungsten rod by removing the center portion by an electro-erosion technique. The nominal dimensions of the specimens were: length 102 mm ( 4 in.) , outside diameter, 6.3 mm ( 0.25 in. ); and thickness, 0.5 mm ( $0.02 \mathrm{in)}$. . The outer surface of the specimen was polished to reduce heat loss due to thermal radiation. The rods used in the fabrication of the two specimens were obtained from two different sources. They were manufactured by two different techniques: sintered (tungsten-1), and arc cast (tungsten-2). Both specimens were 99.9 ${ }^{+}$percent pure. Spectrochemical analyses on tungsten-1 indicate the presence of the following impurities in ppm weight: Mo, 310; Th, < 250; Fe, 60; Zr, 30; Ca, Nb, < 20 each; Cu, Ti, 10 each; A1, Cr, Si, 5 each; and $\mathrm{B}, \mathrm{Co}, \mathrm{Mg}, \mathrm{Mn}, \mathrm{Ni}, \mathrm{Pb}, \mathrm{Sn}, \mathrm{Sr},<2$ each. The residual resistivity ratio of tungsten-1 was 41. All measurements reported in this paper, unless stated otherwise, are based on the International Practical Temperature Scale of 1968 (IPTS-1968) [5].

Specimen temperature near and during the initial melting period was measured as a function of time. The plateau in temperature indicates the region of solid and liquid equilibria. By averaging temperature points on the plateau the following values were obtained for the melting point: 3692.6 K for tungsten-1, and 3696.8 K for tungsten-2, with a standard deviation (individual point) of 1.3 K and 1.1 K , respectively. The measured temperatures at the plateau for the two specimens are shown in
figure 1. Averaging the results of the two specimens yields a value of 3695 K for the melting point of tungsten. To determine the trend of measured temperatures at the plateau, temperature data were fitted to a linear function in time using the least squares method. This procedure indicated that the slope of the linear function was small, corresponding to a maximum temperature difference of less than 0.5 K between the beginning and end of the plateau for both specimens.

Electrical resistance of tungsten-1 near and at the melting point is shown in figure 2. It may be seen that resistance behaved normally until approximately 10 K below the melting point was reached. Electrical resistivity was calculated using the relation $\rho=R A / L$, where $R$ is the resistance, A the cross-sectional area, and L the length of the specimen between the potential probes. Dimensions were based on their room temperature values. The cross-sectional area was determined from measurements of density and weight. Measured values for the electrical resistivity (in $10^{-8} \Omega \mathrm{~m}$ ) are: 112.0 at $3600 \mathrm{~K}, 113.5$ at 3650 K , and 114.4 at 3680 K .

Sources and estimates of errors in experiments similar to the one conducted in this study are given in detail in earlier publications [1, 3]. The combination of errors gives an estimate for the inaccuracy of measured properties: I percent for electrical resistivity, and 15 K for the melting point.


FIGURE 2. Electrical resistance of tungsten-1 as a function of temperature near and at the melting point.

## 3. Discussion

As may be seen in Table l, considerable differences exist in the tungsten melting points reported in the literature. In order to have a common ground for comparisons, all reported values were converted to IPTS-1968. It is interesting to note that, in general, the reported values increase chronologically. The measurements were performed either before 1930 or after 1960. The melting points reported prior to 1915, as were summarized by Langmuir [6], were lower than that of Langmuir by as much as 50 to 500 K . Experimental difficulties, including pyrometry problems, encountered in high temperature quasi steady-state measurements might have been responsible for the large discrepancies. Another source of the discrepancies could have been the differences in the purity of various tungsten specimens.

Probably, the most reliable measurement performed on the melting point of tungsten before 1930 was that of Worthing [7] which is 25 K below the present value; however, this difference is within the combined vatue
uncertainties of the two results. The average, of the melting points reported by three investigators [ 11, 12, 14 ] since 1960 is 3693 K ; average and maximum differences from this value being 7 K and 10 K , respectively. The melting point obtained in this study is 2 K higher than the above average.

TABLE 1
Melting Point of Tungsten Reported in the Literature

| Investigator | Ref. | Year | Constants* |  | Melting Point, K |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{Au}}$ (K) | $c_{2}(\mathrm{~cm} \mathrm{~K})$ | as reported\%* | on IPTS-1968 |
| Langmuir | 6 | 1915 | 1335 | 1.439 | $3540 \pm 30$ | 3559 |
| Worthing | 7 | 1917 | 1336 | 1.435 | $3675 \pm 15$ | 3670 |
| Henning and Heuse | 8 | 1923 | 1336 | 1.430 | 3643 | 3616 |
| Pirani | 9 | 1923 | 1336 | 1.430 | $3660 \pm 60$ | 3633 |
| Forsythe and Worthing | 10 | 1925 | 1336 | 1.433 | 3655 | 3641 |
| Zalabak | 14 | 1961 | 1336.15 | 1.438 | $3680 \pm 25$ | 3687 |
| Allen | 11 | 1962 | 1336.15 | 1.438 | $3682 \pm 20$ | 3689 |
| Rudy et at | 12 | 1966 | 1336.15 | 1.438 | $3696 \pm 30$ | 3703 |
| IPTS-1968\% $\%$ \% | 5 | 1968 | 1337.58 | 1.4388 | 3660 | 3660 |
| Present Work |  |  | 1337.58 | 1.4388 | $3695 \pm 15$ | 3695 |

*Values of $T_{A u}$ (gold point) and $c_{2}$ ( second radiation constant) used by the investigator.
**Based on $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{Au}}$ and $\mathrm{c}_{2}$ used by the investigator.
***Recommended as secondary reference point on IPTS-1968.

The presence of impurities in a specimen alters (in general, reduces) the melting point of the element. Based on the Raoult-Van't Hoff equation, the melting point depression for the tungsten specimen (with total amount of impurities less than 0.1 percent) is estimated to be less than 3 K . Also, under the present operating conditions, it is very unlikely that the effect of superheating, if present at all, is more than a fraction of a degree. One may conclude that the melting point of tungsten is $3695 \pm 15 \mathrm{~K}$.

The electrical resistivity of this work at 3600 K is approximately 2 percent lower than the value reported by Jones [13].

Measurements indicate a normal behavior of electrical resistivity until approximately 10 K below the melting point was reached. Above this temperature, a departure from normalcy is observed which may be due to: (1) premelting effects of impurities present in the specimen, and (2) increase in vacancy concentration. Small temperature gradients in the specimen also may partially account for this.

With the present system it was not possible to follow the entire melting process because the specimen collapsed and opened the main electrical circuit prior to the completion of melting.
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## Chapter 8

MEASUREMENT OF MELTING POINT, NORMAL SPECTRAL

EMITTANCE (AT MELTING POINT), AND ELECTRICAL RESISTIVITY (ABOVE 2650 K ) OF NLOBIUM BY A PULSE HEATING METHOD*

Ared Cezairliyan<br>National Bureau of Standards<br>Washington, D. C. 20234

Abstract

A subsecond duration pulse heating method is used to measure the melting point, normal spectral emittance (at the melting point), and electrical resistivity (above 2650 K ) of niobium. The results yield a value of 2750 K for the melting point on the International Practical Temperature Scale of 1968. Normal spectral emittance at the melting point is 0.348 , and remained constant during melting. At 2740 K , electrical resistivity is $90.11 \times 10^{-8} \Omega \mathrm{~m}$. Estimated inaccuracy is 10 K in the melting point, $3 \%$ in normal spectral emittance and $0.5 \%$ in electrical resistivity.

[^9]
## 1. Introduction

A millisecond resolution pulse heating technique was developed earlier in connection with the measurement of selected thermophysical properties of electrical conductors at high temperatures (Cezairliyan et al., 1970a). This technique was also applied to the measurement of the melting point of molybdenum (Cezairliyan et al., 1970b), and the normal spectral emittance of tantalum at its melting point (Cezairliyan, 1970).

In the present study, the same technique is used for the measurements of the melting point, normal spectral emittance (at the melting point), and electrical resistivity (above 2650 K ) of niobium.

The technique is based on resistive pulse heating of the specimen from room temperature to its melting point in less than one second and measuring, with millisecond resolution, current through the specimen, potential difference across the specimen, and specimen temperature. Specimen temperature was measured with a high-speed photoelectric pyrometer (Foley, 1970) which permits 1200 evaluations of specimen temperature per second. The recordings of voltage, current, and temperature were made with a high-speed digital data acquisition system (Cezairliyan et al., 1970a), which is capable of recording data with a full-scale signal resolution of approximately one part in 8000 and a time resolution of 0.4 ms . Details regarding the construction and operational characteristics of the entire measurement system is given in an earlier publication (Cezairliyan, 1971a).

Melting point and electrical resistivity measurements were performed on two niobium specimens in the form of tubes, designated as niobium-1 and niobium-2. The nominal dimensions of the tubes were: length, 102 mm ; outside diameter, 6.3 mm ; thickness, 0.5 mm . A small rectangular hole ( $0.5 \times 1 \mathrm{~mm}$ ) fabricated in the wall at the middle of the specimen approximated blackbody conditions for temperature measurements. Normal spectral emittance measurements were performed on two niobium specimens in the form of strips, designated as niobium-3 and niobium-4. The nominal dimensions of the strips were: length, 102 mm ; width, 6.3 mm ; thickness, 0.25 mm . The surfaces of all specimens were polished.

The specimens were 99.9 percent pure. Spectrochemical analysis indicated the presence of the following impurities in ppm by weight: Ta, 450; W, < 100; Hf, < 50; Sb and $\mathrm{Zn},<10$ each; A1, Mo, 5 each; As, $\mathrm{Bi}, \mathrm{Cd}, \mathrm{Si}, \mathrm{Te}, \mathrm{Zr},<5$ each; $\mathrm{Sn}, 3$; $\mathrm{Fe},<3$; and $\mathrm{B}, \mathrm{Ca}, \mathrm{Co}, \mathrm{Cr}, \mathrm{Cu}$, $\mathrm{Mg}, \mathrm{Mn}, \mathrm{Ni}, \mathrm{Pb}, \mathrm{Ti}, \mathrm{V},<1$ each.

Before starting the experiments, all the specimens were annealed by subjecting them to 30 heating pulses (up to 2400 K ). The experiments were conducted with the specimens in a vacuum environment of approximately $10^{-4}$ torr. Duration of the current pulses was 500 ms for the tubes and 600 ms for the strips. This corresponds to a heating rate of approximately $4700 \mathrm{~K} \mathrm{~s}^{-1}$ for the tubes and $2000 \mathrm{~K} \mathrm{~s}^{-1}$ for the strips near the melting point. The magnitude of current pulses near the melting point was approximately 1400 A in the case of the tubes, and 250 A in the case of the strips.

Al1 measurements reported in this paper, unless stated otherwise, are based on the International Practical Temperature Scale of 1968 (IPTS -68, 1969).

### 2.1. Me1ting Point

Temperature of the tubular specimens was measured near and during the initial melting period. The results on niobium- 1 are shown in Figure 1. Temperature of the heating specimen increased almost 1inearly with time above 2650 K . A linear fit of temperature in terms of time obtained using the least squares method yielded a standard deviation (individual point) of 0.8 K . The plateau in temperature indicates the region of solid and liquid equilibria. Measured temperatures at the plateau for the two niobium specimens are shown in Figure 2. The melting point was obtained by averaging temperature points on the plateau of a given specimen.

The melting point obtained by this approach was 2750.6 K for niobium-1, and 2750.5 K for niobium-2. Standard deviation of an individual temperature point from the average for each specimen was 0.7 K . The duration of the plateau of niobium-1 was longer than that of niobium-2. This may be attributed to an early collapse of niobium-2. To determine the trend of measured temperatures at the plateau, temperatures for niobium-1 were fitted to a linear function in time using the least squares method. The slope of the linear function was $1.8 \mathrm{~K} \mathrm{~s}^{-1}$, which corresponds to a maximum temperature difference of less than 0.03 K between the beginning and the end of the plateau. This procedure gave a standard deviation of 0.7 K , which is the same as that obtained by averaging the temperatures.

It may be concluded that the melting point of niobium is 2750 K .

### 2.2. Normal Spectral Emittance

Normal spectral emittance was determined from the measurements of the surface radiance temperature of niobium strips and the melting point obtained from the measurements on the tubular specimens. Based on the Wien radiation equation, the relation between emittance and temperature is

$$
\begin{equation*}
\epsilon:=\frac{1}{\exp \left[\frac{c_{2}}{\lambda}\left(\frac{1}{\mathrm{~T}_{\mathrm{s}}}-\frac{1}{\mathrm{~T}_{\mathrm{m}}}\right)\right]} \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\varepsilon$ is normal spectral emittance, $T_{m}$ the melting point, $T_{s}$ the surface radiance temperature, $c_{2}$ the second radiation constant ( 1.4388 $\times 10^{-2} \mathrm{~m} \mathrm{~K}$ ), and $\lambda$ the effective wavelength of the optical system. The measurements were performed at 650 nm which corresponds to the effective wavelength of the pyrometer's interference filter. The bandwith of the filter was 10 nm . The circular area viewed by the pyrometer was 0.2 mm in diameter.

The experimental results of the surface radiance temperature for niobium-3 near and at the melting point are shown in Figure 3. Each measured temperature during melting is an average quantity representing a combination of solid and liquid phases over the area viewed by the pyrometer. It is interesting to note the sharp peak in the radiance temperature, which amounts to approximately 5 K , at the start of melting. A peak similar in shape and magnitude was also observed in the case of niobium-4. The plateau in the surface radiance temperature corresponds to melting of the specimen.

The average surface radiance temperature was computed to be 2432.5 K for niobium-3, and 2431.0 K for niobium-4 with a standard deviation of 0.7 K . To check the deviations from constancy at the plateau, temperature data for niobium-3 were fitted to a linear function in time (standard deviation $=0.7 \mathrm{~K}$ ). The results do not indicate any significant departure from constancy. The slope of this function was approximately $0.6 \mathrm{~K} \mathrm{~s}^{-1}$, which corresponds to a maximum temperature difference of 0.1 K between the beginning and the end of the plateau.

Normal spectral emittance was computed for each temperature using Equation (1). The average of the results for each specimen was 0.349 for niobium-3 and 0.347 for niobium-4 with a standard deviation of $0.3 \%$. The results on the two specimens are in agreement within $0.6 \%$. It may be concluded that the normal spectral emittance of niobium at its melting point is 0.348 .

### 2.3. Electrical Resistivity

Electrical resistivity of the tubular niobium specimens was calculated using the relation $\rho=R A / L$, where $R$ is the resistance, $A$ the cross-sectional area, and $L$ the length of the specimen between the potential probes. Dimensions were based on their room temperature values. Cross-sectional area was determined from the measurement of weight and density. The results of the electrical resistivity of niobium-1 above approximately 2650 K are shown in Figure 4. In the range 2650 to 2740 K, the electifcal resistivity was fitted to a linear function in temperature with a standard deviation of $0.02 \%$ using the least squares method. The average absolute difference in the measured electrical resistivity of
the two niobium specimens in the range 2650 to 2740 K was approximately $0.4 \%$. The final result for the electrical resistivity of niobium was obtained by averaging the results of the two specimens. This yielded a value of $87.92 \times 10^{-8} \Omega \mathrm{~m}$ at $2650 \mathrm{~K}, 89.14 \times 10^{-8} \Omega \mathrm{~m}$ at 2700 K , and 90.11 $\times 10^{-8} \Omega \mathrm{~m}$ at 2740 K . As shown in Figure 4, electrical resistivity continued to increase during melting of the specimen.

## 3. Estimate of Errors

Sources and estimates of errors in experiments similar to the one conducted in this study are given in detail in earlier publications (Cezairliyan et al., 1970a, 1970b). Specific items in the error analysis were recomputed whenever the present conditions differed from those in the earlier publications. A summary of the results on imprecision and inaccuracy of some of the measured and computed quantities are given in Table 1.

It may be seen from Table 1 that the imprecision of blackbody temperature measurements during heating of the specimen (before reaching the melting point) was approximately the same as that during the melting period. This indicates that in the experiment the initial melting phase progressed normally and that there were no undesirable effects during melting of the specimen, such as vibration of the specimen, movement of the blackbody sighting hole in the specimen, and the instantaneous development of hot spots or zones in the speaimen. Also the imprecision of the surface radiance temperature measurements was the same as that of blackbody temperature measurements, which indicates that the specimen's surface conditions did not change in a random fashion during the melting period.

Conversion of the results of the two recent measurements reported in the 1iterature to IPTS-68 yie1ds 2746 K (Schofield, 1956-1957) and 2745 K (Pemsler, 1961) for the melting point of niobium. These are 4 to 5 K lower than the present result, 2750 K . However, the differences are within the measurement uncertainties reported by the investigators. In addition to this, there are indications that the specimens used in the earlier measurements were less pure than those used in the present study, which may account partially for the lower melting points obtained earlier. The melting point depression due to the impurities in the present specimens is estimated to be not more than 2 K .

Normal spectral emittance of niobium at its melting point is reparted to be 0.368 (Pemsler, 1961); this is approximately $4 \%$ higher than the present value of 0.348. Earlier results (Cezairliyan, 1971b) on tubular niobium specimens in the range 1700 to 2300 K showed a linear variation of normal spectral emittance with temperature. Extrapolation of these results to the melting point yields 0.348 for normal spectral emittance, which is identical to the present value.

Electrical resistivity reported by Gebhardt et al. (1966) goes only to 2500 K . Extrapolation of the results to 2700 K yields a value of 90.74 $\times 10^{-8} \Omega \mathrm{~m}$, which is $1.8 \%$ higher than the present valueof $89.14 \times 10^{-8} \Omega \mathrm{~m}$. Electrical resistivity behaved normally until approximately 5 to 10 K below the melting point was reached (Figure 4). Above this, a departure
from normalcy was observed which may be due to: (1) premelting effects of impurities present in the specimen, and (2) increase in vacancy concentration. Small temperature gradients in the specimen also may partially account for this.

The sharp peak in surface radiance temperature observed at the beginning of melting (Figure 3) was reproducible, both in shape and magnitude, for the two strips. However, no such peak was observed in the true temperature of the tubes (Figure 1). This implies that the peak could not have been due to superheating of the specimen. The effect of superheating in metals (if present at all), under the present operating conditions, is unlikely to be more than a fraction of a degree. Also, it is not likely that the strip surface was in the liquid phase several degrees above the melting point for a short period before establishing the melting plateau. A possible explanation is that a sudden change in the surface conditions took place at the start of melting. An earlier investigation on tantalum (Cezairliyan, 1970) did not show a sharp peak in surface radiance temperature at the start of melting. However, a uniform decrease in normal spectral emittance was observed in tantalum as melting progressed. The results on niobium do not show any such variation.
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TABLE 1

Imprecision and inaccuracy of measured and computed quantities*

| Quantity | Imprecision | Inaccuracy |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Temperature-blackbody <br> (during heating) <br> Temperature-blackbody <br> (during melting) | 0.8 K | 7 K |
| Temperature-surface radiance <br> (during melting) | 0.7 K | 7 K |
| Voltage <br> Current | 0.7 K | 7 K |
| Me1ting point <br> Normal spectral emittance <br> Electrical resistivity | $0.02 \%$ | $0.05 \%$ |

*Imprecision refers to the standard deviation of an individual point as computed from the difference between measured value and that from the smooth function obtained by the least squares method. Inaccuracy refers to the estimated total error (random and systematic).
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## Chapter 9

A PULSE HEATING TECHNIQUE FOR
THE MEASUREMENT OF HEAT OF FUSION OF METALS AT HIGH TEMPERATURES*

A. Cezairliyan<br>National Bureau of Standards<br>Washington, D. C. 20234

A pulse heating technique was developed earlier for the measurement of selected thermophysical properties (specific heat, electrical resistivity, and hemispherical total emittance) of electrically conducting substances at high temperatures. In this paper a preliminary experiment (on niobium) is described which demonstrates the feasibility of extending the technique to the measurement of heat of fusion of metals.

[^10]The method is based on rapid resistive self-heating of a composite specimen by the passage of high currents through it, and measuring the pertinent quantities as a function of time. The details of the measurement system and its operational characteristics may be found in an earlier publication [1].

The composite specimen (Figure 1) was made of three strips, each having the following nominal dimensions: length, 75 mm ; width, 6.3 mm ; and thickness 0.25 mm . The middle strip was niobium, and the two outer strips were tantalum. The specimen was pulse heated from room temperature to approximately 200 K above the melting point of niobium in 0.8 s . During the heating period, current through the composite specimen, potential drop across the composite specimen, and surface radiance temperature of the outer strip were measured every 0.4 ms . Potential measurements were made across the middle 25 mm portion of the specimen using spring-loaded knife-edge probes. Temperature was measured with a high-speed photoelectric pyrometer [2].

Variation of surface radiance temperature of the tantalum strip as a function of time is shown in Figure 2. The plateau corresponds to melting of the inner strip (niobium). When niobium reached a temperature approximately 200 K above its melting point, heating was stopped by automatically switching off the current. Since the melting point of tantalum is approximately 500 K higher than that of niobium, the outer strips did not melt during the entire experiment and acted as a container for niobium. At the end of the experiment (after the specimen cooled down to room temperature), it was observed that the entire specimen had retained its original geometry and weight.

The heat of fusion of niobium was computed using the following equation:

$$
Q_{f}=\text { ei } \Delta t-Q_{r}-Q_{s}
$$

where

```
\(Q_{f}=\) heat of fusion
e = potential drop across the specimen
i \(=\) current through the specimen
\(\Delta t=\) duration of plateau, \(t_{2}-t_{1}\) in Figure 2
\(Q_{r}=\) heat loss due to thermal radiation
\(Q_{S}=\) energy absorbed by two outer strips during melting of niobium
```

The quantity $\Delta t$ was obtained from the points of interaction of polynomial functions (obtained by the least squares method) representing temperature versus time data in premelting, melting, and postmelting periods of niobium. Standard deviation of an individual point from the function was 0.7 K for premelting and postmelting regions, and 0.9 K for the melting region. Heat loss by thermal radiation, $Q_{r}$, was determined from data obtained during the radiative cooling period following the rapid heating period. The correction $Q_{S}$ was necessitated as the result of the existing 5 K difference between the temperatures at the beginning and the end of the plateau.

The results of computations using the experimental data indicate that energy imparted to the specimen (ei $\Delta t$ ) was 145.1 J , energy radiated $\left(Q_{r}\right)$ was 47.5 J , and energy absorbed by the two outer strips $\left(Q_{s}\right)$ was 1.5 J . The above yield 96.1 J for energy absorbed during melting, which corresponds to a value of $26,900 \mathrm{~J} \mathrm{~mol}^{-1}$ for the heat of fusion of niobium. In the computations the atomic weight of niobium was taken as 92.91. If one considers that the melting point of niobium is $2750 \mathrm{~K}[3]$, entropy of fusion becomes $9.80 \mathrm{~J} \mathrm{~mol}^{-1} \mathrm{~K}^{-1}$ (2.34 cal mol ${ }^{-1} \mathrm{~K}^{-1}$ ).

The only other experimental results on the heat of fusion of niobium were those reported by Margrave [4], and more recently by Sheindin et al. [5]. Both investigations utilized the lavitation calorimetry technique. A summary of the results is given in Table 1. It may be seen that the result of the present work agrees, within $2.6 \%$, with that of Sheindlin et al. However, the value reported by Margrave is considerably higher than the value given both in the present work (by $23 \%$ ) and by Sheindlin et al. (by $20 \%$ ).

The present preliminary investigation has demonstrated that the millisecond resolution transient technique shows considerable promise in measuring heat of fusion of electrically conducting substances at temperatures above 2000 K where other more conventional techniques encounter serious difficulties. However, additional work, both mathematical and experimental, is required to assess the reliability and the accuracy of the technique.

## TABLE 1

Heat of fusion of niobium reported in the literature

| Investigator | Ref. | Year | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Heat of } \\ & \text { cal mol-1 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { usion } \\ & \mathrm{J} \text { mol }{ }^{-1} \end{aligned}$ | Me1ting Point K | Entropy of cal $\mathrm{mol}^{-1} \mathrm{~K}^{-1}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Fusion } \\ & \mathrm{J} \text { mol } 1^{-1} \mathrm{~K}^{-1} \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Margrave | 4 | 1970 | 7,900 | 33,050 | 2740 | 2.88 | 12.1 |
| Sheindlin et al. | 5 | 1972 | 6,600 | 27,600 |  | 2.41 | 10.1 |
| Present work |  |  | 6,430 | 26,900 | 2750 | 2.34 | 9.8 |
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Figure 1. Schematic diagram showing the arrangement of the composite specimen, clamps, and surface radiance temperature measurement system (dimensions are not to scale). Strip of material "B" is sandwiched between two strips of material "A". The melting point of " B " is lower than that of " A ".
A. Cezairliyan and J. L. McClure National Bureau of Standards Washington, D. C. 20234


#### Abstract

Preliminary results of an experiment concerning the $\gamma \rightarrow \delta$ phase transformation in iron demonstrate the feasibility of applying a high-speed pulse heating technique to the study of high temperature solid-solid phase transformations in electrically conducting substances. The variations of surface radiance temperature as a function of time and the electrical resistivity as a function of surface radiance temperature clearly show the phase transformation. The surface radiance temperature of iron at the transformation point is 1561 K . Electrical resistivity shows an increase of approximately $0.3 \%$ during the phase transformation.


[^11]A millisecond resolution pulse heating technique was developed in connection with the measurement of selected thermophysical properties of electrical conductors at high temperatures [1]. This technique has recently been applied to measurements of the melting point and the normal spectral emittance at the melting point of selected metals $[2,3,4]$.

This paper describes an experiment which was conducted to demonstrate the feasibility of applying the same technique to a study of solid-solid phase transformations. A preliminary investigation of the phase transformation $(\gamma \rightarrow \delta)$ in iron, that occurs at approximately 1675 K , is reported. Approximate determinations of the transformation temperature, the normal spectral emittance at the melting point, and the electrical resistivity above 1600 K are also reported.

The high-speed technique is based on rapid resistive self-heating of the specimen from room temperature to its melting point. During an experiment, which lasts less than one second, the current through the specimen, the potential across the specimen, and the specimen temperature are measured as functions of time and recorded with a digital data acquisition system which has a full-scale signal resolution of one part in 8,000 and a time resolution of 0.4 ms . Temperature measurements are made with a high-speed photoelectric pyrometer [5]. Details regarding the construction and operation of the measurement system are given in an earlier publication [6].

Iron was chosen for this study because it has a high temperature phase transformation (approximately at 1675 K ). A lower temperature
phase transformation in iron (approximately at 1185 K ) could not be studied because of pyrometric limitations.

The experiment was conducted on an iron specimen of $99.9 \%$ purity. The specimen was a rod of the following nominal dimensions: length, 76 mm ; and diameter, 3.2 mm . The surface was polished to reduce radiation losses. The specimen was used for only one experiment, in which it was heated from room temperature to its melting point. It was not possible to conduct a series of experiments on the same specimen in the vicinity of the transformation point, because of the distortions in the specimen resulting from volume changes that accompany the phase transformations. Using the recorded data, surface radiance temperature was plotted as a function of time and electrical resistivity was obtained as a function of surface radiance temperature.

Figure 1 shows the heating curve for the specimen. The solid-solid phase transformation is clearly evident as a temperature arrest or plateau in the heating curve (the plateau on the left). There were 22 temperature measurements during the transformation which were averaged to give a surface radiance temperature at the transformation point of 1561 K . The standard deviation of the individual points from the average is 0.7 K . The heating rate just below the plateau was approximately $1300 \mathrm{~K} \mathrm{~s}^{-1}$.

The second plateau in Figure 1 (the plateau on the right) shows the melting of the iron specimen. The average surface radiance temperature at the melting point is 1667 K . The standard deviation from the average is 0.6 K .

The resistivity of the specimen was calculated using the relation $\rho=R A / L$ where $R$ is the resistance, $A$ the cross-sectional area, and L the length of the specimen between the potential probes. Dimensions were based on their room temperature values. The results for resistivity of iron are shown in Figure 2. The resistivity is clearly discontinuous at the transformation. During the transformation it increased by approximately 0.3\%.

The melting point data was used to compute an approximate value for the normal spectral emittance of iron at the melting point. Based on the Wien radiation equation, the relation between emittance and temperature is

$$
\begin{equation*}
\epsilon=\frac{1}{\exp \left[\frac{c_{2}}{\lambda}\left(\frac{1}{\bar{T}_{s}}-\frac{1}{\mathrm{~T}_{\mathrm{m}}}\right)\right]} \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\varepsilon$ is the normal spectral emittance, $T_{m}$ the melting point, $T_{S}$ the surface radiance temperature at the melting point, $c_{2}$ the second radiation constant ( $1.4388 \times 10^{-2} \mathrm{~m} \mathrm{~K}$ ) and $\lambda$ the effective waveleng th of the optical system. The measurements were made at 650 nm , which is the effective wavelength of the interference filter of the pyrometer. The bandwidth of the filter is 10 nm .

The generally accepted melting temperature of iron is 1810 K [7]. When this value and the observed surface radiance temperature at the melting point are substituted into Equation (1), the normal spectral emittance is computed to be 0.352. If it is assumed that this value can approximate the normal spectralemittance at the transformation
temperature, an approximate true temperature can be obtained for the transformation point. This method yields a transformation temperature of 1685 K which is 10 K higher than the accepted value. A higher value is to be expected in this approximation since the normal spectral emittance at the melting point would have a lower value than that at the transformation point. A normal spectral emittance of 0.38 is required to correct the observed surface radiance temperature at the transformation point to the accepted value.

Using the value of 0.352 for the normal spectral emittance, the resistivities at 1500 K and 1600 K (surface radiance temperatures) were associated with approximate true specimen temperatures (1614 K and 1731 K respectively). The resistivities thus obtained are higher than those of another investigator [8] by about $1.8 \%$ at 1614 K and $0.8 \%$ at 1731 K.

The preliminary results reported in this paper demonstrate the feasibility of studying solid-solid phase transformations in electrically conducting substances at high temperatures using the high-speed pulse heating technique. The major limitation of this preliminary work was that true specimen temperature could not be obtained directly. In future investigations tubular specimens with blackbody sighting holes will be used in order to obtain true temperature directly. Such studies will yield reliable measurements of the transformation and melting temperatures. It is also possible to obtain the energy of solid-solid phase transformation if the duration of the transformation is accuracely deternine?
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## Chapter 11

## RATE CONSTANTS FOR THE REACTIONS

$$
(\mathrm{M})+\mathrm{NH}_{3} \xrightarrow[\mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{r}}]{\stackrel{\mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{d}}}{\longrightarrow}} \mathrm{NH}_{2} \cdot+\mathrm{H} \cdot+(\mathrm{M})
$$

## W. Tsang

## ABSTRACT

Data for the reactions $\mathrm{NH}_{3}+(\mathrm{M}) \underset{\mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{d}}}{\stackrel{\mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{d}}}{\leftrightarrows}} \mathrm{NH}_{2} \cdot+\mathrm{H} \cdot+$ (M) have been critically examined and tabulated. A best fit of the data appears to require active external rotations. Suggested rate constants of these reactions over the range $0-10^{2}$ atm and $200-4000^{\circ} \mathrm{K}$ are tabulated.
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b. \begin{tabular}{rl}
$\mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{r}}$ \& $=12 \times 10^{10} \mathrm{l} / \mathrm{mol} \sec (1000 \mathrm{~mm})$ <br>
\& $=4.2 \times 10^{10} \mathrm{l} / \mathrm{mol} \mathrm{sec}(500 \mathrm{~mm})$ <br>
\& $=2.9 \times 10^{10} \mathrm{l} / \mathrm{mol} \mathrm{sec}(250 \mathrm{~mm})$

$\quad$

c. $\quad \Delta \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{f}}\left(\mathrm{NH}_{2} \cdot\right)=45.5$ at $300^{\circ} \mathrm{K}$.
\end{tabular}

2. Comments on Experimental Data

Ia) The data analysis involve a best fit of the onccentration time traces with the integrated rate expression. Unfortunately no provision has been made for reaction endothermicity. This will be especially serious for the $8 \%$ runs and a decrease in temperature of several hundred degrees during the course of the reaction must be expected. This may account for the apparent $3 / 2 \frac{\text { th }}{}$ order dependence on $\mathrm{NH}_{3}$ concentration. Due to the possibility of large errors in reaction temperature, the uncertainty of these results may well be as much as a factor of ten.

Ib) Reactions are carried out at very high $\mathbb{N H}_{3}$ concentrations. Although initial rates are used, the published traces suggest that the first measurable point occurs no less than $100 \mu$ secs after the passage of the shock wave. Thus, considerable reaction must have occurred and as in Ia the true reaction temperature is probably much lower than calculated. This will be most serious at higher temperatures (large conversions). Estimated uncertainty is about an order of magnitude.

Ic) The use of the reflected shock may cause problems in defining reaction temperature. (2) An induction period is observed at lower temperatures ( $2400^{\circ} \mathrm{K}$ ). Rates were determined from higher temperature experiments. The estimated uncertainty is about a factor of 5 .

Id) This should be the most reliable of the direct studies. Unfortunately the authors do not present sufficient data so as to permit a more detailed analysis. The estimated uncertainty is a factor of 3 .

IIa) This must be considered a rough estimate. The number is dependent not only on the correctness of the mechanism but also on a whole string of other rate constants whose values are uncertain.

IIb) This number may be a satisfactory upper limit, as in all such experiments the reliability is dependent on the postulated mechanism. In the present case it is assumed that equivalent amounts of $\mathrm{NH}_{2}$ and H radicals are formed and that subsequently the important processes are

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\mathrm{NH}_{2} \cdot+\mathrm{NH}_{2} \cdot & \rightarrow \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{H}_{4} \\
\mathrm{H} \cdot+\mathrm{H} \cdot+(\mathrm{M}) & \rightarrow \mathrm{H}_{2}+(\mathrm{M})
\end{array}
$$

and $\mathrm{NH}_{2}+\mathrm{H} \cdot+(\mathrm{M}) \rightarrow \mathrm{NH}_{3}+(\mathrm{M})$
Even after accepting the mechanism the reported number is dependent to a considerable extent on the rate constants for the other two processes. A particularly disturbing fact is the detection of NH radicals. Thus, the true mechanism may be more complex. Furthermore, each. NH radical suggests the presence of 2 additional H-atoms as well as serve as a sink for active specie.
3. Discussion

The data from Ia,b, $c, d$ are plotted in Figure I. In view of the large estimated uncertainties, the agreement is very satisfactory. It appears that within the temperature range $2000-3000^{\circ} \mathrm{K}$, the bimolecular rate constant for $\mathrm{NH}_{3}$ decomposition in argon can be considered to be well established. Note that in plotting the data we have set the true bimolecular rate to be one-half the measured rate constant for $\mathrm{NH}_{3}$ disappearance since under the reaction conditions the processes
$(\mathrm{M})+\mathrm{NH}_{3} \xrightarrow{\mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{d}}} \mathrm{NH}_{2} \cdot+\mathrm{H} \cdot+(\mathrm{M})$
$\mathrm{H} \cdot+\mathrm{NH}_{3} \longrightarrow \mathrm{H}_{2}+\mathrm{NH}_{2}$.
must be concurrent. We have also converted the data of Ia so that it reflects a first order order dependence in ammonia and argon.

The problem that remains is to project these numbers into other temperature ranges. Note that the experimental activation energies are all lower than the bond energy. This is expected since with increasing temperature more internal degrees of freedom become activated. Thus, linear extrapolation of the standard Arrhenius plot will lead to gross errors. Our approach is to calculate the bimolecular rate constant on the basis of the expression

$$
k_{d}=\frac{\lambda z}{Q} \int_{\Delta E_{0}^{\circ}}^{\infty} \mathbb{N}(E) e^{-E / R T} d E^{(3)}
$$

where $\lambda$ is the transmission coefficient and is usually set as 1 , although for the present purposes we will use it as a temperature independent adjustable parameter; $Z$ collision numbers (for $\mathrm{NH}_{3}$ we use collision diameter $=4 \AA$ ) ; $\mathbb{N}(E)$, the density of vibrational and rotational states at energy $E ;$ Q, the partition function for the molecule, and $\Delta E_{0}^{\circ}$, the energy change for the reaction at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{K}$. In this approach the vibrations and external rotations are taken as fully coupled. This is contrary to the most common practice and indeed there are angular momentum constraints against complete coupling. The present approach is purely empirical in that for other similar systems ${ }^{(4)}$ agreement with regard to the shape of the $\log \mathrm{k}$ vs $1 / \mathrm{T}$ plots is improved using active external rotations. For $N(E)$ we use the Laplace Transform technique. A complete discussion of this and
other techniques for computing the density of states and the ranges of validity can be found in a recent review ${ }^{(5)}$.

The results of such a computation suing an argon efficiency of $.136^{(6)}$ and $\lambda=\sim .27$ (in order to obtain the best fit) can be seen in Figure I. For completeness we have also plotted the results of a computation using $\lambda=1$ and all external rotations inactive. These are the most commonly used assumptions and it can be seen that this reproduces the data with almost equal facility. On the other hand it has a somewhat stronger temperature dependence. However, with neither model can we reproduce the experimental activation energy exactly. It is suspected that this is an experimental artifact. Jacobs (Ia) has discussed the possibility of $\mathrm{O}_{2}$ impurities affecting the shock tube results while Takeyama et al (Ic) mentions the presence of an induction period at lower temperatures. All of these factors will tend to lower the experimental activation energy. In any case the discrepancies are all within the uncertainty limits. Note that these results are not sufficiently sensitive as to shed any light on the current controversy on the heat of formation of $\mathrm{NH}_{2}$ (IIc).

On this basis recommended bimolecular and termolecular rate constants, for ammonia dissociation and amino and $H$ atom combination, respectively, in the temperature range $200-4000^{\circ} \mathrm{K}$ are summarized in Table I. The estimated uncertainty is about a factor of 5. Note that the numbers refer to $\mathrm{NH}_{3}$ as the third body. For other third bodies data from the dissociation of $\mathrm{NO}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}{ }^{(7)}$ and the isomerization of $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{NC}^{(6)}$ are summarized in Table II.

The data for the bimolecular combination process are not directly related to the termolecular process since the former is dependent on
the structure of the transition state. It does permit an estimate to be made of the range of validity of the data in Table I. On the basis of RRKM calculations with external rotations inactive we are not able to reproduce either the rate constants or the pressure dependence derived by cordon and coworkers (IIb). With external rotations active (for both the transition state and normal molecule) a very satisfactory fit can be achieved. Details may be found in Tables III and IV. In view of our earlier analysis of the recombination results it is difficult to draw definitive conclusions with regard to this fit. Further experiments are needed. In any case it is clear that over most accessible temperature and pressure ranges the data in Table I are valid. At 1 atm or higher and at sufficiently low temperatures deviations can be expected and recourse must be made to the numbers of Table IV.
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## Table I

Recommended Rate Constants for the Decomposition of $\mathrm{NH}_{3}$ and Combination of Amine and H Radicals. $\mathrm{NH}_{3}+\mathrm{NH}_{3} \underset{\mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{r}}}{\stackrel{\mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{d}}}{\leftrightarrows}} \mathrm{NH}_{2}+\mathrm{H} \cdot+\mathrm{NH}_{3}$

| Temperature | Rate Constant Decomposition $\mathrm{L} / \text { mole-sec }\left(\mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{d}}\right)$ | Rate Constant Combination $L^{2} / m o l e^{2} \sec \left(k_{r}\right)$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 200 | $5.5 \times 10^{-102}$ | $1.1 \times 10^{13}$ |
| 300 | $1.5 \times 10^{-62}$ | $4.6 \times 10^{12}$ |
| 400 | $7.6 \times 10^{-43}$ | $3.3 \times 10^{12}$ |
| 500 | $4.8 \times 10^{-31}$ | $2.6 \times 10^{12}$ |
| 600 | $3.3 \times 10^{-23}$ | $2.2 \times 10^{12}$ |
| 700 | $1.3 \times 10^{-17}$ | $1.9 \times 10^{12}$ |
| 800 | $1.8 \times 10^{-13}$ | $1.6 \times 10^{12}$ |
| 900 | $3.1 \times 10^{-10}$ | $1.4 \times 10^{12}$ |
| 1000 | $1.1 \times 10^{-7}$ | $1.3 \times 10^{12}$ |
| 1200 | $7.5 \times 10^{-4}$ | $1.0 \times 10^{12}$ |
| 1400 | $3.7 \times 10^{-1}$ | $8.1 \times 10^{11}$ |
| 1600 | $3.7 \times 10^{+1}$ | $6.6 \times 10^{11}$ |
| 1800 | $1.2 \times 10^{+3}$ | $5.4 \times 10^{11}$ |
| 2000 | $2.0 \times 10^{4}$ | $4.5 \times 10^{11}$ |
| 2200 | $1.8 \times 10^{5}$ | $3.7 \times 10^{11}$ |
| 2400 | $1.1 \times 10^{6}$ | $3.1 \times 10^{11}$ |
| 2600 | $5.1 \times 10^{6}$ | $2.6 \times 10^{11}$ |
| 2800 | $1.8 \times 10^{7}$ | $2.2 \times 10^{11}$ |
| 3000 | $5.4 \times 10^{7}$ | $1.9 \times 10^{11}$ |
| 3200 | $1.4 \times 10^{8}$ | $1.6 \times 10^{11}$ |

Temperature
Rate Constant Decomposition

$$
\mathrm{L} / \text { mole-sec }\left(k_{d}\right)
$$

Rate Constant Combination $L^{2} / \operatorname{mole}^{2} \sec \left(k_{r}\right)$

3400
3600
3800
4000

$$
3.1 \times 10^{8}
$$

$1.4 \times 10^{11}$
$6.2 \times 10^{8}$
$1.2 \times 10^{11}$
$1.1 \times 10^{9}$
$2.0 \times 10^{9}$
$1.0 \times 10^{11}$
$8.9 \times 10^{10}$

Table II: Third body efficiencies from (a) decomposition of $\mathrm{NO}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}^{7}$
(b) isomerization of $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{NC}^{6}$

| (a) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| He | .25 | (b) $\mathrm{He}^{2}$ | .171 |
| Ne | .18 | Ne | .120 |
| Ar | .21 | Ar | .136 |
| Kr | .21 | Kr | .115 |
| $\mathrm{H}_{2}$ | .34 | $\mathrm{D}_{2}$ | .23 |
| $\mathrm{~N}_{2}$ | .29 | $\mathrm{~N}_{2}$ | .21 |
| $\mathrm{O}_{2}$ | .26 | $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ | .42 |
| $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ | .39 | $\mathrm{H}_{2}$ | .28 |
| $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ | .36 | $\mathrm{CD}_{4}$ | .41 |
|  |  | $\mathrm{CH}_{4}$ | .44 |
|  |  | $\mathrm{C}_{2} \mathrm{H}_{6}$ | .56 |
|  |  | $\mathrm{C}_{2} \mathrm{H}_{4}$ | .43 |
|  | $\mathrm{C}_{3} \mathrm{H}_{6}$ | .60 |  |

Table III: Data used in deriving results in Table IV
a) Transition state is assumed to have same geometrical structure as molecules.
b) Collision diameter is $4 \AA$.
c) Vibrational frequencies for the molecules are 3400(3), 1620(2), 960(1).
d) Vibrational frequencies for the transition states are 3200(2) 1500(1) 40(2)
e) All external rotations are active.
f) Transmission coefficient $=.27$.

Recommended rate constants for the unimolecular decomposition of ammonia and the bimolecular combination of amino and $H$ radicals
$\mathrm{NH}_{3} \underset{\mathrm{k}(\mathrm{COM})}{\stackrel{\mathrm{k}(\mathrm{DEC})}{\curvearrowleft}} \mathrm{NH}_{2}+\mathrm{H}$.
(Table is on pages 166-168.)

TEMPERATURF IS $200 ~ K$
A．F．T．A－FACTOR IS $1.99578 E+14 \quad / S E C$
PFACTION THRFSHOLD IS 107090 －CALS
EKPEPIMENTAL A＝FACTOR IS 2．8O918E＋15／SEC（HIGH PRESSURE）
EXPERIMENTAL ACTIVATION ENERGY IS 108028．CALS
（HIGH PRESSURE）
HIGH PRESSURE RATE CONSTANT IS 2•1450 $4 E-1$ O3／SEC

| PRFCSURF | $K(D E C)$ | $\mathrm{K}(\mathrm{COM})$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| （ MM，HG） | （／SEC） | （L／MOL－SEC） |
| 10 | 4．26018E－105 | 8． $46398 E+9$ |
| $10 \%$ | 3－5620 5E－104 | 7．07695E＋10 |
| 1090 | 1－37881E－103 | 2．73937E＋11 |
| 10090 | ？．010 $03 E-103$ | $3.99425 E+11$ |
| 1月0日ac | 2．12939E－103 | $4 \cdot 23060 E+11$ |
| 1－Gの90のE＋6 | $2 \cdot 14343 F-103$ | $4 \cdot 25850 \mathrm{E}+11$ |

TEMPERATIPF IS $300 K$
$A \cdot R \cdot T \cdot A-F A C T O P$ IS $6.08735 E+14 / S E C$
REACTION THFESHOLD IS 107090．CALS
EXPERIMENTAL A－FACTOR IS $9.23941 E+15$／SEC（HIGH PRESSURE）
EXPERIMENTAL ACTIVATION ENERGY IS 108598．CALS
（HIGH PRFSSURE）
HIGH PRESSUPE RATE CONSTANT IS 6．38718E－64／SEC
PRESSURE
（MM HG）
10
100
1000
10000
100800
$1.00000 E+6$

| $K(D E C)$ | $K(C O M)$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $(/ S E C)$ | $(L / M O L-S E C)$ |


| $7.38998 E-66$ | $2.31121 E+9$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $6 \cdot 44338 E-65$ | $2.01762 E+10$ |
| $2.97327 E-64$ | $9.31021 E+10$ |
| $5.33263 E-64$ | $1.66981 E+11$ |
| $6.26595 E-64$ | $1.94327 E+11$ |
| $6.36632 E-64$ | $1.99349 E+11$ |

TEMPERATURE IS $\angle O Q K$
$A \cdot R \cdot T \cdot A-F A C T O P I S \quad 1 \cdot 34539 E+15$／SEC
PEACTION THPESHOLD IS $167690 \cdot$ CALS
EKPERIMENTAL $A-F A C T O F$ IS ？日 $1165 E+16$／SEC（HIGH PRESSURE）
EXPERIMENTAL ACTIVATION ENERGY IS 109127 CALS
（HIGH PRESSURE）
HIGH PRESSURE PATE CONSTANT IS $4 \cdot 41072 E-44 / S E C$

| PRESSURE | K（DEC） | $\mathrm{K}(\mathrm{COM})$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| （ MM HG） | （／SEC） | （L／MOL－SEC） |
| 10 | $2.81396 E-46$ | 1．20425E＋9 |
| 100 | 2． $52642 \mathrm{E}-45$ | $1.08122 E+10$ |
| 1000 | 1．33267E－44 | 5． $70336 \mathrm{E}+10$ |
| 10 nog | $2 \cdot 97297 \mathrm{E}=44$ | 1－27232E＋11 |
| $10 \square \mathrm{CO}$ | $4.04467 \mathrm{E}-44$ | 1－73098E＋11 |
| 1－9E000E +6 | 4．359？4E－44 | $1.86560 F+11$ |

TEMPERATLRE IS 5OC K
A.R.T• A-FACTOR IS 2.46131E+15 /SEC

REACTION THRESHOLD IS $107090 \cdot$ CALS
EXPFRIMENTAL A-FACTOR IS 3. $47 \angle 27 E+16$ /SEC(HIGH PRESSURE)
EXPERIMENTAL ACTIUATION ENERGY IS $109607 \cdot$ CALS
(HICH PRESSUPE)
HIGH PRESSURE FATE CONSTANT IS 4.R1509E-32 /SEC

| PRESSURE | K (DEC) | K ( COM ) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (MiM HG) | (/SEC) | (L/MOL-SEC) |
| 10 | 1. $41643 \mathrm{E}-34$ | 7.69059 $5+8$ |
| 100 | 1.29697E-33 | 7.04195F+9 |
| 1000 | 7.5738 $4 \mathrm{E}-33$ | 4.112265+16 |
| 10000 | 2.05044E-32 | 1-11330E+11 |
| 100000 | 3.332 76E-32 | 1.80954E+11 |
| 1-000005+6 | 3.89381E-3? | 2.11416E+1 |

TEMPERATURE IS 60G K
A.P.T. A-FACTOR IS $3.97652 E+15$ /SEC

REACTION THRESHOLD IS $107090 \cdot$ CALS
EXPFRTMENTAL A-FACTOR IS 5.19783F+16 /SEC(HIGH PRESSURE)
EXPERIMENTAL ACTIUATION ENERGY IS $110041 \cdot$ GALS
(HIGH PRESSURE)
HIGH PRESSURE RATE CONSTANT IS 4•07327E-24 /SEC

PRESSURE
( MM HE)
10
100
1000
10000
100000
$1.00000 E+6$

K(DEC)
(/SEC)
8.20147E-27
7.61879E-26
4.812R9E-95
1.53136E-24
2.95495E-24
3.82241E-24
$\mathrm{K}(\mathrm{COM})$
(LMOL-SEC)
$5.39678 \mathrm{E}+8$
5.01336E+9
$3 \cdot 16648 \mathrm{E}+15$
1.00767E+11
$1.94444 \mathrm{E}+11$
2. $51525 \mathrm{E}+11$
fevperature is 700 K
A•R•T• A-FACTOR IS $5 \cdot 88693 E+15$ /SEC
REACTION THRESHOLD IS 107090 . CALS
EXPERIMENTAL A-FACTOR IS $7.07347 E+16$ /SEC(HIGH PRESSURE)
EXPFRIMENTAL OCTIVATION ENERGY IS $110434 \cdot$ CALS
(HIGH PRESSURE)
HIGH PRESSURE PATE CONSTANT IS ?.?4009E-18 /SEC

PRESSURE
(MM HG)
10
100
1000
10000
100000
$1.0000 \mathrm{E}+6$

K(DEC)
(/SEC)
2.68023F-21
2. $51724 \mathrm{E}-20$
1.69998E-19 ?.5?413E+10
$6 \cdot 14747 E-19 \quad 9 \cdot 17636 E+10$
$1 \cdot 38447 \mathrm{~F}-18 \quad 2 \cdot 06661 \mathrm{E}+11$
2.00257F-18 ?.98925E+11

TEMPERATURE IS 800 K
A.R.T. A-FACTOR IS 8.17218E+15 /SEC

REACTION THRESHOLD IS $167090 \cdot$ CALS
EXPERIMENTAL A-FACTOR IS 9. $21256 E+16$ /SEC(HIGH PEESSURE)
EXPERIMENTAL ACTIVATION ENERGY IS $11079 ?$ CALS
(HIGH PRESSURE)
HIGH PRESSURE RATE CONSTANT IS $4.67917 \mathrm{E}-14 /$ /SEC

| PRESSURE | K (DEC) | K(COM) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ( $\mathrm{MN}, \mathrm{HG}$ ) | (/SEC) | (L/MOL-SEC) |
| 10 | 3.46098E-17 | $3 \cdot \mathrm{C} 7434 \mathrm{E}+8$ |
| 100 | 3.27844E-16 | $2.91220 \mathrm{E}+9$ |
| 1000 | 2.31374F-15 | $2 \cdot 05527 \mathrm{E}+10$ |
| 1000\% | 9.38916E-15 | 8-34027E+10 |
| 100000 | 2. $\triangle 2155 \mathrm{~F}-14$ | $2 \cdot 15103 \mathrm{E}+11$ |
| 1.00000E+6 | 3.92345E-14 | 3.48515E+11 |

TEMPERATURE IS 900 $K$
A.R.T. $\triangle-F \triangle C T O R$ IS $1 \cdot 08018 E+16$ /SEC

REACTION THPESHOLD IS 107M90. CALS
EXPERIMENTAL A-FACTOR IS 1.09470 + 17 /SEC(HI GH PRESSURE)
EXPERIMENTAL AGTIVATION ENFPGY IS 111118• CALS
(HIGH PRESSURE)
HIGH PRESSUR- PATF CONSTAT IS 1.O9763F-10 /SEC

| PRESSURE | K(DFC) | K(COM) |
| :--- | :---: | :--- |
| (MM HG) | $(1 S E C)$ | $(L / M O L-S E C)$ |
| 10 | $5.20131 E-14$ | $2.42257 E+8$ |
| 100 | $4.96080 E-13$ | $2.31055 E+9$ |
| 1000 | $3.64469 E-12$ | $1.69755 E+10$ |
| 10000 | $1.62095 E-11$ | $7.54977 E+10$ |
| 100000 | $4.7 ח 416 E-11$ | $2.19101 E+11$ |
| $1.00 C 00 E+6$ | $8.51002 E-11$ | $3.96364 \mathrm{~F}+11$ |

TEMPFRATURE IS $10 Q 0$
K
A•R.T. A-FACTOR IS 1.37397E+16 /SEC
REACTION THRESHOLD IS $107090 \cdot$ CALS
EXPERIMENTAL A-FACTOR IS $1.28277 E+17$ /SEC(HIGH PRESSURE)
EXPERIMENTAL ACTIVATION ENEPGY IS 111415 . CALS
(HIGH PRESSURE)
HIGH PRESSURE RATE CONSTANT IS 5.54934E-8 /SEC

PRESSURE
(MM HG)
10
100
1000
10000
100000
$1000000 E+6$
$\mathrm{K}(\mathrm{DEC}) \quad \mathrm{K}(\mathrm{COM})$
(/SEC)
1.73835E-11
1.66723E-10
1.26634E-9
6.03389E-9
1.95659E-8
$3.92909 E-8$
(L/MOL-SEC)
$1.94458 \mathrm{E}+8$
1.86501E+9
$1.41656 \mathrm{E}+1 \mathrm{C}$
$6.80562 E+10$
? $\cdot 18870 \mathrm{E}+11$
$4.39520 E+11$


## Legend for Figure 1 (page 169)

Figure 1: Experimental and calculated rate constants for $\mathrm{NH}_{3}$ decomposition (in argon)

Experimental results -=--
(A) reference Ia
(B) reference Ib
(C) reference Ic
(D) reference Id

Calculated results ——
(E) no external rotations, , transmission coefficient $=1$
(F) all external rotations active $\beta 6$ transmission coefficient $=$ .27 argon efficiency $=.136$

## Chapter 12

RATE CONSTANTS FOR THE REACTIONS (M) $+\mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{H}_{4} \underset{\underset{\mathrm{~d}}{\stackrel{\mathrm{k}}{\leftrightarrows}}}{\stackrel{\mathrm{kr}^{\prime}}{\leftrightarrows}} 2 \mathrm{NH}_{2} \cdot+(\mathrm{M})$

W. Tsang

## ABSTRACT

Data for the reactions $\mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{H}_{4}+(\mathrm{M}) \underset{\mathrm{kd}}{\stackrel{\mathrm{k}_{r}}{\leftrightarrows}} 2 \mathrm{NH}_{2} \cdot+\mathrm{M}$ have been tabulated and critically examined. These span the range 0.01-200 atm and 300-1600 K. A satisfactory correlation of the data has been made using RRKM unimolecular rate theory. The results are consistent with $\Delta \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{f}}^{300}\left(\mathrm{NH}_{2} \cdot\right)=45.5 \pm 1.5 \mathrm{kcals} / \mathrm{mol}$. This is in marked contrast to the JANAF value of $40.1 \mathrm{kcals} / \mathrm{mol}$. On this basis suggested rate constants for these reactions over the range $10^{-5}-10^{2} \mathrm{~atm}$ and $200-3000^{\circ} \mathrm{K}$ are tabulated.


## §

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \begin{array}{l}
\Delta H_{f}(300) \\
S \quad(300) \\
C_{p}(300) \\
C_{p}(700) \\
C_{p}(1000) \\
C_{p}(2000) \\
\Delta H_{R}(300) \\
\Delta S_{R}(300)
\end{array}
\end{aligned}
$$




[^12]R. W. Diesen, J. Chem.
Phys. 39, 2121 (1963). Reactions are carried out be-
hind reflected shock wave with
T. 0. F. mass spectrometer for in
situ determinationof reactants.
Temperature: $1200-2500^{\circ} \mathrm{K}$
Composition: 0.1 to $1 \% \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{H}_{4}$ in .04 to .25 atm Argon.

 Heating time: $1-4 \mathrm{msec}$.
 to 8.6 atm argon.


 pg. 353, The Combustion Institute, Pittsburgh, Pa. (1965).
\[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Reactions are carried out be- } \\
& \text { hind reflected shock wave. Rate } \\
& \text { of hydrazine pyrolysis followed } \\
& \text { by decrease of absorption at } \\
& 2300 \AA \text {. } \\
& \text { Temperature: } 1100-1600^{\circ} \mathrm{K} \\
& \text { Composition: } .03-5 \% \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{H}_{4} \text { in }
\end{aligned}
$$
\]

Reference
J. A. Kerr, R. C. Sekhar,
and A. R. Trotman-
Dickenson, J. Chem. Soc.,
3217 (1963).
$\quad$ Method and Condition
Toluene carrier
Temperature: $887-1034^{\circ} \mathrm{K}$
Heating time: $\quad .5 \mathrm{sec}$.
Composition: $6-30 \mathrm{~mm}$ toluene

d. The rate expression for the unimolecu-
 T-

e.

| Method and Condition | Reference |
| :---: | :---: |
| Reactions at low pressures are carried out behind incident | E. Meyer, H. A. Olscheusik, <br> J. Troe, and H. Gg. Wagner, |
| shocks while those at high pres- | Eleventh Symposium on |
| ures are from reflected shocks | Combustion (International) |
| $\mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{H}_{4}$ concentration monitored by | 345, The Combustion |
| absorption at $2300 \AA$. | Institute, Pittsburgh, Pa. |
| Temperature: $1110^{\circ} \mathrm{K}-1580^{\circ} \mathrm{K}$ | (1967). |
| Composition: . $001 \%-.5 \% \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{H}_{4}$ in |  |
| .2-300 atm argon. |  |

f. At low pressures the bimolecular rate
for hydrazine decomposition is
$\mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{d}}(0)=10^{15} \cdot 6 \exp (-41,000 / \mathrm{RT}) \mathrm{cc} / \mathrm{mol}-$
At high pressures $\left(1280-1580^{\circ} \mathrm{K}\right)$.

Results


[^13] Flame 2, 137, 149 (1958).
D. W. Setser and W. C.
Richardson, Can. J. Chem.
$47,2593(1969)$. ART calculation assuming tran-
sition state structure for hy-
drazine for ethane decomposition
are similar. Critical energy
for decomposition is taken to be
56.8 kcals.
 data and the fluid dynamic properties of the toluene carrier system.


It is assumed that combination S.W. Bensen, H. E. O'Neal, Kinetics Data on Gas Phase Unimolecular Reaction, pg. 34 NSRDS-NBS 21 U. S. Government Printing Office Washington, DC 20402 (1970). It is assumed that combination
rates of nitrogen and carbon rates of nitrogen and carbon
radicals are similar and that the extrapolated (to high pressures) rate constants of McHale et. al. (Id) are correct

| Method and Condition | Reference |
| :--- | :--- |
| Electron impact study on the prod－ | S．N．Foner and R．L． |
| ucts formed from an electrodeless | Hudson，J．Chem．Phys．29， |
| discharge in hydrazine in a fast | 442 （1958）． | flow system．

．
응
M．H．Hanes and E． J．Chem．Phys ．39， （1963）．

 function of time following $r f$


Pressure ． $425-.850 \mu \mathrm{NH}_{3}$
OT－S fđәวхә әлоqе se әues
unur）$O$ T－S 7 đəつXə əлоqe se əures $\mathrm{Hg}) \mathrm{NH}_{3}$ Pulse radiolysis of $\mathrm{NH}_{3}$ with $2 M V$
 Кq pəmotiof əourxeəđdrsṭ $乙_{\text {HN }}$ よо measurement of decrease in absorp－ tion at 5976 A．

Very low pressure pyrolysis of benzyl amine．
h．Data is compatible with rate expres－ sion for benzyl amine decomposition of $\mathrm{K}_{\infty}\left(\phi \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{NH}_{2} \rightarrow \phi \mathrm{CH}_{2}{ }^{\cdot}+\mathrm{NH}_{2}{ }^{\circ}\right)=$ $10^{15 \cdot 2} \exp (-71,900 / R T) \mathrm{sec}^{-1}$ ．Thus $\Delta H_{f}(300)$ for $N H=47.2 \mathrm{kcal}$ ．Pre－ dicts $\mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{d}}(\infty)=10^{17.82} \exp (-74,000 / \mathrm{RT})$ $\mathrm{sec}^{-1}$ ．
d． $\mathrm{D}\left(\mathrm{NH}_{2}-\mathrm{H}\right)=106 \pm 3 \mathrm{kcals}$
$\Delta \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{f}}(300)$ for $\mathrm{NH}_{2}=43 \pm 3$
$\mathrm{Based}^{2}$ on appearance potential of
$\mathrm{NH}_{2}^{+}$from $\mathrm{NH}_{2}$ and $\mathrm{NH}_{3}$ ．
e． $\mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{r}}=2.33 \times 10^{12} \mathrm{cc} / \mathrm{mole} \mathrm{sec}$.
no pressure dependence．

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { f. } \mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{r}}=2.5 \times 10^{12} \mathrm{cc} / \mathrm{mole} \mathrm{sec} \\
& (\text { limiting high pressure result }) \\
& \text { g. } \mathrm{k}_{r}=6.2 \times 10^{13} \mathrm{cc} / \text { mole } \mathrm{sec}
\end{aligned}
$$


Results
i. $\mathrm{k}\left(\phi \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{NH}_{2} \rightarrow \phi \mathrm{CH}_{2} \cdot+\mathrm{NH}_{2} \cdot\right)=10^{13.0}$
12.8

2) Comments on Individual Studies

Ia. The main decomposition reaction is heterogeneous. Contributions from the homogeneous reaction are deduced from the presence of dibenzyl. Overall mechanism is assumed to be

$$
\begin{array}{lll}
3 \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{H}_{4} & \rightarrow \mathrm{~N}_{2}+4 \mathrm{NH}_{3} \\
2 \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{H}_{4} & \rightarrow \mathrm{H}_{2}+\mathbb{N}_{2}+2 \mathrm{NH}_{3} & \text { heterogeneous } \\
\mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{H}_{4} & \rightarrow 2 \mathrm{NH}_{2} \cdot & \\
\mathrm{NH}_{2}+\phi \mathrm{CH}_{3} & \rightarrow \mathrm{NH}_{3}+\phi \mathrm{CH}_{2} \cdot & \\
2 \phi \mathrm{CH}_{2} \cdot & \rightarrow\left(\phi \mathrm{CH}_{2} \cdot\right)_{2} &
\end{array}
$$

and is supported by stoichiometric checks. Rate constants are determined assuming heterogeneous and homogeneous processes proceed by lst order kinetics.

Although the measured rate constants are probably accurate to a factor of 2 or 3, it should be noted that practically every set of rate parameters determined by Szwarc (IIc) using this method has turned out to be much lower than the currently accepted number. The causes for such errors are unknown. Furthermore, the small size of the molecule and the low pressures and high temperatures all lead to the conclusion that the reaction is in the 2nd order region. Gilbert (IIa) has demonstrated that this is the case if the fluid dynamics of reactor is taken into account.

Thus, these results are strongly indicative of a $\mathbb{N}-\mathbb{N}$ bond energy far in excess of 60 kcals .

Ib. Similar experiments as in Ia, except that homogeneous contribution is determined from the production of ammonia, after taking into account the heterogeneous contribution. The mechanism of Szwarc (Ia) is assumed. The data treatment involves the subtraction of two large numbers. Uncertainties are at least as large as for (Ia). Rate constants and parameters are in excellent agreement with (Ia).

Ic. The use of this technique for quantitative work must be seriously questioned. Reaction conditions are very poorly defined. Rate constants for hydrazine disappearance are probably no better than order of magnitude estimates. Rate parameters are only compatible with extremely low $\mathbb{N}-\mathbb{N}$ bond energies.

Id. The experimental rate constants are based on the assumed mechanism.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{H}_{4} \stackrel{\mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{a}}}{\rightarrow} 2 \mathrm{NH}_{2} \\
& \mathrm{NH}_{2}+\mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{H}_{4} \rightarrow \mathrm{NH}_{3}+\mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{H}_{3} \cdot \\
& \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{H}_{3} \cdot+\mathrm{NH}_{2} \rightarrow \mathrm{NH}_{3}+\mathrm{N}_{2}+\mathrm{H}_{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

For steady state in $\mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{H}_{3} \cdot$ and $\mathrm{NH}_{2}$ concentrations

$$
\mathrm{d}\left(\mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{H}_{4}\right) / \mathrm{dt}=-2 \mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{d}}\left(\mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{H}_{4}\right)
$$

An important omission is the neglect of the reverse reaction $2 \mathrm{NH}_{2} \cdot \stackrel{\mathrm{k}_{r}}{\rightarrow}$ $\mathbb{N}_{2} \mathrm{H}_{4}$. All direct measurements (Ie,f,g) give very high values. If this reaction is of importance calculated rate constants and the activation energy will be smaller than the true values.

Considerable effort has been devoted to purification of the hydrazine. The authors claim that with hydrazine dried over $\mathrm{CaH}_{2}$, a lower activation energy and slightly higher rate constants (at low temperatures)
can be obtained. Their sample has been dried over molecular sieve. Questions regarding the purity of the hydrazine used are fundamental to all the decomposition studies. Although rigorous purification is the most direct procedure, it is probably only in the toluene carrier studies and the shock tube experiments with extremely low concentrations of hydrazine that one can assume the relative unimportance of homogeneous catalytic effects.

Belford and Strehlow ${ }^{(2)}$ have questioned the used of the single pulse shock tube for quantitative kinetic studies. Ignoring mechanistic problems, (which may be very serious) the uncertainty in rate constants is probably no less than a factor of 3 .

Ie. Details of the hydrazine decomposition process are followed with time resolution of $\sim 1 \mu s e c$. The oscilloscopic traces show under varying conditions, induction periods and deviation from first order behavior. Thus the processes which are represented by the calculated first order rate constants are uncertain.

Induction periods occurred only in the low temperature runs 1100$1200^{\circ} \mathrm{K}$. They have been ignored in the data analysis. However, this is just at the high temperature end of the results of McHale et. al. (If) and calls into question their mechanism. Palmer ${ }^{(3)}$ maintains that they represent artifacts arising from non-ideal shock behavior.

Commercial liquid hydrazine is used without special attempts at purification. Hydrazine is absorbed on the shock tube walls. In order to maintain concentration a continuous flow system is used. The substitution of helium for argon as the inert diluent showed no striking
effects. This is also the case with added traces of oxygen.
The reported rate expressions are in excellent agreement with that of McHale et. al. (Id). The estimated uncertainty is probably a factor of 3 .

If. This represents a continuation of (Ie). Reactions are now carried out under more extreme conditions. Problems encountered earlier appear to have been surmounted through the proper choice of reaction variables. RRK theory is used to fit all the existing data. High pressure limiting rates are achieved at 200-300 atm.

It is claimed that the rate expression for the unimolecular high pressure decomposition of hydrazine is compatible with the recombination number of Bair (II,e,f). This is incorrect. See (IIb,c).

Uncertainty is probably a factor of 3.
IIb. From the subsequent discussion it can be seen that if these rate expressions are correct, all the measured numbers are in error.

IId.. Electron impact studies of this type are no longer considered satisfactory means of determining bond energies. (4) However, in the present case there may have been a fortuitous cancellation of errors.

IIe,f. The derivation of the necessary calibration factors depend on assumptions regarding the nature of the processes occurring during and after the rf discharge. Thus, large errors may be introduced. It should be noted that the reported number represents the rate of the 2 nd order disappearance of $\mathrm{NH}_{2} \cdot$. It must be regarded as a maximum rate for the recombination of amino radicals.

There also appears to be a discrepancy between these two studies. In (IIe) $\mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{r}}$ is reported to be pressure independent in the sub mm Hg range. This is in contrast to the situation in (IIf) where high pressure behavior is not reached till 10 mm Hg pressure. The possibility that the number reported in (IIe) is due to the reaction $\mathrm{NH}_{2}+\mathrm{NH}_{2} \rightarrow \mathrm{NH}$ $+\mathrm{NH}_{3}$ would seem to be ruled out by the fact that the rate for this reaction as reported in (IIf) is $.46 \times 10^{12} \mathrm{cc} / \mathrm{mol} \mathrm{sec}$.

IIg. Similar comments as for (IIe,f). However, the initial excitation is orders of magnitude shorter. Furthermore, the radiolytic behavior of $\mathrm{NH}_{3}$ is probably better understood. On this basis Ausloos (5) suggests an uncertainty of no more than a factor of 2 for the rate of the 2nd order disappearance of $\mathrm{NH}_{2}$.

IIh. Although the data are compatible with the published numbers, it is not clear that other sets of rate parameters may not produce equally satisfactory agreement.

II(i,j). See comments (Ia,b).
3) Discussion

The main discrepancy in the data is between the rate parameters for decomposition and the recombination rates. These are related by the equilibrium constant $K_{E}=k_{d} / k_{r}$. If it is assumed that the latter has little or no temperature dependence, then $A_{d} / A_{r} \sim A_{d} / k_{r} \sim \frac{e^{\Delta S / R}}{e R T}$ (where $A$ is the temperature independent factor). Thus, for $k_{r} \sim 10^{13.8}$ $\mathrm{cc} / \mathrm{mol}-\mathrm{sec}$, at $300^{\circ} \mathrm{K}, \mathrm{A}_{\mathrm{d}}$ is approximately $10^{17} \mathrm{sec}^{-1}$. This is three or more orders of magnitude higher than any of the published numbers and is in accord with the surmises of Setser and Richardson (IIb) and

Benson and O'Neal (IIc). The possibility that the A-factor for recombination is in fact 3 orders of magnitude lower due to a negative activation of about 4 kcals can be ruled out since it implies a "tight" transition state. This is physically implausible and is also unrealixable since the lowest frequencies for hydrazine are 875, 780 , and 378 $\mathrm{cm}^{-1}$. Thus, at $300^{\circ} \mathrm{K}$ it is not possible to raise these numbers so as to give the required temperature dependence. The remaining possibility is that the published rate parameters are in gross error, but that hopefully the rate constants are (within the estimated uncertain limit) correct. There is ample precedence in gas kinetics for such occurrences, since small errors in rate constants can result in catastrophically large mistakes in the rate parameters. Furthermore, the methods used in deriving the hydrazine decomposition data are well known for this sort of error.

The present approach to the problem of deriving $\mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{d}}$ and $\mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{r}}$ for any arbitrary reaction condition is to make RRKM calculations of the falloff behavior assuming an A-factor (and a transition state) consistent with the pulse radiolysis experiments (IIg) and with a variety of bond energies. This is dictated by the current controversy over the $\mathbb{N}-\mathbb{N}$ bond energy in hydrazine. Furthermore, the small size of hydrazine makes it probable that most, if not all, of the published data are in the fall-off region. The results of such calculations may be found in Figure I. The transition state model (I) involve the frequencies 3300 (4), 1300 (2), 1000 (2), 20 (3). It is assumed that the molecular structure remain unchanged. The collision diameter is assumed to be

5 A. With regard to third bodies the results of Rabinovitch and co(6) workers (6) are the best available. In the present analysis we have used $\mathrm{Ar}=.136$ and toluene $=\left(\mathbb{N}_{2} \mathrm{H}_{4}=T\right)$. The density of states of the activated molecule is calculated using the Laplace transform method. (7) to an energy where it gives comparable ( $\sim 10 \%$ deviation) answers as the Laplace transform method. After which, the latter is used.

Except for the data of Diesen (Ic) which is derived from shock tube studies using in situ mass spectroscopic detection an unambiguous choice of an optimum bond energy can be made. With regard to the former, it is suspected that an important cause for the discrepancy is due to sampling from the cold boundary layer; thus, making the calculated temperatures meaningless. This data will not be considered further. From the other experiments, the best bond energies are 65, $64.5,64,65.5,67.5,64.5$, and 69 kcals . The mean value is 66 kcals. With this number all except the data of Diesen can be accomodated with a maximum deviation of a factor of 3 . This is within the estimated error limits. It should be noted that in no case is it possible to fit the data with $\Delta \mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{O}}^{\mathrm{O}}$ of 57 kcals. This itself is 1.5 kcals higher than the value that can be deduced from the JANAF Tables ${ }^{(1)}$ with $\Delta \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{f}}^{300}\left(\mathrm{NH}_{2}\right)=40.1 \pm 3$ kcals. The present number gives $\Delta \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{f}}^{300}\left(\mathrm{NH}_{2}\right)=$ 45.5 kcals with an estimated uncertainty of $\pm 1.5$ kcals. That this analysis leads to a substantially different $\Delta \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{f}}^{300}\left(\mathrm{NH}_{2}\right)$ should not be surprising. The older estimate was based on a more limited set of rate data (Ia and Ib ). Both studies were at pressures far below the
high pressure limit. Their activation energies did not reflect the bond strength. Indeed, from Figure Ia and Ib it can be seen that the experimental and calculated temperature dependences are in good agreement. There remains important differences between the shock tube and calculated temperature dependences.

The calculated rates constants for the decomposition of hydrazine and the combination of amino radicals over a range of $10^{-2}-10^{5} \mathrm{~mm}$ $\mathrm{Hg}\left(\mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{H}_{4}\right)$ and $200-3000^{\circ} \mathrm{K}$ are summarized in Table I. With regard to other third bodies some of the results of Rabinovitch and coworkers can be found in Table II.

Although there is considerable arbitrariness in the definition of the transition state, it is generally agreed ${ }^{(8)}$ that for a given A-factor the fall-off characteristics will be relatively unchanged in spite of variations in the pattern of the assumed frequencies. In the current investigation this has been verified by carrying out fall-off calculations with (model II) 3330 (4), 1300 (2), 200 (3), 40 (2) and (model III); and $3300(4), 1300(2), 80(2), 60(3)$ complexes. They give numbers close to the desired A-factor and have rates of decomposition which are never more than a factor of 3 or those in Table I (usually less, especially at higher temperatures). Characteristic results can be seen in Figures IIa,b. It is also necessary to consider the consequences of error in the pulse radiolysis experiments. Accordingly, experiments have been carried out with a (model IV) 3300 (4), $1300(2), 1000(2), 40(3)$, complex. This gives an A-factor and recombination rate at $300^{\circ} \mathrm{K}$ of about a factor of 8 lower. Fitting
this data in the same manner as before we obtain the results in Figures III. This results in a best $\mathbb{N}-\mathbb{N}$ bond energy of about 64.5. The key points are: (a) This is still 9 kcals higher than the JANAF number and (b) for the decomposition studies there is probably a range of rate parameters which will fit the data. Thus, it is not surprising that Meyer, et. al., (If) should also be able to fit the existing decomposition data with their much lower rate parameters. It is only after the combination rates are considered (in essence extending the range of rate constants tremendously $k_{d}^{300}(1000 \mathrm{~mm}) \sim 10^{-32.5}$ $\sec ^{-1}$ ) that definite distinction can be made. Finally, it is gratifying to note that the data in Table I also demonstrate that the difference between the r-f discharge and pulse radiolytic determinations of amino radical recombinations is due to the latter being considerably further into the fall-off region. Indeed at 10 mm pressure $\left(\mathrm{NH}_{3}\right.$, efficiency $\sim .76^{6}$ ) the calculated number is $3.0 \times 10^{12}$ $\mathrm{cc} / \mathrm{mol} \sec$ while the experimental number at this pressure is 2.5 x $10^{12} \mathrm{cc} / \mathrm{mol} \mathrm{sec}$.
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Table I. Rate Constants for the reaction

$$
\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{H}_{4} \underset{\mathrm{k}(\mathrm{COM})}{\mathrm{k}(\mathrm{DEC})} 2 \mathrm{NH}_{2} \cdot+\mathrm{M}
$$

in the temperature range $200-3000^{\circ} \mathrm{K}$ and pressure range $.01-100,000 \mathrm{~mm} \mathrm{Hg}\left(\mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{H}_{4}\right)$.
(The table is on pages 188-195.)

TEMPERATURE IS 200 K
$A \cdot R \cdot T$. A-FACTOR IS 1.60715E+15 /SEC
REACTION THRESHOLD IS 66000. CALS
EXPERIMENTAL A-FACTOR IS 5.19307E+16 /SEC(HIGH PRESSURE)
EXPERIMENTAL ACTIVATION ENERGY IS $67311 \cdot 4$ CALS
(HIGH PRESSURE)
HIGH PRESSURE RATE CONSTANT IS $1.31156 \mathrm{E}-57$ /SEC

| PRESSURE <br> (MM HG) | K(DEC) <br> $(/ S E C)$ | K(COM) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  | (L/MOL-SEC) |

TEMPERATURE IS 300 K
$A \cdot R \cdot T \cdot A-F A C T O R$ IS 6.49981E+15 /SEC
REACTION THRESHOLD IS 66000. CALS
EXPERIMENTAL A-FACTOR IS $1.68812 E+17$ /SEC(HIGH PRESSURE)
EXPERIMENTAL ACTIVATION ENERGY IS 67871.5 CALS
(HIGH PRESSURE)
HIGH PRESSURE RATE CONSTANT IS 5.67615E-33 /SEC

PRESSURE
K(DEC) K(COM)
(MM HG)
$\cdot 1$
1
10
100
1000
10000
100000
(/SEC) (LMOL-SEC)

| $5 \cdot 82289 E-37$ | $6 \cdot 98691 E+6$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $5 \cdot 40080 E-36$ | $6 \cdot 48044 E+7$ |
| $4 \cdot 39414 E-35$ | $5 \cdot 27254 E+8$ |
| $2.88105 E-34$ | $3.45698 E+9$ |
| $1.30728 E-33$ | $1.56861 E+10$ |
| $3.43774 E-33$ | $4 \cdot 12495 E+16$ |
| $5.12106 E-33$ | $6.14478 E+10$ |
| $5.60084 E-33$ | $6.72046 E+10$ |

TEMPERATURE IS 400 K
A.R.T. A-FACTOR IS $1.60736 E+16$ /SEC

REACTION THRESHOLD IS 66000. CALS
EXPERIMENTAL A-FACTOR IS $3.09771 E+17$ /SEC(HIGH PRESSURE)
EXPERIMENTAL ACTIVATION ENERGY IS 68281.3 CALS
(HIGH PRESSURE)
HIGH PRESSURE RATE CONSTANT IS 1.45204E-20 /SEC

| PRESSURE | K(DEC) | K(COM) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $(M M H G)$ | $(/ S E C)$ | (L/MBL-SEC) |


| 081 | 5.50753E-25 | $3 \cdot 389$ 46E+6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| .1 | 5.22957E-24 | $3.21839 E+7$ |
| 1 | 4.5089 AE-23 | 2.7749]E+8 |
| 10 | 3.30168E-22 | 2.03193E+9 |
| 100 | 1.80335E-21 | 1.10982E+10 |
| 1000 | $6.11101 \mathrm{E}-21$ | 3.76085E+10 |
|  | 1.14585E-20 | 7-05181E+10 |
| 100000 | 1.39558E-20 | B.58874E10 |

TEMPERATURE IS 500 K
$A \cdot R \cdot T \cdot A-F A C T O R$ IS $3.02444 E+16$ /SEC
REACTION THRESHOLD IS 66000. CALS
EXPERIMENTAL A-FACTOR IS 4.35202E+17 /SEC(HIGH PRESSURE) EXPERIMENTAL ACTIVATION ENERGY IS 68578.8 CALS
(HIGH PRESSURE)
HIGH PRESSURE RATE CONSTANT IS 4.41914E-13 /SEC

| PRESSURE <br> (MM HG) | K(DEC) <br> $(/ S E C)$ | K(COM) <br> $(L / M O L-S E C)$ |
| :--- | :---: | :--- |
| .01 |  |  |
| .1 | $7.37608 E-18$ | $2.01819 E+6$ |
| 10 | $7.09902 E-17$ | $1.94238 E+7$ |
| 10 | $6.33785 E-16$ | $1.73412 E+8$ |
| 100 | $4.97086 E-15$ | $1.36009 E+9$ |
| 1000 | $3.06602 E-14$ | $8.38902 E+9$ |
| 10000 | $1.24931 E-13$ | $3.41826 E+10$ |
| 100000 | $2.88194 E-13$ | $7.88535 E+10$ |
|  | $4.03256 E-13$ | $1.10336 E+11$ |

TEMPERATURE IS 600 K
$A \cdot R \cdot T \cdot A-F A C T O R$ IS $4.81273 E+16$ /SEC
REACTION THRESHOLD IS 66000. CALS
EXPERIMENTAL A-FACTOR IS $5.34254 E+17$ /SEC(HIGH PRESSURE)
EXPERIMENTAL ACTIVATION ENERGY IS 68799.2 CALS
(HIGH PRESSURE)
HIGH PRESSURE RATE CONSTANT IS 4.49747E-8 /SEC

| PRESSURE | K(DEC) | K(COM) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $(M M H G)$ | $(/ S E C)$ | (L/MQL-SEC) |


| .01 | $3.67623 E-13$ | $1.30544 \mathrm{E}+6$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| .1 | $3.56885 \mathrm{E}-12$ | $1.26730 \mathrm{E}+7$ |
| 10 | $3.26056 \mathrm{E}-11$ | $1.15783 \mathrm{E}+8$ |
| 10 | $2.67928 \mathrm{E}-10$ | $9.51415 \mathrm{E}+8$ |
| 100 | $1.80011 \mathrm{E}-9$ | $6.39221 \mathrm{E}+9$ |
| 1000 | $8.42450 \mathrm{E}-9$ | $2.99155 \mathrm{E}+10$ |
| 10000 | $2.32159 \mathrm{E}-8$ | $8.24400 \mathrm{E}+10$ |
| 100000 | $3.77921 \mathrm{E}-8$ | $1.34200 \mathrm{E}+11$ |

TEMPERATURE IS 700 K
$A \cdot P \cdot T \cdot A-F A C T O R$ IS $6.86275 E+16$ /SEC
REACTION THRESHOLD IS 66000. CALS
EXPERIMENTAL A-FACTOR IS $6.09422 E+17$ /SEC(HIGH PRESSURE)
EXPERIMENTAL ACTIVATION ENERGY IS 68966.9 CALS (HIGH PRESSURE)
HIGH PRESSURE RATE CONSTANT IS 1.73720E-4 /SEC

| PRESSURE | K(DEC) | K(COM) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $(M M H G)$ | $(/ S E C)$ | $(L / M \emptyset L-S E C)$ |


| .01 | $7.48935 E-10$ | 880290. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| -1 | $7.31382 E-9$ | $8.59658 E+6$ |
| 1 | $6.79187 E-8$ | $7.98309 E+7$ |
| 10 | $5.77144 E-7$ | $6.78369 E+8$ |
| 100 | $4.13076 E-6$ | $4.85525 E+9$ |
| 1000 | $2.15215 E-5$ | $2.52961 E+10$ |
| 10000 | $6.89285 E-5$ | $8.10178 E+10$ |
| 100000 | $1.30392 E-4$ | $1.53261 E+11$ |

TEMPERATURE IS 800 K
$A \cdot R \cdot T \cdot A-F A C T O R$ IS $9 \cdot 07513 E+16$ /SEC
REACTION THRESHOLD IS 66000. CALS
EXPERIMENTAL A-FACTOR IS 6.66103E+17 /SEC(HIGH PRESSURE)
EXPERIMENTAL ACTIVATION ENERGY IS 69098. CALS
(HIGH PRESSURE)
HIGH PRESSURE RATE CONSTANT IS 8.62552E-2 /SEC

| PRESSURE | K(DEC) | K(COM) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| (MM HG) | (/SEC) | (L/MOL-SEC) |
|  |  |  |
| 001 | $2.06872 E-7$ | 607487. |
| 1 | $2.02891 E-6$ | $5.95795 E+6$ |
| 1 | $1.90709 E-5$ | $5.59997 E+7$ |
| 10 | $1.66187 E-4$ | $4.88015 E+8$ |
| 100 | $1.24861 E-3$ | $3.66659 E+9$ |
| 1000 | $7.08451 E-3$ | $2.08039 E+10$ |
| 10000 | $2.57625 E-2$ | $7.56524 E+10$ |
| 100000 | $5.61664 E-2$ | $1.64935 E+11$ |

TEMPERATURE IS 90ロ K
$A \cdot R \cdot T \cdot A-F A C T O R$ IS $1 \cdot 13707 E+17$ /SEC
REACTION THRESHOLD IS 66000. CALS
EXPERIMENTAL A-FACTOR IS 7.09164E+17 /SEC(HIGH PRESSURE)
EXPERIMENTAL ACTIVATION ENERGY IS 69202.8 CALS
(HIGH PRESSURE)
HIGH PRESSURE RATE CONSTANT IS 10.8685 /SEC

| PRESSURE | K(DEC) | K(COM) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| (MM HG) | $(/ S E C)$ | $(L / M O L-S E C)$ |
|  |  |  |
| .01 | $1.51643 E-5$ | $427226 \cdot$ |
| 11 | $1.49203 E-4$ | $4.20352 E+6$ |
| 1 | $1.41543 E-3$ | $3.98771 E+7$ |
| 10 | $1.25789 E-2$ | $3.54388 E+8$ |
| 100 | $9.82048 E-2$ | $2.76674 E+9$ |
| 1000 | .597165 | $1.68240 E+10$ |
| 10000 | 2.41877 | $6.81444 E+10$ |
| 100000 | 6.00693 | $1.69234 E+11$ |

TEMPERATURE IS $100 \square K$
$A \cdot R \cdot T \cdot A-F A C T O R$ IS $1.36906 E+17$ /SEC
REACTION TRRESHOLD IS 66000. CALS
EXPERIMENTAL A-FACTOR IS 7.42300E+17 /SEC(HIGH PRESSURE)
EXPERIMENTAL ACTIVATION ENERGY IS 69288.2 CALS
(HI GH PRESSURE)
HIGH PRESSURE RATE CONSTANT IS 523.32 /SEC

| PRESSURE | K(DEC) | $K(C O M)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $(M M H G)$ | (/SEC) | (L/MOL-SEC) |


| .01 | $4 \cdot 40113 E-4$ | $304675 \cdot$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| .1 | $4.34108 E-3$ | $3.00518 E+6$ |
| 1 | $4.14839 E-2$ | $2.87178 E+7$ |
| 10 | .374468 | $2.59231 E+8$ |
| 100 | 3.0156 | $2.08759 E+9$ |
| 1000 | 19.4178 | $1 \cdot 34422 E+10$ |
| 10000 | 86.2466 | $5.97055 E+10$ |
| 100000 | 241.029 | $1.66856 E+11$ |


| PRESSURE | K(DEC) | K(COM) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| (MM HG) | $(/ S E C)$ | $(L / M O L-S E C)$ |
| .01 | $6.52903 E-3$ | 219866. |
| .1 | $6.45261 E-2$ | $2.17293 E+6$ |
| 1 | .62026 | $2.08874 E+7$ |
| 10 | 5.67056 | $1.90957 E+8$ |
| 100 | 46.8467 | $1.57757 E+9$ |
| 1000 | 316.495 | $1.06580 \mathrm{E}+10$ |
| 10000 | $1522 \cdot 03$ | $5.12547 \mathrm{E}+10$ |
| 100000 | 4730.8 | $1.59311 \mathrm{E}+11$ |

TEMPERATURE IS 1200 K
$A \cdot R \cdot T \cdot A-F A C T O R$ IS $1.82505 E+17$ /SEC
REACTION THRESHOLD IS 66000. CALS
EXPERIMENTAL A-FACTOR IS 7.88662E+17 /SEC(HIGH PRESSURE)
EXPERIMENTAL ACTIVATION ENERGY IS 69418.9 CALS
(HIGH PRESSURE)
HIGH PRESSURE RATE CONSTANT IS $176426 \cdot / S E C$

| PRESSURE | K(DEC) | K(COM) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $(M M H E)$ | $(/ S E C)$ | $(L / M O L-S E C)$ |
| .01 | $5.86957 E-2$ | 160353. |
| .1 | .581008 | $1.58728 E+6$ |
| 1 | 5.61202 | $1.53317 E+7$ |
| 10 | 51.8486 | $1.41647 E+8$ |
| 100 | 437.592 | $1.19547 E+9$ |
| 1000 | 3079.53 | $8.41307 E+9$ |
| 10000 | 15867.9 | $4.33501 E+10$ |
| 100000 | 54269.7 | $1.48261 E+11$ |

TEMPERATURE IS 1300 K
$A \cdot R \cdot T \cdot A=F A C T O R$ IS $2 \cdot 04438 E+17$ /SEC
REACTION THRESHOLD IS 66000. CALS
EXPERIMENTAL A-FACTOR IS 8-05118E+17 /SEC(HIGH PRESSURE)
EXPERIMENTAL ACTIVATION ENERGY IS 69469.9 CALS (HIGH PRESSURE)
HIGH PRESSURE RATE CONSTANT IS $1.65981 E+6$ /SEC

| $P R E S S U R E$ | $K(D E C)$ | $K(C O M)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $(M M H G)$ | $(/ S E C)$ | $(L / M O L-S E C)$ |


| .01 | $\bullet 359759$ | 118100. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\bullet 1$ | 3.56576 | $1 \cdot 17055 \mathrm{E}+6$ |
| 1 | 34.581 | $1 \cdot 13521 \mathrm{E}+7$ |
| 10 | 322.321 | $1.05811 \mathrm{E}+8$ |
| 100 | 2770.02 | $9.09332 \mathrm{E}+8$ |
| 1000 | 20189.5 | $6.62772 \mathrm{E}+9$ |
| 10000 | 110507. | $3.62767 \mathrm{E}+10$ |
| 100000 | 411890 | $1.35214 \mathrm{E}+11$ |



A•R•T•A-FACTOR IS 2.65501E+17 /SEC
REACTION THRESHOLD IS 66000. CALS
EXPERIMENTAL A-FACTOR IS $8.38676 E+17$ /SEC(HIGH PRESSURE)
EXPERIMENTAL ACTIVATION ENERGY IS 69585.9 CALS
(HIGH PRESSURE)
HIGH PRESSURE RATE CONSTANT IS 2.58840E+8 /SEC

| PRESSURE | K(DEC) | K(COM) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| (MM HG) | $(/ S E C)$ | $(L / M O L-S E C)$ |
| .01 | 17.3866 | 49876.4 |
| .1 | 172.804 | 495720. |
| 1 | 1690.67 | $4.85000 E+6$ |
| 10 | 16068.9 | $4.60965 E+7$ |
| 100 | 143819. | $4.12571 E+8$ |
| 1000 | $1.13595 E+6$ | $3.25866 E+9$ |
| 10000 | $7.16848 E+6$ | $2.85640 E+10$ |
| 100000 | $3.29937 E+7$ | $9.46482 E+10$ |



```
TEMPERA TURE IS 2000
A.R.T. A-FACTOR IS 3.35270E+17 /SEC
REACTION THRESHOLD IS 66000. CALS
EXPERIMENTAL A-FACTOR IS 8.63248E+17 /SEC(HIGH PRESSURE)
EXPERIMENTAL ACTIVATION ENERGY IS 69687.6 CALS
                                    (HI GH PRESSURE)
HIGH PRESSURE RATE CONSTANT IS 2.07285E+10 /SEC
\begin{tabular}{lll} 
PRESSURE & K(DEC) & K(COM) \\
(MM HG) & \((/ S E C)\) & \((L / M \theta L-S E C)\) \\
& & \\
.01 & 370.896 & 18264.4 \\
1 & 3694.33 & 1819240 \\
10 & 364060 & \(1.79278 E+6\) \\
10 & 351700 & \(1.73192 E+7\) \\
100 & \(3.25857 E+6\) & \(1.60465 E+8\) \\
1000 & \(2.76179 E+7\) & \(1.36002 E+9\) \\
10000 & \(1.98402 E+8\) & \(9.77016 E+9\) \\
100000 & \(1.11733 E+9\) & \(5.50220 E+10\)
\end{tabular}
TEMPERA TURE IS 2RDO K
A PR.T. A-FACTOR IS 3.65535E+17 /SEC
REACTION THRESHOLD IS 66000. CALS
EXPERIMENTAL A=FACTOR IS 8.71020E+17 /SEC(HIGH PRESSURE)
EXPERIMENTAL ACTIVATION ENERGY IS 69724.8 CALS
                                    (HIGH PRESSURE)
HIGH PRESSURE RATE CONSTANT IS 1.02200E+11 /SEC
\begin{tabular}{lll} 
PRESSURE & \(K(D E C)\) & \(K(C O M)\) \\
\((M M H G)\) & \((/ S E C)\) & \((L / M O L-S E C)\)
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{lll}
.01 & 991.875 & \(11298 \cdot 7\) \\
.1 & 9886.78 & 112623. \\
1 & 97672.3 & \(1.11261 \mathrm{E}+6\) \\
10 & 948948 & \(1.08097 \mathrm{E}+7\) \\
100 & \(8.90057 \mathrm{E}+6\) & \(1.01388 \mathrm{E}+8\) \\
1000 & \(7.73845 \mathrm{E}+7\) & \(8.81505 \mathrm{E}+8\) \\
10000 & \(5.83280 \mathrm{E}+8\) & \(6.64428 \mathrm{E}+9\) \\
100000 & \(3.54823 \mathrm{E}+9\) & \(4.04187 \mathrm{E}+10\)
\end{tabular}
```

TEMPERATURE IS 2400 K
$A \cdot R \cdot T \cdot A-F A C T O R$ IS $3 \cdot 93087 E+17$ /SEC
REACTION THRESHOLD IS 66000. CALS
EXPERIMENTAL A-FACTOR IS 8.76991E+17 /SEC(HIGH PRESSURE)
EXPERIMENTAL ACTIVATION ENERGY IS 69755.9 CALS
(HIGH PRESSURE)
HIGH PRESSURE RATE CONSTANT IS $3.86485 E+11 /$ SEC

| PRESSURE | K(DEC) | K(COM) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (MM HG) | (/SEC) | (L/MOL-SEC) |
| -11 | 2118.24 | $7178 \cdot 27$ |
| -1 | 21126.1 | $71592 \cdot 1$ |
| 1 | 209124. | 708677. |
| 10 | $2 \cdot 104114 E+6$ | $6.91698 \mathrm{E}+6$ |
| 100 | 1.93367E +7 | $6.55279 E+7$ |
| 1000 | 1.71684E+8 | 5.81802E+8 |
| 10000 | 1-34696E+9 | 4. $56458 \mathrm{E}+9$ |
| 100000 | 8-74690E+9 | $2 \cdot 96414 E+10$ |

## TEMPERATURE IS 2600 <br> K

A•R•T. A-FACTOR IS 4.18209E+17 /SEC
REACTION THRESHOLD IS 66000. CALS
EXPERIMENTAL A-FACTOR IS 8.81675E+17 /SEC(HIGH PRESSURE)
EXPERIMENTAL ACTIVATION ENERGY IS $69782 \cdot 2$ CALS
(HIGH PRESSURE)
HIGH PRESSURE RATE CONSTANT IS $1.19163 E+12$ /SEC

| PRESSURE | K(DEC) | K(COM) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| (MM HG) | $(/ S E C)$ | $(L / M Q L-S E C)$ |
|  |  |  |
| .01 | 3823.61 | 4675.03 |
| .1 | 38151.9 | 46647.3 |
| 10 | 378271. | 462502. |
| 10 | $3.70600 E+6$ | $4.53122 E+6$ |
| 100 | $3.53981 E+7$ | $4.32804 E+7$ |
| 1000 | $3.19813 E+8$ | $3.91027 E+8$ |
| 10000 | $2.59501 E+9$ | $3.17285 E+9$ |
| 100000 | $1.78143 E+10$ | $2.17811 E+10$ |

TEMPERATURE IS 2800 K
A•R•T. A-FACTOR IS 4.41166E+17 /SEC
REACTION THRESHOLD IS 66000. CALS
EXPERIMENTAL A-FACTOR IS $8.85415 E+17$ /SEC(HIGH PRESSURE)
EXPERIMENTAL ACTIVATION ENERGY IS 69804.8 CALS (HIGH PRESSURE)
HIGH PRESSURE RATE CONSTANT IS 3.12925E+12 /SEC

## PRESSURE <br> (MM HG)

| .01 | 6071.37 | 3115.29 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| .1 | 60662.2 | 31095.7 |
| 1 | 601661. | 308719. |
| 10 | $5.91290 \mathrm{E}+6$ | $3.03398 \mathrm{E}+6$ |
| 100 | $5.68632 \mathrm{E}+7$ | $2.91772 \mathrm{E}+7$ |
| 1000 | $5.21277 \mathrm{E}+8$ | $2.67474 \mathrm{E}+8$ |
| 10000 | $4.35160 \mathrm{E}+9$ | $2.23286 \mathrm{E}+9$ |
| 100000 | $3.13239 \mathrm{E}+10$ | $1.60727 \mathrm{E}+10$ |

$\mathrm{K}(\mathrm{DEC}) \quad \mathrm{K}(\mathrm{COM})$
(/SEC) (L/MOL-SEC)

TEMPERATURE IS 3000 K
A•R•T. A-FACTOR IS 4.62195E+17 /SEC
REACTION THRESHOLD IS 66000. CALS
EXPERIMENTAL A-FACTOR IS $8.88447 E+17$ /SEC(HIGH PRESSURE)
EXPERIMENTAL ACTIVATION ENERGY IS 69824.5 CALS
(HIGH PRESSURE)
HIGH PRESSURE RATE CONSTANT IS 7.22671E+12 /SEC

| PRESSURE | K(DEC) | K(COM) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $(M M H G)$ | $(/ S E C)$ | (L/MQL-SEC) |


| .01 | 8727.06 | 2119.98 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| .1 | 87136.2 | 21167.2 |
| 1 | 866039. | 210378. |
| 10 | $8.53302 \mathrm{E}+6$ | $2.07284 \mathrm{E}+6$ |
| 100 | $8.25267 \mathrm{E}+7$ | $2.00474 \mathrm{E}+7$ |
| 1000 | $7.65835 \mathrm{E}+8$ | $1.86037 \mathrm{E}+8$ |
| 10000 | $6.54878 \mathrm{E}+9$ | $1.59083 \mathrm{E}+9$ |
| 100000 | $4.90910 \mathrm{E}+10$ | $1.19252 \mathrm{E}+10$ |

Table II. Collisional Efficiencies of Bath Gases*

1. $\mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{H}_{4}$
(1.00)
2. He
. 171
3. Ne
.120
4. Ar
.136
5. Kr
.115
6. $D_{2}$
.23
7. $N_{2}$
.21
8. $S F_{6}$
.42
9. $\mathrm{H}_{2}$
.28
10. $\mathrm{NH}_{3}$
.76
II. $\mathrm{CD}_{4}$. 41
11. $\mathrm{CH}_{4}$
.44
12. $\mathrm{C}_{2} \mathrm{H}_{6}$
.56
13. $\mathrm{C}_{2} \mathrm{H}_{4}$. 43
14. $\mathrm{C}_{3} \mathrm{H}_{6}$. 60
15. $\mathrm{C}_{3} \mathrm{H}_{8} .62$
16. $\mathrm{iC}_{4} \mathrm{H}^{10}$.73
17. $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{5} \mathrm{CH}_{3}$. 80
*From results of ref. 6 on $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{NC}$ isomerization.

Figure I. Comparison of calculated - and experimental - - rate constants for hydrazine decomposition at constant pressure. Transition state model (I) for hydrazine 3300, (4), 1300 (2), 1000 (2), 20 (3). Collision diameter 5A, Argon efficiency ${ }^{(6)}$. 136 , Toluene efficiency ${ }^{(6)}$. 8. The numbers are assumed bond energies in kcals.
(a) reference Ia ( 7 mm Hg toluene)
(b) reference $\mathrm{Ib} \quad(15 \mathrm{~mm} \mathrm{Hg}$ toluene).
(c) reference Ic ( 100 mm Hg argon)
(d) reference Id (3000 mm Hg argon)
(el) reference $\mathrm{Ie} \quad(2000 \mathrm{~mm} \mathrm{Hg}$ argon)
(e2) reference $\mathrm{Ie} \quad(5500 \mathrm{~mm} \mathrm{Hg}$ argon)
(fl) reference If ( 150 mm Hg argon)
(f2) reference If (200,000 mm Hg argon)

Figure II. Comparison of the results of RRKM calculations with varying frequency patterns for the transition state, but essentially invariant high pressure rate parameters ${ }^{\circ}$
a. $k(I) / k(I I) ; 300^{\circ} \mathrm{K} \quad k_{\infty}(I)=10^{17.2} \exp (-67,871 / R T)$

$$
\begin{aligned}
k_{\infty}(I I) & =10^{17.2} \exp (-68,397 / \mathrm{RT}) \\
900^{\circ} \mathrm{K} & k_{\infty}(I)=10^{17.8} \exp (-69,203 / \mathrm{RT}) \\
& k_{\infty}(I I)=10^{18.2} \exp (-70,659 / \mathrm{RT}) \\
1500^{\circ} \mathrm{K} & \mathrm{k}_{\infty}(\mathrm{I})=10^{17.9} \exp (-69,552 / \mathrm{RT}) \\
& k_{\infty}(I I)=10^{18.4} \exp (-71,279 / \mathrm{RT})
\end{aligned}
$$

b. $\mathrm{k}(\mathrm{I}) / \mathrm{k}($ III $) ; 300^{\circ} \mathrm{K} \mathrm{k}($ III $)=10^{17 \cdot 3} \exp (-68585 / \mathrm{RT})$

$$
\begin{array}{rl}
900^{\circ} \mathrm{K} & \mathrm{k}(\text { III })
\end{array}=10^{18.5} \exp (-70,893 / \mathrm{RT}) .
$$

Figure III: Comparison of calculated - and experimental - - rate constants for hydrazine decomposition at constant pressure. Transition state model (IV) for hydrazine 3300 (4), 1300 (2), 1000 (2), 40 (3). Collision diameter 5 A. Argon efficiency ${ }^{(6)}$. 136 Toluene efficiency ${ }^{(6)}$ .8. The numbers are assumed bond energies in kcals.
(a) reference Ia ( 7 mm Hg toluene)
(b) reference Ib ( 15 mm Hg toluene)
(c) reference Ic ( 100 mm Hg argon)
(d) reference Id ( 3000 mm Hg argon)
(el) reference Ie (2000 mm Hg argon)
(e2) reference Ie ( 5500 mm Hg argon)
(fl) reference If ( 150 mm Hg argon)
(f2) reference If ( $200,000 \mathrm{~mm} \mathrm{Hg}$ argon)
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RATE CONSTANTS FOR THF REACTIONS $(M)+\mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{~F}_{4} \underset{\mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{d}}}{\stackrel{\mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{r}}}{\leftrightarrows}} 2 \mathrm{NF}_{2} \cdot+(\mathrm{M})$
W. Tsang

ABSTRACT

Data for the reactions $\mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{~F}_{4}+\mathrm{M} \underset{\underset{\mathrm{kd}}{\underset{\mathrm{r}}{\boldsymbol{r}}} \underset{2}{\stackrel{\mathrm{r}_{2}}{ }} 2 \mathrm{NF}_{2}}{ }$ + M have been critically examined and tabulated. A correlation of the data on the basis of RRKM calculations require a $N-N$ bond energy of $\Delta E_{0}^{\circ}=18.0 \mathrm{kcals}$. This is somewhat lower than the JANAF value of $\Delta \mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{o}}^{\circ}=20.8 \mathrm{kcals}$. Suggested rate constants for these reactions over the ranges $10^{-5}-10^{2} \mathrm{~atm}$ and $200-1800^{\circ} \mathrm{K}$ are tabulated.

1. Survey of Experimental Data
I. Direct Studies
Reference
Darwent,
$\stackrel{N}{\sim}$
$\begin{aligned} & \text { I. Brown and B. } \\ & \text { J. Chem. Phys., } \\ & (1965) \text {. }\end{aligned}$
$\begin{aligned} & \text { Shock tube at } 344-410^{\circ} \mathrm{K} \text { with } \\ & .6 \text { to } 6 \text { atm Ar or } \mathrm{N}_{2}\left(1 \% \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{~F}_{4}\right)\end{aligned}$
Spectrophotometric detection of
$\mathrm{NF}_{2}$ at $2602 \AA$ ( 4 A bandpass)
(incident shock).
I. Direct Studies (Continued)

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \quad \frac{\text { Reference }}{} \\
& \text { A. P. Modica and D. F. } \\
& \text { Hornig, J. Chem. Phys., } \\
& 1317,49 \text { (1968). }
\end{aligned}
$$

JANAF Thermochemical Tables NSRDS-NBS 37 , U. S. Government Printing Office,

Review and recalculation of existing data for the equilibrium $\mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{~F}_{4} \xrightarrow{\leftrightarrows} 2 \mathrm{NF}_{2} \cdot$ Method and Condition
*All data from Ref. IIa.

III. Comments:

Ia, b. The results are derived from very straight forward shock tube experiments. Since reactions are carried out behind incident shock waves, at low temperatures and for the most part dilute mixtures of $\mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{~F}_{4}$, mechanistic complications as well as non-ideal shock tube behavior are probably absent. Measured rates are probably reliable. Absolute uncertainties in rate constants should be less than a factor of 2 . A direct comparison of runs under similar condition can be found in Fig. I. Agreement is satisfactory.

There may be discrepancies in the reported pressure dependence. Modica and Hornig (Ib) publish data which indicate a linear dependence of unimolecular rate constant with pressure. This means that under these conditions (.58-2.7 atm) reaction is in the bimolecular region. Brown and Darwent (Ia) find at 6 atm $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ pressure they are close to the high pressure limit. These results are not compatible since this suggests an unacceptably sharp fall-off curve. The collisional efficiency of argon as reported by Modica and Hornig (Ib) is rather high. This may be an indication that they are not as far into the fall-off region as they believe.

There is a disagreement of about 2 kcals in activation energy for decomposition in the presence of argon. Although this may not be considered large at first sight note that the process in question has an extremely low activation energy. The percentage deviation is more of the order of $12 \%$. This is fairly large even in the context of shock tube experiments. IIa. The numbers given here is based on the measured equilibrium constants and calculated entropies of reaction. The reported 2nd law
determinations give numbers of $19.8,21.7,19.3,19.8$, and 21.5 kcals (see ref. in IIa). The source of this discrepancy is unknown. Ordinarily, one would favor the 3rd law determination. It should be noted all the entropies are based on spectroscopic data. A direct measurement of the entropy of $N_{2} \mathrm{~F}_{4}$ will increase our confidence in the validity of the $3 r \bar{a}$ law determinations.
2. Discussion

The two studies are in substantial agreement with regard to measured rates of $\mathrm{NF}_{2}$ formation. The unimolecular rate constants have a pressure dependence but it would seem that the extent of this dependence is uncertain. The activation energy is also uncertain.

Assuming the correctness of the measured rate constants, a series of RRKM calculations will permit (in essence) a best two parameter fit of the data. The results of such calculations for a range of A-factors (details regarding transition state models and other parameters used in RRKM calculation can be found in Table I) and $\mathbb{N}-\mathbb{N}$ bond energies confirm the experimental observation that results are in the "fall-off" region. For reactions at 2 atmospheres argon comparisons between calculation and experiments can be found in Figures Ia,b,c. For each A-factor two rates have been determined. One involves the use of an argon efficiency of .5 as determined by Modica and Hornig (Ib) while the other uses .136 from the work of Rabinovitch and coworkers. (1) This should cover the possible range of argon efficiencies. The key factors to be noted are: 1) For $\Delta E_{0}^{O}=20.8$ kcals reaction is so far into the fall-off region such that
there is no transition state model which will fit the data; 2) with $\Delta E_{0}^{\circ}=$ 19.6 kcals, if one considers the uncertainty limits in the experiments (factor of 2) and calculation (factor of 3) then a tenuous fit may be possible; c) Finally for $\Delta E_{o}^{\circ}=18$ kcals one obtains a comfortable fit with A-factors which are commonly observed for other bond dissociation reactions. With this bond energy a transition state compatible with an A-factor of $10^{17.3} \mathrm{sec}^{-1}$ and an argon efficiency of .136 and $N_{2}$ efficiency of .21 the accumulated data on the pressure dependence of the unimolecular rate constant and the results of shocks in $\mathbb{N}_{2}$ at 2.5 atm can be accomodated. This can be seen in Figure IIa,b,c. In addition from the present results we can compute the apparent third body efficiencies of $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$, He and A (since reaction is not completely in the bimolecular region) using the numbers given by Rabinovitch and coworkers. (I) The values are $\mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{d}}\left(\mathrm{SF}_{6}\right) / \mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{d}}(\mathrm{Ar})=1.6, \mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{d}}\left(\mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{~F}_{4}\right) / \mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{d}}(\mathrm{Ar})=3.5$, and $\mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{d}}(\mathrm{He}) / \mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{d}}(\mathrm{Ar})$ = l.0. These numbers are in reasonable accord with the values given by Modica and Hornig (Ib).

The $\mathbb{N}-\mathbb{N}$ bond energy that is recommended in the JANAF Tables (Ia) is 22.2 kcals $\left(298^{\circ} \mathrm{K}\right)$. This corresponds to $\Delta \mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{O}}^{\circ}=20.8 \mathrm{kcals}$. As we have noted it is not possible to fit the data on this basis. Thus if this number is correct than the only proper conclusion is that the experimental results are in error and the satisfactory fits that have been obtained with $\Delta E_{0}^{\circ}=18.0 \mathrm{kcals}$ mere coincidences. Although the former is always possible (for example, presence of $\mathrm{NF}_{2}$ producing impurities) the gross discrepancies make it unlikely. Furthermore, we are not convinced that $\mathbb{N}-\mathbb{N}$ bond energy has been settled. The value of $\Delta \mathbb{E}_{0}^{O}=18.0$
kcals corresponds to a $\Delta H_{298}=19.4 \mathrm{kcals}$ which is in agreement with the 2nd law determinations.

Pending the settlement of this question we summarize in Table II rate constants for $\mathbb{N}_{2} \mathrm{~F}_{4}$ decomposition and $\mathrm{NF}_{2}$ combination over the range $.01-100,000 \mathrm{~mm} \mathrm{Hg}\left(\mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{~F}_{4}\right)$ and $200-1800^{\circ} \mathrm{K}$ using $\Delta \mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{O}}^{\mathrm{O}}=18.0$ and a transition state which yields an A-factor of $210^{17.3} \mathrm{sec}^{-1}$. Assuming the correctness of the experimental data these numbers should have an uncertainty of about a factor of 3 . If the JANAF $\mathbb{N}-\mathbb{N}$ bond energy should be confirmed we summarize in Table III results with the same transition state and $\Delta \mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{O}}^{\circ}$ $=20.8$. These are however no better than order of magnitude estimates since there will no longer be any experimental tie-points. Finally, there is arso the possibility that this discrepancy is due to defects in the calculational procedure. Thus, if the high bond energy and the rate data should both proved to be correct, then the data in Table II may still be valid (it runs through the experimental numbers) but it will indicate that the computational technique is not sufficiently sensitive to this small change in bond energy. Obviously further experimental work should be carried out.

## References

1. S. C. Chen, B. S. Rabinovitch, J. Bryant, L. D. Spicer, T. Fryimoto, Y. N. Lin, and S. P. Pavlou, J. Phys. Chem. 74, 3160 (1970).

TABLE I: Data Used in Fall-off Calculations.
a) Transition state is assumed to have some geometrical structure as molecule.
b) Collision diameter is $6 \AA$.
c) Vibrational frequencies for the molecule are 950(5), 740(1), 520(5), 120(1).
d) Vibrational frequencies for transition states are

1. $950(4), 570(2), 300(2), 60(3)$ giving $A^{4000}(\infty)=10^{15.7} \mathrm{sec}^{-1}$
2. $950(4), 570(2), 150(2), 30(3)$ giving $A_{\exp }^{400}(\infty)=10^{17.3} \mathrm{sec}^{-1}$
3. $950(4), 570(2), 50(2), 20(3)$ giving $A_{\exp }^{400}(\infty)=10^{18.7} \mathrm{sec}^{-1}$
4. $950(4), 570(2), \quad 10(5) \quad$ giving $A_{\exp }^{400}(\infty)=10^{21} \mathrm{sec}^{-1}$
e) Since fall-off behavior is independent of pattern of vibrational frequencies but is sensitive to exact value of $A(\infty)$, it is assumed that the above covers all possible transition state models within this range of A -factors.

## TABLE II

 pressure range $.01-100,000 \mathrm{~mm} \mathrm{Hg}\left(\mathbb{N}_{2} \mathrm{~F}_{4}\right)$ and $200-1800^{\circ} \mathrm{K} . \mathrm{A}(\infty) \sim 10^{17.3}$ $\sec ^{-1} \quad \Delta E_{0}^{O}=18000$ cals. Note that $k(D E C) / k(C O M)=$ equilibrium constant with $\Delta E_{O}^{O}=18000$ cals .
(The table is on pages 212-215.)

TEMPERATURE IS 200 K
$A \cdot R \cdot T \cdot A-F A C T O R$ IS $6.88975 E+14$ /SEC
REACTION THRESHOLD IS 180 180 CALS
EXPERIMENTAL A-FACTOR IS $2.86886 E+16$ /SEC (HI GH PRESSURE)
EXPERIMENTAL ACTIVATION ENERGY IS $19462 \cdot 4$ CALS
(HIGH PRESSURE)
HIGH PRESSURE RATE CONSTANT IS 1.50580E-5 /SEC

| PRESSURE | K(DEC) | K(COM) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| (MM HG) | $(/ S E C)$ | (L/MOL-SE |
|  |  |  |
| .01 | $3.11337 E-10$ | 18764.6 |
| .1 | $3.07811 E-9$ | 185520. |
| 1 | $2.82798 E-8$ | $1.78445 E+6$ |
| 10 | $2.10627 E-7$ | $1.26947 E+7$ |
| 100 | $1.15621 E-6$ | $6.96861 E+7$ |
| 1000 | $4.24485 E-6$ | $2.55841 E+8$ |
| 10000 | $9.57262 E-6$ | $5.76950 E+8$ |
| $10 日 000$ | $1.35960 E-5$ | $8.19442 E+8$ |

TEMPERATURE IS 300 K
$A \cdot R \cdot T \cdot A=F A C T O R$ IS $3.08483 E+15$ /SEC
REACTION THRESHOLD IS 18000. CALS
EXPERIMENTAL A-FACTOR IS $9.99696 E+16$ /SEC (HIGH PRESSURE)
EXPERIMENTAL ACTIVATION ENERGY IS 20053.6 CALS
(HIGH PRESSURE)
HIGH PRESSURE RATE CONSTANT IS 241.142/SEC

| PRESSURE | K(DEC) | $K(C O M)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $(M M H G)$ | $(/ S E C)$ | $(L / M O L-S E C)$ |


| .01 | $7.72187 E-4$ | 4327.03 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | $7.67468 E-3$ | 43005.8 |
| 10 | .073189 | 410122. |
| 10 | .612868 | $3.43427 E+6$ |
| 100 | 4.19646 | $2.35153 E+7$ |
| 1000 | 21.6034 | $1.21057 E+8$ |
| 10000 | 74.8421 | $4.19385 E+8$ |
| 100000 | 159.594 | $8.94300 E+8$ |

TEMPERATURE IS 400 K
$A \cdot R \cdot T \cdot A-F A C T O R$ IS $8 \cdot 0552 I E+15$ /SEC
REACTION THRESHOLD IS 18080. CALS
EXPERIMENTAL A-FACTOR IS $1.81544 E+17$ /SEC (HIGH PRESSURE)
EXPERIMENTAL ACTIUATION ENERGY IS 20455.9 CALS
(HIGH PRESSURE)
HIGH PRESSURE RATE CONSTANT IS $1 \cdot 19085 E+6$ /SEC

$K(D E C)$
(/SEC)

- 181
- I

1
10
100
1000
10000
100000

K(CDM)
(L/MOL-SEC)
.850684
8.47479
82.2422
730.705
5630.92
35179.
161028.
481210.
.850684
8.47479
82.2422
730.705
5630.92
35179.
161028.
481210.
.850684
8.47479
82.2422
730.705
5630.92
35179.
161028.
481210.
.850684
8.47479
82.2422
730.705
5630.92
35179.
161028.
481210.
.850684
8.47479
82.2422
730.705
5630.92
35179.
161028.
481210.
.850684
8.47479
82.2422
730.705
5630.92
35179.
161028.
481210.
.850684
8.47479
82.2422
730.705
5630.92
35179.
161028.
481210.
.850684
8.47479
82.2422
730.705
5630.92
35179.
161028.
481210.
1582.37
15764.1

152980 。
1.35920E+6

1. $04742 E+7$
$6 \cdot 54370 E+7$
$2.99531 \mathrm{E}+8$
$8.95107 E+8$

TEMPERATURE IS 500 K
A•R•T• A-FACTOR IS 1.56054E+16 /SEC
REACTION THRESHOLD IS 18000. CALS
EXPERIMENTAL A-FACTOR IS 2•50174E+17 /SEC (HIGH PRESSURE)
EXPERIMENTAL ACTIVATION ENERGY IS 20736.3 CALS
(HIGH PRESSURE)
HIGH PRESSURE RATE CONSTANT IS $2 \cdot 13354 E+8$ /SEC
PRESSURE
K(DEC)
K(COM)
(MM HG)
(/SEC) (L/MOL-SEC)

| .01 | 42.3612 | 677.796 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| .1 | 422.553 | 6761.01 |
| 110 | 4140.65 | 66252. |
| 10 | 38097.7 | 609578. |
| 100 | 315642. | $5.05039 \mathrm{E}+6$ |
| 1000 | $2.23104 \mathrm{E}+6$ | $3.56975 \mathrm{E}+7$ |
| 10000 | $1.23392 \mathrm{E}+7$ | $1.97432 \mathrm{E}+8$ |
| 100000 | $4.76811 \mathrm{E}+7$ | $7.62916 \mathrm{E}+8$ |

TEMPERATURE IS 600 K
A.R.T. A-FACTOR IS 2.52449E+16 /SEC

REACTION THRESHOLD IS 18000. CALS
EXPERIMENTAL A-FACTOR IS 3002202E+17 /SEC (HIGH PRESSURE)
EXPERIMENTAL ACTIVATION ENERGY IS 20939.3 CALS
(HIGH PRESSURE)
HIGH PRESSURE RATE CONSTANT IS $7.05820 \mathrm{E}+9$ /SEC

| PRESSURE <br> (MM HG) | K(DEC) <br> $(/ S E C)$ | K(CQM) <br> (L/MOL-SE |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  |
| .01 | 456.144 | 316.86 |
| 11 | 4553.52 | 3163.09 |
| 1 | 44888.9 | 311820 |
| 10 | 422463. | 293463. |
| 100 | $3.67313 E+6$ | $2.55154 E+6$ |
| 1000 | $2.32531 E+7$ | $1.96260 E+7$ |
| 10000 | $1.78803 E+8$ | $1.24205 E+8$ |
| 100000 | $8.39921 E+8$ | $5.83450 E+8$ |

TEMPERATURE IS 700 K
A•R•T• A-FACTOR IS 3.63523E +16 /SEC
REACTION THRESHOLD IS 18000 . CALS
EXPERIMENTAL A-FACTOR IS 3.40590E+17 /SEC (HIGH PRESSURE)
EXPERIMENTAL ACTIVATION ENERGY IS 21091.6 CALS
(HIGH PRESSURE)
HIGH PRESSURE RATE CONSTANT IS 8.77533E+10 /SEC

## PRESSURE

K(DEC)
K(COM)
(MM HG)
(/SEC)
2094.26
20916.6
207014.
$1.97874 E+6$
1.77980E+7

1. $45475 \mathrm{E}+8$
$1.01713 \mathrm{E}+9$
2. $55428 \mathrm{E}+9$
(L/MOL-SEC)
158.513
1583.16
15668.8

149770 .
1.34712E+6
1.10110E+7
$7.69859 \mathrm{E}+7$
$4.20401 \mathrm{E}+8$

TEMPERATURE IS 800 K
A•R•T. A-FACTOR IS 4.83636E+16 /SEC
REACTION THRESHOLD IS 18000. CALS
EXPERIMENTAL $A-F A C T O R$ IS $3.68975 E+17$ /SEC (HIGH PRESSURE)
EXPERIMENTAL ACTIVATION ENERGY IS 21269.6 CALS
(HIGH PRESSURE)
HIGH PRESSURE RATE CONSTANT IS 5.88043E+11 /SEC

| PRESSURE | K(DEC) | K(CQM) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $(M M H G)$ | (/SEC) | (L/MOL-SEC) |


| .01 | 6225.65 | 90.982 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| .1 | 62200.1 | 908.997 |
| 110 | 617284. | 9021.03 |
| 10 | $5.96606 \mathrm{E}+6$ | 87188.4 |
| 100 | $5.50076 \mathrm{E}+7$ | 803885. |
| 1000 | $4.70378 \mathrm{E}+8$ | $6.87414 \mathrm{E}+6$ |
| 10000 | $3.54745 \mathrm{E}+9$ | $5.18426 \mathrm{E}+7$ |
| 100000 | $2.17975 \mathrm{E}+10$ | $3.18551 \mathrm{E}+8$ |

TEMPERATURE IS 1000 K
A.R.T. A-FACTOR IS 7.34293E+16 /SEC

REACTION THRESHOLD IS 18000. CALS
EXPERIMENTAL A-FACTOR IS $4.26437 E+17$ /SEC (HI GH PRESSURE)
EXPERIMENTAL ACTIVATION ENERGY IS 21379.4 CALS
(HIGH PRESSURE)
HIGH PRESSURE RATE CONSTANT IS 8.58582E+12 /SEC

| PRESSURE | K (DEC) | K (COM) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (MM HG) | (/SEC) | (L/MOL-SEC) |
| - 01 | 19513.1 | 29.5697 |
| $i^{1}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 195034 . \\ & 1.94206 E+6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 295 \cdot 55 \\ & 2942 \cdot 96 \end{aligned}$ |
| 10 | 1.90390E+7 | $28851 \cdot 3$ |
| 100 | $1.81362 E+8$ | 274832 。 |
| 1080 | $1 \cdot 64803 E+9$ | 2.49740E+6 |
| 10000 | 1.37999E+10 | 2.09120E+7 |
| 100000 | 1.20376E+11 | 1-52108E+8 |

TEMPERATURE IS 1290 K
$A \cdot R \cdot T \cdot A-F A C T O R$ IS $9.81603 E+16$ /SEC
REACTION THRESHOLD IS 18000. CALS
EXPERIMENTAL A-FACTOR IS $4.28868 E+17$ /SEC (HI GH PRESSURE)
EXPERIMENTAL ACTIVATION ENERGY IS 21495.3 CALS
(HIGH PRESSURE)
HIGH PRESSURE RATE CONSTANT IS 5•19035E+13 /SEC

| PRESSURE | K(DEC) | K(CQM) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $(M M H G)$ | (/SEC) | (L/MOL-SEC) |


| .01 | 33218.4 | 11.4897 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 18 | 332091. | 114.865 |
| 1 | $3.31284 \mathrm{E}+6$ | 1145.86 |
| 10 | $3.27418 \mathrm{E}+7$ | 11324.8 |
| 100 | $3.17931 \mathrm{E}+8$ | 1099670 |
| 1000 | $2.99684 \mathrm{E}+9$ | $1.03655 \mathrm{E}+6$ |
| 10000 | $2.67799 \mathrm{E}+10$ | $9.26273 \mathrm{E}+6$ |
| 100000 | $2.17216 \mathrm{E}+11$ | $7.51312 \mathrm{E}+7$ |

TEMPERATURE IS 1490 K
$A \cdot R \cdot T \cdot A=F A C T O R$ IS $1 \cdot 21497 E+17$ /SEC
REACTION THRESHOLD IS 18000. CALS
EXPERIMENTAL A-FACTOR IS $4 \cdot 43168 E+17$ /SEC (HI GH PRESSURE)
EXPERIMENTAL ACTIVATION ENERGY IS 21579.2 CALS
(HIGH PRESSURE)
HIGH PRESSURE RATE CONSTANT IS $1.88769 E+14$ /SEC

| PRESSURE | K(DEC) | K(COM) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $(M M H G)$ | $(/ S E C)$ | $(L / M O L-S E C)$ |


| .01 | 41717.2 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 11 | 4171040 |
| 10 | $4.16513 E+6$ |
| 10 | $4.13592 E+7$ |
| 100 | $4 \cdot 06213 E+8$ |
| 1000 | $3.91520 E+9$ |
| 10000 | $3.64351 E+10$ |
| 100000 | $3.17073 E+11$ |

5.14461
51.4378
$513 \cdot 649$
5100.46
50094.8

482827 .
$4.49322 E+6$
3.91019E+7

TEMPERA TURE IS 1600 K
$A \cdot R \cdot T \cdot A-F A C T O R$ IS 1. $43042 E+17$ /SEC
REACTION THRESHOLD IS 18000 CALS
EXPERIMENTAL A-FACTOR IS 4.52778E+17 /SEC (HIGH PRESSURE)
EXPERIMENTAL ACTIVATION ENERGY IS 21642.6 CALS
(HIGH PRESSURE)
HIGH PRESSURE RATE CONSTANT IS 4.98781E+14 /SEC

| PRESSURE | K(DEC) | K(CDM) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $(M M H G)$ | $(/ S E C)$ | $(L / M O L-S E C)$ |
| .01 | 44139.4 | 2.55698 |
| 11 | 441351. | 25.5674 |
| 1 | $4.40977 E+6$ | 255.457 |
| 10 | $4.39077 E+7$ | 2543.56 |
| 100 | $4.34165 E+8$ | 25151.1 |
| 1000 | $4.24118 E+9$ | 245690. |
| 10000 | $4 \cdot 04712 E+10$ | $2 \cdot 34449 E+6$ |
| 100000 | $3.68402 E+11$ | $2 \cdot 13414 E+7$ |

TEMPERATURE IS 1800 K
$A \cdot R \cdot T \cdot A-F A C T O R$ IS $1.62728 E+17$ /SEC
REACTION THRESHOLD IS 18000. CALS
EXPERIMENTAL A-FACTOR IS 4.59519E+17 SEC (HIGH PRESSURE)
EXPERIMENTAL ACTIVATION ENERGY IS $21692 \cdot 2$ CALS
(HIGH PRESSURE)
HIGH PRESSURE RATE CONSTANT IS $1.06407 E+15$ /SEC

PRESSURE
(MM HG)

```
\bullet01
-1
I
10
1 0 0
10008
10000
100008"6
```

K(DEC)
K(CDM)
(L/MOL-SEC)

| .01 | 41871 | 1.36661 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 11 | 4186860 | 13.6653 |
| 10 | $4.18465 E+6$ | 136.581 |
| 10 | $4.17321 E+7$ | 1362.08 |
| 100 | $4.14306 E+8$ | 13522.4 |
| 1000 | $4.08004 E+9$ | $133167 \cdot$ |
| 10000. | $3.95404 E+10$ | $1.29055 E+6$ |
| $100000^{\prime 4}$ | $3.70402 E+11$ | $1.20894 E+7$ |

## TABLE III


#### Abstract

$\mathrm{k}(\mathrm{DEC})$ Estimated rate constants for the reaction $\mathbb{N}_{2} \mathrm{~F}_{4} \underset{\mathrm{k}(\stackrel{\leftarrow}{\mathrm{COM}})}{\stackrel{+}{4}} \quad 2 \mathrm{NF}_{2}$. over the pressure range $.01-100,000 \mathrm{~mm} \mathrm{Hg}\left(\mathbb{N}_{2} \mathrm{~F}_{4}\right)$ and $200-1800^{\circ} \mathrm{K} . \mathrm{A}(\infty) \sim 10^{17.3}$ $\sec ^{-1} \quad \Delta E_{0}^{\circ}=20800$ cals. Note that $k(D E C) / k(C O M)=$ equilibrium constant with $\Delta E_{O}^{O}=20800$ cals.


(The table is on pages 217-220.)

TEMPERATURE IS 200 K
$A \cdot R \cdot T \cdot A-F A C T O R$ IS $6.88975 E+14$ /SEC
REACTION THRESHOLD IS 20800. CALS
EXPERIMENTAL A-FACTOR IS 2.86886E+16 /SEC (HIGH PRESSURE)
EXPERIMENTAL ACTIVATION ENERGY IS 22259.4 CALS
(HIGH PRESSURE)
HIGH PRESSURE RATE CONSTANT IS 1.31667E-8 /SEC

```
PRESSURE
(MM HG)
```

K (DEC)
(/SEC)
(/SEC)
8.29910E-13
8.05125E-12
$6 \cdot 81524 E-11$
4. 46225E-10
2.06155E-9
6. $13405 \mathrm{E}-9$
1.11596E-8

1. 37881 E-8
K(COM)

K(COM)
(L/MOL-SEC)

| .01 | $8 \cdot 29910 E-13$ | 685.715 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| .1 | $8.05125 E-12$ | 6652.36 |
| 1 | $6.81524 E=11$ | $56311 \cdot 1$ |
| 10 | $4 \cdot 46225 E-10$ | $368694 \cdot$ |
| 100 | $2.06155 E-9$ | $1.70336 E+6$ |
| 1000 | $6.13405 E-9$ | $5.06827 E+6$ |
| 10000 | $1.11596 E-8$ | $9.22066 E+6$ |
| 100000 | $1.37881 E-8$ | $1.13925 E+7$ |

TEMPERATURE IS 300 K
$A \cdot R \cdot T \cdot A=F A C T O R$ IS $3.08483 E+15$ /SEC
REACTION THRESHOLD IS 20800. CALS
EXPERIMENTAL A-FACTOR IS $9.99696 E+16$ /SEC (HIGH PRESSURE)
EXPERIMENTAL ACTIVATION ENERGY IS 22850.7 CALS (HIGH PRESSURE)
HIGH PRESSURE RATE CONSTANT IS 2.20502 /SEC
PRESSURE
K(DEC)
K(COM)
(MM HG)
(/SEC)
(L/MOL-SEC)

| .01 | $2 \cdot 14135 E-5$ | 287.181 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 11 | $2 \cdot 10600 E-4$ | $2824 \cdot 4$ |
| 1 | $1.91034 E-3$ | 25620. |
| 10 | $1.46796 E-2$ | 196871. |
| 100 | $8.89234 E-2$ | $1.19257 E+6$ |
| 1000 | .387585 | $5.19799 E+6$ |
| 10000 | 1.09046 | $1.462 .44 E+7$ |
| 100000 | 1.90563 | $2.55568 E+7$ |

TEMPERATURE IS 400 K
A•R•T•A-FACTOR IS 8.05521E+15 /SEC
REACTION THRESHOLD IS 20800. CALS
EXPERIMENTAL A-FACTOR IS $1.81544 E+17$ /SEC (HIGH PRESSURE)
EXPERIMENTAL ACTIVATION ENERGY IS 23252.9 CALS
(HIGH PRESSURE)
HIGH PRESSURE RATE CONSTANT IS $35213.8 /$ SEC

| PRESSURE | K (DEC) | K(COM) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (MM HG) | (/SEC) | (L/MOL-SEC) |
| -01 | 7.54666E-2 | 140.377 |
| -1 | -746834 | 1389.2 |
| 1 | 7.00635 | $13032 \cdot 6$ |
| 10 | 58.5077 | 108831. |
| 100 | 411.259 | 764988 . |
| 1000 | 2251.75 | 4.18852E+6 |
| 10000 | 8609.94 | 1.60155E+7 |
| 100000 | 21008.3 | 3-90778E+7 |

```
TEMPERATURE IS 500 K
A.R.T. A-FACTOR IS 1.56054E+16 /SEC
REACTION THRESHOLD IS 20800. CALS
EXPERIMENTAL A-FACTOR IS 2.50174E+17 /SEC (HIGH PRESSURE)
EXPERIMENTAL ACTIVATION ENERGY IS 23533.4 CALS
                                    (HIGH PRESSURE)
HIGH PRESSURE RATE CONSTANT IS 1.27580E+7 /SEC
\begin{tabular}{lcc} 
PRESSURE & K(DEC) & K(COM) \\
(MM HG) & \((/ S E C)\) & \((L / M O L-S E\) \\
& & \\
.01 & 7.48175 & 70.9141 \\
11 & 74.2928 & 704.167 \\
1 & 710.571 & 6734.98 \\
10 & 6238.66 & 59131.8 \\
100 & 48115.7 & 456054. \\
1000 & 3057270 & \(2.89776 E+6\) \\
10000 & \(1.45135 E+6\) & \(1.37563 E+7\) \\
100000 & \(4.64923 E+6\) & \(4.40667 E+7\)
\end{tabular}
TEMPERATURE IS 600 K
A}\cdotR\cdotT\cdotA-FACTOR IS 2.52449E+16 /SEC
REACTION THRESHOLD IS 20800. CALS
EXPERIMENTAL A-FACTOR IS 3.02202E+17 /SEC (HIGH PRESSURE)
EXPERIMENTAL ACTIVATION ENERGY IS 23736.4 CALS
                                    (HIGH PRESSURE)
HIGH PRESSUKE RATE CONSTANT IS 6.74938E+8 /SEC
\begin{tabular}{lll}
\(P R E S S U R E\) & \(K(D E C)\) & \(K(C G M)\) \\
\((M M H G)\) & \((/ S E C)\) & \((L / M O L-S E C)\)
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{lll}
.01 & 126.519 & 36.7215 \\
.1 & 1258.92 & 365.394 \\
1 & 12189.2 & 3537.85 \\
10 & 110610 & \(32104 \cdot\) \\
100 & 908277. & 263622. \\
1000 & \(6.40139 E+6\) & \(1.85797 E+6\) \\
10000 & \(3.55795 E+7\) & \(1.03267 E+7\) \\
100000 & \(1.41239 E+8\) & \(4.09938 E+7\)
\end{tabular}
TEMPERATURE IS 700 K
A.R.T. A FACTOR IS 3.63523E+16 /SEC
REACTION THRESHOLD IS 20800. CALS
EXPERIMENTAL A-FACTOR IS 3.4059\OmegaE+17 /SEC (HIGH PRESSURE)
EXPERIMENTAL ACTIVATION ENERGY IS 23888.7 CALS
                                    (HIGH PRESSURE)
HIGH PRESSURE RATE CONSTANT IS 1.17345E+10 /SEC
\begin{tabular}{lll} 
PRESSURE & K(DEC) & K(CGM) \\
(MM HG) & (/SEC) & (L/MOL-SEC)
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{lll}
.01 & 795.5 & 19.606 \\
11 & 7926.27 & 195.351 \\
1 & 77381.6 & 1907.15 \\
10 & 7185750 & 17710.1 \\
100 & \(6.17027 E+6\) & 152073. \\
1000 & \(4.69000 E+7\) & \(1.15590 E+6\) \\
10000 & \(2.93501 E+8\) & \(7.23365 E+6\) \\
100000 & \(1.38001 E+9\) & \(3.40119 E+7\)
\end{tabular}
```

TEMPERATURE IS 800 K
$A \cdot R \cdot T \cdot A-F A C T O R$ IS $4.83636 E+16$ /SEC REACTION THRESHOLD IS 20800. CALS
EXPERIMENTAL A-FACTOR IS $3.68975 \mathrm{E}+17$ /SEC (HI GH PRESSURE)
EXPERIMENTAL ACTIVATION ENERGY IS 24006.7 CALS
(HIGH PRESSURE)
HIGH PRESSURE RATE CONSTANT IS $1.01120 \mathrm{E}+11$ /SEC

| PRESSURE <br> (MM HG) | K(DEC) <br> $(/ S E C)$ | K(COM) <br> $(L / M O L-S E C$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  |
| 001 | 2747.28 | 10.8436 |
| 11 | 27399.1 | 108.144 |
| 1 | 269055 | 1061.96 |
| 10 | $2.54074 E+6$ | 10028.3 |
| 100 | $2.25504 E+7$ | 89006.8 |
| 1000 | $1.81445 E+8$ | 7161650 |
| 10000 | $1.24427 E+9$ | $4.91115 E+6$ |
| 100000 | $6.69621 E+9$ | $2.64300 E+7$ |

TEMPERATURE IS 1000 K
$A \cdot R \cdot T \cdot A-F A C T O R$ IS $7.34293 E+16$ /SEC
REACTION THRESHOLD IS 20800. CALS
EXPERIMENTAL A-FACTOR IS $4.06437 E+17$ /SEC (HIGH PRESSURE)
EXPERIMENTAL ACTIVATION ENERGY IS 24176.5 CALS
(HIGH PRESSURE)
HIGH PRESSURE RATE CONSTANT IS 2.09954E+12 /SEC

PRESSURE
(MM HG)

| 001 | 11780.6 | 3.71096 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 11 | 117625 | 37.0524 |
| 1 | $1.16367 \mathrm{E}+6$ | 366.564 |
| 10 | $1.12348 \mathrm{E}+7$ | 3539.01 |
| 100 | $1.04259 \mathrm{E}+8$ | 32842. |
| 1000 | $9.07228 \mathrm{E}+8$ | 285782. |
| 10000 | $7.07979 \mathrm{E}+9$ | $2.23017 \mathrm{E}+6$ |
| 100000 | $4.64203 \mathrm{E}+10$ | $1.46227 \mathrm{E}+7$ |

K(DEC)
K(CDM)
(L/MOL-SEC)
3.71096
37.0524
366.564
3539.01

32842 。
285782.
$2 \cdot 23017 \mathrm{E}+6$
1.46227E+7

TEMPERATURE IS 1200 K
A•R•T. A-FACTOR IS 9.81603E+16 /SEC
REACTION THRESHOLD IS 20800. CALS
EXPERIMENTAL A-FACTOR IS 4.28868E+17 /SEC (HIGH PRESSURE)
EXPERIMENTAL ACTIVATION ENERGY IS 24292.4 CALS
(HIGH PRESSURE)
HIGH PRESSURE RATE CONSTANT IS $1.60502 E+13$ /SEC

PRESSURE
K(DEC)
K(COM)
(/SEC) (L/MOL-SEC)

| .01 | 24289.4 | 1.46671 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| .1 | 242673. | 14.6537 |
| 10 | $2.41099 \mathrm{E}+6$ | 145.587 |
| 10 | $2.35862 \mathrm{E}+7$ | 1424.24 |
| 100 | $2.24917 \mathrm{E}+8$ | 13581.5 |
| 1000 | $2.05540 \mathrm{E}+9$ | 1241140 |
| 10000 | $1.74321 \mathrm{E}+10$ | $1.05263 \mathrm{E}+6$ |
| 100000 | $1.30415 \mathrm{E}+11$ | $7.87507 \mathrm{E}+6$ |

TEMPERATURE IS 1400 K
A•R.T. A-FACTOR IS 1.21497E+17 /SEC
REACTION THRESHOLD IS 20800. CALS
EXPERIMENTAL A-FACTOR IS 4. $43168 \mathrm{E}+17$ /SEC (HI GH PRESSURE)
EXPERIMENTAL ACTIVATION ENERGY IS 24376.3 CALS
(HIGH PRESSURE)
HIGH PRESSURE RATE CONSTANT IS 6.90291E+13 /SEC

| PRESSURE <br> (MM HG) | K(DEC) <br> (/SEC) | $\mathrm{K}(\mathrm{CDM})$ <br> (L/MOL-SEC) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0.81 | 34526.6 | -656215 |
| $i^{1}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 345076 \theta \\ & 3.43696 E+6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6.55853 \\ & 65 \cdot 323 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 10 \\ & 100 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3 \cdot 38952 E+7 \\ & 3 \cdot 28752 E+8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 644.213 \\ & 6248 \cdot 27 \end{aligned}$ |
| 1000 <br> 10000 | $\begin{aligned} & 3.09933 E+9 \\ & 2.77513 E+10 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 58905.9 \\ & 527442 . \end{aligned}$ |
| 100000 | $2.26855 E+11$ | 4.31162E+6 |

TEMPERATURE IS 1600 K
$A \cdot R \cdot T \cdot A-F A C T O R$ IS 1.43042E+17 /SEC
REACTION THRESHOLD IS 20800. CALS
EXPERIMENTAL A-FACTOR IS 4. 52778E+17 /SEC (HI GH PRESSURE) EXPERIMENTAL ACTIVATION ENERGY IS $24439 \cdot 7$ CALS
(HIGH PRESSURE)
HIGH PRESSURE RATE CONSTANT IS 2.D6835E+14 /SEC

| PRESSURE | K(DEC) | K(CDM) <br> (MM HG) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | (/SEC) |  |
| (L/MOL-SEC) |  |  |

TEMPERATURE IS 1800 K
$A \cdot R \cdot T \cdot A-F A C T O R$ IS 1.62728E+17 /SEC
REACTION THRESHOLD IS 20800. CALS
EXPERIMENTAL A-FACTOR IS 4.59519E+17 /SEC (HIGH PRESSURE)
EXPERIMENTAL ACTIVATION ENERGY IS $24489 \cdot 3$ CALS
(HIGH PRESSURE)
HIGH PRESSURE RATE CONSTANT IS $4.86586 \mathrm{E}+14$ /SEC

| PRESSURE | K(DEC) | K(CDM) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| (MM HG) | $(/ S E C)$ | $(L / M O L-S E C)$ |
|  |  |  |
| 01 | 40230.6 | 1171377 |
| 11 | 402219 | 1.71339 |
| 1 | $4.01563 E+6$ | 17.106 |
| 10 | $3.99190 E+7$ | 170.049 |
| 100 | $3.93880 E+8$ | 1677.87 |
| 1000 | $3.83512 E+9$ | 16337.1 |
| 10000 | $3.63915 E+10$ | 155022 |
| 100000 | $3.28356 E+11$ | $1.39875 E+6$ |

TABLE IV. Collisional Efficiencies of Bath Gases (I)

1. $\mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{~F}_{4}$ ..... (1.00)2. He171
2. Ne .....  120
3. Ar ..... 136
4. Kr .....  115
5. $D_{2}$ ..... 23
6. $\mathbb{N}_{2}$ .....  21
7. $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ ..... 42
8. $\mathrm{H}_{2}$ ..... 28
9. $\mathrm{NH}_{3}$ ..... 76
10. $\mathrm{CD}_{4}$ ..... 41
11. $\mathrm{CH}_{4}$ ..... 44
12. $\mathrm{C}_{2} \mathrm{H}_{6}$ ..... 56
13. $\mathrm{C}_{2} \mathrm{H}_{4}$ ..... 43
14. $\mathrm{C}_{3} \mathrm{H}_{6}$ ..... 60
15. $\mathrm{C}_{3} \mathrm{H}_{8}$ ..... 62
16. $\mathrm{iC}_{4} \mathrm{H}_{10}$ ..... 73
17. $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{5} \mathrm{CH}_{3}$ ..... 80

## Captions for Figure 1 (page 223) and Figure 2 (page 224)

Figure I. Comparison of experimental -(Ref. Ia); +(Ref. Ib) and calculated - - and ---- rates of decomposition for various $\Delta E_{o}^{O}$ and $A_{d}(\infty)$. The upper of the two dotted lines refer to argon efficiency of .5 . The lower efficiency is .136 . Pressure $\sim .05$ mol/liter argon.
a) $\Delta E_{o}^{0}=20800$ cal.; $-A_{d}(\infty) \sim 10^{21} \mathrm{sec}^{-1}$ and $A_{\alpha}(\infty) \sim 10^{17.3} \mathrm{sec}^{-1}$.
b) $\Delta E_{0}^{O}=19600 \mathrm{cal}$; $-A_{d}(\infty) \sim 10^{18.7} \mathrm{sec}^{-1}$ and $-\ldots$ $A_{d}(\infty) \sim 10^{17.3}$.
c) $\Delta E_{o}^{\circ}=18000 \mathrm{cal} . ;-\quad-A_{d}(\infty) \sim 10^{17.3} \mathrm{sec}^{-1}$ and $\ldots$ $A_{d}(\infty) \sim 10^{15.8} \mathrm{sec}^{-1}$.

Figure II. a) Comparison of calculated (-) $A_{d}(\infty) \sim 10^{17.3} \Delta E_{o}^{0}=$ 18,000 cals $\mathbb{N}_{2}$ efficiency $=.21$ and experimental ( + ) rates of decomposition of $\mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{~F}_{4}$ in $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ at $400^{\circ} \mathrm{K}$ (Ref. Ia).
b) Comparison of calculated (-) $A_{d}(\infty) \sim 10^{17.3} \Delta \mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{o}}^{0}=18000$ cals A efficiency $=.136$ and experimental $(+)$ rates of decomposition of $\mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{~F}_{4}$ in argon at $360^{\circ} \mathrm{K}$ (Ref. Ib).
c) Comparison of calculated $(---) A_{d}(\infty) \sim 10^{17.3} \Delta E_{o}^{0}=18000$ cals $\mathbb{N}_{2}$ efficiency $=.21$ and experimental ( - ) rates of decomposition of $\mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{~F}_{4}$ at $.07 \mathrm{mols} /$ liter $N_{2}$ as a function of temperature.
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## Introduction

This bibliofraphy lists research papers on the kinetics of cas phase reactions of the chlorine, nitrogen and oxygen fluorides, with emphasis on the processes occuring during their thermal decompositions.

The material is arranged by chemical reaction in three separate lists - chlorine fluorides, nitrogen fluorides, and oxygen fluorides. After each reaction are listed rererences to papers that either report rate data or discuss the mechanism of reaction. If it is the latter a note is appended to the reference citations. There are sixty reactions in the lists, based on work in 51 papers.

The references under each reaction list the author(s) and the sources, in the following form:

$$
\text { Author }(s) \quad \text { Source-Year-Volume-Page }
$$

Diesen, R. $W$.
JCPSA-1964-41-3256
Lin and Bauer
JACSA-1969-91-7737 Blauer, et al.

JPCIIA-1971-75-3939
Number of
Author (s)
1
2
3 or more

The sources are indicated by their AsmM CODEN abbreviation. A guide to these codes follows the introduction.

Wert TY is a list of references, alphabetically by mothon in which full citations are given for the bricf civations in the reaction listings in parts I-III.
ine wibliogiaphy is based on the files of the Chemical Kinetics Trformation Center and an examination of Chemical Aostracts 1034-2972. Most of the papers listed were pubiisher since 1962.

ACSRA Abstracts of Papers. American Chemical Society (Washington)

BBPCA Berichte Der Bunsengesellschaft Fuer Physikalische Chemie (Weinheim, Germany)
BOOKA BOOK
CHPLE Chemical Physics Letters (Amsterdam)
CHREA Chemical Reviews (Washington)
CMEAA Commissarial A L'Energie Atomique, France, Rapport (Gif-sur-yvette, France)
DABBB Dissertation Abstracts International B. The Sciences and Engineering
DIASA Dissertation Abstracts
JACSA Journal of the American Chemical Society (Washington)
JCPSA Journal of Chemical Physics (New York)
JPCHA Journal of Physical Chemistry (Washington/Ithaca, New York)
NSRDA United States National Bureau of Standards, National Standard Reference Data Series (Washington)
RCRVA Russian Chemical Reviews (London)
RJICA Russian Journal of Inorganic Chemistry (London)
XCCIA United States Department of Commerce, Clearinghouse for Scientific and Technical Information, A.D.
ZEELA Zeitschrirt Fuer Elektrochemie (Weinheim/Halle, Germany)
ZPCBA Zeitschrift Fuer Physikalische Chemie, Abteilung B. Chemie Der Elementarprozesse, Aufbau Der Materie (Leipzig)
ZPCFA Zeitschrift Fuer Physikalische Chemie (Frankfurt am Main)
12WSA Congreso Internacional De Quimica Pura Y Aplicada, 9 O Congress, Madrid, April, 1934
$\mathrm{CI}+\mathrm{CIF}+\mathrm{CI}_{2}+\mathrm{F}$
MeIntyre and Diesen
McIntyre and Diesen
YCCIA-1971-AD713938 (estimate)
JPCHA-1971-75-1765 (estimate)
$\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{F}+\mathrm{M} \rightarrow \mathrm{CIF}+\mathrm{M}$
Fletcher and Dahneke JACSA-1969-91-1603 (estinete)
$\mathrm{Cl} \div \mathrm{F}_{2} \rightarrow \mathrm{ClF}+\mathrm{F}$
San Roman and Schumacher ZPCFA-1970-71-153 (mechanism)
$\mathrm{Cl}_{2}+\mathrm{F} \rightarrow \mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{ClF}$
McIntyre and Diesen JPCHA-1971-75-1765 (estimate)
$\mathrm{Cl}_{2}+\mathrm{F}_{2} \rightarrow \mathrm{ClF}+\mathrm{ClF}$ (overall)
Fletcher and Dahneke
JACSA-1969-91-1603
$\mathrm{ClF}+\mathrm{ClF}_{3} \rightarrow \mathrm{ClF}_{2}+\mathrm{ClF}_{2}$
Blauer, et al.
JPCHA-1969-73-2683 (mechanism)
$\mathrm{ClF}+\mathrm{F}+\mathrm{M} \rightarrow \mathrm{ClF}_{2}+\mathrm{M}$
San Roman and Schumacher ZPCEA-1970-71-153 (mechanism)
$C I F+h \nu \rightarrow C I+F$
San Roman and Schumacher 2PCFA-1970-71-153

```
ClF}+M->Cl+F+
```

Blauer, et al. JPCHA-1971-75-3939
McIntyre and Diesen XCCIA-1971-AD713938 (mechanism)
McIntyre and Diesen
JPCHA-1971-75-1765 (mechanism)
$\mathrm{ClF}_{2}+\mathrm{ClF}_{2} \rightarrow \mathrm{ClF}+\mathrm{ClF}_{3}$
San Roman and Schumacher ZPCFA-1970-71-153
$\mathrm{ClF}_{2}+\mathrm{F} \rightarrow \mathrm{ClF}+\mathrm{F}_{2}$
Blauer, et al.
XCCIA-1969-AD692493
Blauer, et al.
$\mathrm{CDF}_{2}+\mathrm{F}+\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{CH} \mathrm{B}_{3}+\mathrm{H}$
San Pomar and Schumacher zPCDf-1970-71-153
$\mathrm{ClF}_{2}+\mathrm{M} \rightarrow \mathrm{O}+\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{M}$
Blauer, éval. XCCIA-1969-AD692493
Blauer, et al.
TPCFA-1969-73-2683
$\mathrm{ClF}_{3} \rightarrow \mathrm{CIF}+\mathrm{F}_{2}$.
Bernstein and Katz JPCHA-1952-56-885
$\mathrm{ClF}_{3}+\mathrm{ClF}_{5}^{*}+\mathrm{ClF}_{4}+\mathrm{ClF}_{4}$
Krieger, et al.
2PCPA-1966-5I-240
$\mathrm{ClF}_{3}+\mathrm{P}+\mathrm{ClF}_{2}+\mathrm{F}_{2}$
Blauer, et al. JPCHA-1969-73-2683
$\mathrm{CIF}_{3}+\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{ClF}_{2}+\mathrm{F}+\mathrm{M}$
Blaues, et al. XCCIA-1969-AD692493
Blauer, et al. JPCHA-1969-73-2683
$\mathrm{CiF}_{4}+\mathrm{F} \rightarrow \mathrm{ClF}_{3}+\mathrm{F}_{2}$
Kriegers et al. ZPCFA-1966-51-240
$\mathrm{ClF}_{4}+\mathrm{F} \rightarrow \mathrm{ClF}_{5}^{*}$
Krieger, et al. ZPCFA-1966-51-240
$\mathrm{ClF}_{5}{ }^{*} \rightarrow \mathrm{ClF}_{4}+\mathrm{F}$
Krieger, et al. ZPCFA-1966-51-240
$\mathrm{ClF}_{5}+\mathrm{M} \rightarrow \mathrm{ClF}_{3}+\mathrm{F}_{2}+\mathrm{M}$ (overall)
Axworthy and Sullivan JPCHA-1970-74-949
Sullivan and Axworthy ACSRA-1968-155-J-25
$\mathrm{ClF}_{5}+\mathrm{M} \rightarrow \mathrm{ClF}_{4}+\mathrm{F}+\mathrm{M}$
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { Blauer, et al. } & \text { XCCIA-1969-AD692493 } \\ \text { Blauer, et al. } & \text { JPCHA-1970-74-1183 }\end{array}$
$\mathrm{ClF}_{5}^{*}+\mathrm{M} \rightarrow \mathrm{ClF}_{5}+\mathrm{M}$
Krieger, et al. ZPCPA-1966-51-240

II (a). BUACMIOUS OR NIMPOGTV FLUORIDIS
$N F^{*} \rightarrow \mathrm{NF}+\mathrm{hV}$
Clyne and White
$N F^{*}+\mathrm{M} \rightarrow \mathrm{NF}+\mathrm{M}$
Clyne and White
$\mathrm{NF}+\mathrm{NF} \rightarrow \mathrm{F}+\mathrm{F}+\mathrm{N}_{2}$
Diesen, R. W.
Diesen, R. W.
$\mathrm{NF}+\mathrm{NF}_{2} \rightarrow \mathrm{~F}_{2}+\mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{~F}$
Diesen, R. W.
$6 \mathrm{NF}_{2} \rightarrow 4 \mathrm{NH}_{3}+\mathrm{M}_{2}$
Cherednikov, et ai. $\mathrm{NF}_{2}+\mathrm{F}+\mathrm{M} \rightarrow \mathrm{NF}_{3}+\mathrm{M}$

Levy and Copeland
$\mathrm{NF}_{2}+\mathrm{F}_{2} \rightarrow \mathrm{~F}+\mathrm{NF}_{3}$
Diesen, R.W.
Levy and Copeland
Modica and Hornig
$4 N F_{2}+\mathrm{F}_{2} \mathrm{O} \rightarrow 3 \mathrm{NF}_{3}+\mathrm{NOF}$
Rubinstein, et. al.
$\mathrm{NF}_{2}+\mathrm{F}_{2} \mathrm{O} \rightarrow \mathrm{NF}_{3}+\mathrm{OH}$
Rubinstein, et al. $\mathrm{NF}_{2}+\mathrm{M} \rightarrow \mathrm{F}+\mathrm{NF}+\mathrm{M}$

Diesen, R. W. Diesen, R. W. Modica and Hornag

CHP1B- $2970-6-465$

CHP1, $-1970-6-465$

JCPSA-1964-41-3256
JCPSA-1966-45-759 (review)

JCPSA-j.966-45-759 (review)

RJICA-1969-14-154

JPCHA-1965-69-3700

JCPSA-1966-45-759 (review)
JPCHA-1965-69-3700
JCPSA-1966-45-760

ZPCFA-1964-43-51 (overal2)

ZPCFA-1964-43-51

JCPSA-1964-41-32.56
ЈСРSA-1966-45-759 (review)
JCPSA-1965-43-2739
$\mathrm{NF}_{3}+\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{F}+\mathrm{HF}_{2}+\mathrm{H}$
Diesen, R . H . JCPSA-i966-45-759 (review)
$\mathrm{NF}_{2}+\mathrm{H} \rightarrow \mathrm{NF}_{2} \because+\mathrm{M}$
Modica and Jornig
JCPSA-1966-45-760 (mechanism)
$\mathrm{NF}_{2}^{*}+\mathrm{INF}_{2}^{*}+\mathrm{F}_{2}+\mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{~F}_{2}^{*}$
Modica and Hornig
JCPSA-1966-45-760 (mechanism)
$\mathrm{NF}_{2}+\mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{~F} \rightarrow \mathrm{IF}_{3}+\mathrm{N}_{2}$
Diesen, R.W.
JCPSA-1966-45-759 (review)
$\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{~F} 2: \mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{~F}_{2}+\mathrm{HV}$
Modica and Hornig
JCPSA-1966-45-760 (nechanism)
$3 \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{~F}_{4} \rightarrow \mathrm{HII}_{3}+\mathrm{N}_{2}$ (overall)
Cherednikov, et al.
RJICA-1969-14-454
$\mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{~F}_{4}+\mathrm{F} \rightarrow \mathrm{HF}_{2}+\mathrm{HF}_{3}$
Levy and Copeland JPCHA-1965-69-3700
$\mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{~F}_{4}+\mathrm{F}_{2}+\mathrm{NF}_{3}+\mathrm{NF}_{3}$ (overall)
Cherednikov and II'in RJICA-1968-13-1750
$2 \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{~F}_{4}+\mathrm{F}_{2} \mathrm{O} \rightarrow 3 \mathrm{NF}_{3}+\mathrm{NOF}$ (overall)
Pubinstein, et al. ZPCFA-1964-43-51
$\mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{~F}_{4}+\mathrm{M} \rightarrow \mathrm{NF}_{2}+\mathrm{HF}_{2}+\mathrm{M}$

Brown, L. II.
Brown and Darwent
Levy and Copeland
Modica, A. P.
ilodica and Hornig
Modica and Hornig

DIASA-1964-25-2774
JCPSA-1965-42-2158
JPCFA-1965-69-3700 (review)
DIASA-1064-24-4427
XCCI $\hat{R}_{2}-1963-A D 425108$
JCPSA-1968-49-629
II (b). REVIEWS

Kondratiev, V. W.

Troe and Wagner

BOOFA-1970-207 (IN, and NF 2 ; general tables) BUPCA-1967-71-337 (inifluoroaraino-free-radical)

$$
\begin{aligned}
& F+F_{2} O+F_{2}+O F \\
& \text { Gatti, et al. ZPCFA-1952-35-343 } \\
& \mathrm{F}+\mathrm{O}_{3}+1 / 2 \mathrm{~F}_{2}+3 / 2 \mathrm{O}_{2} \\
& \text { Staricco, et al. ZPCFA-1962-31-385 } \\
& \mathrm{F}+\mathrm{O}_{3} \rightarrow \mathrm{OF}+\mathrm{O}_{2} \\
& \text { Staricco, et al. } \\
& \text { ZPCFA-1962-31-385 } \\
& \mathrm{F}_{2}+\mathrm{O} \rightarrow \mathrm{~F}+\mathrm{OF} \\
& \text { Lin and Bauer } \\
& \mathrm{F}_{2}+\mathrm{OF} \rightarrow \mathrm{~F}+\mathrm{F}_{2} \mathrm{O} \\
& \text { Iin and Bauer } \\
& \text { JACSA-1969-91-7737 (review) } \\
& \text { Blauer and Solomon } \\
& \text { Henrici, et al. } \\
& \text { Lin and Bauer } \\
& \text { Solomon, et al. } \\
& \text { JPCHA-1968-72-2307 } \\
& \text { JCPSA-1970-52--5834 } \\
& \text { JACSA-1969-91-7737 } \\
& \text { JPCFIA-1968-72-2311 } \\
& \text { Asmus, T. W. } \\
& \text { Dauerman, et al. JPCHA-1967-71-3999 } \\
& \text { Dauerman, et al. JPCHA-1969-73-1621 } \\
& \text { Koblitz and Schumacher } \\
& \text { Lin and Bauer } \\
& \text { Schumacher, II.-J. } \\
& \text { Solomon, et al. } \\
& \text { Troe, et al. } \\
& \text { Wieder and Marcus } \\
& \mathrm{F}_{2} \mathrm{O}+4 \mathrm{NF}_{2} \rightarrow 3 \mathrm{HF}_{3}+\mathrm{NOF} \\
& \text { Rubinstejn, et al. } \\
& \text { DABBB-1971-31-4606 } \\
& \text { ZPCBA-1934-25-283 } \\
& \text { JACSA-1969-91~7737 } \\
& \text { 12WSA-1935-2-485 } \\
& \text { JPCHA-1968-72-2311 } \\
& \text { ZPCFA-1067-56-238 } \\
& \text { JCPSA-1962-37-1835 (calculation) } \\
& \text { 2PCFA-1964-43-51 (overal.1) }
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{F}_{2} \mathrm{C}+\mathrm{NF}_{2} \rightarrow \mathrm{NF}_{3}+\mathrm{OH} \\
& \text { Rubinstein, et al. ZPCPA-1964-43-5I } \\
& \mathrm{F}_{2} \mathrm{O}+2 \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{~F}_{4} \rightarrow 3 \mathrm{NF}_{3}+\mathrm{NOF} \text { (overall) } \\
& \text { Rubinstein, et al. 7PCFA-9964-43-51 } \\
& \mathrm{F}_{2} \mathrm{O}+\mathrm{O} \rightarrow \mathrm{OF}+\mathrm{OF} . \\
& \text { Lin and Bauer } \\
& \text { JACSA-1959-91-7737 (review) } \\
& \mathrm{F}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{2}+\mathrm{M} \rightarrow \mathrm{~F}_{2}+\mathrm{O}_{2}+\mathrm{M} \text { (overall) } \\
& \text { Benson and O'Neal } \\
& \text { Frisch and Schumacher } \\
& \text { Frisch and Schumacher } \\
& \text { Frisch and Schumacher } \\
& \text { Schumacher, H.-J. } \\
& \text { Schumacher and Frische } \\
& \mathrm{OF}+\mathrm{M} \rightarrow \mathrm{~F}+\mathrm{O}+\mathrm{M} \\
& \text { In and Bauer } \\
& O F+O F \rightarrow F+F+O_{2} \\
& \text { Lin and Bauer } \\
& O F+O F \rightarrow \mathrm{~F}_{2}+\mathrm{O}_{2} \\
& \text { Gatti, et al. } \\
& \mathrm{OF}+\mathrm{O}_{3} \rightarrow \mathrm{~F}+\mathrm{O}_{2}+\mathrm{O}_{2} \\
& \text { staricco, et al. } \\
& \text { IJSRDA-1970-21-5.59 (review) } \\
& \text { ZEFIA-1937-43-807 } \\
& \text { 7PCBA-1936-34-322 } \\
& \text { ZPCBA-1937-37-18 } \\
& \text { ZEEIAA-1941-47-673 (review) } \\
& \text { 7PCEA-1937-37-1 } \\
& \text { JACSA-1969-91-7737 (review) } \\
& \text { JACSA-1969-91-7737 } \\
& \text { ZPCFA-1962-35-343 (mechanism) } \\
& \text { ZPCFA-1962-31-385 (mechanism) }
\end{aligned}
$$

## III (b) . REVIEWS

Nikitin and Rosolovskij RCRVA-1971-40-889 (Oxygen
Streng, A. G.
Troe and Vagrier

Fluorides)
CHPISA-1963-63-607 (Oxygen
Fluorides)
BBPCA-1967-71-937 (Oxygen Difiluoricle)

Asmus, Tr. Ho, "The Kinetics and Mechanism of the Parolysis of Oxyger Difiuoride and of the Reaction of Hydrogen with Oxyern Diflworide," Dissertation Abstr. Intern. B 31, 4606 (197.2)

Axworthy, A. E., and Sullivar, J. Mo, "Kinetias of the Gas Phase Pyrolysis of Chlorine Pentafluoride," J. Phys. Chem. 71, 949 (1970)

Benson, S. W., and OlNeal, H. E., "Kinetic Data on Gas Phase Uninclecular Reactions," Hatl. Std. Ref. Data Series JISRDS HBS 21, pg. 559 (1970)

Eernstein, R. B., and Katz, J. J., "Isotope Exchange Reactions of Fluorine with Halogen Pluorides," J. Phys. Chem. 56, 885 (1952)

Blauer, J. A., Mcirath, H. G., and Jaye, F. C., "The Thermal Dissociation of Chlorine Trifluoride behind Incident Shock Waves," J. Phys. Chen. 13, 2683 (1969)

Blauer, J. A., Mcliath, H. G., Jaye, Fo C., and Encleman, V. S., "Decomposition Kinetics of Chlorine Trifluoride and Chlorine Pentafluoride," Air Rocket Propul. Lab., Edwards AFB, Calif. AFRPL-TR-69-144; AD692493

Blauer, J. A., Mchath, H. G., Jaye, F. C., and Engleman, V. S., "The Kinetics of Dissociation of Chlorine Pentafluoride," J. Phys. Chem. 74, 1183 (1970)

Blauer, J.A., and Solomon, N. C., "The Thermal Dissociation of Oxygen Difluoride. I. Incident Shock Waves," J. Phys. Chem. 72, 2307 (1968)

Blauer, J. A., Solomon, W. C., and Engleman, V. S., "The Kinetics of Chlorine Fluoride at High Temperatures," J. Phys. Chern. 75, 3939 (1971)

Bougon, R., "Chlorine Pentarluoride," Commis. Energ. At. (Fr.), Rapp. 1970 CEA-R-3924; Chem. Abstr. 73:83318r (1970)

Brown, L. M., "Spectrophotometric Determination of the Rate
 Waves" Dissertation Abstr. 25, 2774 (1964)

Brown, i. M., and Darwent, B. deB., "Spectrophotometric Determination of the Rate of Dissociation of Teirarluoronydrazine Behind a Shock Wave," J. Chem. Phys. 42, 21.58 (1965)

Cherednikov, V. N., and II'in, E. K., "Rinetics of the Reaction of Tetrarluorohydrazine with Fluorine," Russ. J. Inorg. Chem. 13, 1750 (1968)

Cherednikov, V.N., Pereverzev, V. S., and Ryabov, V. P., "Kinetics of the Thermal Decomposition of Tetrafluorohydrazine," Russ. J. Inorg. Chem. 14, 454 (1969)

Clyne, M. A. A., and White, I. F., "Electronic Energy Transfer Processes in Fluorine-Containing Radicals: Singlet NF," Chem. Phys. Ltrs. 6,465 (1970)

Dauerman, L., Salser, G.E., and Tajina, Y. A., "The Thermal Decomposition of Oxygen Difluoride in a Flow System," J. Phys. Chenn. 71, 3999 (1967)

Dauerman, L., Salser, G. E., and Tajima, Y. A., "Comment on 'The Thermal Dissociation of Oxygen Difluoride. I. Incident Shock Waves, $" 1$ J. Phys. Chera. 73, 1621 (1969)

Diesen, R. W., "Observation and Kinetic Investigation of the NF and NF 2 Radicals," J.Chem. Phys. 4.I, 3256 (.1964)

Diesen, R. W., "Comment on $\mathrm{NF}_{2}$ Decomposition behind Shock Waves," J. Chem. Phys. 45, 759 (1966)

Fletcher, E. A., and Dahneke, B. E., "Kinetics of the Chlorine Fluoride Reaction," J. Am. Chem. Soc. 21, 1603 (1969)

Frisch, P., and Schumacher, H. J., "Das Thermische Verhalten des $\mathrm{F}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{2}$. Die Kinetik des Zerfalls und seine Beeinflussung Durch Fremdgase," 2. Elektrochem. 43, 807 (1937)

Frisch, P., and Schumacher, H.-J., "Der thermische Zerfall des Fluoroxyds $\mathrm{F}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{2}, "$ Z. Physik. Chem. B 34, 322 (1936)

Frisch, P., and Schumacher, H.-J., "Der Einfluss der Zusatzyase $\mathrm{O}_{2}, \mathrm{~F}_{2}, \mathrm{~F}_{2}$, Ar, $\mathrm{He}, \mathrm{CO}_{2}$, auf die Zerfallsgeschwindigkeit des $\mathrm{F}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{2}, " \mathrm{Z}$. Physik. Chem. 37, 18 (1937)

Gatti, R., Staricco, E., Sicre, J. E., and Schumacher, H.-J., "Der photochemische Zerfall des $\mathrm{F}_{2} \mathrm{O}, \mathrm{Z}$ Z. Physik. Chem. [NF] (Frankfurt) 35, 343 (1962)

Henrici. II., Lin, M. C., and Bauer, S. H., "peactions of $\mathrm{T}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ in Shock Waves. II. Kinetics and Mechanisns of the $\mathrm{F}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ CO Reaction," J. Chem. Phys. 52, 5834 (1970)

Koblitz, W., and Schumacher, H.-J., "Der chermische Zerfall res $\mathrm{F}_{2} \mathrm{O}$," Z. Physik. Chem. P 25, 283 (1934)

Kondratiev, V. N., "Konstanty Skorosti Gazof"aznykh Reaktsij Spravochnik," (Flandibook of Kinetic Constants of Gaseous Reactions) Izdatei'stvo "Nauka", Moscow (1970); also issued as "Rate Constants of Gas Phase Reactions," Reference Book, Ed. P. M. Fristrom, translated by I. J. Holtschlag, NSRDS CON-72-10014 (1972)

Kriceer, R. L., Gatti, R., and Schumacher, H.-J., "Die Kinetil: der photochemischen Bildung von Chlorpentafluorid, $\mathrm{ClF}_{5}$, aus Chlortrifluorid und Fluor," Z. Physik. Chem. [NF] (Frankfurt) 51, 240 (1966)

Irevy, J. B., and Copeland, B. K. W., "The linetics of the Tetrafluorohydrazine-Fluorine Reaction," J. Phys. Chem. 69, 3700 (1965)
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## NEW IDEAL-GAS THERMOCHEMICAL TABLES

S. Abramowitz, G. T. Armstrong, C. W. Beckett, K. L. Churney, V. H. Dibeler, T. B. Douglas, J. T. Herron, R. F. Krause, Jr., K. E. McCulloh, M. L. Reilly, H. M. Rosenstock, and W. Tsang

## Introduction

In the following pages of this report are collected together 31 new "JANAF-type" ideal-gas thermochemical tables recently generated in this program. The immediate purpose was to provide such tables for those gas species which are important in current chemical laser research, but for which present JANAF tables do not exist or are inconsistent with later, more accurate data. An updating literature survey (April to June, 1972) was carried out in an effort to base the new tables on as accurate and complete data as now exist. Even so, some of these tables are based on thermodynamic parameters which are not only of inferior accuracy but which may remain so for some time to come; whereas for several other gas species, tables of a higher order of accuracy could have been generated, but this has not been done because time was insufficient to review critically new data reported for them. Details may be found in the "JANAF-type" texts preceding the individual tables.

The tables and accompanying texts follow closely the format and conventions of the JANAF tables (JANAF Thermochemical Tables, 2nd Edition, NSRDS-NBS 37, June 1971, and subsequent looseleaf JANAF tables), which may be consulted for these details. Thus, for example, the temperature " 298 " in the tables really refers to 298.15 K ; the unit "gibbs" is 1 calorie per degree Kelvin; and the tables are in order of their alphabetical finding formulas, which appear in the upper-right-hand corners of the tables.

Certain differences from the JANAF tables need explanation. One major difference is the inclusion of tables for a number of chemical species containing deuterium (designated by D instead of by ${ }^{2} \mathrm{H}$ ) as well as the analogous species containing the "lighthydrogen" isotope (designated by $H$ instead of by ${ }^{H}$ ). In this connection it is to be noted that the tables (but not the table texts) for the light=hydrogen species are equally applicable to the natural isotopic mixture (approximately $99.98 \% \mathrm{H}$ and $0.02 \% \mathrm{D}$ ), since the molar thermodynamic properties of the different pureisotope varieties differ by only a few percent at the temperatures here tabulated. For hydrogen-containing species the gram-formulamasses (GFW) and molecular constants given with these tables are to be understood as specific for the particular hydrogen isotope(s) in the chemical formula, but averaged (by adjustment of reported values when necessary) for the natural-isotopic mixture of the other elements such as chlorine, unless otherwise stated.

It is important to identify unambiguously the particular chemicalelement reference-state tables on which the computation of the present tables (last three columns) is based. For four elements these are the presently latest JANAF reference-state tables, which are not reproduced here: $C l_{2}, 0_{2}$, and $N_{2}$ (each dated Sept. 30, 1965) and $S$ (dated Dec. 31, 1965). But for the three remaining elements-fluorine, hydrogen (i.e., ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ ), and deuterium--the reference-state tables used are not JANAF tables but those included here. (As explained in the table texts for $\mathrm{H}_{2}$ and $\mathrm{D}_{2}$, these two tables are for the ortho-para "equilibrium" varieties at all temperatures; as tabulated, the values differ from those for the more commonly encountered "normal" varieties only at $0 \mathrm{~K}, 100 \mathrm{~K}$, and 200 K , but interpolation over 100-degree intervals below 298.15 K would be inaccurate anyhow.)

The practical approximations used in computing the ideal-gas thermodynamic functions from the available molecular constants follow, in general, those used for the JANAF tables. In particular, the functions for the diatomic species account for anharmonicity, stretching, and vibration-rotation interaction by the use of the same closedbracket approximation formulas, whereas the polyatomic-species functions
/Bre ${ }^{\text {Bed }}$ on the harmonic-oscillator rigid-rotor approximation. But, as in the JANAF tables, there are exceptions here too: the tables for $\mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{HDO}, \mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}, \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{~S}$, and $\mathrm{NH}_{3}$ were taken (with minor interpolation and extrapolation) directly from authors who used direct-summation methods, and these tables were used to adjust the tables for HD, $\mathrm{D}_{2}, \mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{~S}$, and $\mathrm{ND}_{3}$ to a somewhat comparable degree of refinement, as described in the respective table texts for the last four species. In certain other cases (see the tables for $\mathrm{OH}, \mathrm{OD}, \mathrm{SH}$, and SD ) this refinement of the tables was not carried out for lack of time; the types of errors are indicated in the discussions of heat capacity and entropy.

For each of several molecules, substantially different molecular constants have been reported for the ground and some of the excited electronic states. In this case the partition function cannot be factored rigorously into electronic and molecular contributions, but a simple approximation was used which is satisfactorily accurate in many cases. Using respectively subscripts $t, v, r$, and $e$ for translational, vibrational, rotational, and electronic, and superscripts $i=0$ and $i$ for the ground and an excited electronic state, the total molecular partition function $Q$ can be expressed exactly by

$$
\begin{equation*}
Q=Q_{t} Q_{V}{ }^{i=0} Q_{r}{ }^{i=0}\left[Q_{e}{ }^{i=0}+\Sigma_{i}\left(Q_{V}{ }^{i} Q_{r}{ }^{i} / Q_{V}{ }^{i=0} Q_{r}{ }^{i=0}\right) Q_{e}^{i}\right] . \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

The parenthesized factor in Eq (1) was approximated as follows. For vibrational mode $v$ we have in the harmonic approximation

$$
\begin{equation*}
Q_{v}{ }^{\mathbf{i}} \simeq \mathrm{kT} / \mathrm{hc} \omega^{\mathrm{i}} \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

if $\left(\mathrm{kT} / \mathrm{hc} \mathrm{w}^{\mathrm{i}}\right) \gg 1$. Using Eq (2) and the usual rigid-rotor hightemperature expressions for $Q_{r}{ }^{i}$, it can be readily shown that for a linear molecule

$$
\begin{gather*}
\left(Q_{V}{ }^{i} Q_{r}{ }^{i} / Q_{V}{ }^{i=0} Q_{r}{ }^{i=0}\right) \sim\left(I^{i} / I^{i=0}\right) \prod_{V}\left(\omega_{V}^{i=0} / \omega_{V}^{i}\right)^{g}= \\
\left(B^{i=0} / B^{i}\right) \prod_{V}\left(\omega_{V}^{i=0} / \omega_{V}^{i}\right)^{g} \tag{3}
\end{gather*}
$$

and for a non-linear molecule

$$
\begin{align*}
& Q_{V}{ }^{i} Q_{r}{ }^{i} / Q_{V}{ }^{i=0} Q_{r}{ }^{i=0} \simeq\left(I_{A}{ }^{i} I_{B}{ }^{i} I_{C}{ }^{i} / I_{A}{ }^{i=0} I_{B}{ }^{i=0} I_{C}{ }^{i=0}\right)^{1 / 2} \prod_{V}\left(\omega_{V}{ }^{i=0} / \omega_{V}\right)^{i}{ }^{g}= \\
& \left.\left(B_{A}{ }^{i=0} B_{B}{ }^{i=0} B_{C}{ }^{i=0}\right) / B_{A}{ }^{i} B_{B}{ }^{i} B_{C}{ }^{i}\right)^{1 / 2} \prod_{V}\left(\omega_{V}{ }^{i=0} / \omega_{V}{ }^{i}\right)^{g}, \tag{4}
\end{align*}
$$

where the various moments of inertia are represented by $I$, and the degeneracy of vibrational state $v$ by $g$. (The electronic degeneracies are included in $Q_{e}$ as defined. The rigid-rotor harmonic-oscillator approximation is not used for the $Q_{v}{ }^{i=0}$ and $Q_{r}{ }^{i=0}$ outside the brackets in Eq (1) when the necessary molecular constants are available.)

The errors resulting from using Eq (3) or (4) may be illustrated by the contributions of the $\nu_{2}$ vibrational mode, the doublet ground state $\left(\omega=1497 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}\right)$, and a doublet excited ( $10249 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$ ) state $\left(\omega=633 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}\right)$ of $\mathrm{NH}_{2}$. These errors were calculated to be, at 6000 K (and in cal mole $e^{-1} \operatorname{deg} K^{-1}$ ): $C_{P}^{o},-0.018 ; S^{\circ},+0.068 ;-\left(G^{\circ}-H_{0}^{O}\right) / T,+$ 0.032. These errors are several times smaller than would result from the simpler approximation (commonly used) of taking $1497 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$ for both fundamentals. At lower temperatures the poorer approximation involved in Eq (2) is overshadowed by the exponentially decreasing value of the factor $Q_{e}{ }^{i}$ in Eq (1).

Several species of current interest in laser research may be listed together with the reasons why no ideal-gas thermochemical tables for them were generated at the present time: (a) $\mathrm{H}_{2} 0, F$ (atomic), and HC\& (no basis of improvement over the existing JANAF tables--however, for the first two of these, revisions of the JANAF discussions of the heats of formation seemed warranted, and these are given following the present 31 tables); (b) NCl, ClO, OF, $0 F_{2}$, $\mathrm{NF}, \mathrm{NF}_{2}$, and $\mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{~F}_{2}$ (cis and trans) (insufficient review of the heat-of-formation data) ; (c) $\mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{~F}_{4}$ (trans and gauche), $\mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{H}_{4}$, and $\mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{D}_{4}$ (unsatisfactory means available to account accurately for the contributions of restricted internal rotation--however, JANAF tables do exist for the first two) ; (d) raäicals such as $\mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{H}$, and peroxides such as $S 00$ (no data found).

Finally, it is appropriate to point out here some generalities with regard to six of the present "JANAF-type" table texts. In the first place, as stated in the discussions of the heats of formation of $H D, D F$, and $D C 1$, these three data reviews are to be regarded as incomplete because they omit analyses of experimental or theoretical work which was found too late to be considered. In the second place, three revisions over existing JANAF tables were made (thermodynamic functions of $\mathrm{F}_{2}$, and the heats of formation of ClF and atomic F) which, it appears, may warrant the revision of existing JANAF tables for many other species which properly depend on them; however, these propagated consequences were not examined in detail.

$$
\mathrm{S}_{298.15}^{\circ}=46.04 \text { cal } \mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{mol}}^{-1}
$$

$$
\Delta H f_{298.15}^{\circ}=-22.31 \pm 0.05 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{~mol}^{-1}
$$

## Electronic States and Molecular Constants

| State | $\varepsilon_{2} \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$ | 8 | ${ }^{\omega_{\mathrm{e}}, \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}}$ | $\chi^{e^{\omega} e^{, c m}{ }^{-1}}$ | $\mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{e}}, \mathrm{cm}{ }^{-1}$ | $\alpha_{e^{\prime}, c ⿴}{ }^{-1}$ | $\mathrm{r}_{\mathrm{e}}, \AA$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{X}^{1} \Sigma^{+}$ | 0 | 1 | 2144.0 | 26.90 | 5.4444 | 0.1121 | 1.2746 |
| $B^{1}$ II | 75160 | 2 | 2199.0 | [26.9] | 5.1793 | [0.1121] |  |
| $V^{1} \Sigma^{+}$ | 76520 | 1 | 684.6 | [26.9] | 1.555 | [0.1121] | 243 |
| $\mathrm{C}^{1} \pi$ | 77525 | 2 | 2114.1 | [ 26.9] | 4.9605 | [0.1121] |  |

## Heat of Formation (Provisional-evaluation incomplete)

The heat of fomation was calculated from the selected value of $\Delta \mathrm{Hf}_{298}^{\circ}$ of $\mathrm{HCl}(\mathrm{g})$ given by JANAF (1), the appropriate thermal functions (see $\mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{D}_{2}, \mathrm{DCl}$ tables, and $\mathrm{HCl}(1)$ ) and zero point energies. The zero point energies of $H_{2}(g), D_{2}(g)$ are taken from Herzberg and Monfils (2). The zero point energies of $\mathrm{HCl}(\mathrm{g})$ and $\mathrm{DCl}(\mathrm{g})$, including the Dunham correction, were calculated from the molecular constants taken from Rosen (3).

## Heat Capacity and Entropy

The vibrational and rotational constants at the respective electronic levels were taken from Rosen (3) and were adjusted to $\mathrm{Cl}^{35}=75.4 \%$ and $\mathrm{Cl}^{37}=24.6 \%$.

## References
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| T, ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{K}$ | gibbs/mol |  |  | - kcal/mol |  | $\Delta \mathrm{Gr}$ | $\log ^{\mathbf{K}} \mathbf{p}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Cp ${ }^{\circ}$ | $\mathrm{S}^{\circ}$ | $-\left(\mathrm{C}^{\circ}-\mathrm{H}^{\circ}{ }_{298}\right) / \mathrm{T}$ | $\mathrm{H}^{\circ}-\mathrm{H}^{\circ}{ }^{298}$ | $\Delta H^{\circ}$ |  |  |
| 0 | . 000 | . 000 | IVFIVITE | -2.070 | -22.259 | -22.259 | INFIVITE |
| 100 | 6.950 | 38.435 | 52.230 | -1.379 | -22.245 | -22.484 | 49.140 |
| 200 | 5.961 | 43.259 | 46.676 | -. 634 | -22.265 | -22.718 | 24.825 |
| 298 | 6.972 | 46.039 | 46.039 | . 000 | -22.310 | -22.931 | 16.809 |
| 300 | 6.972 | 45.082 | 46.039 | . 013 | -22.311 | -22.935 | 10.708 |
| 400 | 7.02b | 48.094 | 46.313 | . 712 | -22.375 | -23.134 | 12.640 |
| 500 | 7.147 | 49.674 | 46.833 | 1.421 | -22.444 | -23.315 | 16.191 |
| 600 | 7.316 | 50.992 | 47.419 | 2.144 | -22.508 | -23.484 | ヒ. 554 |
| 700 | 7.501 | 52.134 | 42.013 | 2.984 | -22.553 | -23.642 | 7.381 |
| 800 | $7.60{ }^{\text {d }}$ | 53.147 | 46.593 | 3.644 | -22.607 | -23.793 | 6.500 |
| 900 | 7.84 - | 54.062 | 49.150 | 4.420 | -22.544 | -23.939 | 5.813 |
| 1000 | 7.979 | 54.897 | 49.684 | 5.213 | -22.673 | -24.082 | 5.263 |
| 1100 | 8.130 | 55.565 | 50.193 | 6.020 | -22.696 | -24.221 | 4.812 |
| 1200 | 8.244 | 56.378 | 50.679 | 6.938 | -22.716 | -24.359 | 4.436 |
| 1300 | 8.342 | 57.042 | 51.143 | 7.569 | -22.730 | -24.496 | 4.118 |
| 1400 | 4.429 | 57.663 | 51.587 | 8.506 | -22.744 | -24.631 | 3.845 |
| 1500 | 3.504 | 58.247 | 52.012 | 9.353 | -22.755 | -24.765 | 3.608 |
| 1500 | 3.570 | 58.798 | 52.419 | 10.207 | -22.768 | -24.999 | 3.401 |
| 1700 | 8.628 | 59.319 | 52.810 | 11.067 | -22.779 | -25.031 | 3.218 |
| 1800 | 8.680 | 59.814 | 53.185 | 11.932 | -22.789 | -25.164 | 5.055 |
| 1900 | 8.726 | 60.285 | 53.546 | 12.903 | -22.799 | -25.295 | 2.910 |
| 2000 | 8.703 | 50.733 | 53.895 | 13.577 | -22.809 | -25.426 | 2.778 |
| 2100 | H.806 | 61.162 | 54.231 | 14.556 | -22.921 | -25.558 | 2.660 |
| 2200 | H. $84{ }^{\text {i }}$ | 61.573 | 54.555 | 15.439 | -22.832 | -25.687 | C.552 |
| 2300 | B.87\% | 61.955 | 54.869 | 16.324 | -22.844 | -25.816 | 2.453 |
| 2400 | 8.901 | 52.344 | 55.172 | 17.213 | -22.857 | -25.945 | 2.303 |
| 2500 | 8.925 | 62.708 | 55.467 | 18.104 | -22.970 | -26.073 | 2.279 |
| 2600 | 8.953 | 63.059 | 55.752 | 18.998 | -22.896 | -26.201 | 2.202 |
| 2700 | 8.970 | 53.307 | 56.029 | 19.995 | -22.901 | -26.328 | 2.131 |
| 2800 | 8.998 | 63.724 | 56.298 | 20.794 | -22.918 | -26.454 | 2.065 |
| 2900 | 9.019 | 64.040 | 56.560 | 21.674 | -22.939 | -26.581 | 2.003 |
| 3000 | 9.039 | 64.346 | 56.814 | 22.597 | -22.958 | -26.706 | 1.946 |
| 3100 | 9.1557 | 64.643 | 57.062 | 23.502 | -22.982 | -26.931 | 1. 892 |
| 3200 | 9.075 | 64.931 | 57.303 | 24.409 | -23.003 | -26.955 | 1.841 |
| 3300 | 9.092 | 65.211 | 57.530 | 25.317 | -23.028 | -27.079 | 1.793 |
| 3400 | 9.109 | 65.482 | 57.768 | 26.227 | -23.053 | -27.200 | 1.748 |
| 3500 | 9.124 | 65.745 | 57.992 | 27.139 | -23.083 | $-27.323$ | 1.706 |
| 3600 | 9.14 J | 65.004 | 59.211 | 28.052 | -23.111 | -27.441 | 1.666 |
| 3700 | 9.154 | 66.254 | 54.425 | 28.967 | -23.145 | -27.562 | 1.628 |
| 3800 | 9.159 | 66.499 | 5e.ó35 | 29.383 | -23.179 | -27.683 | 1.592 |
| 3900 | 9.143 | 66.737 | 58.439 | 30.301 | -23.216 | -27.900 | 1.558 |
| 4000 | $9.1 \geqslant 5$ | 56.970 | 59.040 | 31.719 | -23.253 | -27.914 | 1.525 |
| 4100 | 9.209 | 67.197 | 50.235 | 32.640 | -23.292 | -29.035 | 1.494 |
| 4200 | 9.222 | 67.419 | 59.429 | 33.561 | -23.332 | -28.149 | 1.405 |
| 4300 | 9.235 | 57.635 | 59.617 | 34.494 | -23.372 | -28.264 | 1.437 |
| 4400 | 9.247 | 67.849 | 59.801 | 35.408 | -23.415 | -28.374 | 1.409 |
| 4500 | 9.259 | 68.055 | 57.982 | 36.334 | -23.462 | -28.491 | 1.384 |
| 4600 | 9.271 | 68.260 | 50.160 | 37.260 | -23.507 | -22.600 | 1.359 |
| 4700 | 9.283 | 68.453 | 60.335 | 38.198 | -23.553 | -23.709 | 1.335 |
| 4800 | 9.294 | 68.555 | 60.506 | 39.117 | -23.599 | -28.917 | 1.312 |
| 4900 | 9.300 | 68.847 | 60.674 | 40.747 | -23.648 | $-28.025$ | 1.290 |
| 5000 | 9.317 | 59.035 | 66.840 | 40.778 | -23.599 | -29.035 | 1.269 |
| 5100 | 9.328 | 69.220 | 61.002 | 41.910 | -23.750 | -29.139 | 1.249 |
| 5200 | 9.339 | 59.401 | 61.162 | 42.843 | -23.801 | -29.245 | 1.229 |
| 5300 | 9.350 | 69.570 | 61.319 | 43.778 | -23.953 | -29.351 | 1.210 |
| 5400 | 9.304 | 69.754 | 61.474 | 44.713 | $-23.005$ | -29.452 | 1.192 |
| ssuu | 9.371 | 69.925 | 61.626 | 45.650 | -23.959 | -29.556 | 1.174 |
| 5600 | 9.301 | 70.095 | 61.775 | 46.597 | -24.012 |  |  |
| 5700 | 9.392 | 70.261 | 61.923 | 47.526 | -24.067 | -29.759 | 1.141 |
| 5800 | 9.402 | 70.424 | 52.003 | 48.466 | -24.122 | -29.856 | 1.125 |
| b90u | 9.412 | 70.595 | 52.211 | 49.406 | -24.178 | -29.957 | 1.110 |
| 6000 | $9.4<3$ | 70.743 | 62.352 | 50.348 | -24.234 | -30.053 | 1.045 |

$$
\mathrm{S}_{298.15}^{0}=52.157 \text { cal } \mathrm{K}^{-1} \mathrm{~mol}^{-1}
$$

$$
\Delta \mathrm{Hf}_{298.15}^{\circ}=-12.02 \pm 0.1 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{~mol}^{-1}
$$

## Electronic States and Molecular Constants

## Heat of Formation

The selected value, $\Delta H f_{298}^{\circ}(C 1 F)=-12.0 \pm 0.1 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}{ }^{-1}$, is based on spectroscopy. Three studies of the visible absorption bands of C1F, by A. L. Wahrhaftig, J. Chem. Phys. 10, 248 (1942), by H. Schmitz and H. J. Schumacher, Z. Naturforsch. 29, 359 (1947), and by W. Stricker, Deutsche Luft-und Raumfahrt Forschungsbericht 66-04 (1966) agree in indicating a band convergence limit at $21,514 \pm 10 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$. Assignment of this 1 imlt to $\mathrm{Cl}\left({ }^{2} \mathrm{P}_{1 / 2}\right)+\mathrm{F}\left({ }^{2} \mathrm{P}_{3 / 2}\right)$ is supported by the dissociative ionization threshold for C1F reported by V. H. Dibeler, J. A. Walker, and K. E. McCulloh, J. Chem. Phys. 53, 4414 (1970), whose ion-pair threshold, when reassigned to a hot band, corroborates this choice. From this assignmert it follows that $D_{0}^{\circ}(C 1 F)=58.98 \pm 0.02 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}{ }^{-1}$.

Combining this value with $D_{0}^{0}\left(F_{2}\right)=36.7 \pm 0.2 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}^{-1}$, reported by J. Berkowitz, W. A. Chupka, P. M. Guyon, J. H. Holloway, and R. Spohr, J. Chem. Phys. 54,5165 (1971), and with $D_{0}^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right)=57.177 \pm 0.006 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}{ }^{-1}$, given by A. E. Douglas, C. K. Moller, and B. P. Stoicheff, Can. J. Phys. 41, 1174 (1963), one obtains $\Delta H f_{0}^{\circ}(C 1 F)=$ $-12.0 \pm 0.1 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}^{-1}$.

Calorimetric values for $\Delta \mathrm{Hf}_{298}^{\circ}$, which brasket the selected value, are as follows: -11.6 kcal mol ${ }^{-1}$, E. Wicke, Nachr. Akad. Wiss. Göttingen Math-Phys. Klasse p. 89 (1946); -11.7 kcal mol ${ }^{-1}$, E. Wicke and H. Friz, Z. Elektrochem. 57, 9 (1953); -14.34 and -15.0 kcal mol ${ }^{-1}$, H. Schmitz and H. J. Schumacher, Z. Naturforsch 29 , 362 (1947); and $-14.4 \pm 0.8 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}{ }^{-1}, \mathrm{R}$. L. Nuttall and G. T. Armstrong, NBS Report 10326, Chapter 1 , July 1 , 1970.

## Heat Capacity and Entropy

The vibrational and rotational constants of the respective electronic levels were taken from $B$. Rosen, Spectroscopic Data Relative to Diatomic Molecules, Pergamon Press, Oxford, 1970, and were adjusted to $\mathrm{C} 1{ }^{35}=75.4 \%$ and $\mathrm{Cl}^{37}=24.6 \%$.

| T, ${ }^{\circ} \mathbf{K}$ | $C p^{\circ}$ | gibbs/mol |  | _._kcal/mol |  | $\Delta \mathbf{G f}{ }^{\circ}$ | $\log \mathbf{K p}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\mathbf{S}^{\circ}$ | $--\left(\mathrm{G}^{\circ}-\mathrm{H}^{\circ} 298\right) / \mathrm{T}$ | $\mathrm{H}^{\circ}-\mathrm{H}^{\circ}{ }^{\text {a }}$ 98 | $\Delta H f^{\circ}$ |  |  |
| 0 | . 000 | . 000 | INFINITE | -2.133 | -12.002 | -12.002 | INFINITE |
| 100 | 6.901 | 44.303 | 58.685 | -1.438 | -12.002 | -12.140 | 2b. 533 |
| 200 | 7.219 | 49.181 | 52.846 | -. 733 | -12.010 | -12.276 | 13.415 |
| 293 | 7.723 | 52.156 | 52.156 | . 000 | -12.020 | -12.405 | 9.093 |
| 300 | 7.732 | 52.204 | 52.157 | . 014 | -12.020 | -12.407 | 9.039 |
| 400 | 8.160 | 54.491 | 52.465 | . 810 | -12.024 | -12.536 | 0.849 |
| 500 | 8.459 | 56.345 | 53.002 | 1.642 | -12.021 | -12.663 | b. 535 |
| 600 | 9.670 | 57.907 | 53.743 | 2.499 | -12.013 | -12.793 | 4.660 |
| 700 | 8.824 | 59.256 | 54.436 | 3.374 | -12.001 | -12.924 | 4.035 |
| 800 | 8.943 | 60.442 | 55.114 | 4.263 | -11.996 | -13.057 | 3.567 |
| 900 | 9.039 | 61.501 | 55.766 | 5.162 | -11.968 | -13.191 | 3.203 |
| 1000 | 9.120 | 62.459 | 56.389 | 6.070 | -11.947 | -13.329 | 2.913 |
| 1100 | 9.190 | 63.331 | 56.980 | 6.995 | -11.922 | -13.468 | 2.676 |
| 1200 | 9.254 | 64.133 | 57.543 | 7.908 | -11.896 | -13.610 | 2.479 |
| 1300 | 9.311 | 64.876 | 58.079 | 8.836 | -11.965 | -13.754 | 2.312 |
| 1400 | 9.365 | 65.569 | 58.590 | 9.770 | -11.934 | -13.901 | 2.170 |
| 1500 | 9.410 | 66.215 | 59.077 | 10.709 | -11.799 | -14.049 | 2.047 |
| 1600 | 9.405 | 66.825 | 59.542 | 11.653 | -11.762 | -14.200 | 1.940 |
| 1700 | 9.512 | 67.400 | 59.98? | 12.672 | -11.722 | -14.353 | 1.845 |
| 1800 | 9.559 | 67.945 | 6 C .415 | 13.555 | -11.680 | -14.509 | 1.762 |
| 1900 | 9.640 | 68.464 | 60.825 | 14.514 | -11.634 | -14.667 | 1.687 |
| 2000 | 9.654 | 68.957 | 61.219 | 15.477 | $-11.587$ | -14.928 | 1.620 |
| 2100 | 9.701 | 69.430 | 61.599 | 16.444 | -11.536 | -14.092 | 1.560 |
| 2200 | 9.757 | 69.882 | 61.905 | 17.417 | -11.482 | -15.158 | 1.506 |
| 2300 | 9.814 | 70.317 | 62.319 | 18.396 | -11.424 | -15.326 | 1.456 |
| 2400 | 9.876 | 70.735 | 62.661 | 19.380 | -11.363 | -15.497 | 1.411 |
| 2500 | 9.945 | 71.141 | 62.992 | 20.372 | -11.296 | -15.671 | 1.370 |
| 2600 | 10.026 | 71.533 | 63.313 | 21.370 | -11.224 | -15.947 | 1.332 |
| 2700 | 10.117 | 71.913 | 63.625 | 22.378 | -11.146 | -16.027 | 1.297 |
| 2300 | 14.21m | 72.292 | 63.927 | 23.394 | -11.061 | -16.208 | 1.265 |
| 2900 | 10.331 | 72.643 | 64.22 ? | 24.4? 2 | -10.966 | -16.394 | 1.235 |
| 3000 | 10.450 | 72.995 | 64.508 | 25.461 | -10.963 | -16.583 | 1.208 |
| 3100 | 10.599 | 73.347 | 64.788 | 26.514 | -10.748 | -16.776 | 1.183 |
| 3200 | 10.755 | 73.679 | 65.060 | 27.591 | -10.621 | -16.972 | 1.159 |
| 3300 | 10.920 | 74.013 | 65.326 | 28.655 | -10.479 | -17.173 | 1.137 |
| 3400 | 11.112 | 74.342 | 65.587 | 29.767 | -10.322 | -17.378 | 1.117 |
| 3500 | 11.313 | 74.667 | 65.842 | 30.598 | -10.148 | -17.588 | 1.098 |
| 3500 | 11.529 | 74.989 | 66.091 | 32.030 | -9.955 | -17.903 | 1.081 |
| 3700 | 11.750 | 75.307 | 66.336 | 33.194 | -9.742 | -18.023 | 1.005 |
| 3400 | 12.000 | 75.624 | 66.576 | 34.392 | -9.508 | -18.251 | 1.050 |
| 3900 | 12.253 | 75.939 | 66.812 | 35.595 | -9.251 | -18.485 | 1.036 |
| 4000 | 12.517 | 75.253 | 67.044 | 36.833 | -8.970 | $-18.725$ | 1.023 |
| 4100 | 12.78: | 76.565 | 67.273 | 38.099 | -9.664 | -18.072 | 1.011 |
| 4200 | 13.065 | 76.877 | 67.498 | 39.391 | -8.3.32 | $-19.228$ | 1.001 |
| 4300 | 13.351 | 77.157 | 67.719 | 40.712 | -7.975 | -19.492 | . 991 |
| 4400 | 13.035 | 77.498 | 67.939 | 42.061 | -7.590 | -19.763 | . 982 |
| 4500 | 13.920 | 77.807 | 68.154 | 43.440 | $-7.177$ | -20.044 | .973 |
| 4600 | 14.213 | 78.117 | 6๕. 367 | 44.247 | -6.737 | -20.335 | . 966 |
| 4100 | 14.490 | 78.425 | 68.578 | 46.292 | -5.271 | -20.635 | . 960 |
| 4500 | 14.770 | 78.733 | 68.786 | 47.746 | -5.777 | -20.947 | . 954 |
| 4900 | 15.044 | 79.1141 | 68.993 | 49.237 | -5.258 | -21.268 | . 949 |
| suou | 15.313 | 79.348 | 69.197 | 50.755 | -4.711 | -21.602 | . 944 |
| 5100 | 15.50is | 79.653 | 60.399 | 52.299 | -4.140 | -21.943 | . 940 |
| b200 | 15.812 | 79.954 | 69.599 | 53.968 | -3.545 | -22.290 | . 937 |
| 5300 | 16.044 | 80.261 | 67.797 | 55.451 | -2.928 | -22.665 | . 935 |
| 5400 | 16.202 | 80.563 | 69.994 | 57.077 | -2.289 | -23.043 | . 933 |
| 5500 | 16.407 | 90.864 | 70.189 | 58.713 | -1.629 | -23.432 | . 931 |
| 5000 | 15.650 | 81.162 | 70.382 | 60.359 | -. 951 | -23.235 | . 930 |
| 5700 | 15.831 | 81.459 | 70.574 | 62.714 | -. 255 | -24.252 | . 930 |
| 5500 | 16.9 .30 | 81.753 | 70.764 | 63.735 | . 457 | -24.678 | . 930 |
| b900 | 17.154 | 82.044 | 7 7. 952 | 65.441 | 1.192 | -25.118 | . 930 |
| g000 | 17.20 c | 92.333 | 71.140 | 67.161 | 1.921 | -25.570 | . 931 |

$$
\mathrm{S}_{298.15}^{\circ}=42.923 \mathrm{cal} \mathrm{~K}_{\text {mol }}^{-1} \quad \Delta H f_{298.15}^{\circ}=-65.85 \pm 0.2 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{~mol}{ }^{-1}
$$

## Electronic States and Molecular Constants

| State | $\varepsilon, \mathrm{cm}^{-1}$ | g | $\omega_{e, \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}}$ | $X^{e^{\omega}} e^{, c m}{ }^{-1}$ | $\mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{e}}, \mathrm{~cm}{ }^{-1}$ | $\alpha_{e, \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}}$ | $\mathrm{ra}^{\text {, }}$ A |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{X}^{1} \Sigma^{+}$ | 0 | 1 | 2998.19 | 45.76 | 11.000 | 0.2907 | 0.9187 |
| $\mathrm{V}^{1} \Sigma^{+}$ | 83755 | 1 | 839.4 | 8.90 | 2.121 | 0.00712 | 2.088 |

## Heat of Formation

The heat of formation was calculated from $\Delta H f_{298}^{\circ}$ of $\operatorname{HF}(g),-65.14 \pm 0.2 \mathrm{kcal}$ mol ${ }^{-1}$, given in JANAF Thermochemical Tables 2nd Edition, NSRDS-NBS 37, June (1971), the appropriate thermal functions (see tables for $H_{2}$, $\mathrm{D}_{2}$, DF and HF (JANAF loc. cit.)) and the estimated zero point energies. The energies for $H_{2}(g), D_{2}(g)$ are those given by $G$. Herzberg and A. Monfils, J. Molec. Spectroscopy 5, 482 (1960). The energies for $H F(g)$ and $D F(g)$ include the Dunham correction and were calculated from the data given by D. E. Mann, B. A. Thrush, D. R. Lide, Jr., J. J. Ball, and N. Acquista, J. Chem. Phys. 34, 420 (1961) and R. N. Spanbauer, K. N. Rao and L. H. Jones, J. Molec. Spectroscopy 16, 100 (1965).

## Heat Capacity and Entropy

The vibrational and rotational constants of the respective electronic levels were taken from B. Rosen, Spectroscopic Data Relative to Diatomic Molecules, Pergamon Press, 0xford, 1970.

| T，${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{K}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { gibbs/mol } \\ & \mathbf{S}^{\circ} \quad-\left(\mathbf{G}^{\circ}-H^{\circ}{ }_{298}\right) / T \end{aligned}$ |  | $\mathbf{H}^{\circ}-\mathbf{H}^{\circ} \text { ’as }$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { kcal/mol- } \\ \Delta H f^{\circ} \end{gathered}$ | $\Delta \mathrm{Gf}{ }^{\circ}$ | $\underline{\log } \mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{p}}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | CP ${ }^{\text { }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | ． 000 | .000 | INFINITE | －2．065 | －65．836 | －65．836 | INFINITE |
| 100 | 5．939 | 35.319 | 49.112 | －1．379 | －65．927 | －65．977 | 144.193 |
| 200 | 5.901 | 40.143 | 43.500 | －． 593 | －65． 1.34 | －66．125 | 72.258 |
| 298 | 6.964 | 42.923 | 42.923 | ． 000 | －65．850 | －66．265 | 40.573 |
| 304 | 6.964 | 42.966 | 42.923 | ． 013 | －65．851 | －66．267 | 48.276 |
| 400 | 6.975 | 44.970 | 43.196 | ． 710 | －65．897 | －66．401 | 30.280 |
| 500 | 7.042 | 46.520 | 43.713 | 1.408 | －65．941 | －66．524 | ＜4．077 |
| 300 | 7.065 | 47.811 | 44.292 | 2.111 | －66．005 | －66．635 | 24.272 |
| 700 | 7.151 | 48.907 | 44.875 | 2.922 | －66．075 | －66．734 | 24.835 |
| suO | 7.281 | 49.870 | 45.440 | 3.544 | －66．144 | －66．823 | 18.255 |
| 9u0 | 7.413 | 50.735 | 45.981 | 4.279 | －66．214 | －66．704 | 10.246 |
| 1uU0 | 7．54 | 51.523 | 46.497 | 5.027 | －66．281 | －66．078 | 14.638 |
| 1100 | 7．681 | 52.249 | 46.987 | 5.798 | －66．343 | －67．043 | 13.320 |
| 1200 | 7.800 | 52.923 | 47.454 | 6.563 | －66．403 | －67．105 | 12.222 |
| 1300 | 7.926 | 53.552 | 47.899 | 7.349 | －66．457 | －67．161 | 11.291 |
| 1400 | 5.029 | 54.143 | 48.324 | 8.147 | －66．509 | －67．214 | 10.493 |
| 1500 | 8． 126 | 54.701 | 48．731 | 8.955 | －66．558 | －67．262 | 4.800 |
| 1500 | 9． 21 is | 55.229 | 49.121 | 9.772 | －66．606 | －67．307 | Y． 194 |
| 1700 | 8.295 | 55.729 | 49.495 | 10.597 | －66．651 | －67．350 | 0.658 |
| 1500 | 8.367 | 56.205 | 49.854 | 11.431 | －66．693 | －67．390 | 8.182 |
| 1900 | 8．433 | 56.659 | 50.201 | 12.2 .71 | －66．735 | －67．428 | 7.756 |
| 2000 | 8.493 | 57.093 | 50.535 | 13.117 | －66．774 | －67．462 | 7.372 |
| 2100 | 8.547 | 57.509 | 50.857 | 13.969 | －66．815 | －67．497 | 7.024 |
| 2200 | 8.597 | 57.909 | 51.108 | 14.326 | －66．852 | －57．527 | 0.708 |
| 2300 | 3.643 | 58.291 | 51.470 | 15.598 | －66．889 | －67．557 | 0.419 |
| 2400 | 8.685 | 58.659 | 51.7 oz | 16.555 | －56．926 | －67．586 | 0.155 |
| 2500 | 8.724 | 59.015 | 52.045 | 17.425 | －66．961 | －67．613 | b．911 |
| 2000 | 8.704 | 59.359 | 52.319 | 18.299 | －66．998 | －67．638 | 2.605 |
| 2700 | 8.793 | 59.689 | 52.586 | 19.177 | －67．033 | －67．662 | 3.477 |
| 2500 | 8.825 | 60.700 | 52．846 | 20.758 | －67．069 | －67．684 | 5.283 |
| 2900 | $9.55+$ | 60.319 | 53.098 | 20.942 | －67．106 | －67．705 | 5.102 |
| 3000 | 8．3E1 | 60.620 | 53.344 | 21.329 | $-67.141$ | －67．725 | 4.934 |
| 3100 | 3.907 | 60．912 | 53.583 | 22.718 | －67．179 | －67．744 | 4.776 |
| 3200 | 3.932 | 61.195 | 53.817 | 23.610 | －67．214 | －67．76？ | 4.0628 |
| 3360 | 8．95s | 61.470 | 54.044 | 24.505 | －67．250 | －67．780 | 4.489 |
| 3400 | 8.977 | 61.738 | 54.267 | 25.401 | －67．286 | －67．795 | 4.358 |
| s500 | R．940 | 61.998 | 54.484 | 26.300 | －67．325 | －67．209 | 4.234 |
| 5500 | 9．01s | 62.252 | 54.695 | 27.201 | －67．362 | －67．522 | 4.117 |
| 3700 | 9.051 | 62.499 | 54.904 | 29.103 | －67．403 | －67．834 | 4.007 |
| SHUO | Q．u5b | －2．741 | 55.107 | 29．008 | －67．444 | －67．845 | 3.942 |
| 3900 | 9.073 | 62.975 | 55.306 | 29． 314 | －67．487 | －67． 257 | 3.803 |
| 4000 | 9.090 | 63.206 | 55.500 | 30．R23 | －67．529 | $-67.866$ | 3.708 |
| 4100 | $4.10{ }^{\text {a }}$ | 63．431 | 55.691 | 31.732 | －67．572 | －67．874 | 3.618 |
| 4200 | 9.122 | 63.550 | 55.978 | 32.644 | －67．615 | －67．879 | 3.532 |
| 4300 | 3.130 | 63.865 | 5ó．0ól | 33.557 | －67．659 | －67．985 | 3.450 |
| 4400 | ＇3．15c | 04.075 | 56.241 | 34.471 | －67．705 | －67．889 | 3.372 |
| 4500 | 9.167 | 64.281 | 50．417 | 35.387 | $-67.754$ | －67．995 | 5.297 |
| 4500 | 9.181 | 54.493 | 56.591 | 36.305 | －67．402 | －67．896 | 3.226 |
| 4700 | 9.195 | 64.690 | 5 5．761 | 37.274 | －67．951 | －67．898 | 3．157 |
| 4.900 | 9．2U3 | 64.874 | 55.928 | 38.144 | －67．900 | －67．890 | 3.091 |
| 4 yOH | 9.222 | 65.1164 | 57.092 | 39.055 | －67．952 | －67．296 | 3.428 |
| buuw | 9.234 | 65.251 | 57.253 | 39.984 | －63．007 | －67． 297 | c． 908 |
| b100 | 9.247 | 65.434 | 57.412 | 40.912 | －68．061 | －67．393 | 2.909 |
| らくuls | $9.25 \%$ | 65.613 | 57.564 | 41.837 | －68．116 | －67．884 | 2．853 |
| 5300 | 9.272 | 65.790 | 57．721 | 42.764 | －68．173 | －67．285 | 2．799 |
| 勺40u | ヲ．2ツ」 | 65.963 | 57.872 | 43.672 | －68．730 | －67．878 | 2.747 |
| b50u | 9.293 | 65.134 | 58.021 | 44．6？1 | －68．289 | －67．072 | ＜．097 |
| 35015 | 19．307 | 66.301 | 54.167 | 45.551 | －68．349 | －67．0．63 | C．048 |
| ら7U0 | 1．310 | 66.468 | 50.311 | 46.482 | －683．410 | －67．8bs | c．002 |
| ち．5U0 | 4．32： | ób．629 | 54.453 | 47.414 | －64．473 | －67．34 | 2.550 |
| byuu | 3.341 | 65.7184 | 54.543 | 48．344 | －68．5＊7 | －67．833 | 2． 513 |
| bu0u | 9．351 | 66.945 | 5 H .731 | 49.382 | －68．601 | －67．920 | 2.470 |

$$
\begin{aligned}
& D_{0}^{\circ}=104.089 \pm 0.002 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{~mol}^{-1}
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Ground State Configuration } 1_{\Sigma}{ }_{g}^{+} \\
& \begin{array}{lll}
\omega_{e}=3817.09 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} & \omega_{e^{x}}=94.958 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} & D_{e}=0.02614 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} \\
\mathrm{~B}_{\mathrm{e}}=45.655 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} & \alpha_{\mathrm{e}}=1.9927 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} & r_{e}=0.7414 \AA
\end{array}
\end{aligned}
$$

Heat of Formation (Provisional-evaluation incomplete)
The heat of formation of $H D\left({ }^{1} H^{2} H\right.$ ) was calculated using zero point energies of $H_{2}, D_{2}$ and HD using the Dunham formulation as given by G. Herzberg and A. Monfils (1). The value obtained is consistent with the $D_{0}^{\circ}$ values given by G. Herzberg (2) in a later publication. The estimated uncertainty is based on the uncertainties assigned to the zero point energies (1).

## Heat Capacity and Entropy

The thermodynamic functions were generated similarly as those in the table for $D_{2}$ ( $q . v$.). To the current table for $H_{2}$ (which is based on reference 3) was added to the table for $H D$ from reference 4, and the table for "equilibrium" $\mathrm{H}_{2}$ from reference 3 was subtracted.
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(IdEaL Gas) GFW = 3.0221

| T, ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{K}$ | $\mathbf{C p}{ }^{\circ}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { gibbs/mol } \\ & \mathrm{S}^{\circ} \\ & -\left(\mathbf{G}^{\circ}-\mathrm{H}^{\circ}{ }_{298}\right) / \mathrm{T} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\mathbf{H}^{\circ}-\mathbf{H}^{\circ}{ }_{298}$ | kcal/mol $\Delta H f^{\circ}$ | $\Delta \mathrm{Gf}{ }^{\circ}$ | $\log \mathbf{K p}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | . 000 | . 000 | INFINITE | -2.034 | . 078 | . 078 | INFINITE |
| 100 | 0.902 | 26.723 | 40.547 | -1.382 | . 042 | .. 081 | .175 |
| 200 | 6. 974 | 31.559 | 34.983 | -. 585 | . 065 | -. 212 | . 231 |
| 298 | 6.978 | 34.345 | 34.345 | . 000 | . 076 | -.3b0 | . 257 |
| 300 | 0.978 | 34.398 | 34.345 | . 013 | . 076 | -. 353 | . 257 |
| 400 | 0.985 | 35.395 | 34.619 | . 710 | . 078 | -. 496 | . 271 |
| 500 | 6.997 | 37.955 | 35.136 | 1.410 | . 078 | -. 640 | . 279 |
| 600 | 7.024 | 39.232 | 35.714 | 2.111 | . 076 | -. 783 | . 285 |
| 700 | 7.072 | 40.319 | 36.295 | 2.816 | . 073 | -. 926 | . 289 |
| 300 | 7.150 | 41.258 | 36.860 | 3.525 | . 069 | -1.069 | . 292 |
| 900 | 7.240 | 42.116 | 37.397 | 4.247 | . 054 | -1.211 | . 294 |
| 1000 | 7.338 | 42.881 | 37.908 | 4.973 | . 058 | -1.352 | . 296 |
| 1100 | 7.443 | 43.587 | 38.393 | 5.713 | . 053 | -1.493 | . 297 |
| 1200 | 7.551 | 44.240 | 38.853 | 6.464 | . 049 | -1.633 | . 297 |
| 1300 | 7.605 | 44.848 | 39.291 | 7.224 | . 045 | -1.773 | . 298 |
| 1400 | 7.785 | 45.420 | 39.709 | 7.995 | . 040 | -1.913 | . 298 |
| 1500 | 7.910 | 45.952 | 40.108 | 8.781 | - 036 | -2.052 | . 299 |
| 1500 | 3.013 | 45.476 | 40.490 | 9.578 | . 033 | -2.192 | . 299 |
| 1700 | 8.113 | 46.965 | 40.856 | 10.385 | . 030 | -2.330 | . 300 |
| 1800 | \%.206 | 47.431 | 41.208 | 11.201 | . 027 | -2.468 | . 300 |
| 1900 | 8. 294 | 47.877 | 41.548 | 12.925 | . 024 | -2.60\% | . 300 |
| 2000 | 8.377 | 48.305 | 41.875 | 12.860 | . 022 | -2.746 | - 300 |
| $\angle 100$ | H.455 | 48.716 | 42.191 | 13.702 | . 020 | $-2.885$ | . 300 |
| 2200 | 8.529 | 49.111 | 42.497 | 14.551 | . 019 | -3.023 | . 301 |
| 2300 | 6.599 | 49.491 | 42.793 | 15.475 | . 017 | -3.161 | - 301 |
| 2400 | 8.604 | 49.859 | 43.080 | 16.270 | . 016 | -3.300 | . 301 |
| 2500 | 8.727 | 50.213 | 43.358 | 17.138 | - 015 | -3.436 | . 301 |
| 2600 | U.785 | 50.557 | 43.629 | 18.015 | . 014 | -3.574 | . 301 |
| 2700 | 8.841 | 50.890 | 43.891 | 18.897 | . 013 | -3.713 | . 301 |
| 2800 | 8.892 | 51.212 | 44.147 | 19.782 | . 012 | -3.851 | . 301 |
| 2900 | 8.939 | 51.525 | 44.396 | 20.674 | . 012 | -3.988 | . 301 |
| 3000 | 8.983 | 51.829 | 44.638 | 21.573 | . 011 | -4.120 | . 301 |
| 3100 | 9.030 | 52.123 | 44.875 | 22.459 | .008 | -4.264 | . 301 |
| 3200 | 9.076 | 52.411 | 45.106 | 23.376 | . 009 | -4.402 | . 301 |
| 3300 | 9.122 | 52.592 | 45.332 | 24.288 | . 010 | -4.542 | . 301 |
| 3400 | 9.166 | 52.964 | 45.552 | 25.201 | . 010 | -4.677 | . 301 |
| 3500 | 9.211 | 53.231 | 45.768 | 26.120 | . 010 | -4.817 | . 300 |
| 3000 | 9.255 | 53.491 | 45.979 | 27.043 | . 009 | -4.953 | . 300 |
| 3700 | 9.299 | 53.745 | . 46.186 | 27.968 | . 008 | -5.09b | . 300 |
| souv | 9.342 | 53.994 | 45.388 | 28.903 | .008 | -5.233 | . 300 |
| 3900 | 9.384 | 54.237 | 45.586 | 29.839 | . 008 | -5.370 | . 300 |
| 4000 | 9.425 | 54.475 | 46.780 | 30.790 | . 008 | -5.508 | . 300 |
| 4100 | 9.467 | 54.708 | 45.970 | 31.726 | . 009 | -5.644 | - 3000 |
| $+200$ | 9.507 | 54.937 | 47.157 | 32.676 | . 010 | -5.781 | . 300 |
| 4300 | 7.547 | 55.161 | 47.34: | 33.624 | . 000 | -5.920 | . 300 |
| 4400 | 4.586 | 55.381 | 47.522 | 34.580 | . 008 | -6.060 | . 301 |
| 4500 | 9.625 | 55.596 | 47.698 | 35.541 | .008 | -6.197 | - 301 |
| 4500 | 9.603 | 55.809 | 47.872 | 36.510 | . 009 | -6.332 | . 301 |
| 4700 | 9.7U0 | 56.017 | 48.044 | 37.473 | . 010 | -6.473 | . 301 |
| 4800 | 9.736 | 56.222 | 48.212 | 38.448 | . 012 | -6.608 | . 301 |
| 4900 | 9.772 | 56.423 | 48.377 | 39.425 | .013 | -6.745 | . 301 |
| 5000 | \%.808 | 58.620 | 48.540 | 40.400 | .012 | -6.884 | . 301 |
| b100 | 9.843 | 56.815 | 48.701 | 41.383 | . 010 | -7.021 | . 301 |
| b200 | 9.878 | 57.006 | 48.858 | 42.369 | . 010 | -7.160 | . 301 |
| ¢ 300 | 9.913 | 57.195 | 49.014 | 43.358 | .010 | -7.291 | . 301 |
| b400 | 9.948 | 57.380 | 49.157 | 44.351 | . 011 | -7.43b | . 301 |
| 5500 | 7.981 | 57.563 | 49.318 | 45.347 | . 011 | -7.574 | . 301 |
| b600 | 10.015 | 57.743 | 49.467 | 46.346 | . 011 | -7.714 | . 301 |
| b700 | 10.048 | 57.920 | 49.613 | 47.349 | . 012 | -7.853 | . 301 |
| b४uo | 10.081 | 58.096 | 49.759 | 48.356 | . 012 | -7.986 | . 301 |
| b900 | 10.113 | 58.268 | 49.901 | 49.365 | .012 | -8.12b | . 301 |
| 6000 | 10.144 | 53.438 | 50.042 | 50.378 | .013 | -8.264 | . 301 |

Point Group $C_{h}$
$S_{298.15}^{0}=47.658 \mathrm{cal} \mathrm{deg}^{-1} \mathrm{~mol}^{-1}$
Ground Scate Quantum Weight $=1$

$\Delta \mathrm{Hf}_{298.15}^{\circ}=-58.645 \pm 0.015 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}^{-1}$
Wibrational Levels and Multiplicities
$\omega, \mathrm{cm}^{-1}$

$1402.80(1)$
$3707.47(1)$

| Bond Lengths and Angle: | $0-H$ Distance $=0.9584 \AA$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $0-D$ Distance $=0.9584 \AA$ |  |$\quad \sigma=1$

Product of Moments of Inertia: $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{H}-0-\mathrm{D} \\ & \mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{A}} \mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{B}} \mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{C}}=15.827 \times 10^{-120} \mathrm{~g}^{3} \mathrm{~cm}{ }^{6}\end{aligned}$
Heat of Formation
Third and second law (where possible) analyses of the more recent determinations (1-5) of the experimental equilibrium constants, Keq, were made for the reactions: ( A$) \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(\mathrm{g})+\mathrm{HD}(\mathrm{g})=\mathrm{HDO}(\mathrm{g})+\mathrm{H}_{2}(\mathrm{~g})$, ard $(\mathrm{B})=\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(\mathrm{g})+$ $\mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}(\mathrm{g})=2 \mathrm{HDO}(\mathrm{g})$. Spectroscopic values for the heats of react1on, $\Delta \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{R} 298 \text {, of }(\mathrm{A}) \text { and (B) were based on the zero }}^{\circ}$ point energies of $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}, \mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}$, and HDO given by Hulston (6) and Wolfsberg (7) and $\mathrm{H}_{2}$, HD given by Heraberg and Monfils (8). The earlier work on (A) cited by Kirshenbaum (9) is in poor agreement except for that of Herrick, Kirshenbaum, Brown and Herrick, Crist, Davis ( $\Delta H_{R 298}^{\circ}=928 \pm 30,921$ cal; respectively). $\Delta H_{R}^{\circ} 298$ for the reaction (C) $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(\ell)+\mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}(\ell)=2 \mathrm{HDO}(\ell)$ has been determined to be $-32 \pm 1 \mathrm{cal}$. ( $10-12$ ) assuming ideal solutions (see (13)) and $\mathrm{Keq}(\mathrm{C}) ~ \sim 3.8$. (We calculate $\mathrm{Keq}(\mathrm{C})=3.76 \pm 0.04$ from $\mathrm{Keq}(\mathrm{B})=3.76 \pm 0.02, \mathrm{P}^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{H}_{2} 0\right) / \mathrm{P}^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right)=1.15 .1 \pm 0.006$ (14) at 298 K , and $\mathrm{P}^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right) / \mathrm{P}^{\circ}(\mathrm{HDO})=1.073 \pm 0.004$ (15) at 298 K .) $\Delta \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{R}}^{\circ} 298$ of (B) was calculated from the difference in heats of vaporization at 298 K of $\mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}(\ell)-\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(\ell)=331 \pm 8 \mathrm{cal}$ (see $\mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ table), and $\mathrm{HDO}(\ell)-\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(\ell)=183 \pm 20$ cal. (14). Values selected for $\Delta H^{\circ} 298$ based on non-spectroscopic and spectroscopic work for (A) and (B), underlined in the table, were used to calculate values of $\Delta H f_{298}^{\circ}$ of $\mathrm{HDO}(\mathrm{g})-\mathrm{H}_{2} 0(\mathrm{~g})$ of $-845 \pm 6,-852 \pm 10$, $-852 \pm 12$, and $-851 \pm 10 \mathrm{cal}$, respectively (see $\mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ and HD tables). An average value of $-850 \pm 10$ cal was added to dHf ${ }_{298}^{\circ}$ of $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(\mathrm{g})$ to obtain $\Delta \mathrm{Hf}_{298}^{\circ} \mathrm{HDO}(\mathrm{g})$.

| Reaction | Source | Temperature, K |  | Drift, e.u. |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A | Cerrai et al (1954) | 324 - 1015 | $-915 \pm 20$ | $0.04 \pm 0.10$ | $(-864 \pm 30,0.12 \pm 0.07)^{a}$ |
| A | Suess (1949) | 353-473 | $\underline{-921 \pm 6}$ | $0.05 \pm 0.05$ | $(-955 \pm 29,0.09 \pm 0.09)^{\text {a }}$ |
| A | Huls ton (1969) | Spectroscopic | $\underline{-928 \pm 10}$ |  |  |
| A | Wolfsberg (1969) | Spectroscopic | $-937 \pm 10$ |  |  |
| B | Pyper, Newbury, and Barton (1967) | $\begin{aligned} & 273.15 \\ & 297.95 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 56 \pm 11 \\ & 63 \pm 11 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & (3.75 \pm 0.08)^{b} \\ & (3.74 \pm 0.04)^{b} \end{aligned}$ |
| B | Friedman and Shiner (1966) | $\begin{aligned} & 273.15 \\ & 298.15 \\ & 358.15 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 58 \pm 3 \\ 60 \pm 3 \\ \hline 62 \pm 7 \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & (3.74 \pm 0.02)^{\mathrm{b}} \\ & (3.76 \pm 0.02)^{\mathrm{b}} \\ & (3.80 \pm 0.04)^{\mathrm{b}} \end{aligned}$ |
| B | Kresge, Ch $\ddagger$ ang(1968) | 298.15 | $46 \pm 5$ |  | $(3.85 \pm 0.03)^{\text {b }}$ |
| B | Reaction C, see text | 298.15 | $57 \pm 22$ |  |  |
| B | Hulston (1.969) | Spectroscopic | $65 \pm 10$ |  |  |
| B | WoJ.fsberg (1969) | Spectroscopic | $70 \pm 10$ |  |  |
| ${ }^{a}$ Second <br> at Capac | $\text { w: } \quad \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{R} 298}^{\circ}, \quad \mathrm{S}_{298}^{\circ} \text { (obsv.-ca }$ <br> and Entropy | $\text { ); } \quad b_{\text {Keq }} \text { at }$ | ature cited. |  |  |

The thermodynamic functions of this table are analogous to those in the JANAF table for $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ ( g ) (dated March 31 , 1961): both tables are taken from A. S. Friedman and I. Haar, J. Chem. Phys. 22, 2051 (1954). Friedman and Haar applied their non-rigid-rotor, anharmonic-oscillator treatment (with vibrational-rotational coupling terms and lowtemperature rotational corrections) to the infrared-spectra analyses of W. S. Benedict, N. Gailar, and E. K. Plyler, J. Chem. Phys. 21, 1301 (1953) and of W. S. Benedict, H. H. C1aasen and J. H.Shaw, J. Research Nat. Bur. Standards 49 , 91 (1952). In the present table for HDO, the values of $\mathrm{C}^{\circ}$ of Friedman and Haar between 4000 and 5000 K were extrapolated 1inearly (except with a term in $T^{-2}$ ) from 5080 to 6000 K . $I_{e} A^{-4}=1.211 \times 10^{-40}$, $I_{e}{ }^{B}=3.060 \times 10^{-40}$ $I_{e}^{C}=4.271 \times 10^{-40} \mathrm{gm} \mathrm{cm}$ from Friedman and Haar

## References

1. E. Cerrai, C. Marchetti, R. Renzoni, L. Roseo, M. Silvestri, and S. Villani, Chem. Eng. Prog. Symp Ser. 50 (11), 271 (1954).
2. H. Suess, 2. Naturforschung 4a, 328 (1949).
3. J. W. Pyper, R. S. Newbury, and G. W. Barton, Jr., J. Chem. Phys. 46, 2253 (1967).
4. L. Friedman and V. J. Shiner, Jr., J. Chem. Phys. 44, 4639 (1966).
5. A. J. Kresge and Y. Ch lang, J. Chem. Phys. 49, 1439 (1968).
6. J. R. Hulston, J. Chem. Phys. 50, 1483 (1969).
7. M. Wolfsberg, J. Chem. Phys. 50, 1484 (1969).
8. G. Herzberg and A. Monfils, J. Molec. Spectroscopy 5, 482 (1960).
9. $\bar{I}$. Kirshenbaum, Physical Properties and Analysis of Heavy Wacer (McGraw-Hill, N. Y., 1951).
10. E. Doehlemann, F. Lange, Z. Physik. Chem. 173A, 295 (1935).
11. V. P. Skripov, I. V. Povyshev, Russ. J. Phys. Chem. 36, (2), 162 (1962).
12. W. C. Duer, G. L. Bertrand, J. Chem. Phys. 53, 3020 (1970).
13. W. A. Van Hook, J, Phys. Chem. 72, 1234 (1968).
14. W. M. Jones, J. Chem. Phys. 48, 207 (1968) [see C. Liu, W. T. Lindsay, Jr., J. Chem. Eng. Data 15, 510 (1970)].
15. A. Narten, J. Chem. Phys. 41, 1318 (1964).
(Ideal Gas) $\quad G F W=19.021$

| T, ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{K}$ | Cp ${ }^{\circ}$ | gibbs/mol |  | $\mathbf{H}^{\circ}-\mathrm{H}^{\circ}{ }_{298}$ | - <br> kcal/mol $\Delta H \rho^{\circ}$ | $\Delta \mathrm{Gf}$ | $\log K_{p}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\mathrm{S}^{\circ}$ | $-\left(\mathrm{G}^{\circ}-H^{\circ}{ }_{298}\right) / \mathrm{T}$ |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | . 000 | . 000 | INFINITE | -2.372 | -57.943 | -57.943 | INFINITE |
| 100 | 7.959 | 38.940 | 54.769 | -1.583 | -58.188 | -57.454 | 125.587 |
| 200 | 7.974 | 44.459 | 48.392 | -. 787 | -58.415 | -56.650 | 61.904 |
| 298 | 8.075 | 47.658 | 47.658 | . 000 | -58.645 | -55.735 | 40.855 |
| 300 | 8.078 | 47.707 | 47.658 | . 015 | -58.650 | -55.717 | 40.590 |
| 400 | 8.311 | 50.061 | 47.977 | . 834 | -58.882 | -54.704 | 29.889 |
| 500 | 8.615 | 51.947 | 48.588 | 1.679 | -59.102 | -53.634 | 23.444 |
| 600 | 8.951 | 53.547 | 49.285 | 2.558 | $-59.303$ | -52.522 | 19.131 |
| 700 | 9.302 | 54.953 | 49.996 | 3.470 | -59.487 | -51.377 | 16.041 |
| 800 | 9.657 | 56.218 | 50.696 | 4.418 | -59.652 | -50.207 | 13.716 |
| 900 | 10.008 | 57.376 | 51.375 | 5.401 | -59.801 | -49.017 | 11.903 |
| 1000 | 10.345 | 58.448 | 52.029 | 6.419 | -59.930 | $-47.812$ | 10.449 |
| 1100 | 10.665 | 59.450 | 52.659 | 7.470 | -60.043 | $-46.594$ | 9.257 |
| 1200 | 10.964 | 60.391 | 53.264 | 8.551 | -60.141 | -45.367 | 8.263 |
| 1300 | 11.240 | 61.279 | 53.847 | 9.662 | -60.224 | -44.133 | 7.419 |
| 1400 | 11.493 | 62.122 | 54.408 | 10.799 | -60.296 | -42.892 | 6.696 |
| 1500 | 11.724 | 62.922 | 54.949 | 11.960 | -60.359 | -41.646 | 6.068 |
| 1600 | 11.935 | 63.686 | 55.472 | 13.143 | -60.415 | -40.398 | 5.518 |
| 1700 | 12.126 | 64.415 | 55.977 | 14.346 | -60.463 | -39.145 | 5.032 |
| 1800 | 12.300 | 65.113 | 56.465 | 15.567 | -60.505 | -37.890 | 4.601 |
| 1900 | 12.458 | 65.783 | 56.938 | 16.805 | -60.542 | -36.633 | 4.214 |
| 2000 | 12.603 | 66.425 | 57.396 | 18.059 | -60.573 | -35.373 | 3.865 |
| 2100 | 12.734 | 67.044 | 57.841 | 19.325 | -60.605 | -34.113 | 3.550 |
| 2200 | 12.855 | 67.639 | 58.273 | 20.605 | -60.631 | -32.850 | 3.263 |
| 2300 | 12.965 | 68.213 | 58.693 | 21.896 | -60.656 | -31.587 | 3.001 |
| 2400 | 13.066 | 68.767 | 59.101 | 23.198 | -60.680 | -30.321 | 2.761 |
| 2500 | 13.160 | 69.302 | 59.498 | 24.509 | -60.702 | -29.058 | 2.540 |
| 2600 | 13.246 | 69.820 | 59.885 | 25.830 | -60.725 | -27.790 | 2.336 |
| 2700 | 13.325 | 70.321 | 60.263 | 27.158 | -60.747 | -26.524 | 2.147 |
| 2800 | 13.399 | 70.807 | 60.631 | 28.494 | -60.769 | -25.256 | 1.971 |
| 2900 | 13.468 | 71.279 | 60.990 | 29.838 | -60.793 | -23.985 | 1.808 |
| 3000 | 13.532 | 71.736 | 61.340 | 31.188 | -60.816 | -22.717 | 1.655 |
| 3100 | 13.592 | 72.181 | 61.683 | 32.545 | -60.841 | -21.446 | 1.512 |
| 3200 | 13.648 | 72.613 | 62.018 | 33.906 | -60.865 | -20.176 | 1.378 |
| 3300 | 13.701 | 73.034 | 62.345 | 35.274 | -60.890 | -18.904 | 1.252 |
| 3400 | 13.750 | 73.444 | 62.666 | 36.646 | -60.916 | -17.632 | 1.133 |
| 3500 | 13.797 | 73.843 | 62.979 | 38.024 | -60.946 | -16.358 | 1.021 |
| 3600 | 13.841 | 74.233 | 63.287 | 39.406 | -60.975 | -15.082 | .916 |
| 3700 | 13.883 | 74.612 | 63.587 | 40.792 | -61.010 | -13.808 | . 816 |
| 3800 | 13.922 | 74.983 | 63.883 | 42.182 | -61.044 | -12.532 | . 721 |
| 3900 | 13.960 | 75.345 | 64.172 | 43.576 | -61.082 | -11.256 | . 631 |
| 4000 | 13.996 | 75.699 | 64.456 | 44.973 | $-61.121$ | -9.979 | . 545 |
| 4100 | 14.030 | 76.045 | 64.734 | 46.375 | -61.161 | -8.699 | . 464 |
| 4200 | 14.062 | 76.383 | 65.007 | 47.780 | -61.203 | -7.418 | . 386 |
| 4300 | 14.093 | 76.715 | 65.276 | 49.187 | -61.246 | -6.137 | . 312 |
| 4400 | 14.123 | 77.039 | 65.540 | 50.598 | -61.293 | -4.855 | . 241 |
| 4500 | 14.151 | 77.357 | 65.799 | 52.012 | -61.344 | -3.575 | .174 |
| 4600 | 14.178 | 77.668 | 66.053 | 53.428 | -61.395 | -2.286 | . 109 |
| 4700 | 14.204 | 77.973 | 66.307 | 54.833 | -61.463 | -1.016 | . 047 |
| 4800 | 14.230 | 78.273 | 66.550 | 56.269 | -61.501 | . 288 | -. 013 |
| 4900 | 14.254 | 78.567 | 66.792 | 57.693 | -61.559 | 1.573 | -. 070 |
| 5000 | 14.278 | 78.854 | 67.030 | 59.120 | -61.620 | 2.860 | -. 125 |
| 5100 | 14.300 | 79.137 | 67.265 | 60.549 | -61.682 | 4.155 | -. 178 |
| 5200 | 14.322 | 79.415 | 67.496 | 61.981 | -61.745 | 5.443 | -. 229 |
| 5300 | 14.344 | 79.688 | 67.724 | 63.414 | -61.810 | 6.738 | -. 278 |
| 5400 | 14.364 | 79.957 | 67.948 | 64.848 | -61.879 | 8.029 | -. 325 |
| 5500 | 14.385 | 80.220 | 68.168 | 66.287 | -61.947 | 9.325 | -. 371 |
| 5600 | 14.405 | 80.480 | 68.386 | 67.726 | -62.018 | 10.620 | -. 414 |
| 5700 | 14.424 | 80.735 | 68.600 | 69.167 | -62.092 | 11.917 | -. 457 |
| 5800 | 14.443 | 80.986 | 68.812 | 70.610 | -62.168 | 13.217 | -. 498 |
| 5900 | 14.461 | 81.233 | 69.020 | 72.056 | -62.244 | 14.519 | -. 538 |
| 6000 | 14.479 | 81.476 | 69.226 | 73.502 | -62.323 | 15.820 | -. 576 |

$$
S_{298.15}^{0}=44.723 \mathrm{cal} \mathrm{~K}^{-1} \mathrm{~mol}^{-1}
$$

$$
\Delta H f_{298.15}^{\circ}=89.7 \pm 5 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{~mol}^{-1}
$$

Electronic States and Molecular Constants


Heat of Formation
$\Delta H f_{298}^{\circ}$ of $N D(g)$ minus $N H(g)$ was calculated from the JANAF thermal functions and the zero point energies of $\mathrm{H}_{2}(\mathrm{~g}), \mathrm{D}_{2}(\mathrm{~g})$ [given by G. Herzberg and A. Monfils, J. Molec. Spectroscopy 5, 482 (1960)], NH(g), and ND(g) [given by L. Haar, A. S. Friedman, and C. W. Beckett, NBS Monograph 20 (1961)]. $\Delta H f_{298}^{0}$ of ND(g) was calculated from this value and the JANAF selection for $\Delta H f_{298}^{\circ}$ of $\mathrm{NH}(\mathrm{g})$.

## Heat Capacity and Entropy

The molecular constants which are given for NH in the JANAF Thermochemical Tables, 2nd Edition, D. R. Stull. and H. Prophet, Froject Directors, NSRDS-NBS 37, Washington, D. C., June 1971, were adjusted for the isotope effect.

| T，${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{K}$ | gibbs／mol |  |  | kcal／mol |  |  | $\log K_{p}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Cp ${ }^{\circ}$ | $\mathbf{S}^{\circ}$ | －（ $\left.\mathrm{G}^{\circ}-\mathrm{H}^{\circ}{ }_{298}\right) / \mathrm{T}$ | $\mathbf{H}^{\circ}-\mathrm{H}^{\circ} \mathbf{2 9 8}$ | $\Delta H{ }^{\circ}$ | $\Delta \mathbf{G f}^{\circ}$ |  |
| 0 | ． 000 | ． 000 | INFINITE | －2．057 | 89.693 | 99.693 | INFINITE |
| 100 | 6.959 | 37.119 | 50.914 | －1．390 | 89．705 | 89．249 | －195．053 |
| 200 | 6.902 | 41.942 | 45.360 | －． 584 | 09.700 | 88.795 | －97．030 |
| 298 | 6.909 | 44.723 | 44.723 | ． 000 | 89.700 | BR． 250 | －04．702 |
| 300 | 6.905 | 44.766 | 44.723 | ． 013 | 99．700 | 98． 342 | －04．357 |
| 400 | 7.003 | 46.775 | 44.997 | ． 711 | 89．701 | 87.089 | －48．020 |
| bu0 | 7.080 | 48.345 | 45.515 | 1.415 | 89.703 | 87.436 | －58．218 |
| 000 | 7．221 | 49.649 | 46.098 | 2.130 | 89.710 | 96．982 | －31．083 |
| 700 | 7.345 | 50.774 | 46.688 | 2.950 | 89.719 | 86.526 | －27．015 |
| sue | 7－5コ5 | 51.771 | 47.262 | 3.607 | 89.734 | 86．069 | －23．513 |
| yuu | 7．71y | 52.670 | 47.814 | 4.371 | 89.749 | 85.610 | －20．789 |
| 1000 | 7．41＋ | 53.492 | 48.341 | 5.151 | 89.768 | 85.149 | －18．609 |
| 1100 | 5.013 | 54.249 | 48.844 | 5.945 | 89.787 | 84.687 | －10．826 |
| 1200 | 8.130 | 54.951 | 49.324 | 6.753 | 89.806 | 84．722 | －15．339 |
| 1500 | 8.249 | 55.607 | 49.782 | 7.572 | 89．827 | 83.755 | －14．081 |
| 1400 | 8.347 | 56.22 .2 | 50.221 | 8.402 | 89.845 | 83.287 | －13．002 |
| 1500 | H． 434 | 56.801 | 50.640 | 9.241 | 89.365 | R2．819 | －12．067 |
| 1000 | 4.512 | 57.348 | 51.04 .3 | 10.089 | 89．R83 | 82． 348 | －11．248 |
| 1700 | H． 581 | 57．866 | 51.429 | 10.943 | 89.999 | 81.377 | －10．526 |
| 1800 | 9.644 | 58.359 | 51.800 | 11.905 | 89.916 | 81.404 | －y．884 |
| 1900 | 5.700 | 58.827 | 52.158 | 12.572 | 89.932 | 80.031 | －9．309 |
| 2000 | 5.751 | 59.275 | 52.503 | 13.545 | 89.949 | 80．458 | －0．7ヶ2 |
| 2100 | 3.797 | 59.703 | 52.335 | 14.422 | 89.762 | 79.981 | －5．324 |
| 2200 | 2．840 | 60.113 | 53.157 | 15.304 | 89.376 | 79.507 | －7．898 |
| 23013 | 9．879 | $\bigcirc 0.507$ | 53.498 | 16.190 | 89.990 | 79.030 | －7．51u |
| 2400 | 3.910 | 60.985 | 53.709 | 17.030 | 90.003 | 78.554 | －7．153 |
| 2500 | 3.950 | 61.251 | 54.001 | 17.973 | 30.017 | 78．070 | －u． 825 |
| 2，00 | 93.981 | 61.602 | $54 \cdot 345$ | 19.870 | 90.027 | 77.599 | －0． 523 |
| C700 | 9.011 | 61.942 | 54.620 | 19．739 | 90.039 | 77.121 | －0．242 |
| csue | 9.039 | 62.270 | 54.887 | 20.572 | 90.051 | 76.542 | －5．982 |
| 29011 | 9.060 | 62.589 | 55.147 | 21.577 | 90.061 | 76.164 | －5．740 |
| su0u | 7.091 | 52.895 | 55.400 | 22.485 | 90.071 | 75．684 | －5．514 |
| 3100 | 9.115 | 63.194 | 55.647 | 23.395 | 90.080 | 75.903 | －5．302 |
| 3200 | 9.135 | 63.494 | 55.887 | 24.308 | 90.091 | 74.723 | －5．103 |
| 3500 | 9.160 | 63.765 | 56.122 | 25.223 | 90.100 | 74.742 | －4．917 |
| 3400 | 4.162 | 64.039 | 56.351 | 26.140 | 90.112 | 73.763 | －4．741 |
| 3500 | 4.202 | 64.305 | 5á． 574 | 27.059 | 90.119 | 73.281 | －4．576 |
| souv | 9.226 | 64.565 | 55.793 | 27．980 | 90.127 | 72．f01 | $-4.4<0$ |
| 3700 | 3.242 | 54.818 | 57.006 | 25.904 | 90.133 | 72.318 | －4．272 |
| 3300 | a．2．6u | 65.755 | 57.215 | 29.327 | 90.139 | 71.936 | －4．132 |
| $3 \rightarrow 00$ | 9．27\％ | 65.305 | 57.419 | 30.756 | 90.144 | 71.355 | － 2.999 |
| 4000 | $\rightarrow 290$ | 65.540 | 57.619 | 31.694 | 90.150 | 70.872 | －3．872 |
| 4100 | 9.314 | 65.770 | 57.815 | 32.515 | 90.154 | 70.389 | －3．752 |
| 4200 | 9．33i | 65.995 | 58.007 | 33.547 | 90.159 | 69.709 | －3．638 |
| 4300 | 7.347 | 66.215 | 52.195 | 34.491 | 90.165 | 69.427 | －3．529 |
| 4400 | 9.304 | 66.430 | $5 \mathrm{H}$. | 35.417 | 90.167 | 68.745 | －3．4＜5 |
| 4500 | $9.38 u$ | 56.640 | 58.56 ？ | 36.354 | 90.167 | 68.46 u | －3．325 |
| 4500 | 4.330 | 66.347 | 5 ヶ． 740 | 37.293 | 90.170 | 67.981 | －3．230 |
| 4700 | 9．4i1 | 67.049 | 59．914 | 38.233 | 90.172 | 67.497 | －3．139 |
| 4800 | $9.4<7$ | 67.247 | ba．08f | 39.175 | 90.174 | 67.018 | －3．051 |
| 4900 | 9.442 | 67.442 | 59.254 | 40.119 | 90.174 | 66.533 | －2．907 |
| bueu | $9.45 \%$ | 67.633 | 59.420 | 41.053 | 90.171 | 66.051 | －2．8d7 |
| bluu | 9.471 | 67.8320 | 50.533 | 42.010 | 90.170 | 65.567 | －2．810 |
| b200 | 9.450 | 68.10114 | 59.743 | 42.957 | 90.158 | 65.085 | －2．735 |
| b300 | 9.541 | 68.125 | 59．901 | 43.307 | 90.165 | 64.601 | －2．064 |
| b400 | 9.515 | 68.363 | 60．0ゝ6 | 44.95 H | 90.163 | 64.120 | －＜． 595 |
| ら500 | 9．52\％ | 68.537 | 60.208 | 45．810 | 90.158 | 63.538 | －2．529 |
| bouo | 4.543 | 68.709 | 50.359 | 46.763 | 90.154 | 63.156 | －2．465 |
| 5700 | 9.557 | 68．8378 | 60.507 | 47.718 | 90.149 | 62.674 | －6．403 |
| boud | 9.571 | 69.1145 | 60.652 | 48.675 | 90.143 | 62.193 | －＜．343 |
| b900 | 4．50！ | 69.208 | 60.736 | 49.633 | 90.137 | 61.709 | －2． 200 |
| GUUU | 4.590 | 69.369 | 60.933 | 50.592 | 90． 130 | 61.228 | －2．230 |

July 31， 1972

$$
\mathrm{S}_{298.15}^{\circ}=45.307 \mathrm{cal} \mathrm{~K}^{-1} \mathrm{~mol}^{-1}{ }^{*}
$$

$$
\Delta \mathrm{Hf}_{0}^{\circ}=8.65_{9} \mathrm{kcal}_{\mathrm{mol}}-\mathrm{i}^{*}
$$

$$
\Delta \mathrm{Hf}_{298.5}^{\circ}=8.74_{8} \pm 0.29 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{~mol}^{-1}
$$

## Electronic States and Molecular Constants



## Heat of Formation

The heat of formation was calculated from the selected value for $\Delta H f_{298}^{\circ}$ of $\mathrm{OH}(\mathrm{g}),-9.27 \pm 0.3 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}{ }^{-1}$ (see OH table), the appropriate thermal functions, and zero point energies of $H_{2}(g), D_{2}(g), O H(g)$, and $O D(g)$. The zero point energies of $H_{2}(g)$ and $D_{2}(g)$ were taken from G. Herzberg and A. Monfila, J. Molec. Spectroscopy 5, 482 (1960). The zero point energies of $0 H$ and $O D$ include the Dunham correction (see G. Herzberg and A. Monfils, loc. cit.). The molecular constants are those given by B. Rosen, Spectroscopic Data Relative to Diatomic Molecules (Pergamon Press, Oxford, 1970) with the exception of the coupling constants taken from G. Herzberg, Spectra of Diatomic Molecules, D. Van Nostrand Company, Inc., New York (1950) pp. 232, 561.

## *Heat Capacity and Entropy

The vibrational and rotational constants of the respective electronic levels were taken from B. Rosen, Spectroscopic Data Relative to Diatomic Molecules, Pergamon Press, Oxford, 1970. Comparison of the results with those from a more exact treatment given by L. Haar, A. S. Friedman, and C. W. Beckett, NBS Monograph 20, May 29, 1961 (U. S. Govt. Printing Office, Washington, D. C., 20402) indicates errors in the tables above 400 K are negligible. Below this, they may be appreciable. In particular, it is recommended that $H_{0}^{\circ}-H_{298}^{\circ}, S_{298}^{\circ}$, and $C_{p}^{\circ} 298$ be taken as $-2.151 \mathrm{kcal}_{\mathrm{mol}}{ }^{-1}, 45.307 \mathrm{gibbs} \mathrm{mol}{ }^{-1}$, and $7.156 \mathrm{cal} \mathrm{deg}^{-1} \mathrm{~mol}{ }^{-1}$, respectively. These errors result from dealing with the ground state $\left(X_{i}^{2} \Pi_{i}\right)$ as two different electronic states separated by $139.7 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$.
$G F W=18,0135$


July 31, 1972
$\mathrm{S}_{298.15}^{\circ}=48.138 \mathrm{cal}^{-1} \mathrm{~K}^{-1} \mathrm{~mol}^{-1^{\neq}}$

Electronic States and Molecular Constants

| State | $\varepsilon, \mathrm{cm}^{-1}$ | 8 | $\omega_{e}, c m-1$ | $x_{e^{\omega}} e^{, c m}$ | $\mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{e}}, \mathrm{~cm}-1$ | ${\underline{\alpha} e^{,} \mathrm{cm}^{-1}}^{\underline{1}}$ | $\mathrm{r}_{\mathrm{e}}, \AA^{\circ}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $x^{2} \pi_{i}$ | $\left\{\begin{array}{r}0 \\ 376.8\end{array}\right.$ | $\left.\begin{array}{l}2 \\ 2\end{array}\right\}$ | 1930.4 | 23.44 | 4.949 | 0.101 | 1.345 |
| $A^{2} \Sigma^{+}$ | 30769 | 2 | 1417 | 48.85 | 4.392 | 0.172 | 1.423 |
| $\mathrm{B}^{2} \Sigma$ | 59566 | 2 | 1917.7 | 29.3 | 4.532 | 0.105 | 1.405 |
| $\mathrm{C}^{2} \Delta$ | 63872 | 47 |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{D}^{2} \triangle$ | 71205 | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{E}^{2} \mathrm{~L}$ | 71328 | 2 \} | [1930.4] | [23.44] | [4.949] | [0.101] |  |
| $\mathrm{F}^{2} \Delta$ | 76717 | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{G}^{2} \Delta$ | 79320 | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{H}^{2} \Delta$ | 80858 | 4 ) |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\sigma=1$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Heat of Formation

The heat of formation was calculated from the appropriate thermal functions (see tables for $H S, D S, H_{2}, D_{2}$ ), the selected value for $\Delta H f_{298}^{\circ}$ of $\mathrm{HS}(\mathrm{g})\left(33.3 \pm 1.2 \mathrm{kcal}\right.$ mol ${ }^{-1}$, see table for HS$)$, and the zero point energies of $\mathrm{H}_{2}(\mathrm{~g})(1), \mathrm{D}_{2}(\mathrm{~g})(1), \mathrm{HS}(\mathrm{g})(2)$, and $\mathrm{DS}(\mathrm{g})(2)$. The Dunham corrections were made in ref. (1) for $\mathrm{H}_{2}(\mathrm{~g})$ and $\mathrm{D}_{2}(\mathrm{~g})$. Spectroscopic constants tabulated in ref. (2) were used to calculate the zero point energies of $H S$ and DS including Dunham corrections.

## 'Heat Capacity and Entropy

The vibrational and rotational constants of the respective electronic levels were taken from $B$. Rosen, Spectroscopic Data Relative to Diatomic Molecules, Pergamon Press, 0xford, 1970. From an examination of the approximations in this calculation with more exact methods (see $\mathrm{SH}^{\text {tables) it is concluded that the errors are }}$ negligible above 400 K . Below this, they may be appreciable. In particular, it is recomended that $H_{0}^{\circ}-H_{298}^{\circ}$, $\mathrm{S}_{298}^{\circ}$, and $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{p} 298}^{\circ}$ be taken as $-2.171 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}^{-1}, 48.138 \mathrm{gibbs}$ mol $^{-1}$, and $7.760 \mathrm{cal} \mathrm{deg}^{-1}$ mol ${ }^{-1}$, respectively.

## References

1. G. Herzberg and A. Monfils, J. Molec. Spectroscopy 5, 482 (1960).
2. B. Rosen, "Spectroscopic Data Relative to Diatomic Molecules", Pergamon Press, New York (1970). For coupling constants, see L. Haar, A. S. Friedman, and C. W. Beckett, NBS Monograph 20, May 29, 1961 (U. S. Govt. Printing Office, Washington, D. C., 20402). For the cause of these errors, see the text (page 256) of the table for Deutero-hydroxyl (0 D).
(Ideal Gas)
$G F N=34.0781$

| $\mathbf{T},{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{K}$ | $\mathrm{Cp}^{\circ}$ | gibbs $/ \mathrm{mol}$$\mathrm{S}^{\circ} \quad-\left(\mathrm{G}^{\circ}-\mathrm{H}^{\circ}{ }^{\circ}{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{m}\right) / \mathrm{T}$ |  | $\boldsymbol{H}^{\circ}-\mathbf{H}^{\circ}{ }_{298}$ | $\begin{gathered} -\mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol} \\ \Delta H \mathrm{f}^{\circ} \end{gathered}$ | $\Delta \mathrm{Gf}^{\circ}$ | Log Kp |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | . 000 | . 000 | INFINITE | -2.221 | 32.956 | 32.956 | INFINITE |
| 100 | 7.214 | 39.776 | 55.032 | -1.526 | 33.159 | 30.924 | -07.367 |
| 200 | 7.815 | 45.007 | 48.844 | -. 767 | 33.171 | 28.478 | -31.119 |
| 298 | 7.772 | 48.129 | 48.129 | . 000 | 33.100 | 26.187 | -19.195 |
| 300 | 7.770 | 48.177 | 48.129 | . 014 | 33.098 | 26.144 | -19.046 |
| 400 | 7.669 | 50.396 | 48.433 | . 786 | 32.422 | 23.967 | -13.040 |
| 500 | 7.678 | 52.107 | 49.003 | 1.552 | 31.899 | 21.789 | -9.524 |
| 600 | 7.770 | 53.514 | 49.641 | 2.324 | 31.462 | 19.809 | -7.215 |
| 700 | 7.898 | 54.721 | 50.282 | 3.107 | 31.089 | 17.921 | -5.595 |
| 800 | 8.034 | 55.784 | 50.905 | 3.904 | 17.699 | 14.795 | -4.042 |
| 900 | 8.162 | 56.738 | 51.501 | 4.714 | 17.703 | 14.432 | -3.505 |
| 1000 | 8.277 | 57.604 | 52.068 | 5.536 | 17.709 | 14.069 | -3.075 |
| 1100 | 8. 378 | 58.398 | 52.608 | 6.369 | 17.718 | 13.703 | -2.723 |
| 1200 | 8.467 | 59.131 | 53.122 | 7.211 | 17.728 | 13.338 | -2.429 |
| 1300 | 8.544 | 59.812 | 53.610 | 8.061 | 17.740 | 12.973 | -2.181 |
| 1400 | 8.611 | 60.447 | 54.076 | 8.919 | 17.751 | 12.605 | -1.968 |
| 1500 | 8.670 | 61.043 | 54.521 | 9.783 | 17.762 | 12.236 | -1.783 |
| 1600 | 8.722 | 61.605 | 54.946 | 10.653 | 17.772 | 11.868 | -1.621 |
| 1700 | 8.768 | 62.135 | 55.354 | 11.528 | 17.781 | 11.499 | -1.478 |
| 1800 | 8.810 | 62.637 | 55.745 | 12.406 | 17.789 | 11.128 | -1.351 |
| 1900 | 8.847 | 63.114 | 56.120 | 13.289 | 17.797 | 10.759 | -1.238 |
| 2000 | 8.881 | 63.569 | 56.481 | 14.176 | 17.806 | 10.389 | -1.135 |
| 2100 | 8.911 | 64.003 | 56.829 | 15.065 | 17.810 | 10.015 | -1.042 |
| 2200 | 8.940 | 64.418 | 57.165 | 15.958 | 17.816 | 9.647 | -. 958 |
| 2300 | 8.966 | 64.816 | 57.489 | 16.853 | 17.821 | 9.274 | -. 881 |
| 2400 | 8.990 | 65.198 | 57.802 | 17.751 | 17.124 | 8.003 | -. 811 |
| 2500 | 9.013 | 65.566 | 5R. 105 | 18.651 | 17.829 | 8.532 | -. 746 |
| 2600 | 9.035 | 65.920 | 58.399 | 19.554 | 17.830 | 8.160 | -. 686 |
| 2700 | 9.055 | 66.261 | 58.684 | 20.458 | 17.833 | 7.787 | -. 630 |
| 2800 | 9.074 | 66.591 | 58.961 | 21.365 | 17.834 | 7.414 | -. 579 |
| 2900 | 9.093 | 66.910 | 59.229 | 22.273 | 17.833 | 7.043 | -. 531 |
| 3000 | 9.110 | 67.218 | 59.490 | 23.183 | 17.832 | 6.672 | -. 486 |
| 3100 | 9.127 | 67.517 | 59.745 | 24.095 | 17.830 | 6.299 | -. 444 |
| 3200 | 9.143 | 67.807 | 59.992 | 25.009 | 17.830 | 5.926 | -. 405 |
| 3300 | 9.159 | 68.089 | 60.233 | 25.924 | 17.828 | 5.552 | -. 368 |
| 3400 | 9.174 | 68.362 | 60.468 | 26.840 | 17.826 | 5.184 | -. 333 |
| 3500 | 9.189 | 68.629 | 60.698 | 27.758 | 17.820 | 4.809 | -. 300 |
| 3600 | 9.204 | 68.888 | 60.922 | 28.678 | 17.818 | 4.439 | -. 270 |
| 3700 | 9.218 | 69.140 | 61.140 | 29.599 | 17.809 | 4.067 | -. 240 |
| 3800 | 9.232 | 69.386 | 61.354 | 30.522 | 17.803 | 3.695 | -. 213 |
| 3900 | 9.246 | 69.626 | 61.563 | 31.446 | 17.794 | 3.322 | -. 186 |
| 4000 | 9.260 | 69.860 | 61.768 | 32.371 | 17.786 | 2.955 | -. 161 |
| 4100 | 9.275 | 70.089 | 61.968 | 33.297 | 17.777 | 2.582 | -. 138 |
| 4200 | 9.287 | 70.313 | 62.164 | 34.225 | 17.767 | 2.213 | -. 115 |
| 4300 | 9.300 | 70.531 | 62.356 | 35.155 | 17.758 | 1.842 | -. 094 |
| 4400 | 9.313 | 70.745 | 62.544 | 36.085 | 17.746 | 1.473 | -. 073 |
| 4500 | 9.327 | 70.955 | 62.729 | 37.017 | 17.731 | 1.103 | -. 054 |
| 4600 | 9.340 | 71.160 | 62.910 | 37.951 | 17.719 | . 734 | -. 035 |
| 4700 | 9.354 | 71.361 | 63.087 | 38.896 | 17.707 | . 364 | -. 017 |
| 4800 | 9.367 | 71.558 | 63.262 | 39.822 | 17.694 | -. 004 | . 000 |
| 4900 | 9.381 | 71.751 | 63.433 | 40.759 | 17.679 | -. 370 | . 016 |
| 5000 | 9.395 | 71.941 | 63.601 | 41.698 | 17.660 | -. 742 | . 032 |
| 5100 | 9.409 | 72.127 | 63.767 | 42.638 | 17.644 | -1.107 | . 047 |
| 5200 | 9.423 | 72.310 | 63.929 | 43.580 | 17.627 | -1.476 | . 062 |
| 5300 | 9.437 | 72.490 | 64.089 | 44.523 | 17.610 | -1.845 | . 076 |
| 5400 | 9.452 | 72.666 | 64.246 | 45.467 | 17.592 | -2.208 | . 089 |
| 5500 | 9.466 | 72.840 | 64.401 | 46.413 | 17.573 | -2.578 | . 102 |
| 5600 | 9.481 | 73.010 | 64.553 | 47.360 | 17.554 | -2.942 | . 115 |
| 5700 | 9.496 | 73.178 | 64.703 | 48.309 | 17.534 | -3.310 | . 127 |
| 5800 | 9.511 | 73.344 | 64.851 | 49.259 | 17.514 | -3.674 | . 138 |
| 5900 | 9.526 | 73.506 | 64.996 | 50.211 | 17.494 | -4.043 | . 150 |
| 6000 | 9.542 | 73.667 | 65.139 | 51.165 | 17.474 | $-4.403$ | . 160 |

DEUTERIUM, DIATOMIC ( $\mathrm{D}_{2}$ or ${ }^{2} \mathrm{H}_{2}$ )

$$
\begin{aligned}
& D_{0}^{\circ}=105.070 \pm 0.002 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{~mol}^{-1} \\
& \text { Ground State Configuration }{ }^{1} \Sigma_{g}^{+} \\
& \omega_{e}=3118.46 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} \quad \omega_{e_{e}}=64.10 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} \\
& B_{e}=30.429 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} \quad \alpha_{e}=1.0492 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} \\
& \Delta H f_{298.15}^{\circ}=0 \\
& \mathrm{~S}_{298.15}^{0}=34.622 \pm 0.01 \mathrm{cal} \mathrm{deg}^{-1} \mathrm{~mol}^{-1} \\
& D_{e}=0.01159 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} \\
& \sigma=2 \\
& r_{e}=0.7416 \AA
\end{aligned}
$$

Heat Capacity and Entropy
The thermodynamic functions were generated from the table of the current series for $H_{2}$ ( $q . v$.) by adding those for "equilibrium" $D_{2}$ and subtracting those for "equilibrium" $H_{2}$, the added and subtracted tables being those from $L$. Haar, A. S. Friedman, and C. W. Beckett, Nat. Bur. Standards Monograph 20 (1961). (In using these tablea of Monograph 20, $\mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{p}}^{\circ}$ was extrapolated smoothly from 5000 to 6000 K by comparing with the harmonic oscillator-rigid rotor values.) This procedure is belleved to give a table approaching in accuracy the current table for $H_{2}$, which is based on the direct-sumation method of H. W. Woolley, R. B. Scott, and F. G. Brickwedde, J. Research Nat. Bur. Standards 4l, . 379 (1948). The tables of Monograph 20, while involving sumation at low temperaturea, approximated by closed expressions the high-temperature first-order contributions due to anharmonicity, rotation-vibration coupling, and rotational stretching. At 2000 K the values of Woolley et al. for $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{p}}^{0}$ and $\mathrm{S}^{\circ}$ of $\mathrm{D}_{2}$ are $0.03 \%$ lower and $0.01 \% \mathrm{higher}$ respectively, than the present table. (Woolley et al. gave no values for $D_{2}$ above 2000 K .) The value for $D_{0}^{\circ}$ is taken from G. Herzberg, J. Molec. Spectroscopy 33, 147 (1970).

## (Ideal Gas, Reference State) GFN $=4.0282$

|  | giblbs/mol - |  |  | keal/mol |  |  | $\underline{L o g ~ K p}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| T, ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{K}$ | Cp ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | $\mathbf{S}^{\circ}$ | $-\left(\mathrm{G}^{\circ}-\mathrm{H}^{\circ}{ }_{298}\right) / \mathrm{T}$ | $\mathbf{H}^{\circ}-\mathrm{H}^{\circ}{ }^{298}$ | $\Delta H{ }^{\circ}$ | $\Delta \mathrm{Gf}$ |  |
| $u$ | . 000 | . 000 | INFINITE | -2.048 | . 000 | . 000 | . 000 |
| 100 | $7.24{ }^{\text {a }}$ | 26.932 | 40.839 | -1.391 | . 000 | . 000 | . 000 |
| 200 | 6.980 | 31.836 | 35.260 | -. 685 | . 000 | . 000 | .000 |
| 298 | 0.978 | 34.622 | 34.622 | . 000 | . 000 | . 000 | . 000 |
| 300 | 6.978 | 34.665 | 34.622 | . 013 | . 000 | . 000 | .000 |
| 400 | 6.989 | 36.672 | 34.896 | . 710 | . 000 | . 000 | . 000 |
| 500 | 7.018 | 38.235 | 35.413 | 1.411 | . 000 | .000 | . 000 |
| 600 | 7.079 | 39.519 | 35.992 | 2.116 | . nOO | . 000 | . 000 |
| 700 | 7.172 | 40.617 | 36.576 | 2.829 | . 000 | . 000 | .000 |
| 800 | 7.297 | 41.582 | 37.143 | 3.551 | .000 | .000 | . 000 |
| 900 | 7.429 | 42.450 | 37.686 | 4.288 | . 000 | . 000 | .000 |
| 1000 | 7.501 | 43.239 | 38.202 | 5.037 | . 000 | . 000 | . 000 |
| 1100 | 7.689 | 43.965 | 38.694 | 5.799 | . 000 | . 000 | . 000 |
| 1200 | 7.813 | 44.641 | 39.161 | 6.576 | . 000 | . 000 | . 000 |
| 1300 | 7.934 | 45.270 | 39.507 | 7.362 | . 000 | . 000 | .000 |
| 1400 | 3.055 | 45.863 | 40.033 | 8.162 | . 000 | . 000 | . 000 |
| 1500 | 8.178 | 46.423 | 40.441 | 8.973 | .000 | .000 | . 000 |
| 1600 | 8.277 | 45.954 | 40.831 | 9.797 | . 000 | . 000 | . 000 |
| 1700 | 8.367 | 47.459 | 41.206 | 10.630 | . 000 | . 000 | . 000 |
| 1800 | 8.450 | 47.939 | 41.567 | 11.470 | . 000 | . 000 | . 000 |
| 1900 | と. 529 | 49.398 | 41.914 | 12.320 | . 000 | .000 | . 000 |
| 2000 | 8.601 | 48.837 | 42.250 | 13.174 | . 000 | .000 | . 000 |
| 2100 | 8.609 | 49.259 | 42.573 | 14.041 | . 000 | . 000 | . 000 |
| 2200 | 8.732 | 49.664 | 42.887 | 14.909 | - 0 ח | .000 | . 000 |
| 2300 | 8.792 | 50.053 | 43.190 | 15.785 | . 000 | .000 | . 000 |
| 2400 | 8.848 | 50.429 | 43.484 | 16.668 | . 000 | .000 | . 000 |
| 2500 | 5.901 | 50.790 | 43.769 | 17.552 | . 000 | . 000 | . 000 |
| 2600 | 8.951 | 51.141 | 44.046 | 18.447 | . 000 | . 000 | . 000 |
| 2700 | 8.997 | 51.479 | 44.315 | 19.343 | . 000 | .000 | . 000 |
| 2800 | 9.041 | 51.807 | 44.577 | 20.244 | .000 | . 000 | . 000 |
| 2900 | 9.081 | 52.126 | 44.832 | 21.153 | . 000 | . 000 | . 000 |
| 3000 | 9.117 | 52.434 | 45.080 | 22.062 | . 000 | . 000 | . 000 |
| 3100 | 9.158 | 52.735 | 45.322 | 22.980 | . 000 | . 000 | -000 |
| 3200 | 9.197 | 53.025 | 45.558 | 23.894 | . 000 | .000 | . 000 |
| 3300 | 9.237 | 53.308 | 45.788 | 24.816 | . 000 | . 000 | . 000 |
| 3400 | 9.276 | 53.584 | 46.014 | 25.738 | . 000 | .000 | . 000 |
| 3500 | 7.316 | 53.854 | 46.234 | 26.670 | . 000 | .000 | .000 |
| 3600 | y. 355 | 54.117 | 46.450 | 27.601 | . 000 | . 000 | .000 |
| 3700 | 9.393 | 54.374 | 46.660 | 28.542 | . 000 | . 000 | . 000 |
| 3800 | 9.432 | 54.625 | 46.866 | 29.484 | . 000 | . 000 | . 000 |
| 3900 | 9.470 | 54.871 | 47.068 | 30.432 | . 000 | . 000 | . 000 |
| 4000 | 9.508 | 55.111 | 47.266 | 31.380 | . 000 | .000 | . 000 |
| 4100 | 9. 545 | 55.346 | 47.460 | 32.333 | . 000 | . 000 | . 000 |
| 4200 | 9.581 | 55.577 | 47.651 | 33.289 | . 000 | . 000 | .000 |
| 4300 | 9.019 | 55.802 | 47.838 | 34.245 | . 000 | . 000 | . 000 |
| 4400 | 9.655 | 56.024 | 48.022 | 35.209 | . 000 | .000 | .000 |
| 4500 | 7.691 | 56.241 | 48.201 | 36.180 | . 000 | . 000 | . 000 |
| 4600 | 9.725 | 56.455 | 48.379 | 37.150 | . 000 | . 000 | . 000 |
| 4700 | 9.759 | 56.664 | 48.553 | 38.122 | . 000 | . 000 | . 000 |
| 4800 | 9.794 | 56.870 | 48.725 | 39.096 | . 000 | . 000 | .000 |
| 4900 | 9.827 | 57.072 | 48.893 | 40.077 | . 000 | . 000 | . 000 |
| 5000 | 9.800 | 57.271 | 49.058 | 41.065 | - 000 | . 000 | .000 |
| 5100 | 9.893 | 57.467 | 49.221 | 42.053 | . 000 | . 000 | . 000 |
| 5200 | 9.927 | 57.659 | 49.381 | 43.044 | . 000 | . 000 | . 000 |
| 5300 | 9.900 | 57.848 | 49.539 | 44.038 | . 000 | . 000 | . 000 |
| 5400 | $9 \cdot 9 \rightarrow 3$ | 58.035 | 49.695 | 45.035 | - 000 | . 000 | . 000 |
| bsoo | $10.0<5$ | 58.218 | 49.848 | 46.036 | . 000 | . 000 | . 000 |
| 5600 | 10.056 | 59.399 | 49.999 | 47.039 | . 000 | . 000 | . 000 |
| 5700 | 10.088 | 58.577 | 50.148 | 48.046 | . 0 OO | . 000 | .000 |
| 5800 | 14.120 | 58.753 | 50.295 | 49.057 | - 000 | . 000 | . 000 |
| 5900 | 10.149 | 58.926 | 50.440 | 50.070 | .000 | . 000 | . 000 |
| b000 | 10.180 | 59.097 | 50.583 | 51.086 | . 0 no | . 000 | . 000 |

July 31, 1972

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Point Group } C_{2 v} \\
& \mathrm{~S}_{298.15}^{\circ}=48.801 \text { gibbs mol }
\end{aligned}
$$

Electronic Level (quantum weight) and Vibrational Frequencies (Degeneracies)

| $\varepsilon_{, ~ \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}}(\mathrm{~g})$ |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | $(2)$ | $[2305](1)$ | $1110(1)$ | $[2367](1)$ |
| 10393 | $(2)$ | $[2305](1)$ | $[500](1)$ | $[2367](1)$ |

```
Bond Distance: \(N-D=1.024 \AA\)
Bond Angle: \(\quad \mathrm{D}-\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{D}=103.4^{\circ}\)
Products of Moments of Inertia: \(I_{A} I_{B} I_{C}=58.53 \times 10^{-120} \mathrm{~g}^{3} \mathrm{~cm}^{6}\)
```


## Heat of Formation

$\Delta f_{298}^{\circ}$ of $\mathrm{ND}_{2}(\mathrm{~g})$ was calculated from the JANAF selection for $\Delta \mathrm{Hf}_{298}^{\circ}$ of $\mathrm{NH}_{2}(\mathrm{~g})$, the JANAF thermal functions and the zero point energies of $H_{2}(g), D_{2}(g), \mathrm{NH}_{2}(g)$, and $\mathrm{ND}_{2}(\mathrm{~g})$. The zero point energies of $\mathrm{H}_{2}(\mathrm{~g})$, $\mathrm{D}_{2}(\mathrm{~g})$ were those given by G. Herzberg and A. Monfils, J. Mol. Spectroscopy 5 , 482 (1960). The zero point energies of $\mathrm{NH}_{2}(\mathrm{~g}$ ) and $\mathrm{ND}_{2}(\mathrm{~g})$ were estimated from vibrational frequencies given by D. E. Milligan and M. E. Jacox, J. Chem. Phys. 43, 4487 (1965) who observed the infrared and visible spectrum of matrix isolated $\mathrm{NH}_{2}$ and $\mathrm{ND}_{2}$.

Heat Capacity and Entropy
The bond distances and angles are from the electronic absorption spectrum (c.f. $\mathrm{NH}_{2}$ ). The vibrational frequencies are from D. E. Milligan and M. E. Jacox, J. Chem. Phys. 43, 4487 (1965).

| T, ${ }^{\circ} \mathbf{K}$ | Cp ${ }^{\circ}$ | gibbs/r $S^{\circ}$ | $-\overline{\left(\mathrm{G}^{\circ}-\mathrm{H}^{\circ} 298\right) / \mathrm{T}}$ | $\mathrm{H}^{\circ}-\mathrm{H}^{\circ} 288$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { kcal/mol } \\ \Delta H f^{\circ} \end{gathered}$ | $\Delta \mathrm{Gf}{ }^{\circ}$ | $\log \mathbf{K p}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | . 000 | . 000 | INFINITE | -2.3.85 | 44.999 | 44.999 | INFINITE |
| 100 | 7.949 | 40.057 | 55.959 | -1.590 | 44.790 | 45.386 | -99.192 |
| 200 | 7.992 | 45.573 | 49.544 | -. 794 | 44.532 | 46.084 | -50.358 |
| 298 | 8.227 | 48.801 | 48.801 | . 000 | 44.300 | 45.896 | -34.376 |
| 300 | 8.233 | 48.852 | 48.801 | . 015 | 44.296 | 46.912 | -34.175 |
| 400 | 8.619 | 51.271 | 49.128 | . 857 | 44.092 | 47.816 | -20.126 |
| 500 | 9.070 | 53.241 | 49.759 | 1.741 | 43.924 | 48.767 | -21.316 |
| 600 | 9.549 | 54.937 | 50.484 | 2.672 | 43.793 | 49.748 | -18.121 |
| 700 | 10.025 | 56.445 | 51.230 | 3.651 | 43.695 | 50.748 | -15.844 |
| 800 | 10.472 | 57.814 | 51.969 | 4.676 | 43.627 | 51.761 | -14.140 |
| 900 | 10.877 | 59.071 | 52.689 | 5.744 | 43.578 | 52.781 | -12.817 |
| 1000 | 11.235 | 60.236 | 53.386 | 6.850 | 43.548 | 53.305 | -11.7ち9 |
| 1100 | 11.546 | 61.321 | 54.059 | 7.989 | 43.532 | 54.833 | -1U.894 |
| 1200 | 11.817 | 62.338 | 54.707 | 9.158 | 43.523 | 55.359 | -10.173 |
| 1300 | 12.051 | 63.293 | 55.331 | 10.351 | 43.525 | 56.887 | $-9.564$ |
| 1400 | 12.250 | 64.194 | 55.932 | 11.567 | 43.530 | 57.915 | -9.041 |
| 1 bou | 12.437 | 65.046 | 56.511 | 12. $8 \cap 2$ | 43.539 | 58.943 | -8.588 |
| 1600 | 12.599 | 65.854 | 57.070 | 14.054 | 43.549 | 59.969 | -8.191 |
| 1700 | 12.746 | 66.622 | 57.610 | 15.321 | 43.562 | 60.994 | -7.841 |
| 1800 | 12.882 | 67.355 | 58.131 | 16.603 | 43.579 | 62.019 | -7.530 |
| 1900 | 13.009 | 68.055 | 58.635 | 17.397 | 43.597 | 63.043 | -7.252 |
| 2000 | 13.130 | 68.725 | 59.123 | 19.204 | 43.621 | 64.067 | -7.001 |
| 2100 | 13.247 | 69.368 | 59.596 | 20.523 | 43.642 | 65.086 | -0.774 |
| 2200 | 13.361 | 69.987 | 60.054 | 21.854 | 43.672 | 66.110 | $\rightarrow$ - 0.567 |
| 2300 | 13.473 | 70.584 | 60.499 | 23.195 | 43.703 | 67.128 | -0.379 |
| 2400 | 13.582 | 71.159 | 60.931 | 24.548 | 43.737 | 68.146 | -0.206 |
| 2500 | 13.690 | 71.715 | 61.351 | 25.912 | 43.779 | 69.163 | -0.046 |
| 2600 | 13.790 | 72.255 | 61.760 | 27.296 | 43.820 | 70.177 | -5.899 |
| 2700 | 13.900 | 72.778 | 62.159 | 28.671 | 43.869 | 71.190 | -5.762 |
| 2800 | 14.003 | 73.285 | 62.547 | 30.066 | 43.923 | 72.201 | -5.636 |
| 2900 | 14.103 | 73.778 | 62.926 | 31.471 | 43.978 | 73.211 | -5.517 |
| 3000 | 14.201 | 74.258 | 63.296 | 32.396 | 44.042 | 74.218 | -5.407 |
| 3100 | 14.290 | 74.725 | 63.657 | 34.311 | 44.106 | 75.221 | $-5.303$ |
| 3200 | 14.387 | 75.181 | 64.010 | 35.745 | 44.192 | 76.224 | -5.206 |
| 3300 | 14.476 | 75.625 | 64.355 | 37.189 | 44.258 | 77.222 | -5.114 |
| 3400 | 14.560 | 76.058 | 64.693 | 38.640 | 44.343 | 78.222 | -5.028 |
| 3500 | 14.641 | 76.481 | 65.024 | 40.101 | 44.425 | 79.216 | -4.946 |
| 3600 | 14.718 | 76.895 | 65.348 | 41.569 | 44.515 | 80.212 | -4.870 |
| 3700 | 14.790 | 77.299 | 65.666 | 43.044 | 44.602 | 81.199 | -4.796 |
| 3500 | 14.858 | 77.694 | 65.977 | 44.526 | 44.595 | 82.186 | -4.727 |
| 3900 | 14.922 | 78.081 | 66.282 | 46.015 | 44.788 | 83.171 | -4.661 |
| 4000 | 14.98 C | 78.460 | 66.582 | 47.511 | 44.896 | 84.153 | -4.598 |
| 4100 | 15.037 | 78.830 | 66.876 | 49.012 | 44.985 | 85.133 | -4.538 |
| 4200 | 15.083 | 79.193 | 67.165 | 50.518 | 45.085 | 86.114 | -4.481 |
| 4300 | 15.134 | 79.549 | 67.449 | 52.029 | 45.190. | 87.090 | - +.426 |
| 4400 | 15.177 | 79.897 | 67.728 | 53.545 | $45.291^{\circ}$ | 88.064 | -4.374 |
| 4500 | 15.215 | 80.239 | 68.002 | 55.064 | 45.3R8 | 89.030 | -4.324 |
| 4600 | 1b. 2 bu | 80.574 | 68.272 | 56.597 | 45.489 | 90.003 | -4.276 |
| 4700 | 15.280 | 80.90 ? | 68.537 | 58.114 | 45.592 | 90.969 | -4.230 |
| 4800 | 15.300 | 81.224 | 68.798 | 59.643 | 45.694 | 91.938 | -4.186 |
| 4900 | 15.331 | 51.540 | 69.055 | 61.175 | 45.792 | 92.897 | -4.143 |
| 5000 | 15.352 | 81.850 | 69.308 | 62.709 | 45.885 | 93.1257 | -4.102 |
| 5100 | 15.369 | 82.154 | 69.557 | 64.246 | 45.979 | 94.815 | -4.063 |
| b200 | 15.384 | 82.452 | 69.802 | 65.793 | 46.072 | 95.771 | -4.025 |
| 5300 | 15.395 | 82.746 | 70.043 | 67.322 | 46.162 | 96.723 | -3.988 |
| 5400 | 15.405 | 83.033 | 70.281 | 68.362 | 46.250 | 97.680 | -3.953 |
| bらUu | 15.411 | 83.316 | 70.516 | 70.403 | 46.334 | 98.529 | -3.919 |
| 5000 | 15.416 | 83.594 | 70.747 | 71.944 | 46.416 | 99.580 | -3.886 |
| 5700 | 15.413 | 83.867 | 70.974 | 73.486 | 46.494 | 100.529 | -3.854 |
| 5800 | 15.41 b | 84.135 | 71.199 | 75.028 | 46.563 | 101.477 | -3.824 |
| 5900 | 15.417 | 84.398 | 71.421 | 76.570 | 46.639 | 102.421 | -3.794 |
| 6000 | 15.414 | 84.658 | 71.639 | 78.111 | 45.707 | 103.367 | -3.765 |

```
Point Group \(C_{2 v}\)
\(\mathrm{S}^{\circ}{ }_{298.15}=53.616 \mathrm{gibbs} \mathrm{mol}{ }^{-1}\)
```

$\Delta H f_{298.15}^{\circ}=49.5 \pm 0.5{\mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}^{-1}}^{-1}$

Ground State Quantum Weight $=1$
Vibrational Frequencies and Degeneracies

| $\omega_{2} \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$ | $\omega_{2} \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$ <br> $[2300](1)$ <br> $[1490](1)$ <br> $[1058](1)$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| $[1150](1)$ |  |
| 750$](1)$ |  |

Bond Distance: $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{N}=[1.230] \AA \quad \mathrm{N}-\mathrm{H}=[1.014]^{\circ} \AA$
Bond Angle: $\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{H}=\left[100^{\circ}\right] \quad \sigma=2$
Product of Moments of Inertia: $I_{A} I_{B} I_{G}=3.8165 \times 10^{-117} \mathrm{~g}^{3} \mathrm{~cm}{ }^{6}$

## Heat of Formation

$\Delta H f_{298}^{\circ}$ of $\mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{D}_{2}(\mathrm{~g})$ was estimated from $\Delta 4 \mathrm{C}_{298}^{\circ}$ of $\mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{H}_{2}(\mathrm{~g}), 50.9 \pm 5 \mathrm{kcal}$ mol ${ }^{-1}$, given in JaNaF Thermochemical Tables, 2nd Edition, NSRDS-NBS-37, June (1971), the appropriate thermal functions (see tables for $N_{2} D_{2}, H_{2}, D_{2}$ and $\mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{H}_{2}$ (JANAF loc. cit.)) and the estimated zero point energies. The energies for $\mathrm{H}_{2}(\mathrm{~g})$, $\mathrm{D}_{2}(\mathrm{~g})$ are those given by G. Herzberg and A. Monfils, J. Molec. Spectroscopy 5, 482 (1960). The energies for $\mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{D}_{2}(\mathrm{~g})$ and $\mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{H}_{2}(\mathrm{~g})$ are taken to be one half the sum of the vibrational frequencies given above and for $\mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{H}_{2}$ (g) (JANAF, loc. cit.).

## Heat Capacity and Entropy

The bond distances and angle were obtained from a quantum mechanical calculation by G. W. Wheland and P. S. K. Chen, J. Chem. Phys, 24, 67 (1956). The three principal moments of inertia are $I_{A}=0.6122, I_{B}=2.2094$, $I_{c}=2.8216 \times 10^{-39} \mathrm{~g} \mathrm{~cm}{ }^{2}$. The infrared spectrum of $N_{2} D_{2}(g)$ has been observed using matrix isolation techniques by K. Rosengren and G. Pimentel, J. Ghem. Phys. 43, 507 (1965). They have observed $\omega_{1}$ or $\omega_{4}=2400 \mathrm{~cm}{ }^{-1}, w_{2}=$ $1490 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$, and $w_{3}=1058 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$.

| T, ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{K}$ | gibbs/mol |  |  | kcal/mol |  |  | $\log K p$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Cp ${ }^{\circ}$ | $\mathrm{S}^{\circ}$ | $-\left(\mathrm{G}^{\circ}-\mathrm{H}^{\circ} 288\right) / \mathrm{T}$ | $\mathbf{H}^{\circ}-\mathrm{H}^{\circ}{ }_{288}$ | $\Delta H{ }^{\circ}$ | $\triangle \mathrm{Gf}$ |  |
| 0 | . 000 | . 000 | INFINITE | -2.464 | 51.156 | 51.156 | INF1NITE |
| 100 | 7.954 | 44.544 | 61.231 | -1.669 | 50.601 | 52.657 | -115.082 |
| 200 | 9.310 | 50.125 | 54.433 | -. 862 | 50.005 | 54.947 | -6U.043 |
| 298 | 9.327 | 53.616 | 53.616 | . 000 | 49.500 | 57.483 | -42.136 |
| 3013 | 9.350 | 53.674 | 53.617 | . 017 | 49.491 | 57.532 | -41.912 |
| 400 | 10.632 | 56.538 | 53.998 | 1.016 | 49.095 | 60.277 | -32.934 |
| 500 | 11.867 | 59.1045 | 54.702 | 2.142 | 48.918 | 63.106 | -27.583 |
| 600 | 12.972 | 61.309 | 55.667 | 3.385 | 48.644 | 65.981 | -24.034 |
| 700 | 13.930 | 63.382 | 56.623 | 4.731 | 48.549 | 68.878 | -21.505 |
| 800 | 14.747 | 65.297 | 57.589 | 6.165 | 48.519 | 71.785 | -19.611 |
| gue | 15.437 | 67.075 | 58.545 | 7.676 | 48.533 | 74.694 | -18.138 |
| 1000 | 15.016 | 68.733 | 59.483 | 9.250 | 43.584 | 77.597 | -10.959 |
| 1100 | 16.505 | 70.283 | 60.395 | 10.877 | 48.561 | 80.496 | -15.993 |
| 1200 | 16.91+ | 71.737 | 61.280 | 12.548 | 48.754 | 83.385 | -15.187 |
| 1300 | 17.250 | 73.105 | 52.138 | 14.258 | 48.867 | 86.256 | -14.503 |
| 1400 | 17.552 | 74.395 | 62.967 | 15.999 | 48.987 | 99.139 | -13.915 |
| 1500 | 17.802 | 75.615 | 63.770 | 17.767 | 49.115 | 92.003 | -13.405 |
| 1500 | 18.015 | 76.770 | 64.547 | 19.558 | 49.246 | 94.858 | -12.957 |
| 1700 | 18.196 | 77.868 | 65.299 | 21.369 | 49.381 | 97.704 | -12.561 |
| 1300 | 18.357 | 78.913 | 66.026 | 23.196 | 49.519 | 100.542 | -12.207 |
| 1900 | 18.495 | 79.900 | 66.731 | 25.1039 | 49.659 | 103.373 | -11.891 |
| 2000 | 19.610 | 80.361 | 67.414 | 26.895 | 49.803 | 106.199 | -11.605 |
| 2100 | 18.722 | 81.772 | ¢6. 6.075 | 28.752 | 49.041 | 109.012 | -11.345 |
| 2200 | 18.815 | 82.545 | 68.718 | 30.6 .39 | 50.084 | 111.824 | -11.109 |
| 2300 | 18.899 | 83.484 | 69.342 | 32.525 | 50.225 | 114.626 | -11.892 |
| 2400 | 14.972 | 84.299 | 69.948 | 34.418 | 50.364 | 117.424 | -10.693 |
| 2500 | 19.033 | 85.065 | 70.538 | 36.319 | 50.506 | 120.215 | -10.509 |
| 2000 | 17.097 | 85.813 | 71.111 | 38.226 | 50.641 | 123.001 | -10.339 |
| 2700 | 19.150 | 86.535 | 71.609 | 40.138 | 50.778 | 125.782 | -10.181 |
| 2800 | 19.195 | 87.232 | 72.212 | 42.056 | 50.914 | 128.557 | -10.034 |
| 2900 | 19.241 | 87.907 | 72.742 | 43.978 | 51.1045 | 131.329 | -y. 897 |
| 3000 | 19.261 | 83.560 | 73.258 | 45.904 | 51.177 | 134.095 | -9.769 |
| 3100 | 19.317 | 89.192 | 73.762 | 47.834 | 51.303 | 136.855 | -9.648 |
| 5200 | 19.349 | 89.305 | 74.254 | 49.757 | 51.434 | 139.612 | -9.535 |
| 3300 | 19.379 | 90.402 | 74.734 | 51.704 | 51.559 | 142.364 | -9.428 |
| 3400 | 19.4197 | 90.981 | 75.204 | 53.643 | 51.686 | 145.118 | -9.328 |
| 3500 | 19.432 | 91.544 | 75.603 | $55.59,5$ | 51.804 | 147.0.61 | -4.233 |
| 5000 | 19.455 | 92.092 | 76.111 | 57.529 | 51.923 | 150.507 | -y. 143 |
| 3100 | 19.477 | 92.625 | 76.551 | 59.476 | 52.035 | 15.3.344 | -9.058 |
| 3300 | 19.497 | 93.145 | 76.980 | 61.425 | 52.146 | 156.1080 | -8.977 |
| S900 | 19.515 | 93.551 | 77.461 | 63.375 | 52.252 | 158.214 | -8.900 |
| 4000 | 19.532 | 94.145 | 77.814 | 65.328 | 52.359 | 161.543 | -8.826 |
| 4100 | 19.548 | 94.528 | 78.218 | 67.282 | 52.461 | 164.270 | -8.756 |
| 4200 | 19.563 | 95.100 | 78.615 | 69.237 | 52.560 | 166.999 | -8.090 |
| $+500$ | 19.577 | 95.550 | 79.003 | 71.194 | 52.561 | 169.724 | -8.626 |
| +400 | 19.590 | 96.010 | 74.385 | 73.153 | 52.754 | 172.446 | -8.565 |
| 4500 | 19.602 | 96.451 | 79.759 | 75.112 | 52.839 | 175.160 | -8.507 |
| 4600 | 17.615 | 96.842 | 80.127 | 77.073 | 52.927 | 177.383 | -8.451 |
| 4700 | 19.684 | 97.304 | 80.488 | 79.035 | 53.013 | 180.597 | -8.398 |
| 4300 | 19.634 | 97.717 | 80.842 | 80.798 | 53.096 | 183.310 | -5.347 |
| 4900 | 19.643 | 98.122 | 81.191 | $82.96 ?$ | 53.173 | 196.023 | -0.297 |
| 5000 | 14.652 | 98.519 | 31.533 | 34.925 | 53.242 | 188.734 | -8.2b0 |
| 5100 | 19.0́ol | 98.908 | 81.870 | 96.972 | 53.312 | 191.441 | -8.204 |
| 5200 | 19.669 | 99.290 | 82.202 | 88.859 | 53.379 | 194.150 | -b. 160 |
| 5300 | 19.675 | 99.664 | 82.528 | 90.826 | 53.443 | 196.853 | -8.117 |
| $5+00$ | 10.685 | 100.032 | 82.948 | 92.794 | 53.504 | 199.561 | -8.077 |
| bouo | 19.690 | 100.394 | 83.164 | 94.752 | 53.559 | 202.265 | -8.037 |
| 勺600 | 19.695 | 100.748 | 83.475 | 95.732 | 53.514 | 204.968 | -7.999 |
| 5700 | 19.702 | 101.097 | 83.751 | 98.702 | 53.564 | 207.672 | -7.963 |
| ¢800 | 19.7U | 101.440 | 84.083 | 170.672 | 53.709 | 210.374 | -7.927 |
| 5900 | 19.71 s | 101.777 | 84.380 | 102.543 | 53.752 | 2.13.072 | -7.893 |
| 6000 | 19.71\% | 102.108 | 84.672 | 104.615 | 53.792 | 215.773 | -7.800 |

```
Point Group \(\quad C_{2 v}\)
\(\mathrm{S}_{298.15}^{\circ}=47.378 \mathrm{cal} \mathrm{deg}^{-1} \mathrm{~mol}^{-1}\)
```

$\Delta \mathrm{Hf}_{0}^{\circ}=-58.856 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}{ }^{-1}$
$\Delta H f_{298.15}^{\circ}=-59.561 \pm 0.016 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}^{-1}$
Ground State Quantum Weight $=1$
$\omega, \mathrm{cm}^{-1}$
2671.69 (1)
1178.33 (1)
2788.02 (1)

Bond Lengths and Ang1e: $0-D$ Distance $=0.958 \AA$
$\begin{aligned} \text { D-0-D Angle } & =104.45^{\circ} \\ \text { Product of Moments of Inertia: } I_{A} I_{B} I_{C} & =39.948 \times 10^{-120} \mathrm{~g}^{3} \mathrm{~cm}^{6}\end{aligned}$

## Heat of Formation

Rossini, Knowlton, and Johnston (1) measured the ratio of the heats of formation of $\mathrm{D}_{2} 0(\ell)$. Recalculation of their results (using $\left\langle\mathrm{Hf}_{298}^{\circ}\right.$ of $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(\ell)=-68.315 \pm 0.010 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}^{-1}$, see $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(\mathrm{g})$ table) yields $\Delta \mathrm{Hf}_{298}^{\circ}$ of $\mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}(\ell)-$. $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(\ell)=-2.1098 \pm 0.01492 \times \Delta \mathrm{Hf}_{298}^{\circ}\left[\mathrm{HDO}(\ell)-\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(\ell)\right] \pm .016 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}^{-1}$. Using a value of $32 \pm 30$ cal. for the reaction $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(\ell)+\mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}(\ell)=2 \mathrm{HDO}(\ell)$ (from (2); some justification that the uncertainty may be smaller is given by Van Hook (3), see also HDO tables) one obtains $\Delta \mathrm{Hf}_{298}^{\circ}\left[\mathrm{D}_{2} 0(\ell)-\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(\ell)\right]=-2.094 \pm 0.016 \mathrm{kcal}$ mol ${ }^{-1}$.

The difference between the heats of vaporization of $\mathrm{D}_{2} 0(\ell)$ and $\mathrm{H}_{2} 0(\ell)$ at 298 K were evaluated as follows. By direct calorimetry, Rossini, Knowlton, and Johnston (1) determined the ratio of the heats of vaporization of $H_{2} 0(\ell) / D_{2} O(\ell)$ at 298 K and zero pressure to be $0.969503 \pm 0.00070$; (2) Bartholomé and clusius (4) deternined the heat of vaporization of $D_{2} O(\ell)$ by direct calorimetry at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Recalculation of their results using the energy equivalent of a Bunsen ice calorimeter given by (5) (compression correction assumed zero) and neglecting gas imperfection corrections yields $12.637 \pm 0.026 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}^{-1}$. The heat of vaporization of $\mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}(\ell)$ at $25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ was calculated using the heat of fusion of $D_{2} O(\ell)$ selected by (6) and (7), the condensed phase heat capacity data of $D_{2} O(\ell)$ given by Long and Kemp (8) snd the gas phase thermal functions of Friedman and Haar (see next section); (3) The difference in heats of vaporization of $D_{2} O(\ell)$ and $D_{2} O(g)$ was derived by differentiating the formula given by Jones (9) (see (10) for a comparison with other measurements) for the ratio of the vapor pressures of $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(\ell) / \mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}(\ell)$ as a function of temperature and assuming negligible corrections for gas imperfection corrections (see (11), however).


Selecting $0.331 \pm .008 \mathrm{kcal}$ mol ${ }^{-1}$ for the difference in the heats of vaporization, one obtains $-1.763 \pm 0.018 \mathrm{kcsl}$ mol ${ }^{-1}$ for $\Delta \mathrm{Hf}_{298}^{\circ}$ of $\mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}(\mathrm{g})-\mathrm{H}_{2} 0(\mathrm{~g})$. The "spectroscopic" value for this difference was calculated to be $-1.768 \pm 0.015$ kcal mol ${ }^{-1}$ based on the zero point energies given by Hulston (13) for $H_{2} \mathrm{O}(\mathrm{g}), \mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}(\mathrm{g})$, Herzberg and Monfils (14) for $\mathrm{H}_{2}(\mathrm{~g}), \mathrm{D}_{2}(\mathrm{~g})$, and the appropriate thermal functions $\left(\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(\mathrm{g})(15)\right.$, see tables for $\mathrm{H}_{2}(\mathrm{~g}), \mathrm{D}_{2}(\mathrm{~g})$, $\mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}(\mathrm{g})$ ). To close the consistency check, the "spectroscopic" value of $\Delta H_{298}^{\circ}$ of $\mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}(\mathrm{g})$ minus $\mathrm{HDO}(\mathrm{g})$ is $-0.916 \pm 0.0015 \mathrm{kcal}$ mol ${ }^{-1}$ and the "nonspectroscopic" value for this difference is (see HDO tables, reaction $A$ ) is $(-1.763 \pm 0.0018)+(0.846 \pm 0.006)=$ $-0.917 \pm 0.019 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}^{-1} . \Delta \mathrm{Hf}_{298}^{\circ}$ of $\mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}(\mathrm{g})-\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(\mathrm{g})$ and $\Delta \mathrm{Hf}_{298}^{\circ}$ of $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(\mathrm{g})=-57.795 \pm 0.010 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}{ }^{-1}$ (12). Heat Capacity and Entropy

The thermodynamic functions of this table are analogous to those in the JANAF table for $\mathrm{H}_{2} 0$ ( g ) (dated March 31 , 1961): both tables are taken from A. S. Friedman and L. Haar, J. Chem. Phys. 22, 2051 (1954). Friedman and Haar applied their non-rigid-rotor, anharmonic-oscillator treatment (with vibrational-rotational coupling terms and lowtemperature rotational corrections) to the infrared-spectra analyses of W. S. Benedict, N. Gailar, and E. K. Plyler, J. Chem. Phys. 21, 1301 (1953) and of W. S. Benedict, H. H. Claasen, and J. H. Shaw, J. Research Nat. Bur. Standards 49, 91 (1952). In the present table for $D_{2} 0$, the values of $C_{p}^{\circ}$ of Friedman and Haar between 4000 and 5000 K were extrapolated linearly (except with a term in $\mathrm{T}^{-2}$ ) from 5000 to 6000 K .
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(Ideal Gas)
$G F W=20.027$

| T, ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{K}$ | gibbs/mol |  |  | -kcal/mol |  |  | $\log K_{p}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Cp ${ }^{\circ}$ | $\mathrm{S}^{\circ}$ | $-\left(\mathrm{G}^{\circ}-\mathrm{H}^{\circ} 298\right) / \mathrm{T}$ | $\mathrm{H}^{\circ}-\mathrm{H}^{\circ} 298$ | $\triangle H L^{\circ}$ | $\Delta \mathrm{Gf}$ |  |
| 0 | . 000 | . 000 | INFINITE | $-2.380$ | -58.856 | -58.856 | INFINITE |
| 100 | 7.958 | 38.634 | 54.529 | -1.590 | -59.069 | -58.169 | 127.129 |
| 200 | 7.994 | 44.156 | 48.119 | -. 793 | -59.326 | -57.168 | 62.471 |
| 298 | 8.187 | 47.378 | 47.378 | . 000 | -59.561 | -56.059 | 41.092 |
| 300 | 8.192 | 47.429 | 47.378 | . 015 | -59.565 | -56.037 | 40.823 |
| 400 | 8.517 | 49.828 | 47.703 | . 850 | -59.783 | -54.827 | 29.956 |
| 500 | 8.887 | 51.768 | 48.328 | 1.720 | -59.979 | $=53.565$ | 23.413 |
| 600 | 9.282 | 53.423 | 49.042 | 2.628 | -60.154 | -52.267 | 19.038 |
| 700 | 9.690 | 54.884 | 49.775 | 3.577 | -60.307 | -50.940 | 15.904 |
| 800 | 10.098 | 56.205 | 50.497 | 4.566 | -60.439 | -49.593 | 13.548 |
| 900 | 10.490 | 57.417 | 51.200 | 5.596 | -60.553 | -48.230 | 11.712 |
| 1000 | 10.856 | 58.542 | 51.878 | 6.664 | -60.648 | -46.855 | 10.240 |
| 1100 | 11.191 | 59.592 | 52.532 | 7.766 | -60.727 | -45.471 | 9.034 |
| 1200 | 11.494 | 60.580 | 53.162 | 8.901 | -60.793 | -44.082 | 8.028 |
| 1300 | 11.765 | 61.510 | 53.769 | 10.064 | -60.845 | -42.687 | 7.176 |
| 1400 | 12.006 | 62.391 | 54.354 | 11.253 | -60.888 | -41.289 | 6.445 |
| 1500 | 12.222 | 63.227 | 54.917 | 12.464 | $-60.923$ | -39.887 | 5.811 |
| 1600 | 12.413 | 64.022 | 55.462 | 13.696 | -60.953 | -38.485 | 5.257 |
| 1700 | 12.584 | 64.780 | 55.988 | 14.946 | -60.977 | -37.079 | 4.767 |
| 1800 | 12.737 | 65.504 | 56.497 | 16.213 | -60.995 | -35.673 | 4.331 |
| 1900 | 12.874 | 66.196 | 56.989 | 17.493 | -61.012 | -34.267 | 3.942 |
| 2000 | 12.997 | 66.860 | 57.466 | 18.787 | -61.023 | -32.858 | 3.591 |
| 2100 | 13.109 | 67.496 | 57.929 | 20.092 | -61.037 | -31.451 | 3.273 |
| 2200 | 13.210 | 68.108 | 58.377 | 21.408 | -61.045 | -30.039 | 2.984 |
| 2300 | 13.301 | 68.698 | 58.814 | 22.734 | -61.053 | -28.631 | 2.721 |
| 2400 | 13.385 | 69.266 | 59.237 | 24.068 | -61.063 | -27.220 | 2.479 |
| 2500 | 13.462 | 69.814 | 59.650 | 25.410 | -61.069 | -25.810 | 2.256 |
| 2600 | 13.533 | 70.343 | 60.051 | 26.760 | -61.080 | -24.399 | 2.051 |
| 2700 | 13.598 | 70.855 | 60.441 | 28.117 | -61.088 | -22.989 | 1.861 |
| 2800 | 13.658 | 71.351 | 60.822 | 29.480 | -61.098 | -21.576 | 1.684 |
| 2900 | 13.714 | 71.831 | 61.194 | 30.849 | -61.112 | -20.164 | 1.520 |
| 3000 | 13.766 | 72.297 | 61.556 | 32.222 | $-61.124$ | -18.753 | 1.366 |
| 3100 | 13.815 | 72.749 | 61.910 | 33.602 | -61.140 | -17.339 | 1.222 |
| 3200 | 13.860 | 73.188 | 62.255 | 34.986 | -61.152 | -15.927 | 1.088 |
| 3300 | 13.904 | 73.615 | 62.593 | 36.375 | -61.168 | -14.515 | . 961 |
| 3400 | 13.944 | 74.031 | 62.923 | 37.766 | -61.184 | -13,099 | . 842 |
| 3500 | 13.982 | 74.436 | 63.246 | 39.163 | -61.206 | -11.685 | .730 |
| 3600 | 14.018 | 74.830 | 63.563 | 40.562 | -61.227 | -10.268 | . 623 |
| 3700 | 14.052 | 75.235 | 63.893 | 41.967 | -61.254 | -8.929 | . 527 |
| 3800 | 14.085 | 75.590 | 64.176 | 43.373 | -61.283 | -7.438 | . 428 |
| 3900 | 14.116 | 75.956 | 64.473 | 44.783 | -61.315 | -6.023 | . 338 |
| 4000 | 14.145 | 76.314 | 64.765 | 46.196 | -61.346 | -4.606 | . 252 |
| 4100 | 14.173 | 76.664 | 65.051 | 47.611 | -61.381 | -3.188 | .170 |
| 4200 | 14.200 | 77.005 | 65.332 | 49.030 | -61.416 | -1.766 | . 092 |
| 4300 | 14.226 | 77.340 | 65.607 | 50.452 | -61.451 | -. 344 | . 017 |
| 4400 | 14.251 | 77.667 | 65.878 | 51.875 | -61.493 | 1.078 | -. 054 |
| 4500 | 14.275 | 77.988 | 66.143 | 53.301 | -61.540 | 2.496 | -. 121 |
| 4600 | 14.298 | 78.302 | 66.404 | 54.731 | $-61.584$ | 3.925 | -. 186 |
| 4700 | 14.320 | 78.610 | 66.661 | 56.161 | -61.631 | 5.348 | -. 249 |
| 4800 | 14.341 | 78.911 | 66.912 | 57.594 | -61.677 | 6.779 | -. 309 |
| 4900 | 14.361 | 79.207 | 67.160 | 59.030 | -61.729 | 8.202 | -. 366 |
| 5000 | 14.381 | 79.498 | 67.404 | 60.467 | -61.788 | 9.627 | -. 421 |
| 5100 | 14.401 | 79.782 | 67.644 | 61.905 | -61.846 | 11.059 | -. 474 |
| 5200 | 14.420 | 80.062 | 67.880 | 63.347 | -61.904 | 12.485 | -. 525 |
| 5300 | 14.438 | 80.337 | 68.113 | 64.790 | -61.965 | 13.916 | -. 574 |
| 5400 | 14.455 | 80.507 | 68.342 | 66.234 | -62.028 | 15.351 | -. 621 |
| 5500 | 14.473 | 80.872 | 68.567 | 67.681 | -62.093 | 16.783 | -. 667 |
| 5600 | 14.490 | 81.134 | 68.789 | 69.129 | -62.159 | 18.217 | -. 711 |
| 5700 | 14.507 | 81.390 | 69.008 | 70.578 | -62.229 | 19.651 | -. 753 |
| 5800 | 14.523 | 81.643 | 69.224 | 72.030 | -62.301 | 21.090 | -. 795 |
| 5900 | 14,539 | 81.891 | 69.436 | 73.483 | -62.374 | 22.528 | -.834 |
| 6000 | 14.555 | 82.135 | 69.646 | 74.938 | -62.448 | 23.970 | -. 873 |

> Point Group $\mathrm{C}_{2 \mathrm{v}}$
> $\mathrm{S}_{298.15}^{\circ}=51.428$ cal $\mathrm{deg}^{-1} \mathrm{~mol}^{-1}$
$\Delta \mathrm{Hf}_{0}^{\circ}=-5.02 \pm 0.2 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}^{-1}$
$\Delta \mathrm{Hf}_{298.15}^{\circ}=-5.71 \pm 0.2 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}^{-1}$

Ground State Quantum Weight $=1$
Vibrational Frequencies and Degeneracies

| $\omega, \mathrm{cm}^{-1}$ |
| :--- |
| 1896.38 (1) |
| 855.45 (1) |
| $1999 \quad$ (1) |

Bond Distance: $S-D=1.328 \AA \quad \sigma=2$
Bond Angle: $D-S-D=92.2^{\circ}$
Product of the Moments of Inertia: $I_{A} I_{B} I_{C}=6.016 \times 10^{-119} \mathrm{~g}^{3} \mathrm{~cm}{ }^{6}$

## Heat of Formation

$\Delta \mathrm{Hf}_{298}^{\circ}$ of $\mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{~S}(\mathrm{~g})$ was determined by Kapustinskii and Kankovskii (1) to be $-5.69{ }_{2} \pm 0.06 \mathrm{kcal}$ mol ${ }^{-1}$ (recalculated) from the reaction: $\mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{~S}(\mathrm{~g})+3 / 2 \mathrm{O}_{2}(\mathrm{~g})=\mathrm{SO}_{2}(\mathrm{~g})+\mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}(\mathrm{l})+\mathrm{S}\left(\right.$ rhombic). The difference of $\Delta \mathrm{Hf}{ }_{298}^{\circ}$ of $\mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{~S}(\mathrm{~g}) \mathrm{minus} \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{~S}(\mathrm{~g})$ for their work was calculated using their results for $\Delta H_{298}^{\circ}$ of $\mathrm{NH}_{3}(g),-4.92 \pm 0.08 \mathrm{kcal}$ mol ${ }^{-1}$ (recalculated) in the hope of eliminating possible systematic error due to uncertainty in the product formed.

The "spectroscopic" value of $\Delta \mathrm{Hf}_{298}^{\circ}$ of $\mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{~S}(\mathrm{~g})$ minus $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{~S}(\mathrm{~g})$ was calculated from the appropriate thermal functions (see $\mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{D}_{2}, \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{~S}$ ) and the zero point energies of $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{~S}(\mathrm{~g}), \mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{~S}(\mathrm{~g})(2), \mathrm{D}_{2}(\mathrm{~g})$ (3), and $\mathrm{H}_{2}(\mathrm{~g})$ (3).

The equilibrium data of Grafe, Clusius, and Kruis (4) for the exchange reaction $H_{2}(g)+D_{2} S(g)=D_{2}(g)+H_{2} S(g)$ was analyzed by third and second law methods.

A weighted average of $-0.81 \pm 0.02 \mathrm{kcal}$ mol ${ }^{-1}$ was selected for $\Delta \mathrm{Hf}_{298}^{\circ}$ of $\mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{~S}(\mathrm{~g})$ minus $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{~S}(\mathrm{~g})$ wss sdded to the selected value of $\Delta \mathrm{Hf}_{298}^{\circ}$ of $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{~S}(\mathrm{~g})$ to determine $\Delta \mathrm{Hf}_{298}^{\circ}$ of $\mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{~S}(\mathrm{~g})$.

## Source

Kapustinskii and Kankovskii (1) (1958)
Spectroscopic $(2,3)$
Grafe, Clusius, and Kruis (4) Third Law Second Law

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \frac{\Delta H f_{298}^{\circ} \text { of } \mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{~S}(\mathrm{~g})-\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{~S}(\mathrm{~g})\left(\mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mo1}{ }^{-1}\right)}{-0.771 \pm 0.10} \\
& -0.810 \pm 0.01 \\
& -0.826 \pm 0.05 ; \text { drift } 0.0 \text { e.u. } \\
& -0.887 \pm 0.02 ; \Delta \mathrm{Sf}_{298}^{\circ} \text { (obsv.-calc.) }=+0.18 \pm 0.02 \text { e.u. }
\end{aligned}
$$

## Heat Capacity and Entropy

The thermodynamic functions were estimated from those in the present table for $H_{2} S(g)$ ( $q . v$.) by adding those for $\mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{~S}(\mathrm{~g})$ and subtracting those for $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{~S}(\mathrm{~g})$, where both the added and subtracted functions were generated using the rigid-rotor harmonic oscillator approximation. In this calculation the molecular constants for $D_{2} S$ were taken from reference (2a).
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| $\mathrm{T},{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{K}$ | $\mathrm{Cp}^{\circ}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { gibbs/mol } \\ & \mathrm{S}^{\circ}-\left(\mathrm{G}^{\circ}-\mathrm{H}^{\circ} 298\right) / \mathrm{T} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\mathrm{H}^{\circ}-\mathrm{H}^{\circ} \mathrm{zes}$ | $\begin{gathered} -\mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}- \\ \Delta H \mathrm{f}^{\circ} \end{gathered}$ | $\Delta \mathrm{Gf}$ | $\underline{L o g} \mathrm{~K}_{\mathrm{p}}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | ． 000 | ． 000 | INFINITE | －2．411 | －5． 020 | －5．020 | 1NFIN1TE |
| 100 | 7.950 | 42.510 | 58.667 | －1．516 | －5．046 | －6．307 | 13.784 |
| 200 | 8.110 | 48.050 | 52.130 | －． 816 | －5．345 | －7．46s | 8.150 |
| 298 | 8.547 | 51.428 | 51.428 | ． 000 | －5．710 | －8．445 | 6.191 |
| 300 | 8.555 | 51.481 | 51.429 | － 016 | －5．717 | －8．463 | 6.165 |
| 400 | 9.082 | 54.013 | 51.769 | －898 | －6．631 | －9．298 | 5.080 |
| 500 | 9.642 | 56.100 | 52.433 | 1.834 | －7．334 | －9．883 | 4.320 |
| 600 | 10.199 | 57.908 | 53.197 | 2.826 | －7．904 | －10．337 | 3.765 |
| 700 | 10.716 | 59.519 | 53.988 | 3.872 | －8．371 | －10．682 | 3.335 |
| 800 | 11.173 | 60.981 | 54.772 | 4.967 | －21．823 | －12．251 | 3.347 |
| 900 | 11.509 | 62.321 | 55.537 | 6.105 | －21．860 | －11．052 | 2.084 |
| 1000 | 11.909 | 63.558 | 56.279 | 7.279 | －21．R76 | －9．851 | 2.153 |
| 1100 | 12.190 | 64.706 | 56.993 | R．485 | －21．875 | －8．646 | 1．718 |
| 1200 | 12.440 | 65.778 | 57.681 | 9.717 | －21．864 | －7．446 | 1.356 |
| 1300 | 12.649 | 66.783 | 58.343 | 10.972 | －21．940 | －6．245 | 1.050 |
| 1400 | 12.828 | 67.726 | 58.979 | 12.246 | －21．813 | －5．046 | ． 788 |
| 1500 | 12.983 | 68.617 | 59.593 | 13.536 | －21．782 | －3．851 | ． 561 |
| 1600 | 13.118 | 69.459 | 60.183 | 14.842 | －21．748 | －2．656 | ． 363 |
| 1700 | 15.236 | 70.258 | 60.752 | 16.160 | －21．712 | －1．463 | ． 188 |
| 1800 | 13.342 | 71.018 | 61.302 | 17.489 | －21．673 | －． 275 | ． 033 |
| 1900 | 13.434 | 71.741 | 61.833 | 18.827 | －21．635 | ． 913 | －． 105 |
| 2000 | 15.520 | 72.433 | 62.345 | 20.175 | －21．592 | 2.101 | －． 230 |
| 2100 | 13.595 | 73.094 | 62.841 | 21.531 | －21．555 | 3.281 | －． 342 |
| 2200 | 13.603 | 73.728 | 63.322 | 2．2．894 | －21．512 | 4.467 | －． 444 |
| 2500 | 13.726 | 74.337 | 63.788 | 24.263 | －21．472 | 5.645 | －． 536 |
| 2400 | 15.785 | 74.922 | 64.239 | 25.639 | －21．432 | 6.826 | －． 622 |
| 2500 | 15.854 | 75.487 | 64.679 | 27．020 | －21．38R | 8.001 | －． 699 |
| 2600 | 15.8 88 | 75.030 | 65.104 | 28.406 | －21．351 | 9.176 | －． 771 |
| 2700 | 13.954 | 76.555 | 65.518 | 29.798 | －21．309 | 10.350 | －． 833 |
| 2800 | 13.977 | 77.062 | 65.922 | 31.193 | －21．270 | 11.520 | －． 899 |
| 2900 | 14.017 | 77.553 | 66.315 | 32.593 | －21．234 | 12.691 | －． 950 |
| 3000 | 14.056 | 78.030 | 66.697 | 33.996 | －21．196 | 13.861 | －1．010 |
| 5100 | 14.093 | 78.491 | 67.070 | 35.404 | －21．161 | 15.029 | $-1.060$ |
| 3200 | 14.128 | 78.940 | 67.435 | 36.815 | －21．121 | 16.192 | $-1.100$ |
| 3500 | 14.100 | 79.375 | 67.790 | 38.229 | －21．085 | 17.354 | －1．149 |
| 3400 | 14.192 | 79.798 | 68.137 | 39.547 | －21．046 | 18.525 | －1．191 |
| 3500 | 14.223 | 80.210 | 68.476 | 41.068 | －21．015 | 19.684 | －1．229 |
| 3600 | 14.252 | 80.611 | 08．807 | 42.491 | －20．980 | 20.850 | －1．266 |
| 3700 | 14.280 | 81.001 | 69.131 | 43.919 | －20．952 | 22.012 | －1．300 |
| 3800 | 14.307 | 81.382 | 69.449 | 45.347 | －20．024 | 23.171 | －1．333 |
| 5900 | 14.354 | 81.755 | 69.760 | 46.78 J | －20．898 | 24.326 | －1．363 |
| 4000 | 14.350 | 82． 118 | 70.064 | 43.214 | －20．871 | 25.491 | －1．393 |
| 4100 | 14.585 | 82.473 | 70.363 | 49.651 | －20．846 | 26.645 | －1．42i |
| 4200 | 14.410 | 82.820 | 70.655 | 51．091 | -20.82 ？ | 27.800 | －1．447 |
| 4500 | 14.424 | 83.159 | 70.942 | 52.533 | －20．796 | 28.965 | －1．472 |
| 4400 | 14.457 | 83.491 | 71.224 | 53.978 | －20．776 | 30.121 | －1．490 |
| 4500 | 14.481 | 83． 816 | 71.499 | 55.425 | －20．761 | 31.277 | －1．519 |
| 4600 | 14.502 | 84.134 | 71.770 | 56.874 | －20．743 | 32.430 | －1．541 |
| 4700 | 14.5 ぐ4 | 84.447 | 72.037 | 58．3＞5 | －20．725 | 33.591 | －1．562 |
| 4800 | 14.547 | 84.753 | 72.299 | 59.779 | －20．7n7 | 34.749 | －1．582 |
| 4900 | $1+.508$ | 85.053 | 72.556 | 61.235 | －20．694 | 35.908 | －1．602 |
| buou | 14.590 | 85.347 | 72.809 | 62.693 | $-20.687$ | 37.050 | －1．620 |
| 2100 | 14.009 | 85.636 | 73.057 | 64.153 | －20．678 | 38.215 | －1．033 |
| 5200 | 14.651 | 85.921 | 73.303 | 65.615 | －20．67n | 39.365 | －1．654 |
| 2300 | 1＋．0́s | 85.199 | 73.543 | 57.079 | －20．563 | 40.518 | －1．671 |
| 5400 | 14．6\％1 | 85.474 | 73.780 | 68.545 | －20．658 | 41.675 | －1．687 |
| 5500 | 14.691 | 85.743 | 74.014 | 70.013 | －20．655 | 42.824 | －1．702 |
| 5600 | 14.711 | 87．0n8 | 74.243 | 71.483 | －20．653 | 43.985 | －1．717 |
| 勺700 | 14.731 | 87.268 | 74.469 | 72.955 | －20．653 | 45.138 | －1．731 |
| 5000 | 14.747 | 87.525 | 74.692 | 74.429 | －20．655 | 46.288 | －1．744 |
| 5900 | 14.770 | 87.777 | 74.912 | 75.906 | －20．656 | 47.440 | －1．757 |
| 0000 | $1+.7$ \％${ }^{\text {a }}$ | AR． 025 | 75.128 | 77.383 | －20．661 | 48.602 | －1．770 |

July 31， 1972

Point Group $\mathrm{C}_{3 \mathrm{v}}$
$S_{298.15}^{\circ}=48.715 \mathrm{cal}_{\mathrm{deg}}{ }^{-1} \mathrm{~mol} \mathrm{~m}^{-1}$
Ground State Quantum Weight $=1$
$\Delta \mathrm{Hf}_{0}^{\circ}=-12.34 \mathrm{kcal}^{\mathrm{mol}}{ }^{-1}$
$\Delta H f_{298.15}^{\circ}=-14.00 \pm 0.1 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}^{-1}$

Vibrational Levels and Multiplicities

| $\omega, \mathrm{cm}^{-1}$ |
| ---: |
| 2495 (1) |
| 793 (1) |
| 2652 (2) |
| 1225 (2) |

Bond Length: $N-D=1.0124 \AA \quad$ Bond Angle: $106.67 \quad \sigma=3$
Product of the Moments of Inertia: $I_{A} I_{B} I_{C}=25.775 \times 10^{-119} \mathrm{~g}^{3} \mathrm{~cm}{ }^{6}$

## Heat of Formation

A "spectroscopic" value for $\Delta H f_{298}^{\circ}$ of $\mathrm{ND}_{3}(g)$ minus $\mathrm{NH}_{3}(\mathrm{~g})$ of $-3.029 \pm 0.01 \mathrm{kcal}$ mol ${ }^{-1}$ was calculated from the appropriate thernal functions (see $\mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{D}_{2}, \mathrm{NH}_{3}$ ) zero point energies o $\overline{\mathrm{F}} \mathrm{ND}_{3}\left(\mathrm{~g}\right.$ ) and $\mathrm{NH}_{3}(\mathrm{~g}$ ) [see J. L. Duncan, I. M. Mills, Spectrochim. Acta 20, 523 (1957) and W. S. Benedict, E. K. Plyier, Canad. J. Phys. 35, 1235 (1964)], and the zero point energies of $H_{2}(g)$ and $D_{2}(g)$ given by G. Herzberg and A. Monfils, J. Molec. Spectroscopy 5, 482 (1960).

Analysis of the equilibrium data of Schulz and Schaefer, Ber. Bunsenges. Physik. Chem. 70, 21 (1966) for $\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{p}}^{\circ}$ (1 atm, $660-773 \mathrm{~K}$ ) for $\mathrm{N}_{2}(\mathrm{~g})+3 / 2 \mathrm{D}_{2}(\mathrm{~g})=\mathrm{ND}_{3}(\mathrm{~g})$ gave the following:

$\overline{1}_{\text {Assuming }} \Delta C_{p}^{0}=1.237-0.00608(T-700)$ cal. mol ${ }^{-1}$
Using the results from the same authors data for $\mathrm{NH}_{3}(\mathrm{~g})$ (see $\mathrm{NH}_{3}(\mathrm{~g})$. evaluation) one obtains values of $\mathrm{Hf}_{2}^{\circ}{ }_{2}$ of $\mathrm{ND}_{3}(\mathrm{~g})$ minus $\mathrm{NH}_{3}(\mathrm{~g})$ of $-2.93 \pm 0.14 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}^{-1}$ (third law) and $-3.22 \pm 0.20 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}^{-1}$ (second law). Both values agree with the "spectroscopic" value within combined uncertainty intervals.
$\underset{-1}{\text { A value of }-3.03 \pm 0.010 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}}{ }^{-1}$ was added to the JANAF selection for $\Delta H f_{298}^{\circ}$ of $\mathrm{NH}_{3}(\mathrm{~g}),-10.97 \pm 0.10 \mathrm{kcal}$ mol ${ }^{-1}$, to obtain $\Delta H f_{298}^{\circ}$ of $\mathrm{ND}_{3}(\mathrm{~g})$.

## Heat Capacity and Entropy

The thermodynamic functions were estimated from those in the present table for $\mathrm{NH}_{3}$ (g) (q.v.) by adding those for $\mathrm{ND}_{3}(\mathrm{~g})$ and subtracting those for $\mathrm{NH}_{3}(\mathrm{~g})$, where both the added and subtracted functions were generated using the rigid-rotor harmonic-oscillator approximation. In this calculation the molecular constants for $\mathrm{ND}_{3}$ were taken from J. L. Duncan, I. M. Mills, Spectrochim. Acta 20, 523 (1964) and W. S. Benedict, E. K. Plyler, Can. J. Phys. 35, 1235 (1957).
(Ideal Gas) GFW $=20,0490$

| T, ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{K}$ | gibbs/mol |  |  | -keal/mol ___ _ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Cp ${ }^{\circ}$ | $\mathbf{S}^{\circ}$ | $-\left(\mathrm{G}^{\circ}-\mathrm{H}^{\circ} \mathbf{2 9 8}\right) / \mathrm{T}$ | $\mathbf{H}^{\circ}-\mathrm{H}^{\circ}{ }_{298}$ | $\Delta H{ }^{\circ}$ | $\Delta \mathrm{Gf}{ }^{\circ}$ | $\log K_{p}$ |
| 0 | . 000 | . 000 | INFINITE | -2.446 | -12.338 | -12.338 | INFINITE |
| 100 | 7.958 | 39.695 | 56.253 | -1.656 | -12.880 | -10.901 | 23.824 |
| 200 | 8.258 | 45.267 | 49.519 | -. 850 | -13.481 | -8.685 | 9.490 |
| 298 | 9.136 | 48.715 | 48.715 | . 000 | -14.000 | -6.217 | 4.557 |
| 300 | 9.155 | 48.771 | 48.715 | . 017 | -14.009 | -6.169 | 4.494 |
| 400 | 10.259 | 51.555 | 49.087 | . 987 | -14.433 | -3.488 | 1.906 |
| 500 | 11.323 | 53.961 | 49.826 | 2.067 | -14.756 | -. 713 | . 312 |
| 600 | 12.302 | 56.113 | 50.697 | 3.249 | -14.987 | 2.118 | -. 771 |
| 700 | 13.195 | 58.077 | 51.613 | 4.525 | -15.145 | 4.981 | -1.555 |
| 800 | 14.003 | 59.893 | 52.536 | 5.885 | -15.239 | 7.864 | -2.148 |
| 900 | 14.723 | 61.585 | 53.449 | 7.322 | -15.287 | 1.0.755 | -2.612 |
| 1000 | 15.358 | 63.170 | 54.342 | 8.827 | -15.293 | 13.650 | -2.983 |
| 1100 | 15.912 | 64.660 | 55.213 | 10.391 | -15.266 | 16.544 | -3.287 |
| 1200 | 16.394 | 66.066 | 56.060 | 12.007 | -15.216 | 19.432 | -3.539 |
| 1300 | 16.813 | 67.395 | 56.881 | 13.668 | -15.140 | 22.316 | -3.752 |
| 1400 | 17.177 | 68.654 | 57.677 | 15.368 | -15.050 | 25.194 | -3.933 |
| 1500 | 17.495 | 69.851 | 58.449 | 17.102 | -14.947 | 28.067 | -4.089 |
| 1600 | 17.773 | 70.989 | 59.198 | 18.866 | -14.837 | 30.929 | -4.225 |
| 1700 | 18.016 | 72.074 | 59.924 | 20.655 | -14.719 | 33.786 | -4.344 |
| 1800 | 18.231 | 73.110 | 60.627 | 22.468 | -14.591 | 36.635 | -4.448 |
| 1900 | 18.420 | 74.100 | 61.311 | 24.301 | -14.459 | 39.477 | -4.541 |
| 2000 | 18.587 | 75.050 | 61.974 | 26.151 | -14.319 | 42.315 | -4.624 |
| 2100 | 18.735 | 75.960 | 62.619 | 28.017 | -14.184 | 45.140 | -4.698 |
| 2200 | 18.867 | 76.835 | 63.245 | 29.898 | -14.039 | 47.965 | -4.765 |
| 2300 | 18.984 | 77.676 | 63.854 | 31.790 | -13.895 | 50.779 | -4.825 |
| 2400 | 19.089 | 78.486 | 64.447 | 33.694 | -13.751 | 53.589 | -4.880 |
| 2500 | 19.182 | 79.267 | 65.024 | 35.608 | -13.601 | 56.392 | -4.930 |
| 2600 | 19.264 | 80.021 | 65.587 | 37.530 | -13.460 | 59.188 | -4.975 |
| 2700 | 19.337 | 80.750 | 66.135 | 39.460 | -13.313 | 61.979 | -5.017 |
| 2800 | 19.403 | 81.454 | 66.670 | 41.397 | -13.168 | 64.767 | -5.055 |
| 2900 | 19.459 | 82.136 | 67.191 | 43.340 | -13.029 | 67.548 | -5.091 |
| 3000 | 19.511 | 82.797 | 67.700 | 45.289 | -12.886 | 70.324 | -5.123 |
| 3100 | 19.555 | 83.437 | 68.198 | 47.242 | -12.753 | 73.094 | -5.153 |
| 3200 | 19.592 | 84.059 | 68.684 | 49.200 | -12.611 | 75.860 | -5.181 |
| 3300 | 19.626 | 84.662 | 69.159 | 51.161 | -12.478 | 78.620 | -5.207 |
| 3400 | 19.652 | 85.248 | 69.624 | 53.124 | -12.342 | 81.382 | -5.231 |
| 3500 | 19.676 | 85.818 | 70.078 | 55.091 | -12.220 | 84.135 | -5.254 |
| 3600 | 19.696 | 86.373 | 70.523 | 57.059 | -12.095 | 86.891 | -5.275 |
| 3700 | 19.709 | 86.913 | 70.959 | 59.030 | -11.983 | 89.634 | -5.294 |
| 3800 | 19.720 | 87.439 | 71.386 | 61.001 | -11.873 | 92.378 | -5.313 |
| 3900 | 19.726 | 87.951 | 71.804 | 62.974 | -11.770 | 95.120 | -5.330 |
| 4000 | 19.730 | 88.450 | 72.214 | 64.946 | -11.668 | 97.858 | -5.347 |
| 4100 | 19.730 | 88.938 | 72.616 | 66.919 | -11.574 | 100.593 | -5.362 |
| 4200 | 19.726 | 89.413 | 73.010 | 68.892 | -11.485 | 103.332 | -5.377 |
| 4300 | 19.721 | 89.877 | 73.397 | 70.864 | -11.397 | 106.066 | -5.391 |
| 4400 | 19.710 | 90.330 | 73.777 | 72.836 | -11.323 | 108.797 | -5.404 |
| 4500 | 19.699 | 90.773 | 74.150 | 74.806 | -11.260 | 111.519 | -5.416 |
| 4600 | 19.682 | 91.206 | 74.516 | 76.776 | -11.197 | 114.254 | -5.428 |
| 4700 | 19.664 | 91.629 | 74.875 | 78.743 | -11.140 | 116.979 | -5.440 |
| 4800 | 19.643 | 92.043 | 75.229 | 80.708 | -11.089 | 119.712 | -5.451 |
| 4900 | 19.618 | 92.448 | 75.576 | 82.671 | -11.051 | 122.432 | -5.461 |
| 5000 | 19.590 | 92.845 | 75.918 | 84.634 | -11.023 | 125.151 | -5.470 |
| 5100 | 19.555 | 93.232 | 76.254 | 86.590 | -11.003 | 127.875 | -5.480 |
| 5200 | 19.546 | 93.611 | 76.584 | 88.544 | -10.989 | 130.597 | -5.489 |
| 5300 | 19.538 | 93.984 | 76.909 | 90.499 | -10.981 | 133.314 | -5.497 |
| 5400 | 19.529 | 94.349 | 77.228 | 92.452 | -10.978 | 136.043 | -5.506 |
| 5500 | 19.522 | 94.707 | 77.543 | 94.405. | -10.982 | 138.702 | -5.514 |
| 5600 | 19.514 | 95.059 | 77.853 | 96.357 | -10.991 | 141.485 | -5.522 |
| 5700 | 19.507 | 95.404 | 78.157 | 98.307 | -11.008 | 144.208 | -5.529 |
| ¢800 | 19.500 | 95.744 | 78.458 | 100.258 | -11.030 | 146.932 | -5.537 |
| 5900 | 19.494 | 96.077 | 78.753 | 102.208 | -11.057 | 149.654 | -5.544 |
| 6000 | 19.488 | 96.404 | 79.045 | 104.157 | -11.090 | 152.381 | -5.550 |

$$
\mathrm{S}_{298.15}^{0}=41.508 \mathrm{cal} \mathrm{~K}^{-1} \mathrm{~mol}^{-1}
$$

$$
\begin{gathered}
\mathrm{GFW}=20.0064 \\
\Delta \mathrm{Hf}_{298.15}^{\circ}=-65.14 \pm 0.2 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{~mol}^{-1}
\end{gathered}
$$

## Electronic States and Molecular Constants

| State | $\varepsilon, \mathrm{cm}^{-1}$ | g | $\omega_{\mathrm{e}, \mathrm{cm}}{ }^{-1}$ | $X_{e^{\omega} e^{, c m i n}}$ | $\mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{e}}, \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$ | $\alpha_{e, \mathrm{~cm}}{ }^{-1}$ | $\underline{r_{e}, \AA}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{X}^{1}{ }^{+}$ | 0 | 1 | 4138,73 | 90.05 | 20.9555 | 0.7958 | 0.9168 |
| $\mathrm{V}_{\Sigma}{ }^{+}$ | 83275 | 1 | 1158.46 | 17.718 | 4.0263 | 0.0173 | 2.091 |

Heat of Formation
The heat of formation selected in JANAF Thermochemical Tables, 2nd Edition, June 1971 (U. S. Govt. Printing Office, Washington, D. C. 20402) was adopted.

Heat Capacity and Entropy
The vibrational and rotational constants of the respective electronic levels were taken from $B$. Rosen, Spectroscopic Data Relative to Diatomic Molecules, Pergamon Press, Oxford, 1970. These constants do not differ appreciably from those given in the JANAF (loc. cit.) tables. The values of $\Delta H f^{\circ}, \Delta \mathcal{G}^{\circ}$, and log Kp are appreciably different because of the new thermal functions for $\mathrm{F}_{2}(\mathrm{~g})$ (see $\mathrm{F}_{2}(\mathrm{~g})$ tables).
(Ideal Gas)
GFil $=20,0064$

| T, ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{K}$ | $\mathrm{Cp}^{\circ}$ | gibbs/mol$\mathbf{S}^{\circ} \quad-\left(G^{\circ}-H^{\circ}{ }^{\circ} 98\right) / T$ |  | $\mathbf{H}^{\circ}-\mathbf{H}^{\circ}{ }_{288}$ | _Kcal/mol $\Delta H{ }^{\circ}$ |  | $\log K_{p}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | . Uuc | . 000 | IVFINITE | -2.055 | -65.129 | -55.129 | INFINITE |
| 100 | $6.96{ }^{\text {6 }}$ | 33.902 | 47.698 | -1.380 | -65.159 | -55.312 | 142.739 |
| 200 | 0.962 | 38.727 | 42.144 | -.683 | -65.135 | -65.475 | 71.547 |
| 298 | 5.964 | 41.509 | 41.508 | . 000 | -65.140 | -65.642 | 48.117 |
| 300 | 6.964 | 41.551 | 41.508 | . 013 | -65.141 | -65.645 | 47.822 |
| 400 | 5.907 | 43.554 | 41.781 | . 709 | -65.176 | -55.808 | 35.956 |
| S00 | 6.972 | 45.110 | 42.297 | 1.406 | $-65.230$ | -65.960 | 28.831 |
| 600 | 6.980 | 46.392 | 42.875 | 2. 104 | -65.297 | -65.101 | 24.077 |
| 700 | 7.015 | 47.461 | 43.455 | 2.904 | -65.372 | -66.228 | 20.677 |
| 300 | 7.003 | 48.400 | 44.015 | 3.508 | -65.452 | -66.345 | 18.125 |
| 900 | 7.129 | 49.236 | 44.550 | 4.217 | -65.535 | -66.452 | 10.137 |
| 1000 | 7.210 | 49.991 | 45.057 | 4.934 | -65.617 | -56.550 | 14.544 |
| 1100 | 7.303 | 50.682 | 45.537 | 5.660 | -65.697 | -65.638 | 15.240 |
| 1200 | 7.402 | 51.322 | 45.993 | 6.375 | -65.775 | -66.721 | 12.152 |
| 1300 | 7.504 | 51.919 | 46.426 | 7.140 | -65.949 | -66.797 | 11.230 |
| 1400 | 7.606 | 52.477 | 46.839 | 7.896 | -65.020 | -66.867 | 10.438 |
| 1500 | 7.705 | 53.007 | 47.232 | 8.561 | -65.989 | -66.932 | 9.752 |
| 1000 | 7.800 | 53.507 | 47.609 | 9.435 | -65.056 | $-66.993$ | 9.151 |
| 1700 | 7.991 | 53.983 | 47.970 | 10.221 | -65.119 | -67.049 | 8.620 |
| 1300 | 7.977 | 54.436 | 48.317 | 11.015 | -66.179 | -67.102 | 8.147 |
| 1900 | 8.058 | 54.869 | 48.650 | 11.816 | -65.238 | -67.152 | 7.724 |
| 2000 | 8.133 | 55.285 | 48.972 | 12.626 | -65.294 | -67.198 | $7 \cdot 343$ |
| 2100 | 8.204 | 55.683 | 44.252 | 13.443 | -66.348 | -67. 242 | 0.998 |
| 2200 | 8.270 | 56.066 | 49.582 | 14.266 | -65.401 | -67.284 | 0.0584 |
| 2300 | 8.331 | 56.435 | 49.872 | 15.797 | -66.451 | -67.322 | 0. 397 |
| 2400 | 8.339 | 56.701 | 50.153 | 15.933 | -66.501 | -67.359 | 0.134 |
| 2500 | 3.442 | 57.135 | 50.425 | 16.774 | -66.550 | -67.396 | 5.892 |
| 2600 | 8.493 | 57.467 | 50.690 | 17.621 | -65.597 | -67.427 | 5.608 |
| 2700 | 8. 540 | 57.798 | 50.947 | 18.473 | -66.644 | -67.459 | 5.400 |
| 2800 | 8.584 | 58.100 | 51.197 | 19.329 | -65.690 | -67.489 | 5.208 |
| 2900 | 8.625 | 58.402 | $51.44 \pi$ | 20.189 | -65.735 | -67.514 | 5.088 |
| su00 | 9.604 | 58.695 | 51.677 | 21.054 | -66.780 | -67.541 | 4.920 |
| 3100 | 3.741 | 58.979 | 51.903 | 21.972 | -65.9? 5 | -67.567 | 4.763 |
| 3200 | 8.735 | 59.256 | 52.133 | 22.794 | -66.969 | -57.591 | 4.616 |
| 3500 | 8.760 | 59.525 | 52.353 | 23.669 | -66.914 | -67.611 | 4.478 |
| 3400 | 8.799 | 59.783 | 52.56 A | 24.547 | -66.958 | -67.633 | 4.347 |
| 3500 | 8.829 | 60.043 | 52.778 | 25.129 | -67.002 | -67.650 | 4.224 |
| 3600 | 9.357 | 60.292 | 52.983 | 26.313 | -67.047 | -67.569 | 4.108 |
| 3700 | 8.984 | 60.535 | 53.184 | 27.200 | -67.093 | -67.684 | 3.998 |
| 3300 | 3.91 u | 60.773 | 53.351 | 29.090 | -67.139 | -67.700 | 3.894 |
| 3900 | 8.934 | 61.004 | 53.573 | 28.982 | -67.185 | -67.715 | 3.795 |
| 4000 | 8.958 | 61.231 | 53.762 | 29.877 | -67.232 | -67.728 | 0.700 |
| 4100 | 4.950 | 61.45 ? | 53.947 | 30.774 | -67.290 | -67.739 | S.011 |
| 4200 | 4.0Uく | 61.669 | 54.128 | 31.573 | -67.329 | -67.749 | 3.525 |
| 4300 | 9.023 | 61.881 | 54.306 | 32.574 | -67.378 | -67.759 | 3.444 |
| 4400 | 9.043 | 62.089 | 54.430 | 33.477 | -67.429 | -67.769 | 3.300 |
| 4500 | $\rightarrow \cdot 005$ | 02.292 | 54.652 | 34.383 | -67.480 | -67.775 | 3.292 |
| 4600 | 7.082 | 62.492 | 54.820 | 35.290 | -67.532 | -67.780 | 3.220 |
| 4700 | 9.100 | 62.637 | 54.985 | 36.199 | -67.595 | -67.785 | 3.152 |
| 4300 | 9.11 y | 62.879 | 55.149 | 37.110 | -67.639 | -67.789 | 3.087 |
| 4900 | 9.135 | 63.067 | 55.307 | 38.022 | -67.694 | -67.792 | 3.024 |
| 5000 | 9.152 | 63.252 | 55.464 | 38.937 | -67.749 | -67.795 | c. 963 |
| 5100 | 3.160 | 63.433 | 55.619 | 39.353 | $-67.306$ | -67.794 | 2.905 |
| 5200 | 7.184 | 63.511 | 55.771 | 40.777 | -67.854 | -67.793 | 2.849 |
| 5300 | 9.199 | 63.785 | 55.920 | 41.690 | -67.922 | -67.789 | 2.795 |
| 5400 | 9.215 | 63.959 | 56.0 ós | 42.610 | -67.983 | -67.788 | <. 744 |
| 5500 | 9.230 | 64.128 | 50.21.3 | 43.532 | -68.044 | -67.784 | $<.693$ |
| 5600 | 9.244 | $64.29^{\prime}$ | 56.356 | 44.1456 | -68.105 | -67.779 | 2.645 |
| b/u0 | 9.258 | 64.458 | 56.496 | 45.321 | -68.168 | -67.772 | 2. 598 |
| bsue | 9.272 | 64.619 | 55.635 | 46.309 | $-68.2 .33$ | -67.760 | <. 553 |
| 5900 | 9.236 | 64.778 | 56.77 ? | 47.236 | -63.298 | -67.756 | C. 510 |
| 60013 | 9.300 | 64.934 | 56.906 | 49.155 | -68.363 | -67.748 | c. 408 |
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$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { Ground State Configuration }{ }^{I_{\Sigma}+} & \Delta H f_{0}^{\circ}=0 \\
\mathrm{~S}_{298.15}^{\circ}=48.44 \text { gibbs mol } \\
-1 & \Delta H £_{298.15}^{\circ}=0
\end{array}
$$

## Electronic States and Molecular Constants

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { State } \quad \varepsilon, \mathrm{cm}^{-1} \\
& i_{\Sigma}{ }^{+} \quad 0 \\
& \stackrel{g}{\omega_{e}, c m}{ }^{-1} \\
& 1 \quad 917.85 \\
& \frac{x_{e^{\omega}} e^{, c m}{ }^{-1}}{11.95} \\
& \frac{B_{e}, c m}{}{ }_{0.8892}^{0.0131} \\
& \frac{r_{e}, \AA}{1.40} \\
& \sigma=2
\end{aligned}
$$

## Heat Capacity and Entropy

Molecular and spectroscopic constants were taken from G. Dilonardo and A. E. Douglas, J. Chem. Phys. 56, 5185 (1972).
（Ideal Gas，Reference State）GFH $=37.9968$

| $\mathbf{T},{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{K}$ | $C p^{\circ}$ | gibls／mol |  | － $\mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}$－＿ |  |  | $\log K_{p}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $S^{\circ}$ | $-\left(\mathrm{G}^{\circ}-\mathrm{H}^{\circ} \mathrm{res}\right) / \mathrm{T}$ | $\mathrm{H}^{\circ}-\mathrm{H}^{\circ} \mathbf{3 9 8}$ | $\Delta \mathrm{Hf}$ | $\Delta \mathrm{Gr}{ }^{\circ}$ |  |
| 0 | ． 000 | .000 | I VFINITE | $-2.109$ | ． 000 | ． 000 | ． 000 |
| 100 | 6．955 | 40.594 | 54.838 | －1．414 | ． 000 | ． 000 | ． 000 |
| 200 | 7.095 | 45.542 | 49.113 | －． 714 | ． 000 | .000 | ． 000 |
| 294 | 7.481 | 48.442 | 49.442 | ． 000 | ． 000 | ． 000 | ． 000 |
| súu | 7.489 | 48.489 | 49.442 | ． 014 | ． 000 | ． 000 | .000 |
| 400 | 7.831 | 50.699 | 48.741 | ． 783 | ． 000 | ． 000 | ． 000 |
| 500 | 8.183 | 52.492 | 49.318 | 1.597 | ． 000 | ． 000 | ． 000 |
| 500 | 4.397 | 54.004 | 49.976 | 2.417 | ． 000 | .000 | .000 |
| 7u0 | 8.554 | 55.311 | 50.647 | 3.255 | ． 000 | .000 | ． 000 |
| 300 | 9.670 | 56.461 | 51.30 .3 | 4.126 | ． 000 | .000 | .000 |
| 900 | 5．75y | b7．459 | 51.934 | 4.998 | ． 000 | ． 000 | ． 000 |
| 1400 | 4.827 | 58.414 | 52.537 | 5.978 | ． 000 | ． 000 | ． 000 |
| 1104 | 8.887 | 59.259 | 53.110 | 6.753 | ． 000 | ． 000 | ． 000 |
| 1200 | 4.935 | 50.034 | 53.655 | 7.655 | ． 000 | .000 | ． 000 |
| 1300 | 8.975 | 60.751 | 54.174 | 8.550 | ． 000 | ． 000 | ． 000 |
| 1400 | 9.012 | 61.417 | 54.508 | 7.450 | .000 | ． 000 | ． 000 |
| 15013 | $\rightarrow 0.044$ | 62.040 | 55.139 | 10.352 | － 000 | ． 000 | .000 |
| 1500 | 9.074 | 62.625 | 55.588 | 11.258 | ． 000 | .000 | ． 000 |
| 1700 | 9.101 | 63.176 | 56.019 | 12.157 | ． 000 | ． 000 | ． 000 |
| 1500 | 9.126 | 63.697 | 56.431 | 13.078 | .000 | ． 000 | ． 000 |
| 1900 | 9.149 | 54.191 | 50.825 | 13.992 | ． 000 | ． 000 | .000 |
| 2000 | 7．17c | 64.651 | 57.207 | 14.978 | － 000 | ． 000 | .000 |
| 2100 | 9.193 | 65.109 | 57.572 | 15.827 | .000 | .000 | .000 |
| － 2200 | 9．214 | 65.537 | 57.925 | 16.747 | .000 | .000 | .000 |
| 2300 | 9.234 | 65.947 | 58.265 | 17.569 | ． 000 | .000 | ． 000 |
| 2400 | 9.253 | 66.340 | 53.593 | 18.594 | .000 | .000 | ． 000 |
| 2らU0 | 9.272 | 66.719 | 58.910 | 19.570 | ． 000 | .000 | ． 000 |
| 2500 | 9.290 | 67．082 | 59.218 | 20.448 | ． 000 | ． 000 | ． 000 |
| 2700 | 9.3 U3 | 57.433 | 50.516 | 21.378 | － 0 O 0 | .000 | ． 000 |
| 2300 | 9.320 | 67.772 | 29．804 | 22．310 | .000 | .000 | .000 |
| 2900 | 9.343 | 68.100 | 60.085 | 23.243 | ． 000 | .000 | ． 000 |
| su00 | 9．306 | 08.417 | 60.357 | 24.178 | .000 | ． 000 | ． 000 |
| 3100 | 9.377 | 58.724 | 60.622 | 25.115 | .000 | .000 | ． 000 |
| 3200 | 9.394 | 69.022 | 60.880 | 26.054 | .000 | .000 | ． 000 |
| 3300 | 9.411 | 69.311 | 61.131 | 26.994 | .000 | ． 000 | .000 |
| 5400 | 9.427 | 59.59 ？ | 61.376 | 27.936 | ． 010 | .000 | ． 000 |
| 3500 | 9.444 | 69.866 | 61.615 | 28．879 | －000 | ． 000 | ． 000 |
| 3600 | 3.46 U | 70.132 | 61.845 | 29．825 | ． 000 | .000 | ． 000 |
| 5700 | 9．470 | 70.392 | 62.075 | 30.771 | － 0 ก0 | ． 000 | ． 000 |
| 5300 | 9.496 | 70.645 | 62.297 | 31.720 | － 000 | .000 | .000 |
| Stu | 7.508 | 70.891 | б2．514 | 32.670 | ． 000 | .000 | .000 |
| 4000 | 3.524 | 71.132 | 62.727 | 33.021 | ． 000 | ． 000 | .000 |
| 4100 | 9.54 J | 71.368 | 52.935 | 34.575 | .000 | ． 000 | ． 000 |
| $+200$ | 9．5bo | 71.598 | 53.138 | 35.529 | ． 000 | ． 000 | ． 000 |
| 4300 | $9.57 i$ | 71.823 | 53.338 | 30.495 | ． 000 | ． 000 | ． 000 |
| $4+00$ | 9.587 | 72.1243 | 63.533 | 37.444 | .000 | ． 000 | ． 000 |
| ＋buu | 9.503 | 72.259 | 63.725 | 38.403 | ． 000 | ． 000 | .000 |
| 4500 | 9.61 ¢ | 72.470 | 53.912 | 39.354 | .000 | ． 000 | ． 000 |
| 4700 | 3.634 | 72.577 | 64.097 | $40 \cdot 327$ | － 000 | ． 000 | ． 000 |
| 4500 | 7.649 | 72.980 | 64.278 | 41.291 | － 0 O 0 | ． 000 | ． 000 |
| 4900 | 9．0．5 | 73.079 | 64.455 | 42.257 | .000 | ． 000 | ． 000 |
| buus | 9.684 | 73.274 | 64.630 | 43.224 | ． 000 | ． 000 | ． 000 |
| 5100 | 9.635 | 73.465 | 64.801 | 44.193 | .000 | ． 000 | ． 000 |
| 5200 | 9.711 | 73.655 | 04.969 | 45.163 | ． 000 | ． 000 | ． 000 |
| 5300 | 9.727 | 73.840 | 65.135 | 46.135 | .000 | ． 000 | ． 000 |
| 3400 | y． 74 c | 74.022 | 65.298 | 47.103 | － 000 | ． 000 | ． 000 |
| 5000 | 9．757 | 74.201 | 65.458 | 49.024 | － 000 | .000 | ． 000 |
| 5600 | 9.773 | 74.377 | 65.616 | 49.760 | .000 | .000 | ． 000 |
| 5700 | $9.78{ }^{\text {9 }}$ | 74.550 | 65.771 | 50.038 | ． 000 | ． 000 | .000 |
| bsuo | 9.903 | 74.720 | 65.924 | 51.013 | ． 000 | .000 | ． 000 |
| 勺ヲロ0 | 9.819 | 74.389 | 65.074 | 51.994 | .000 | .000 | .000 |
| 0000 | 3.854 | 75.053 | 66.223 | 52.981 | .000 | .000 | .000 |

July 31， 1972
$\mathrm{S}_{298.15}^{\circ}=57.08 \pm 1 \mathrm{cal} \mathrm{K}^{-1} \mathrm{~mol}^{-1}$
Ground State Quantum Weight $=1$
$\Delta H f_{0}^{\circ}=-135.4 \pm 0.8 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}^{-1}$
$\Delta H f_{298.15}^{\circ}=-136.87 \pm 0.8 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}^{-1}$

## Vibrational Frequencies and Degeneracies



## Heat of Formation

The enthalpy of $2 \mathrm{HF}(\mathrm{g}) \rightarrow \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{~F}_{2}(\mathrm{~g})$ was taken as the mean of the third law values which were obtained from the following equilibrium data. G. Briegleb and W. Strohmeier, Z. Elektrochem. 57, 668 (1953) measured the vapor density of associated $\mathrm{HF}(\mathrm{g})$ between 26 to $56^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and between 30 and 700 torr. E. U. Franck and F. Meyer, Z. Elektrochem. 63, 571 (1959) measured heat capacity between -20 and $100^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and between 100 and 700 torr. Their second law values differed by 1.2 kcal ; and using the molecular constants discussed below gave respectively mean third law values which differed by 0.34 kcal , a 0.14 kcal temperature trend for Briegleb and Strohmeter, and a 0.02 kcal temperature trend for Franck and Meyer. The $\Delta \mathrm{Hf}_{298.15}^{\circ}$ of $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{~F}_{2}(\mathrm{~g})$ was calculated by using $\Delta \mathrm{Hf}_{298.15}^{\circ}=-65.14 \mathrm{kcal}$ for $\mathrm{HF}(\mathrm{g})$.

## Heat Capacity and Entropy

The product of the moments of inertia was calculated from $I_{A}, 1 / 2\left(I_{B}+I_{C}\right), F-F$ distance, and $F \cdots F-H$ angle which were given by T. R. Dyke, B. J. Howard, and W. Klemperer, J. Chem. Phys. 56, 2442 (1972). They also gave $\sigma$. Reliable experimental values of the vibrational frequencies of $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{~F}_{2}(\mathrm{~g})$ are not available. The estimated frequencies are similar to those used for the higher polymers which were obtained firm data on hF solid. The infrared absorption bands observed in the vapor ( 350 to $400 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}, 700$ to $800 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$, and $1000-1200 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$ regions) are largely due to the higher polymers, such as the tetramer and hexamer. Calculated values ( 610,443 , and $144 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$ ) were obtained from force constants given in a paper on theory of molecular interactions of the HF polymers by J. E. Del Bene and J. A. Pople, J. Chem. Phys. 55, 2296 (1971). The potential energy surface computed for the dimer suggests very anharmonic low frequency motions for the external hydrogen (estimated at $600 \pm 200 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$ ) and for the hydrogen bond stretching mode.

| T, ${ }^{\circ} \mathbf{K}$ | gibbs/mol |  |  | $H^{\circ}-H^{\circ}{ }_{298}$ | kcal/mol | $\Delta \mathrm{GF}$ | $\operatorname{Log~Kp}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Cp ${ }^{\circ}$ | $\mathbf{S}^{\circ}$ | $-\left(\mathrm{G}^{\circ}-\mathrm{H}^{\circ} 298\right) / \mathrm{T}$ |  |  |  |  |
| $u$ | . 0 Uu | . 000 | I JFINITE | -2.693 | -135.420 | -135.420 | LINFINITE |
| 1u0 | 4.287 | 46.942 | 65.702 | -1.832 | -136.031 | -134.251 | C 33.405 |
| 200 | 9.507 | 53.055 | b9.020 | -. 973 | -136.496 | -132.286 | 144.555 |
| 298 | 10.725 | 57.079 | 57.079 | - 000 | -136.970 | $-130.140$ | 95.395 |
| 300 | 10.747 | 57.145 | 57.079 | . 020 | -136.877 | -130.099 | 44.777 |
| 4011 | 11.879 | 60.396 | 57.515 | 1.153 | -137.207 | -127.787 | 09.820 |
| sue | 12.79's | 63.150 | 58.373 | 2.388 | -137.475 | -125.401 | 54.812 |
| Gu4 | 13.512 | 65.549 | 59.373 | 3.705 | -137.688 | -122.963 | 44.790 |
| 7013 | 14.090 | 67.576 | 60.410 | 5.086 | -137.857 | -120.497 | 37.621 |
| suu | 14.579 | 69.590 | 51.440 | 6.520 | -137.990 | -118.008 | 32.238 |
| 900 | 15.011 | 71.333 | 62.444 | 8.000 | -138.094 | -115.503 | 28.048 |
| l UUU | 15.404 | 72.935 | 63.414 | 9.521 | -138.171 | -112.990 | 24.694 |
| 1100 | 15.703 | 74.420 | 64.348 | 11.780 | -138.223 | -110.467 | $<1.949$ |
| 120u | 16.093 | 75.806 | 65.246 | 12.673 | -138.256 | -107.943 | 19.659 |
| 1300 | 16.390 | 77.106 | 66.10 ¢ | 14.297 | -138.271 | -105.416 | 17.722 |
| 1400 | 16.675 | 78.332 | 66.938 | 15.951 | -138.271 | -102.890 | 10.062 |
| 1500 | 16.920 | 79.491 | 67.737 | 17.63 .31 | -138.259 | $-100.361$ | 14.623 |
| 1500 | 17.155 | 80.591 | 68.506 | 19.335 | -133.239 | -97.937 | 13.364 |
| 1700 | 17.364 | 91.637 | 69.249 | 21.062 | -139.209 | -95.311 | 12.253 |
| 1800 | 17.535 | 82.635 | 69.964 | 22.807 | -139.171 | -92.789 | 11.206 |
| $1 \ni$ U | 17.724 | 93.599 | 70.656 | 24.571 | -138.127 | -90.269 | $1 \cup .363$ |
| 2000 | 17.880 | 84.502 | 71.326 | 26.352 | -138.077 | -87.751 | 9.589 |
| 2100 | 18.424 | 85.379 | 71.974 | 28.147 | -138.025 | $-85.237$ | 8.871 |
| z2Uu | 18.14 s | 86.219 | 72.603 | 29.955 | -137.969 | -82.724 | 8.218 |
| 2300 | 18.205 | 87.029 | 73.213 | 31.776 | -137.909 | -80.214 | 7.022 |
| 2400 | 13.371 | 97.808 | 73.405 | 33.605 | -137.849 | -77.707 | 7.076 |
| cbuu | 14.467 | 88.560 | 74.380 | 35.450 | -137.788 | -75.205 | 0.574 |
| zjuu | 18.550 | 89.285 | 74.939 | 37.301 | -137.725 | -72.701 | 5.111 |
| 2700 | 18.630 | 89.998 | 75.484 | 39.161 | -137.652 | -70.202 | 5.682 |
| 2800 | 18.710 | 90.667 | 76.014 | 41.029 | -137.6n0 | -67.706 | 5. 285 |
| 2900 | 1.3 .778 | 91.325 | 76.531 | 42.903 | -137.536 | -65.206 | 4.914 |
| suud | 19.840 | 91.952 | 77.054 | 44.794 | -137.474 | -62.715 | 4.509 |
| 5100 | 18.895 | 92.581 | 77.525 | 46.571 | -137.412 | -60.225 | 4.246 |
| s2uu | 18.951 | 93.182 | 78.006 | 48.553 | -137.353 | -57.736 | 3.943 |
| 3300 | 19.0Uu | 93.766 | 78.475 | 50.461 | -137.294 | -55.249 | 3.659 |
| 3400 | 19.045 | 94.334 | 78.933 | 52.363 | -137.237 | -52.766 | 3.392 |
| shou | 19.087 | 94.885 | 79.381 | 54.259 | -137.183 | -50.278 | 3.140 |
| 3500 | 19.125 | 95.425 | 79.819 | 56.120 | -137.131 | -47.799 | 2.902 |
| 3700 | 19.152 | 95.949 | $80.2+8$ | 58.795 | -137.081 | -45.314 | 2.677 |
| 3ヶ60 | 19.196 | 96.461 | 80.608 | 50.012 | -137.0.35 | -42.83b | 2.464 |
| 5900 | 19.227 | 96.960 | 81.079 | 61.934 | -136.991 | -40.359 | <. 262 |
| 4UU0 | 19.257 | 97.447 | $81.48 ?$ | 63.858 | -136.950 | -37.981 | 2.070 |
| 4100 | 19.284 | 07.923 | 81.977 | 65.795 | -135.913 | -35.403 | 1.887 |
| 4200 | 19.310 | 98.389 | 82.265 | 57.715 | -135.878 | -32.027 | 1.713 |
| 43UU | 13.334 | 98.342 | 82.645 | 69.547 | -136.848 | -30.454 | 1.548 |
| 4400 | 19.350 | 99.287 | 83.019 | 71.591 | -135.921 | -27.982 | 1.390 |
| 45u0 | $19.37 \%$ | 99.722 | 83.385 | 73.518 | -135.797 | -25.508 | 1.239 |
| 4500 | 19.390 | 100.148 | 83.745 | 75.457 | -136.775 | $-23.033$ | 1.094 |
| 4700 | 19.417 | 100.566 | 84.098 | 77.337 | -135.761 | -20.561 | . 936 |
| 4800 | 19.434 | 100.975 | 84.445 | 79.340 | -136.747 | -18.089 | . 824 |
| 4900 | 19.451 | 101.376 | 54.787 | 81.294 | -136.738 | -15.617 | . 697 |
| bueo | 19.407 | 101.769 | 85.123 | 93.231 | -136.732 | -13.15u | . 575 |
| blue | 19.48 c | 102.154 | 85.453 | 85.179 | $-135.730$ | -10.675 | . 457 |
| b<u0 | 19.490 | 102.533 | 85.778 | 87.127 | -136.731 | -9.202 | . 345 |
| 5300 | 19.509 | 102.904 | 86.097 | 99.077 | -136.737 | -5.728 | .230 |
| b400 | 19.5 cl | $103.26 a$ | 86.412 | 91.024 | -136.743 | -3.260 | . 132 |
| b50u | 19.534 | 103.627 | 85.722 | 92.981 | -136.761 | -. 786 | . Us1 |
| bouo | 17.545 | 103.979 | 87.027 | 94.935 | -135.778 | 1.585 | -. 006 |
| 5700 | 19.b.b | 104.325 | 87.327 | 96.790 | -136.799 | 4.100 | -. 159 |
| bsuo | 19.567 | 104.566 | 87.623 | 98.846 | -135.925 | 6.629 | -. 250 |
| bэu0 | 19.577 | 105.000 | 97.915 | 100.804 | -135.853 | 9. 105 | -. 337 |
| suou | 19.500 | 105.329 | 88.202 | 102.752 | -135.985 | 11.577 | -. 422 |

```
Point Group \(\mathrm{C}_{3}\)
\(\mathrm{S}_{298.15}^{\circ}=68.9 \mathrm{cal} \mathrm{K}^{-1} \mathrm{~mol}^{-1}\)
Ground State Quantum Weight \(=1\)
```

Vibrational Frequencies and Degeneracies
$\frac{\omega, \mathrm{cm}^{-1}}{[202](3)}$
$[962](3)$
$[552](3)$
$[3060](3)$

```
Bond Distance: [F-F = 2.5 A ]
Product of the Moments of Inertia: I I I I B I C = 2.238 < 10-114 g 3 cm 6
```


## Heat of Formation

The enthalpy of $3 \mathrm{HF}(\mathrm{g}) \rightarrow \mathrm{H}_{3} \mathrm{~F}_{3}(\mathrm{~g})$ was taken as the mean of third law values which were determined from the equilibrium data of two investigations. Briegleb and Stohmeier (1) measured the vapor density of HF between 20 and $60^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and between 50 and 650 torr. Franck and Meyer (2) measured $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{p}}$ between -20 and $100^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and between 100 and 700 torr. Each investigation evaluated $K_{p}$ at $\underline{n}=2,3,4, \ldots$ for the reactions $n(H F) \rightarrow(H F){ }_{n}$ and reported second law values of $\Delta H$ and $\Delta S$. At $\underline{n}=3$ their second law values differed by 2.7 kcal , which was taken as an estimate of error, while the third law values differed by 0.20 kcal . Using $\Delta \mathrm{H}_{298}^{\circ}=-14.69 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}^{-1}$ and $\Delta \mathrm{Hf}_{298}^{\circ}(\mathrm{HF}, \mathrm{g})=$ $-65.14 \pm 0.2 \mathrm{kcal}^{\mathrm{mol}}{ }^{-1}$ gives the heat of formation of $\mathrm{H}_{3} \mathrm{~F}_{3}(\mathrm{~g})$.

## Heat Capacity and Entropy

The molecular structure of $\mathrm{H}_{3} \mathrm{~F}_{3}$ was assumed as planar with the F-atoms forming the vertices of a regular triangle and with the $H$ atoms also lying on the circumscribed circle. That rings are more stable than open chains was confirmed by Del Bene and Pople's (3) theoretical molecular-orbital studies on th polymers. The length of side ( $F-F$ axis) was taken from Atoji and Lipscomb's (4) x-ray studies of solid $H F(F-F=2.49 \AA$ ) and agrees with $2.52 \AA$ which Janzen and Bartell (5) determined for HF gaseous polymers by electron diffraction. Vibrational frequencies were taken from Kittelberger and Hornig's (6) work on crystalline HF, Huong and Couzi (7) and Smith (8) have made spectral studies of the gas phase in the range from 350 to $4000 \mathrm{~cm} .^{-1}$
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（Ideal Gas）
$\mathrm{GFW}=60,019$

|  | gibbs／mol |  |  |  | －kcal／mol | － |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| T，${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{K}$ | Cp ${ }^{\circ}$ | $S^{\circ}$ | $-\left(\mathrm{G}^{\circ}-\mathrm{H}^{\circ}{ }_{298}\right) / \mathrm{T}$ | $\mathrm{H}^{\circ}-\mathrm{H}^{\circ}{ }_{288}$ | $\Delta H f^{\circ}$ | $\Delta \mathrm{Gf}$ | $\operatorname{Log~Kp}$ |
| $u$ | ．0ue | ． 000 | INFINITE | －3．854 | －207．765 | －207．765 | INFINITE |
| 100 | 11.164 | 53.298 | 82.875 | －2．958 | －204．986 | －204．605 | 447.163 |
| 200 | 15.047 | 62.298 | 70.48 ？ | －1．637 | －209．691 | －199．924 | 218.406 |
| 298 | 18.123 | 68.916 | 68.916 | ． 000 | －210．110 | －195．036 | 142.905 |
| 300 | 19.177 | 69.029 | 68.916 | ． 034 | －210．117 | －194．942 | 142.015 |
| 400 | 20.393 | 74.531 | 69.658 | 1.969 | －210．376 | －189．841 | 103.724 |
| sou | 21.951 | 79.306 | 71.127 | 4.090 | $-210.510$ | －184．690 | 00.728 |
| oud | 23.003 | 83.409 | 72.840 | 5.342 | －210．553 | －179．521 | 05.390 |
| 7 Uu | 23.973 | 47．035 | 74.614 | 8．595 | －210．525 | －174．349 | 54.434 |
| sul | 24.755 | 90.285 | 75.373 | 11.132 | －210．438 | $-169.187$ | 46.220 |
| 900 | $25.44 y$ | 93.245 | 78.086 | 13.543 | $-210.303$ | －164．038 | 39.834 |
| 1000 | 25．071 | 95.959 | 79.739 | 16.219 | $-210.124$ | $-159.708$ | 34.729 |
| 1100 | 26．627 | 98.470 | 81.330 | 18.855 | －209．905 | －153．795 | 30.556 |
| 1200 | 27.127 | 100.809 | 82.856 | 21.543 | $-203.655$ | －148．706 | 27．083 |
| 1300 | 27.571 | 102.998 | 84.323 | 24.278 | －209．379 | $-143.637$ | 24.148 |
| 1400 | 27.905 | 105.056 | 85.731 | 27.056 | －209．082 | －138．593 | 21.035 |
| 1suu | 28.315 | 106.998 | 87.084 | 29.570 | －208．770 | $-133.566$ | 19.46 U |
| 1suu | 28．623 | 108.835 | 38.387 | 32.717 | －208．449 | －128．564 | 17.501 |
| 1700 | 28．899 | 110.570 | 89.642 | 35.594 | $-208.116$ | －123．580 | 13.887 |
| 1800 | 29.143 | 112.234 | $90 \cdot 831$ | 38.496 | －207．776 | －118．617 | 14.402 |
| 1900 | 29.361 | 113.420 | 92.019 | 41.422 | －207．430 | －113．573 | 13.075 |
| cuuv | 29.554 | 115.331 | 93.147 | 44.357 | －207．081 | －108．747 | 11.803 |
| 2100 | 27.727 | 116.777 | 94.238 | 47.332 | －206．731 | $-103.840$ | 14.807 |
| čuu | 29.852 | 118.163 | 95.294 | 50.312 | －2．05．379 | －98．049 | 9.830 |
| 2300 | 30.021 | 119.495 | 96.318 | 53.308 | －206．025 | －94．073 | 8.939 |
| 2400 | 30.147 | 120.775 | 97.310 | 56.316 | －205．674 | －89．214 | 0.124 |
| 2suu | 30.260 | 122．008 | 98.274 | 59.337 | $-205.375$ | －84．372 | $7 \cdot 376$ |
| c50u | 311．302 | 123.197 | 99.209 | 62．368 | －204．976 | －79．538 | －． 686 |
| 270u | 50．455 | 124.345 | 100.110 | 65.409 | －204．631 | －74．721 | 0.1448 |
| zsuu | 30.539 | 125.454 | 101.004 | 68.453 | －204．289 | －69．917 | 5.457 |
| c900 | 30.610 | 126.527 | 101.866 | 71.516 | －203．947 | －65．118 | 4.907 |
| sulu | 30.607 | 127.566 | 102.705 | 74.531 | －203．611 | －60．339 | 4.396 |
| 31019 | 30.751 | 128.573 | 103.524 | 77.553 | $-203.276$ | －55．571 | 5.918 |
| 3200 | 30.810 | 129.550 | 104.322 | 80.732 | －202．947 | －50．911 | 3.470 |
| 35011 | 36.465 | 130.499 | 105.101 | 83.215 | －202．622 | －46．062 | 3.051 |
| 3400 | 311.915 | 131.422 | 105.861 | 86.974 | －202．301 | －41．326 | C．0．06 |
| 3500 | 30.901 | 132.318 | 106.605 | 89.978 | －201．985 | －36．590 | 2． 285 |
| 30011 | 31.004 | 133.191 | 107.331 | 93.036 | $-201.675$ | －31．873 | 1.935 |
| 37011 | 31.043 | 134.041 | 104．042 | 96.199 | －201．370 | －27．155 | 1.604 |
| ． 58011 | 31.030 | 134.870 | 108.737 | 97.305 | －201．071 | －22．450 | 1.291 |
| 5300 | 31.114 | 135.577 | 109.417 | 102.415 | －200．778 | －17．758 | ． 995 |
| 41100 | 31.140 | 136.455 | 110.084 | 105.528 | －200．489 | －13．067 | ． 714 |
| 4100 | 31.175 | 137.235 | 110.736 | 108．544 | －200．208 | $-8.383$ | ． 447 |
| 4200 | 31.204 | 137.9537 | 111.376 | 111.753 | －199．932 | －3．706 | ． 193 |
| 4300 | 31.250 | 134.721 | 112.004 | 114.985 | －199．563 | ． 060 | －． 049 |
| 4400 | 51.254 | 139.439 | 112.619 | 118.009 | －199．399 | 5.520 | －． 279 |
| 4500 | 31.271 | 140.142 | 113.223 | 121.135 | －199．142 | 10.277 | －． 499 |
| 4500 | 31．29\％ | 140.830 | 113.815 | 124.254 | －198．890 | 14．031 | －． 709 |
| 4700 | 51.310 | 141.503 | 114.398 | 127.375 | －198．647 | 19.577 | －． 910 |
| 4800 | 31.337 | 142.16 ？ | 114.909 | 130.525 | －198．408 | 24.210 | －1．103 |
| 4 ¢00 | 31.355 | 142.509 | 115.531 | 133.562 | －198．176 | 28.852 | －1．287 |
| ヶリUu | 31.372 | 143.442 | 116.083 | 136.799 | －197．949 | 33.476 | －1．463 |
| blue | 31．38：0 | 144.064 | 116.625 | 139．237 | －197．730 | 38.107 | －1．633 |
| bこuu | 31.403 | 144.673 | 117.159 | 143.075 | －197．516 | 42.732 | －1．796 |
| د30U | 31.417 | 145.277 | 117.604 | 146.217 | －197．309 | 47.353 | －1．953 |
| 5400 | 31.430 | 145.859 | $11 \mathrm{H}$. | 149.350 | －197．109 | 51.202 | －2．1U3 |
| らちuU | 31.443 | 146.435 | 118.708 | 152.593 | －196．915 | 55.575 | －2．248 |
| bsun | 31.465 | 147.00 .3 | 117.208 | 155．648 | －195．726 | 61.181 | －2．308 |
| b7011 | 31.407 | 147.560 | 117.701 | 158．794 | －196．544 | 65.787 | －2．522 |
| bsuu | 31．47： | 148.107 | 1211.186 | 161．941 | －195．370 | 70.381 | －c．ób2 |
| byou | 51.478 | 148.645 | 120.604 | 165．030 | $-196.201$ | 74.984 | －c．776 |
| suou | 51.43 y | 149.174 | 121.135 | 168．239 | －195．0．36 | 79.574 | － 2.898 |

Ground State Quantum Weight $=1$
Vibrational Frequencies and Degeneracies

| $\frac{\omega_{2} \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}}{1032(1)}$ |
| :--- |
| $642(1)$ |
| $905(2)$ |
| 493 (2) |
| Bond Angle: $\mathrm{F}-\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{F}=102^{\circ} 9^{\prime}$ |
| $\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{A}} \mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{B}} \mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{C}}=8.8543 \times 10^{-115} \mathrm{~g}^{3} \mathrm{~cm} 6^{6}$ |$\quad \sigma=3$

## Heat of Formation

The adopted enthalpy of formation is the mean of values calculated from the reaction processes listed below. and welghted inversely as the squares of the standard deviations. Auxiliary enthalples of formation were taken from NBS TN 270-3, or from simultaneous adjustment of several interconnecting pieces of data leading to values tabulated in JANAF tables, 1968 and later. Also given below are the references, individual and averaged measured values of enthalpies of reaction and their uncertainties (2S), the value of enthalpy of formation calculated from each process and its uncertainty, and the weighted mean.

## Reaction

A $\quad \mathrm{NF}_{3}(\mathrm{~g})+3 / 2 \mathrm{H}_{2}(\mathrm{~g})=3 \mathrm{HF}\left(\mathrm{aq}, 50 \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{o}\right)+1 / 2 \mathrm{~N}_{2}(\mathrm{~g})$
(1) $-196.3 \pm 64$; (2) $-199.49 \pm 0.22$; (3) we derive $-196.23 \pm 0.77$

B $\quad \mathrm{S}(\mathrm{c}, \mathrm{rh})+2 \mathrm{NF}_{3}(\mathrm{~g})=\mathrm{SF}_{6}(\mathrm{~g})+\mathrm{N}_{2}(\mathrm{~g})$
(4)

C $\quad \mathrm{NF}_{3}(\mathrm{~g})+01 / 2 \mathrm{~N}_{2}(\mathrm{~g})+3 / 2 \mathrm{~F}_{2}(\mathrm{~g})$
(5)

D $\quad 8 \mathrm{NF}_{3}(\mathrm{~g})+3 \mathrm{C}_{2} \mathrm{~N}_{2}(\mathrm{~g})=6 \mathrm{CF}_{4}(\mathrm{~g})+7 \mathrm{~N}_{2}(\mathrm{~g})$
(6)
$\mathrm{E} \quad \mathrm{B}(\mathrm{c})+\mathrm{NF}_{3}(\mathrm{~g})=\mathrm{BF}_{3}(\mathrm{~g})+1 / 2 \mathrm{~N}_{2}(\mathrm{~g})$
(7)
$\mathrm{F} \quad \mathrm{NF}_{3}(\mathrm{~g})+4 \mathrm{NH}_{3}(\mathrm{~g})=3 \mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{~F}(\mathrm{c})+\mathrm{N}_{2}(\mathrm{~g})$

Weighted mean

$-291.79 \pm 0.24$
$31.44 \pm 0.3$
$-31.44 \pm 0.3$
$-1308.8 \pm 1.3$
$-239.7 \pm 1.2$
$-31.7 \pm 1.6$
$-259.5 \pm 1.0$

$-31.77 \pm 0.33$
$-31.4 \pm 4.4$
$-29.0^{*} \pm 3.0$
$-31.57 \pm 0.27$
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## Heat Capacity and Entropy

The vibrational and rotational constants are taken from JANAF Thermochemical Tables, 2nd Edition, June, 1971 (U. S. Govt. Printing Office, Washington, D. C. 20402).

| $\mathrm{T},{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{K}$ | $\mathrm{Cp}^{\text {a }}$ | gibbs/mol |  | $H^{\circ}-H^{\circ}{ }_{29}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}- \\ \Delta H \mathrm{P}^{\circ} \end{gathered}$ | $\Delta \mathrm{Gf}^{\circ}$ | $\log K_{p}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\mathrm{S}^{\circ}$ | $-\left(\mathrm{G}^{\circ}-\mathrm{H}^{\circ} 298\right) / \mathrm{T}$ |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | . 000 | . 000 | 1NFINITE | -2.930 | -30.200 | -30.200 | 1NFINITE |
| 100 | 9.132 | 51.550 | 71.875 | -2.032 | -30.792 | -27.934 | 61.050 |
| 200 | 10.211 | 57.729 | 63.374 | -1.129 | -31.287 | -24.870 | 27.177 |
| 298 | 12.744 | 62.289 | 62.298 | . 000 | -31.570 | -21.653 | 15.872 |
| 300 | 12.787 | 62.367 | 62.288 | . 024 | -31.574 | -21.592 | 15.730 |
| 400 | 14.776 | 66.334 | 62.815 | 1.408 | -31.692 | -18.243 | 9.967 |
| 500 | 16.143 | 69.788 | 63.872 | 2.958 | -31.699 | -14.878 | 0.503 |
| 600 | 17.068 | 72.818 | 65.116 | 4.621 | -31.637 | -11.518 | 4.196 |
| 700 | 17.704 | 75.500 | 66.412 | 6.362 | -31.532 | -8.174 | 2.552 |
| 800 | 18.155 | 77.895 | 67.700 | 8.156 | -31.401 | -4.845 | 1.324 |
| 900 | 18.482 | 80.054 | 68.955 | 9.989 | -31.256 | -1.534 | . 372 |
| 1000 | 18.727 | 82.014 | 70.164 | 11.850 | -31.102 | 1.759 | -. 384 |
| 1100 | 14.915 | 83.808 | 71.324 | 13.732 | -30.941 | 5.040 | -1.001 |
| 1200 | 19.058 | 85.460 | 72.434 | 15.631 | -30.780 | 8.302 | -1.512 |
| 1300 | 19.175 | 86.990 | 73.496 | 17.543 | -30.617 | 11.553 | -1.942 |
| 1400 | 19.265 | 88.415 | 74.511 | 19.465 | - 30.455 | 14.788 | -2.309 |
| 1500 | 19.341 | 89.746 | 75.483 | 21.395 | -30.292 | 18.016 | -2.625 |
| 1600 | 19.403 | 90.997 | 76.414 | 23.333 | -30.132 | 21.232 | -2.900 |
| 1700 | 19.455 | 92.175 | 77.307 | 25.276 | -29.974 | 24.438 | -3.142 |
| 1800 | 19.499 | 93.298 | 78.164 | 27.223 | -29.317 | 27.634 | -3.355 |
| 1900 | 19.530 | 94.343 | 78.988 | 29.175 | -29.653 | 30.922 | -3.545 |
| 2000 | 19.565 | 95.346 | 79.781 | 31.130 | -29.511 | 34.002 | -3.716 |
| 2100 | 19.596 | 96.302 | 80.545 | 33.089 | -29.362 | 37.172 | -3.809 |
| 2200 | 19.620 | 97.214 | 81.282 | 35.050 | -29.214 | 40.337 | -4.007 |
| 2300 | 19.641 | 98.086 | 81.994 | 37.013 | -29.068 | 43.496 | -4.133 |
| 2400 | 19.660 | 98.923 | 82.682 | 38.978 | -28.926 | 46.646 | -4.248 |
| 2500 | 19.676 | 99.726 | 83.348 | 40.945 | -28.786 | 49.791 | -4.353 |
| 2600 | 19.691 | 100.499 | 83.993 | 42.913 | -28.648 | 52.932 | -4.449 |
| 2700 | 19.704 | 101.241 | 84.618 | 44.883 | -28.513 | 56.067 | -4.538 |
| 2800 | 19.715 | 101.959 | 85.224 | 46.954 | -28.380 | 59.197 | -4.621 |
| 2900 | 19.726 | 102.650 | 85.813 | 49.826 | -28.249 | 62.326 | -4.697 |
| 3000 | 19.735 | 103.319 | 86.386 | 50.799 | -28.121 | 65.447 | -4.768 |
| 3100 | 19.744 | 103.966 | 86.943 | 52.773 | -27.995 | 68.562 | -4.834 |
| 3200 | 19.752 | 104.593 | 87.484 | 54.748 | -27.873 | 71.674 | -4.895 |
| 3300 | 19.753 | 105.201 | 88.012 | 56.723 | -27.752 | 74.782 | -4.9b3 |
| 3400 | 19.765 | 105.791 | 88.526 | 58.699 | -27.634 | 77.987 | -5.007 |
| 3500 | 19.771 | 106.364 | 89.028 | 60.676 | $-27.518$ | 80.991 | -5.0ヶ7 |
| 3600 | 19.777 | 106.921 | 89.51 ? | 62.654 | -27.406 | 84.087 | -- 105 |
| 3700 | 19.782 | 107.463 | 89.995 | 64.632 | -27.294 | 87. 188 | -b. 150 |
| 3800 | 19.786 | 107.991 | 90.462 | 66.610 | -27.187 | 90.280 | -5.192 |
| 3900 | 19.791 | 108.505 | 90.91 .8 | 68.589 | -27.082 | 93.366 | -5.232 |
| 4000 | 19.795 | 109.006 | 91.364 | 70.568 | -26.978 | 96.453 | -5.270 |
| 4100 | 19.798 | 109.494 | 91.800 | 72.549 | -26.879 | 99.541 | -5.306 |
| 4200 | 19.802 | 109.972 | 92.227 | 74.528 | -26.780 | 102.624 | -5.340 |
| 4300 | 19.805 | 110.438 | 92.645 | 76.508 | -26.685 | 105.703 | -5.372 |
| 4400 | 19.808 | 110.893 | 93.055 | 78.489 | -26.592 | 108.778 | -5.403 |
| 4500 | 19.811 | 111.338 | 93.456 | 80.470 | -26.501 | 111.857 | -5.433 |
| 4600 | 19.813 | 111.774 | 93.849 | 82.451 | -26.413 | 114.931 | -5.460 |
| 4700 | 19.816 | 112.200 | 94.235 | 84.4 .32 | -26.329 | 119.001 | -5.487 |
| 4500 | 19.81 \% | 112.617 | 94.614 | 86.414 | -26.245 | 121.072 | -5.513 |
| 4900 | 19.820 | 113.026 | 94.996 | 88.396 | -26.165 | 124.137 | -5.537 |
| 5000 | 19.822 | 113.426 | 95.350 | 90.379 | -26.087 | 127.203 | -5.560 |
| 5100 | 19.824 | 113.819 | 95.709 | 92.361 | -26.012 | 130.766 | -5.582 |
| 5200 | 19.82b | 114.204 | 96.001 | 34.343 | -25.939 | 133.337 | -5.604 |
| 5300 | 19.828 | 114.581 | 96.407 | 96.326 | -25.869 | 136.397 | -5.624 |
| b400 | 19.829 | 114.952 | 96.747 | 98.309 | -25.802 | 139.457 | -5.644 |
| b500 | 19.831 | 115.316 | 97.081 | 100.292 | -25.738 | 142.520 | $-5.663$ |
| 3600 | 19.832 | 115.673 | 97.410 | 102.275 | -25.675 | 145.579 | -5.681 |
| 5700 | 19.834 | 116.024 | 97.733 | 104.258 | -25.515 | 148.636 | -5.699 |
| 3800 | 19.835 | 116.369 | 98.052 | 106.242 | -25.558 | 151.689 | -0.716 |
| 5700 | 17.836 | 116.708 | 98.365 | 108.225 | -25.594 | 154.746 | -5.732 |
| 6000 | 19.837 | 117.042 | 98.673 | 110.209 | -25.451 | 157.801 | -5.748 |

> Point Group $\mathrm{C}_{4}$
> $\mathrm{~S}_{298.15}^{0}=83.4 \mathrm{cal} \mathrm{K}^{-1} \mathrm{~mol}$
> Ground State Quantum Weight $=1$

$$
\Delta i f_{0}^{\circ}=-280.0 \pm 5 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{~mol}^{-1}
$$

# Vibrational Frequencies and Degeneracies 

$\frac{\omega, \mathrm{cm}^{-1}}{[202](4)}$
$[53](2)$
$[962](4)$
$[552](4)$
$[3060](4)$

Bond Distance: $[F-F=2.5 \AA] \quad \quad 0=4$
Product of the Moments of Inertia: $I_{A} I_{B} I_{C}=1.7903 \times 10^{-113} \mathrm{~g}^{3} \mathrm{~cm}{ }^{5}$

## Heat of Formation

The enthalpy of $4 \mathrm{HF}(\mathrm{g}) \rightarrow \mathrm{H}_{4} \mathrm{~F}_{4}(\mathrm{~g})$ was taken as the mean of third law values which were determined from the equilibrium data of two investigations. Briegleb and Strohmeier (1) measured the vapor density of the associated HF between 20 and $60^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and between 50 and 650 torr. Franck and Meyer (2) measured $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{p}}$ between -20 and $100^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and between 100 and 700 torr. Each investigation evaluated $K_{p}$ at $\underline{n}=2,3,4, \ldots$ for the reactions $n(H F) \rightarrow(H F){ }_{n}$ and reported second law values of $\Delta H$ and $\Delta S$. At $\underline{n}=4$ their second law values differed by 4.2 kcal , which was taken as an estimate of error, while the calculated third law values differed by 1.5 kcal . Using $\Delta H_{298}^{\circ}=-22.38 \mathrm{kcal}$ mol ${ }^{-1}$ and $\Delta \mathrm{Hf}_{298}^{\circ}(\mathrm{HF}, \mathrm{g})=-65.14 \pm 0.2 \mathrm{kcal}$ mol ${ }^{-1}$ gives the heat of formation of $\mathrm{H}_{4} \mathrm{~F}_{4}(\mathrm{~g})$.

## Heat Capacity and Entropy

The molecular structure of $\mathrm{H}_{4} \mathrm{~F}_{4}$ was assumed as planar with the F atoms forming the vertices of a regular tetragon and with the $H$ atoms also lying in the circumscribed circle. That rings are more stable than open chains was confirmed by Del Bene and Pople's (3) theoretical molecular-orbital studies on HF polymers. The length of side
 $2.52 \AA$ which Janzen and Bartell (5) determined for the gaseous polymers by electron diffraction. The low F-berding frequency ( $53 \mathrm{~cm}{ }^{-1}$ ) was taken from Boutin, Safford, and Brajovic's (6) work. The other vibrational frequencies were taken from Kittelberger and Hornig's (7) work on crystalline HF. Huong and Couzi (8) and Smith (9) have made spectral studies of the gas phase in the range from 350 to $4000 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$.
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(Ideal Gas) GFI $=80.025$

| T, ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{K}$ | $\mathrm{Cp}^{\circ}$ | gibbs/mol |  | $\mathbf{H}^{\circ}-\mathrm{H}^{\circ}{ }_{298}$ | kcal/mol $\Delta H f^{\circ}$ | $\Delta G \rho^{\circ}$ | $\underline{L o g K p}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\mathbf{S}^{\circ}$ | $-\left(\mathrm{G}^{\circ}-\mathrm{H}^{\circ}{ }_{398}\right) / \mathrm{T}$ |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | . 000 | . 000 | INFINITE | -5.389 | -280.063 | -290.063 | LNFINITE |
| 100 | 15.024 | 61.249 | 103.154 | -4.194 | -281.692 | -274.868 | 600.723 |
| 200 | 21.395 | 74.096 | 85.642 | -2.309 | -282.495 | -267.692 | 2y<. 520 |
| 294 | $25.47 \%$ | 83.436 | 83.436 | - 000 | -282.940 | -260.321 | 190.820 |
| 300 | 25.540 | 83.594 | 83.436 | . 047 | -282.947 | $-260.181$ | 189.542 |
| 400 | 28.504 | 91.373 | .34.477 | 2.759 | -283.161 | -252.554 | 137.989 |
| 500 | 30.55\% | 97.968 | 86.533 | 5.718 | -293. 208 | -244.894 | $1 \cup 7.043$ |
| 0130 | 32.069 | 103.579 | 88.925 | 8.852 | -283.134 | -237.238 | 80.414 |
| 700 | 33.234 | 108.716 | 91.400 | 12.122 | -282.964 | -229.599 | 71.684 |
| 800 | 34.32m | 113.230 | 93.851 | 15.503 | -292.717 | -221.992 | OU. 645 |
| 900 | 35.25't | 117.328 | 96.235 | 18.783 | -282.405 | -214.419 | 52.068 |
| 1000 | 36.064 | 121.085 | 98.535 | 22.551 | -282.033 | -206.887 | 45.215 |
| 1100 | 36.823 | 124.561 | 101.745 | 26.197 | -291.609 | -199.389 | 39.615 |
| 1200 | 37.495 | 127.794 | 102.860 | 29.914 | -281.144 | -191.937 | 34.956 |
| 1300 | 38.003 | 130.819 | 104.901 | 33.694 | -280.542 | -184.522 | 31.021 |
| 1400 | 38.611 | 133.661 | 106.855 | 37.5?9 | -280.115 | -177.150 | 27.654 |
| 1500 | 39.077 | 136.341 | 108.732 | 41.414 | -279.566 | -169.811 | 24.741 |
| 1000 | 39.490 | 138.877 | 110.53 R | 45.34 ? | -279.006 | -162.514 | 22.198 |
| 1700 | 39.857 | 141.282 | 112.276 | 49.310 | -278.430 | -155.248 | 19.958 |
| 1300 | 40.182 | 143.570 | 113.952 | 53.312 | -277.944 | -148.020 | 17.972 |
| 1900 | 40.47 c | 145.750 | 115.568 | 57.345 | -277.251 | -140.823 | 16.198 |
| 2000 | 40.730 | 147.833 | 117.130 | 61.406 | -276.652 | -133.658 | 14.605 |
| $\angle 100$ | 40.961 | 149.826 | 119.640 | 65.490 | -276.0.54 | -126.525 | 13.168 |
| 2200 | 41.167 | 151.736 | 120.101 | 69.597 | -275.451 | -119.418 | 11.803 |
| 250U | $41.3 b^{3}$ | 153.570 | 121.517 | 73.723 | -274.847 | -112.738 | 1U. 675 |
| 2400 | 41.52 l | 155.334 | 122.889 | 77.867 | -274.247 | -105.286 | 9.588 |
| 2500 | 41.671 | 157.03? | 124.221 | 82.027 | -273.649 | -98.264 | 0.590 |
| 2000 | $41.8 \cup 7$ | 158.669 | 125.515 | 86.201 | -273.051 | -91.256 | 7.0.71 |
| 2700 | 41.931 | 160.249 | 126.772 | 90.339 | -272.453 | -84.276 | 0.822 |
| 2300 | 42.044 | 161.776 | 127.995 | 94.586 | -271.870 | -77.320 | 0.035 |
| 2300 | $+2.145$ | 163.253 | .129.186 | 98.796 | -271.282 | -70. 373 | 5.303 |
| 3000 | 42.240 | 164.684 | 130.345 | 103.015 | -270.701 | -63.459 | 4.623 |
| 3100 | 42.325 | 166.070 | 131.475 | 107.244 | -270.122 | -56.563 | 3.988 |
| 3200 | 42.400 | 167.415 | 132.57 R | 111.480 | -269.552 | -49.683 | 3.393 |
| 3500 | 42.477 | 168.721 | 133.653 | 115.725 | -268.985 | -42.820 | 2.836 |
| 3400 | 42.544 | 169.990 | 134.703 | 119.976 | -268.424 | -35.081 | $<.313$ |
| 3500 | 42.600 | 171.22'4 | 135.729 | 124.233 | -267.871 | -29.144 | 1.820 |
| 3500 | 42.605 | 172.425 | 136.732 | 128.497 | -267.325 | -22.336 | 1.356 |
| 3100 | +2.710 | 173.595 | 137.712 | 132.766 | -266.786 | -15.531 | . 917 |
| 3500 | 42.705 | 174.735 | 138.672 | 137.040 | -266. 254 | -8.747 | . 503 |
| STOU | $+2.811$ | 175.846 | 139.611 | 141.319 | -265.731 | -1.984 | . 111 |
| 4000 | $+2.853$ | 176.931 | 140.530 | 145.602 | -265.214 | 4.775 | -. 261 |
| 4100 | +2.895 | 177.989 | 141.431 | 149.889 | -264.707 | 11.521 | -. 614 |
| 4200 | 42.950 | 179.023 | 142.314 | 154.190 | -264.206 | 18.255 | -.950 |
| 4300 | +2.904 | 180.034 | 143.179 | 158.475 | -263.715 | 24.970 | -1.209 |
| $4+00$ | 42.997 | 181.022 | 144.02R | 162.773 | -263.231 | 31.674 | -1.573 |
| 4500 | +5.021 | 181.989 | 144.361 | 167.074 | -262.756 | 38.372 | -1.864 |
| 4000 | 43.055 | 192.735 | 145.619 | 171.378 | $-262.288$ | 45.063 | - <. 141 |
| +700 | 43.036 | 183.861 | 146.481 | 175.685 | -251.831 | 51.739 | -c.406 |
| + 400 | +3.100 | 184.768 | 147.269 | 179.395 | -261.379 | 58.405 | -2.659 |
| 4900 | 43.131 | 185.057 | 148.044 | 154.307 | -260.937 | 65.063 | -<.902 |
| 5000 | 43.154 | 186.529 | 148.805 | 188.621 | $-260.503$ | 71.702 | -3.134 |
| blue | 43.17, | 187.384 | 149.553 | 192.937 | -260.079 | 78.349 | -3.3ヶ7 |
| 5200 | 43.195 | 188.22? | 150.238 | 197.256 | -259.660 | 84.784 | -3.572 |
| 5300 | 43.214 | 189.045 | 151.012 | 201.576 | -259.252 | 91.612 | -3.778 |
| 5400 | $43.23<$ | 189.853 | 151.724 | 205.89\% | -258.953 | 99.221 | -3.975 |
| b500 | 43.249 | 190.547 | 152.424 | 210.223 | -258.461 | 104.832 | -4.166 |
| 5Su0 | 43.2ci | 191.425 | 153.114 | 214.549 | -253.077 | 111.433 | -4.349 |
| 5700 | $+3 . \mathrm{cou}$ | 192.192 | 153.793 | 218.375 | -257.702 | 118.030 | -4.526 |
| nsou | 43.240 | 192.945 | 154.451 | 223.205 | -257.337 | 124.611 | -4.695 |
| วナ00 | 43.309 | 193.685 | 155.120 | 227.535 | -256.979 | 131.199 | -4.800 |
| 0000 | +3.32\% | 194.413 | 155.769 | 231.866 | -256.628 | 137.770 | -5.018 |

Point Group $\mathrm{C}_{5}$

$$
\Delta H f_{0}^{\circ}=-352.6 \pm 6 \mathrm{kcal}^{\mathrm{mol}}-1
$$

$\mathrm{S}_{298.15}^{\circ}=97.6 \mathrm{cal} \mathrm{K}^{-1} \mathrm{~mol}^{-1}$
$\Delta H f_{298.15}^{\circ}=-356.0 \pm 6 \mathrm{kcal}_{\mathrm{mol}}{ }^{-1}$
Ground State Quantum Weight $=1$

## Vibrational Frequencies and Degeneracies

$$
\begin{array}{r}
\omega_{2}, \mathrm{~cm}-1 \\
\hline[202](5) \\
{[53](4)} \\
{[962]} \\
{[552]} \tag{552}
\end{array}
$$

Bond Distance: $[F-F=2.5 \AA$ ]
Product of the Moments of Inertia: $I_{A} I_{B} I_{C}=1.0598 \times 10^{-112} \mathrm{~g}^{3} \mathrm{~cm}{ }^{6}$

## Heat of Formation

The enthalpy of $5 \mathrm{HF}(\mathrm{g}) \rightarrow \mathrm{H}_{5} \mathrm{~F}_{5}(\mathrm{~g})$ was taken as the mean of third law values which were determined from the equilibrium data of two investigations. Briegleb and Strohmeier (1) measured the vapor density of the associated HF between 20 and $60^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and between 50 and 650 torr. Franck and Meyer (2) measured $C_{p}$ between -20 and $100^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and between 100 and 700 torr. Each investigation evaluated $K_{p}$ at $\underline{n}=2,3,4, \ldots$ for the reactions $n(H F) \rightarrow$ (HF) $n$ and reported second law values of $\Delta H$ and $\Delta S$. At $\underline{n}=5$ their second law values differed by 5.2 kcal, which was taken as an estimate of error, while the calculated third law values differed by 3.1 kcal . Using $\hat{H}_{298}^{\circ}=-30.35 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol} \mathrm{m}^{-1} \mathrm{and} \mathrm{Hff} 298(\mathrm{HF}, \mathrm{g})$ $=-65.14 \pm 0.2 \mathrm{kcal}$ mol ${ }^{-1}$ gives the heat of formation of $\mathrm{H}_{5} \mathrm{~F}_{5}(\mathrm{~g})$.

## Heat Capacity and Entropy

The molecular structure of $\mathrm{H}_{5} \mathrm{~F}_{5}$ was assumed as planar with the F atoms forming the vertices of a regular pentagon and with the $H$ atoms also lying on the circumscribed circle. That rings are more stable than open chains was confirmed by Del Bene and Pople's (3) theoretical molecular-orbital studies on HF polymers. The length of side ( $\mathrm{F}-\mathrm{F}$ axis) was taken from Atoji and Lipscomb's (4) x-ray studies of solid $H F(F-F=2.49 \AA$ ) and agrees with the $2.52 \AA$ which Janzen and Bartell (5) determined for HF gaseous polymers by electron diffraction. The low F-bending frequency $\left(53 \mathrm{~cm}{ }^{-1}\right.$ ) was taken from Boutin, Safford, and Brajovic's (6) work. The other vibrational frequencies were taken from Kittelberger and Hornig's (7) work or crystalline HF. Huong and Couzi (8) and Smith (9) have made spectral studies of the gas phase in the range from 350 to $4000 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$.
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（Ideal Gas）$\quad G F W=100,032$

| T，${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{K}$ | gibbs／mol$\mathrm{S}^{\circ} \quad-\left(\mathrm{G}^{\circ}-H^{\circ} 298\right) / \mathrm{T}$ |  |  | $\mathbf{H}^{\circ}-\mathrm{H}^{\circ}{ }_{398}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol} \\ \Delta H \rho^{\circ} \end{gathered}$ |  | $\log ^{\prime \prime} \mathbf{p}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | ． 000 | ． 010 | I VFINITE | －6．924 | －352．641 | －352．641 | INFINITE |
| 100 | 20．853 | 68.836 | 123.129 | －5．429 | － 354.677 | －345．375 | 754.815 |
| 200 | 27.699 | 85.530 | 100.440 | －2．982 | －355．599 | －335．667 | 300.800 |
| 298 | 32.820 | 97.592 | 97.592 | ． 000 | －356．050 | －325．778 | 236.802 |
| 300 | $32.90<$ | 97.796 | 97.593 | ． 061 | －356．057 | －325．590 | 237.142 |
| 400 | 35.614 | 107.803 | 95.932 | 3.548 | －356．227 | －315．402 | 172.327 |
| 500 | 33.185 | 116.266 | 101.575 | 7.346 | －356．187 | $-305.197$ | 133.402 |
| 600 | 41.070 | 123.595 | 104.647 | 11.363 | － 355.995 | －295．017 | 107.400 |
| 700 | 42.590 | 130.034 | 107.822 | 15.549 | －355．684 | －284．875 | 88.942 |
| 500 | 43.901 | 135.809 | 110.906 | 19.875 | －355．275 | －274．786 | 75.068 |
| 900 | 45.059 | 141.048 | 114.021 | 24.324 | －354．786 | －264．753 | 04.291 |
| 1000 | 46.097 | 145．850 | 116.908 | 28.883 | －354．222 | －254．783 | 55.683 |
| 1100 | 47.027 | 150.299 | 119.798 | 33.540 | －353．593 | －244．864 | 45.650 |
| 1200 | 47．859 | 154.417 | 122.512 | 38.295 | －352．013 | －235．011 | 42.801 |
| 1300 | 48.599 | 158.277 | 125.117 | 43.109 | －352．186 | －225．215 | 37.862 |
| 1400 | 49.256 | 161.903 | 127.616 | 48.002 | －351．429 | －215．479 | 33．638 |
| 1500 | 49.839 | 165.322 | 130.017 | 52.957 | －350．643 | －205．790 | 29.984 |
| 1600 | 20.350 | 168.555 | 132.325 | 57.968 | －349．842 | －196．163 | 2u． 795 |
| 1700 | 50.814 | 171.622 | 134.548 | 63.027 | －349．023 | －186．579 | 23.986 |
| 1900 | b1．221 | 174.538 | 136.68 ？ | 68.129 | －348．191 | －177．049 | 21.497 |
| 1900 | 51．563 | 177.317 | 138.755 | 73.269 | －347．351 | －167．563 | 19.274 |
| 2000 | 51．90 | 179.972 | 140．750 | 78.444 | －346．504 | －158．122 | 17.279 |
| 2100 | 32.194 | 182.511 | 142.678 | 53.649 | －345．656 | －143．726 | 15.478 |
| 2200 | 32.452 | 184.945 | 144.545 | 88.852 | －344．903 | －139．368 | 13.845 |
| 2300 | 52.684 | 187.282 | 146.352 | 94.139 | －343．949 | －130．748 | 12.357 |
| 2400 | 22．893 | 189.529 | 148.105 | $99.41 \%$ | －343．100 | －120．767 | 10.997 |
| 2500 | 53.082 | 191.692 | 149.805 | 104.717 | －342．253 | －111．527 | 9.750 |
| 2000 | 53.252 | 193.777 | 151.457 | 110.034 | －341．406 | $-102.310$ | 8.600 |
| 2700 | 33．407 | 195.790 | 153.06 ？ | 115.367 | －340．566 | －93．131 | 7.538 |
| 2506 | 53.540 | 197.735 | 154.623 | 120.715 | －339．730 | －83．985 | b． 555 |
| 2900 | b3．670 | 199.616 | 156.142 | 126.076 | － 338.897 | －74．855 | 5.641 |
| 3000 | 53.794 | 201．439 | 157.621 | 131.449 | －338．070 | －65．769 | 4.791 |
| 3100 | 33.901 | 203.204 | 159.064 | 136.934 | －337．248 | －56．709 | 3.998 |
| s200 | 34.000 | 204.917 | 160.470 | 142.229 | －336．436 | －47．672 | 3．256 |
| 3300 | 54.090 | 206.580 | 161.842 | 147.634 | －335．629 | －38．660 | C． 260 |
| 3400 | 54.174 | 205．196 | 163.1 b2 | 153.047 | －334．828 | －29．680 | 1.908 |
| 3500 | 34．2ら1 | 209.767 | 164.490 | 158.469 | －334．036 | －20．706 | 1.293 |
| 5600 | 24．322 | 211.296 | 165.769 | 163.397 | －333．255 | －11．771 | ． 715 |
| 5700 | 54.386 | 212．786 | 167.020 | 169.333 | －3．32．482 | －2．442 | ． 168 |
| 3800 | 34.450 | 214.237 | 168.244 | 174.775 | －331．718 | 6．057 | －． 348 |
| 3900 | 34.507 | 215.652 | 169.441 | 180.223 | －330．965 | 14.928 | －． 837 |
| 4000 | 54．50u | 217.033 | 170.614 | 185.676 | $-330.219$ | 23.790 | $-1.300$ |
| 4100 | b4．607 | 218.381 | 171.762 | 191.134 | －329．496 | 32.634 | －1．740 |
| 4200 | b4．655 | 219.697 | 172.888 | 196.593 | －328．750 | 41.462 | －＜．1b7 |
| 4300 | b4．699 | 220.984 | 173.992 | 202.055 | －328．047 | 50.262 | －2．bら5 |
| $4+00$ | 54.739 | 222.242 | 175.074 | 207.537 | －327．343 | 59.047 | －c．933 |
| 4500 | 54． 777 | 223.472 | 175.136 | 213.013 | －326．549 | 67.822 | －3．294 |
| 4000 | 34.813 | 224.677 | 177．178 | 218.493 | －325．965 | 76.586 | －3．659 |
| 4700 | 64．840 | ＜25．956 | 178．201 | 223．976 | －325．294 | 85.330 | －3．908 |
| 4800 | 54．87\％ | 227.1111 | 179.206 | 229.452 | －324．531 | 94．056 | －4．283 |
| 4300 | 54.900 | 228.143 | 130.193 | 234.951 | －323．979 | 102.774 | －4．584 |
| b000 | 54.930 | 229.252 | 181.163 | 240.443 | $-323.337$ | 111.465 | －4．872 |
| 5100 | $54.96<$ | 230.340 | 182.117 | 245.938 | －322．707 | 120.163 | －5．149 |
| b20u | 54.987 | 231.408 | 183.055 | 251.436 | －322．084 | 128．845 | －5．415 |
| 5300 | 55．011 | 232.455 | 193.977 | 256.935 | －321．474 | 137.517 | －0．671 |
| 5400 | 55.053 | 233.494 | 184.884 | 262.433 | －320．277 | 146.161 | －5．915 |
| bら00 | 35.055 | 234.494 | 185.777 | 267．74．2 | －320．288 | 154．908 | －0．152 |
| boue | 55．075 | 235.486 | 136.655 | 273.449 | －319．709 | 163.439 | －0．378 |
| b700 | د）．094 | 236.461 | 187.521 | 278.957 | －319．140 | 172.065 | －0．597 |
| 5300 | 35．11c | 237.419 | 188．373 | 284.468 | －319．595 | 180.568 | －0．808 |
| 5900 | 55.150 | 233.362 | 189.213 | 289.980 | －318．038 | 189.279 | －7．011 |
| buou | 55．14．0 | 239.298 | ＋190．1339 | 275.493 | － 317.499 | 197.860 | －7．207 |
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## Point Group $\quad C_{6}$

$$
\Delta H f_{0}^{\circ}=-428.1 \pm 2 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{~mol}^{-1}
$$

$\mathrm{S}_{298.15}^{\circ}=111.4 \mathrm{cal}_{\mathrm{K}^{-1} \mathrm{~mol}^{-1}}$
$\Delta \mathrm{Hf}_{298.15}^{\circ}=-432.0 \pm 2 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}^{-1}$
Ground State Quantum Weight $=1$
Vibrational Frequencies and Degeneracies
$\frac{\omega, \mathrm{cm}^{-1}}{[202](6)}$
$[53](6)$
$[962](6)$
$[552](6)$
$[3060](6)$

Bond Distance: $[F-F=2.5 \AA$ ]
$\sigma=6$
Product of the Moments of Inertia: $I_{A} I_{B} I_{C}=4.834 \times 10^{-112} \mathrm{~g}^{3} \mathrm{~cm}{ }^{6}$

## Heat of Formation

The enthalpy of $6 \mathrm{HF}(\mathrm{g}) \rightarrow \mathrm{H}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{6}(\mathrm{~g})$ was taken as the mean of third law values which were determined from the equilibrium data of two investigations. Briegleb and Strohmeier (1) measured the vapor density of the associated $H F$ between 20 and $60^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and between 50 and 650 torr. Franck and Meyer (2) measured $C_{p}$ between -20 and $100^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and between 100 and 700 torr. Each investigation evaluated $K_{p}$ at $\underline{n}=2,3,4, \ldots$ for the reactions $n(H F) \rightarrow(H F)$ and reported second law values of $\Delta H$ and $\Delta S$. At $\underline{n}=6$ their second law values differed by 0.8 kcal, which was taken as an estimate of error, while the calculated third law values differed by 0.6 kcal . Using $\Delta \mathrm{H}_{298}^{\circ}=-41.20 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}-1$ and $\Delta \mathrm{Hf}_{298}^{\circ}(\mathrm{HF}, \mathrm{g})=-65.14 \pm 0.2 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}{ }^{-1}$ gives the heat of formation of $\mathrm{H}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{6}(\mathrm{~g})$.

## Heat Capacity and Entropy

The molecular structure of $\mathrm{H}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{6}$ was assumed as planar with the F atoms forming the vertices of a regular hexagon and with the $H$ atoms also lying on the circumscribed circle. That rings are more stable than open chains was confirmed by Del Bene and Pople's (3) theoretical molecular-orbital studies on HF polymers. The length of side (F-F axis) was taken from Atoji and Lipscomb's (4) x-ray studies of solid HF ( $F-F=2.49 \AA$ ) and agrees with the $2.52 \AA$ which Janzen and Bartell (5) determined for HF gaseous polymers by electron diffraction. The low F-bending frequency ( $53 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$ ) was taken from Boutin, Safford, and Brajovic's (6) work. The other vibrational frequencies were taken from Kittelberger and Hornig's (7) work on crystalline HF. Huong and Couzi (8) and Smith (9) have made spectral studies of the gas phase in the range from 350 to $4000 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$.
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## (Ideal Gas) GFW = 120,038

| T, ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{K}$ | gibbs/mol |  |  | —_kcal/mol —__ |  |  | $\log \mathbf{K p}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Cp ${ }^{\text {o }}$ | $\mathbf{S}^{\circ}$ | $-\left(\mathrm{G}^{\circ}-\mathrm{H}^{\circ} 288\right) / \mathrm{T}$ | $\mathrm{H}^{\circ}-\mathrm{H}^{\circ} 288$ | $\Delta \mathrm{Hf}{ }^{\circ}$ | $\Delta \mathrm{Gr}^{\circ}$ |  |
| 0 | . 000 | . 000 | Infinite | -8.459 | -428.100 | -428.100 | INFINITE |
| 100 | 25.74 L | 76.123 | 142.774 | -6.665 | -430.542 | -413.732 | Y 15.137 |
| 200 | 34.005 | 96.665 | 114.937 | -3.654 | -431.563 | -406.462 | 444.161 |
| 298 | 40.160 | 111.449 | 111.449 | . 000 | -432.040 | -394.026 | 288.828 |
| 300 | 40.265 | 111.698 | 111.450 | . 074 | -432.047 | -393.790 | 286.876 |
| 400 | 44.725 | 123.932 | 113.088 | 4.338 | -432.172 | -381.010 | 208.174 |
| 500 | 47.813 | 134.264 | 110.317 | 8.974 | -432.045 | -368.230 | 100.953 |
| 600 | 50.083 | 143.191 | 120.069 | 13.873 | -431.736 | -355.495 | 129.489 |
| 700 | 51.908 | 151.053 | 12.3 .945 | 18.976 | -431.283 | $-342.821$ | 107.033 |
| 800 | 53.474 | 158.088 | 127.780 | 24.246 | -430.714 | -330.221 | 90.212 |
| 900 | 54.864 | 164.469 | 131.508 | 29.665 | -430.047 | -317.697 | 77.147 |
| 1000 | 55.110 | 170.315 | 135.100 | 35.214 | $-429.292$ | -305.258 | 60.714 |
| 1100 | $57.2<7$ | 175.716 | 138.550 | 40.882 | -428.457 | -292.889 | 58.192 |
| 1200 | 58.225 | 180.739 | 141.859 | 46.656 | -427.561 | -280.607 | 51.105 |
| 1300 | 59.113 | 185.435 | 145.032 | 52.524 | -426.610 | -268.398 | 45.122 |
| 1400 | 59.902 | 189.845 | 148.077 | 58.475 | -425.621 | -256.268 | 40.005 |
| 1500 | 60.601 | 194.003 | 151.002 | 64.501 | -424.599 | -244.201 | 35.580 |
| 1600 | 01.221 | 197.934 | 153.813 | 70.593 | -423.559 | -232.212 | 31.719 |
| 1700 | .1.771 | 201.562 | 156.517 | 76.743 | -422.497 | -220.281 | 28.319 |
| 1500 | 62.260 | 205.207 | 159.127 | 32.945 | -421.419 | -208.418 | 25.305 |
| 1900 | 02.694 | 208.585 | 161.641 | 89.193 | -420.331 | -196.614 | 22.616 |
| 2000 | 63.081 | 211.811 | 164.070 | 95.482 | $-419.235$ | -184.867 | cu. 201 |
| 2100 | 03.427 | 214.897 | 166.417 | 101.808 | -418.138 | -173.178 | 18.023 |
| 2200 | 03.737 | 217.855 | 168.689 | 108.166 | -417.036 | -161.539 | 10.047 |
| 2300 | 04.013 | 220.695 | 170.888 | 114.554 | -415.931 | -149.749 | 14.248 |
| 2400 | 04.267 | 223.425 | 173.021 | 120.969 | -414.832 | -138.409 | 12.604 |
| 2500 | 04.493 | 226.053 | 175.090 | 127.407 | -413.737 | -126.921 | 11.095 |
| 2600 | 64.698 | 228.586 | 177.099 | 133.867 | -412.641 | -115.465 | 9.706 |
| 2700 | 04.883 | 231.031 | 179.052 | 140.346 | -411.553 | -104.057 | 8.423 |
| 2800 | 65.052 | 233.394 | 180.950 | 146.843 | -410.471 | -92.591 | 7.235 |
| 2900 | O5.206 | 235.680 | 182.798 | 153.356 | $-409.391$ | -81.348 | 0.131 |
| 3000 | 05.347 | 237.893 | 184.594 | 159.884 | -408.320 | -70.061 | 5.104 |
| 3100 | 05.476 | 240.039 | 186.352 | 166.425 | -407.254 | -58.807 | 4.146 |
| 3200 | 05.594 | 242.118 | 188.062 | 172.778 | -405.200 | -47.58.3 | 3.250 |
| 3300 | 65.703 | 244.138 | 189.731 | 179.543 | -405.152 | -36.391 | 2.410 |
| 3400 | 05.803 | 246.101 | 191.361 | 186.119 | -404.111 | -25.240 | 1.622 |
| 3500 | 05.890 | 248.010 | 192.95? | 192.704 | -403.082 | -14.100 | . 880 |
| 3600 | 05.981 | 249.868 | 194.567 | 199.298 | -402.065 | -3.008 | . 183 |
| 3100 | 06.061 | 251.677 | 196.028 | 205.900 | -401.058 | 8.074 | -. 477 |
| 3800 | of. 134 | 253.439 | 197.516 | 212.510 | -400.061 | 19.119 | -1.100 |
| 3900 | 06.203 | 255.158 | 198.972 | 219.127 | -399.078 | 30.128 | -1.688 |
| 4000 | 06.266 | 256.835 | 200.398 | 225.750 | -398.104 | 41.124 | -2.247 |
| 4100 | 05.320 | 258.472 | 201.794 | 232.380 | -397.144 | 52.097 | -2.777 |
| 4200 | 06.381 | 260.071 | 203.163 | 239.015 | -396.194 | 63.047 | -3.281 |
| 4300 | 06.433 | 261.634 | 204.504 | 245.656 | -395.259 | 73.963 | -5.759 |
| 4400 | 06.402 | 263.161 | 205.820 | 252.302 | -394.334 | 84.259 | -4.215 |
| 4500 | 06.527 | 264.656 | 207.111 | 258.952 | -393.423 | 95.741 | -4.650 |
| 4500 | 06.57u | 266.119 | 208.378 | 265.607 | -392.522 | 106.607 | -5.065 |
| 4700 | 00.611 | 267.551 | 209.622 | 272.256 | -391.638 | 117.448 | -5.461 |
| 4800 | 60́.0́40 | 258.954 | 210.843 | 278.929 | -390.762 | 128.269 | -5.840 |
| 4900 | 06.684 | 270.328 | 212.043 | 295.596 | -389.900 | 139.073 | -0.203 |
| buue | 26.71b | ¢ 71.0675 | 213.223 | 292.260 | -389.050 | 149.846 | -b. 550 |
| 5100 | U6.74, | 272.997 | 214.382 | 298.939 | -388.215 | 160.626 | -0.883 |
| 5200 | 06.780 | 274.294 | 215.521 | 305.616 | -387.388 | 171.385 | -7.203 |
| 5300 | O6.803 | 275.566 | 210.642 | 312.295 | $-385.577$ | 182.129 | -7.510 |
| 3400 | 05.83 | 276.815 | 217.745 | 318.077 | -385.781 | 192.840 | -7.805 |
| 5500 | 06.8611 | 278.042 | 218.830 | 325.662 | -384.994 | 203.552 | -8.088 |
| 5600 | -5.885 | 279.247 | 219.898 | 332.349 | -384.220 | 214.244 | -8.361 |
| 勺700 | 06.908 | 280.431 | 220.950 | 339.739 | -383.453 | 224.928 | -0.624 |
| SHOU | 46.929 | 281.594 | 221.986 | 345.731 | -382.712 | 235.583 | -8.877 |
| houl | 06.950 | 282.739 | 223.006 | 352.425 | -381.976 | 246.246 | -9.122 |
| g.00u | 00.97u | 283.864 | 224.011 | 359.121 | -381.250 | 256.879 | $-4.357$ |

```
Point Group \(\mathrm{C}_{7}\)
\(\mathrm{S}_{298.15}^{\circ}=125.1 \mathrm{cal}^{-1} \mathrm{~mol}^{-1}\)
Ground State Quantum Weight \(=1\)
```

Vibrational Frequencies and Degeneracies
$\frac{w, \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}}{[202](7)}$
$[53](8)$
$[962](7)$
$[552](7)$
$[3060](7)$

```
Bond Distance: \([F-F=2.5 \AA] \quad 0=7\)
```

Product of the Moments of Inertia: $I_{A} I_{B} I_{C}=1.7977 \times 10^{-111} \mathrm{~g}^{3} \mathrm{~cm}{ }^{6}$

## Heat of Formation

The enthalpy of $7 \mathrm{HF}(\mathrm{g})+\mathrm{H}_{7} \mathrm{~F}_{7}(\mathrm{~g})$ was taken as the mean of third law values which were determined from the equilibrium data of two investigations. Briegleb and Strohmeier (1) measured the vapor density of the associated HF between 20 and $60^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and between 50 and 650 torr. Franck and Meyer (2) measured $C_{p}$ between -20 and $100^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and between 100 and 700 torr. Each investigation evaluated $K_{p}$ at $\underline{n}=2,3,4, \ldots$ for the reactions $n(H F) \rightarrow(H F){ }_{n}$ and reported second law values of $\Delta H$ and $\Delta S$. At $\underline{n}=7$ their second 1 aw values differed by 7.3 kcal , which was taken as an estimate of error, while the calculated third law values differed by 6.4 kcal . Using $H_{298}^{\circ}=-46.54 \mathrm{kcal}$ mol ${ }^{-1}$ and $\Delta \mathrm{Hf}_{298}^{\circ}(\mathrm{HF}, \mathrm{g})=-65.14 \pm 0.2 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}{ }^{-1}$ gives the heat of formation of $\mathrm{H}_{7} \mathrm{~F}_{7}(\mathrm{~g})$.
Heat Capacity and Entropy
The molecular structure of $\mathrm{H}_{7} \mathrm{~F}_{7}$ was assumed as planar with the F atoms forming the vertices of a regular septemgon and the $H$ atoms also lying on the circumscribed circle. That rings are more stable than open chains was confirmed by Del Bene and Pople's (3) theoretical molecular-orbital studies on HF polymers. The length of side ( $F-F$ axis) was taken from Atoji and Lipscomb's (4) x-ray studies of solid $H F(F-F=2.49 \AA$ ) and agrees with the $2.52 \AA$ which Janzen and Bartell (5) determined for HF gaseous polymers by electron diffraction. The low F-bending frequency ( $53 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$ ) was taken from Boutin, Safford, and Brajovic's (6) work. The other vibrational frequencies were taken from Kittelberger and Hornig's (7) work on crystalline HF. Huong and Couzi (8) and Smith (9) have made spectral studies of the gas phase in the range from 350 to $4000 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$.
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Hydrogen Fluoride Cyclic Septener（ $\mathrm{H}_{7} \mathrm{~F}_{7}$ ）

| $\mathbf{T},{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{K}$ | gibls／mol |  |  | $\mathbf{H}^{\circ}-\mathbf{H}^{\circ}{ }_{298}$ | kcal／mol－＿＿＿＿ |  | $\log K \mathrm{p}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathrm{Cp}^{\circ}$ | S ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | $-\left(\mathrm{G}^{\circ}-\mathrm{H}^{\circ} 298\right) / \mathrm{T}$ |  | $\Delta H f^{\circ}$ | $\Delta \mathrm{Gr}{ }^{\circ}$ |  |
| 0 | ． 000 | ． 000 | INFINITE | －9．903 | －499．049 | －498．046 | INFINITE |
| 100 | 311.601 | 83.190 | 16？．189 | －7．901 | －500．997 | －496．555 | 1003.305 |
| 200 | 40.31 u | 107.570 | 129.204 | －4．327 | －502．027 | －471．701 | 515.451 |
| 296 | $+7.512$ | 125.075 | 125.075 | －0ワ0 | －502．520 | －456．694 | 334.706 |
| 300 | 47.627 | 125．370 | 125.076 | ． 088 | －502．526 | －456．410 | 352．495 |
| 400 | 52.830 | 139.831 | 127.013 | 5.127 | －502． 508 | －441．016 | 240.900 |
| bull | 26.440 | 152.032 | 130.828 | 10.602 | －502．394 | －425．638 | 100.046 |
| 600 | 29.09 j | 152.567 | 135.260 | 16.394 | －501．967 | －410．320 | 149.401 |
| 700 | －1．22u | 171.940 | 139.837 | 22.403 | －501．373 | －395．095 | 123.354 |
| 900 | －3．04 3 | $18 \cup .137$ | 144.365 | 28.518 | －500．642 | －379．061 | 103.801 |
| 900 | 04.67 u | 187．658 | 148.764 | 35.005 | －499．799 | －364．924 | 88.616 |
| 1 Uu） | 06.123 | 194.549 | 153.002 | 41.546 | －498．851 | －349．993 | 70.491 |
| 1100 | 07.420 | 200.913 | 157.072 | 48.225 | －497．311 | －335．151 | 60.588 |
| 1200 | $03.5 ४ \mathrm{u}$ | 206．831 | 160.975 | 55.02 .7 | －496．7n0 | －320．415 | 26． 356 |
| 1300 | 09.627 | 212.363 | 164.717 | 61.939 | －495．524 | －305．771 | 01.405 |
| 1400 | 10.547 | 217.557 | 168．308 | 58.748 | －494．304 | －291．224 | 45.462 |
| 1500 | 11.303 | 222.453 | 171．756 | 76.045 | －493．045 | －276．755 | 4 U． 323 |
| 1000 | 72.057 | 227．1392 | 175.071 | 93.218 | －491．766 | －262．382 | 35.840 |
| 1700 | 72.72 \％ | 231．47？ | 178.250 | 90.459 | －490．461 | －248．080 | 31.893 |
| 1500 | 13.238 | 235.645 | 191.333 | 97.761 | －489．137 | －233．862 | c6．395 |
| 1300 | 73．800 | 239.622 | 184.297 | 105.117 | －487．801 | －219．716 | 2b． 273 |
| 2000 | 74.201 | 243.419 | 187.159 | 112.520 | $-486.456$ | －205．64u | 22.471 |
| 2100 | 7． 7.661 | 247.052 | 189.925 | 119.957 | －435．110 | －191．535 | 19.944 |
| 2200 | 15．023 | 250．534 | 192.602 | 127.451 | －483．758 | －177．692 | 17.052 |
| 2300 | 75.347 | 253.976 | 195.194 | 134.970 | －492．403 | －153．808 | 13.565 |
| 2400 | $75.64 i$ | 257.089 | 197.706 | 142.520 | －481．055 | －149．987 | 13.658 |
| 2500 | 75.904 | 260.193 | 200．144 | 150.097 | －479．711 | －136．229 | 11.909 |
| 2500 | 75.143 | 263.164 | 20？．511 | 157．599 | －478．367 | －122．509 | 14.298 |
| 2100 | 75.30 L | 266．042 | 204．811 | 165.325 | －477．031 | －109．849 | 6.811 |
| 2300 | 15.551 | 258．423 | 207.047 | 172.971 | －475．702 | －95．24？ | 7.434 |
| くЭ00 | 15．730 | 271.512 | 209.224 | 190.636 | －474．375 | －81．662 | 0.154 |
| suou | 75.951 | 274．117 | 211.344 | 188．318 | －473．060 | －68．149 | 4.965 |
| 3100 | 17.051 | 276.641 | 213.410 | 196.315 | －471．750 | －54．678 | 3.855 |
| 3200 | 77.109 | 279.089 | 215.424 | $203.7 ? 7$ | －470．454 | －41．2．45 | 2.617 |
| 3300 | 77.316 | 251.455 | 217.397 | 211.453 | －489．165 | －27．851 | 1.844 |
| 3400 | 77.433 | 283.776 | 219.309 | 219.190 | －467．985 | －14．500 | ． 932 |
| 3500 | 77．541 | 286.022 | 221.183 | 226．939 | －465．618 | －1．176 | ． 073 |
| 300U | 17.641 | 288．208 | 223.014 | 234.699 | $-465.365$ | 12．090 | －． 734 |
| 3700 | 17.733 | 290.337 | 224.805 | 242.457 | －464．124 | 25.355 | －1．498 |
| 3800 | 77.819 | 292.411 | 226．557 | 250.244 | －462．895 | 38.568 | －2．218 |
| 3900 | 77． BH 9 | 294.433 | 228.272 | 258．730 | －461．692 | 51.738 | － 2.899 |
| 4000 | 17.973 | 296.477 | 229．951 | 265．824 | －460．479 | 64.891 | －3．545 |
| 4100 | 74．045 | 294.333 | 231.595 | 273.525 | －459．293 | 79.015 | －4．159 |
| 4200 | 74.107 | 300.214 | 233.206 | 291.432 | －458．118 | 91．111 | －4．741 |
| 4300 | 73．10 | 302.053 | 234.736 | 289．245 | －456．961 | 104.160 | $-3.294$ |
| $4+00$ | 75.220 | 303．851 | 236．336 | 297.066 | －455．2．16 | 117.196 | －5．821 |
| 4500 | 18.278 | 305.609 | 237.955 | 304.891 | －454．596 | 130.207 | －0．324 |
| ＋60u | $73.3<3$ | 307.330 | 23才． 347 | 312.721 | －453．569 | 143.200 | －0．804 |
| 4700 | 7ヶ．37ヶ | 309．015 | 240.812 | 320.556 | －452．472 | 155．10́1 | －7．261 |
| 430u | 1ヶ．41？ | 310.666 | 242．25！ | 328．396 | －451．393 | 169.1098 | －7．099 |
| $4 \rightarrow 00$ | $7 \mathrm{H.400}$ | 312.293 | 243.663 | 336.240 | －450．312 | 182．014 | －0．118 |
| 5000 | 73.500 | 313.869 | 245.051 | 344.098 | $-449.254$ | 194．091 | －0．519 |
| 5100 | 14.537 | 315.423 | 246.416 | 351.940 | －448．213 | 207.775 | －6．904 |
| 5200 | 18．572 | 316.949 | 247.757 | 359.795 | －447．193 | 220.534 | － 9.273 |
| 3500 | 78．505 | 318.446 | 249.077 | 367.554 | －446．170 | 233.475 | －y．623 |
| 5400 | 73.600 | 319.915 | 250.375 | 375．515 | －445．175 | 245.275 | －y． 907 |
| bsou | 74．6ne | 321.358 | 251.653 | 383．381 | －444．191 | ？ 59.775 | －1U．295 |
| Soud | 79．694 | 322．775 | 252.910 | 391.250 | $-443.221$ | 271.550 | －1u．009 |
| 5700 | 75．721 | 324.159 | 254.143 | 399.120 | －442．266 | 284.510 | －10．913 |
| 5500 | 19.747 | 325.539 | 255.367 | 406.994 | －441．330 | 297.346 | －11．2U4 |
| b900 | 74．771 | 326.885 | 256.558 | 414.970 | －440．405 | 310.084 | －11．480 |
| 6000 | 74．794 | 328.209 | 257．751 | 422.744 | －439．492 | 322.787 | －11．758 |

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\mathrm{S}_{298.15}^{\circ}=43.3 \text { gibbs mol } \\
& \Delta \mathrm{Hf}_{0}^{\circ}=90 \pm 4 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{~mol}^{-1} \\
& \Delta \mathrm{Hf}_{298}^{\circ}=90 \pm 4 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{~mol}^{-1}
\end{array}
$$

## Electronic States and Molecular Constants



## Heat of Formation

The electron impact appearance potential of $\mathrm{N}_{2}^{+}$from $\mathrm{HN}_{3}$, determined by J. L. Franklin, V. H. Dibeler, R. M. Reese, and M. Krauss, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 80, 298 (1958) leads to a value $\Delta H f_{0}^{\circ}(N H, g)=81.7 \pm .5 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}^{-1}$. R. I. Reed and W. Snedden, J. Chem. Soc. 4132 (1959) determined the electron impact appearance potential of $\mathrm{NH}^{+}$from $\mathrm{NH}_{3}$. This combined with the directly measured electron impact ionization potential of $\mathrm{NH}, 13.1 \mathrm{eV}$ gives $\Delta \mathrm{Hf}_{0}^{\circ}=82.9 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}{ }^{-1}$. This value of the ionization potential of NH has also been obtained by S. N. Foner and R. L. Hudson, J. Chem. Phys. 45, 40 (1966). However, all of these electron impact experiments are subject to errors of several tenths of an electron volt or more.

More recently, K. E. Seal and A. G. Gaydon, Proc. Phys. Soc. 89, 459 (1966) measured the concentration of NH in reflected shock waves in nitrogen-hydrogen-krypton and ammonia-krypton mixtures. These led to $D(N H)=3.21 \pm$ 0.16 eV , corresponding to $\Delta H f_{0}^{\circ}(\mathrm{NH}, \mathrm{g})=90.13 \pm 3.7 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}{ }^{-1}$. W. E. Kaskan and M. P. Nadler, J. Chem. Fhys. 56, 2220 (1972) determined $\mathrm{NH}, \mathrm{NH}_{3}$, and OH concentrations in a flat $\mathrm{NH}_{3}-\mathrm{D}_{2}-\mathrm{N}_{2}$ flame and concluded $\Delta H f_{0}^{\circ}(\mathrm{NH})=90 \pm 4$ kcal mol ${ }^{-1}$ - D. H. Stedman, J. Chem. Phys. 52, 3966 (1970) studied the NH emission spectrum obtained by collision of metastable rare gas atoms with $\mathrm{HN}_{3}$. Taking the highest level of NH as observed in emission as a bound, he concluded that $\Delta \mathrm{Hf}_{0}^{\circ}(\mathrm{NH}, \mathrm{g})>80 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}{ }^{-1}$. From analogous considerations on $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ emission observed by collision of metastable argon atoms with $\mathrm{HN}_{3}$ he concluded that $\Delta \mathrm{Hf}_{0}^{\circ}(\mathrm{NH}, \mathrm{g}) \leq 94 \mathrm{kcal}$ mol ${ }^{-1}$.

Quantum chemical calculation of the dissociation energy of small molecules is possible with estimated accuracies of 0.1 to 0.2 eV . A theoretical calculation of the dissociation energy, $\mathrm{D}_{3}$, of $\mathrm{NH}\left(\mathrm{X}^{3} \mathrm{\Sigma}^{-}\right)$, applying the techniques of A. C. Wahl and G. Das, Advan. Quantum Chem. 5, 261 (1970), has been determined by W. Stevens (unpublished) to yield $\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{e}}=3.4 \mathrm{eV}$. This result corroborates the results of Seal and Gaydon and would support $\Delta H f_{0}^{\circ}(\mathrm{NH})=90 \pm 4 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}{ }^{-1}$. Theoretical calculations of this type can be used to distinguish between disparate experimental results that differ by mere than 0.2 ev.

## Heat Capacity and Entropy

The vibrational and rotational constants are taken from the JANAF Thermochemical Tables, 2nd Edition, June 1971 (U. S. Govt. Printing Office, Washington, D. C. 20402).

| T, ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{K}$ | $C p^{\circ}$ | gibbs/mol$S^{\circ} \quad-\left(G^{\circ}-H^{\circ} 398\right) / T$ |  | $H^{\circ}-H^{\circ} 208$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { kcal/mol - } \\ \Delta H f^{\circ} \end{gathered}$ | $\triangle \mathrm{Gf}^{\circ}$ | $\log \mathbf{K p}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | . 000 | . 000 | INFIN1TE | -2.060 | 90.000 | 90.000 | INFINITE |
| 100 | 6.961 | 35.687 | 49.484 | -1.380 | 89.975 | 89.518 | -195.640 |
| 200 | 5.963 | 40.512 | 43.930 | -. 684 | 90.001 | 89.050 | -97.309 |
| 293 | 6.906 | 43.293 | 43.293 | . 000 | 90.012 | A8. 580 | -64.931 |
| 300 | 5.966 | 43.335 | 43.293 | . 013 | 90.012 | 9.9. 571 | -64.524 |
| 400 | 6.973 | 45.341 | 43.566 | . 710 | 90.013 | 88.090 | -48.130 |
| bue | 6.994 | 46.899 | 44.083 | 1.40 A | 90.010 | 87.509 | -38.294 |
| 600 | 7.041 | 48.177 | 44.662 | 2.109 | 90.006 | 87.130 | -31.737 |
| 700 | 7.119 | 49.268 | 45.244 | 2.917 | 49.999 | 86.651 | -27.054 |
| 800 | 7.222 | 50.225 | 45.808 | 3.534 | 89.991 | 85.173 | -23.541 |
| 900 | 7.345 | 51.083 | 46.347 | 4.262 | 89.984 | 85.696 | -20.810 |
| 1000 | 7.471 | 51.863 | 46.860 | 5.003 | 89.978 | 85.220 | -18.625 |
| 1100 | 7.601 | 52.581 | 47.348 | 5.756 | 89.975 | 84.744 | -16.837 |
| 1200 | 7.727 | 53.249 | 47.812 | 6.523 | 89.974 | 84.269 | -15.347 |
| 1300 | 7.847 | 53.871 | 48.255 | 7.302 | 89.975 | 83.793 | -14.087 |
| 1400 | 7.960 | 54.457 | 48.677 | 8.092 | 89.978 | 83.317 | -13.006 |
| 1500 | 4.064 | 55.010 | 49.081 | 8.893 | 89.982 | 82.842 | -12.070 |
| 1500 | 8.161 | 55.533 | 49.463 | 9.705 | 89.996 | 82. 365 | -11.251 |
| 1700 | 8.249 | 56.031 | 49.840 | 10.525 | 89.992 | 81.890 | -10.528 |
| 1800 | 9.331 | 56.505 | 50.197 | 11.354 | 89.998 | 81.412 | -9.885 |
| 1900 | 8.405 | 56.957 | 50.541 | 12.191 | 90.005 | 80.936 | -9.310 |
| 2000 | 8.474 | 57.390 | 50.873 | 13.035 | 90.013 | 80.458 | -8.792 |
| 2100 | 8.537 | 57.805 | 51.193 | 13.886 | 90.020 | 79.980 | -8. 324 |
| 2200 | 8.596 | 59.204 | 51.503 | 14.742 | 90.028 | 79.502 | -7.898 |
| 2300 | 8.650 | 58.587 | 51.802 | 15.605 | 90.036 | 79.023 | -7.509 |
| 2400 | B. 700 | 59.956 | 52.093 | 16.472 | 90.045 | 78.545 | -7.152 |
| 2500 | 8.747 | 59.312 | 52.374 | 17.345 | 90.052 | 78.064 | -6.824 |
| 2óu | 8.791 | 59.656 | 52.648 | 18.222 | 90.061 | 77.585 | -0.522 |
| 2700 | 8.832 | 59.989 | 52.914 | 19.103 | 90.069 | 77.105 | -0.241 |
| 2900 | 8.870 | 60.311 | 53.172 | 19.988 | 90.077 | 76.624 | -5.981 |
| 2900 | 8.906 | 60.622 | 53.424 | 20.877 | 90.096 | 76.145 | -5.738 |
| 3ưu | 9.941 | 60.925 | 53.669 | 21.769 | 90.093 | 75.663 | -5.512 |
| 3100 | 8.973 | 61.219 | 53.908 | 22.565 | 90.102 | 75.181 | -5.300 |
| 3200 | 9.004 | 61.504 | 54.140 | 23.554 | 90.110 | 74.700 | -5.102 |
| 3300 | 9.033 | 61.782 | 54.368 | 24.465 | 90.117 | 74.219 | -4.915 |
| 3400 | 9.001 | 62.052 | 54.590 | 25.370 | 90.126 | 73.737 | -4.740 |
| 3500 | 9.088 | 62.315 | 54.807 | 26.278 | 90.133 | 73.255 | -4. 274 |
| 3ouv | 9.114 | 62.571 | 55.019 | 27.198 | 90.139 | 72.772 | -4.413 |
| 3700 | 9.139 | 62.821 | 55.226 | 28.100 | 90.145 | 72.290 | -4.270 |
| 1800 | 9.153 | 63.065 | 55.430 | 29.015 | 90.151 | 71.208 | -4.150 |
| 3900 | 9.185 | 53.304 | 55.623 | 29.933 | 90.157 | 71.326 | -3.997 |
| 4000 | 9.20v | 63.535 | 55.823 | 30.953 | 90.162 | 70.842 | -3.871 |
| 4100 | 9.230 | 63.76'4 | 56.014 | 31.774 | 90.166 | 70.359 | -3.750 |
| 4200 | 9.251 | 63.987 | 56.201 | 32.699 | 90.170 | 69.877 | -3.636 |
| 4300 | 9.271 | 64.205 | 56.385 | 33.625 | 90.173 | 69.393 | -j. 527 |
| 4400 | 9.291 | 64.418 | 56.565 | 34.553 | 90.176 | 68.009 | -3.423 |
| 4500 | 9.311 | 64.627 | 56.742 | 35.493 | 90.177 | 68.424 | -3.323 |
| 4600 | 9.350 | 64.832 | 25.916 | 36.415 | 90.179 | 67.944 | -3.228 |
| 4700 | 9.349 | 65.033 | 57.086 | 37.349 | 90.190 | 67.460 | -3.137 |
| 4800 | 9.367 | 65.230 | 57.254 | 38.295 | 90.191 | 66.977 | -3.ub0 |
| 4900 | 9.385 | 65.423 | 57.418 | 39.222 | 90.181 | 66.492 | -2.906 |
| bu00 | $9.40<$ | 65.613 | 5 57.580 | 40.162 | 90.190 | 56.009 | -2.885 |
| 5100 | 9.420 | 65.790 | - 57.740 | 41.103 | 90.179 | 65.524 | -c.808 |
| 5200 | 9.437 | 65.982 | 57.897 | 42.746 | 90.178 | 65.042 | -2.754 |
| b300 | 9.453 | 66.162 | 58.051 | 42.990 | 90.175 | 64.559 | -2.662 |
| 5400 | 9.470 | 66.339 | 58.203 | 43.736 | 90.172 | 64.074 | -2.593 |
| 5500 | 9.486 | 65.513 | 5 2. 352 | 44.234 | 90.168 | 63.593 | -2.527 |
| bobu | 9.502 | 66.684 | 59.499 | 45.833 | 90.164 | 63.108 | -2.403 |
| 5700 | 9.510 | 56.852 | 58.545 | 46.784 | 90.160 | 62.627 | - <. 401 |
| bsuo | 9.515 | 67.018 | 54.787 | 47.737 | 90.154 | 62.144 | -<.342 |
| byou | 9.549 | 67.181 | $58.92 R$ | 48.691 | 90.149 | 61.650 | -2.284 |
| GUU0 | 9.504 | 67.342 | 59.067 | 49.547 | 90.142 | 61.170 | -c. 228 |

July 31, 1972
$\Delta H f_{0}^{\circ}=9.26_{1} \mathrm{kcal} \operatorname{mol}-1 *$ $\Delta H f_{298.15}^{\circ}=9.31_{8} \pm 0.29 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mole} \mathrm{e}^{-1}$

Electronic States and Molecular Constants


Heat of Formation
$\Delta \mathrm{Hf}_{0}^{\circ}(\mathrm{OH})$ was calculated from the relation $\Delta H f_{0}^{\circ}(\mathrm{OH})=1 / 2 \mathrm{D}_{0}^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{O}_{2}\right)+1 / 2 \mathrm{D}_{0}^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{H}_{2}\right)-\mathrm{D}_{0}^{\circ}(\mathrm{OH})$. The values employed were as follows: $\mathrm{D}_{0}^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{O}_{2}\right)=117.967 \pm 0.042 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}{ }^{-1}$; and $\mathrm{D}_{0}^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{H}_{2}\right)=103.267^{2} \pm 0.003 \mathrm{kcal}$ mol ${ }^{-1}$ were taken from the CODATA (1) selection. $D_{0}^{\circ}(\mathrm{OH})$ : Barrow (2) in a refinement of the work of Barrow and Downie (3) obtains a value of $D_{0}^{\circ}$ for $O H\left(X^{2} \Pi_{3} / 2\right)=O\left({ }^{3} \mathrm{P}_{2}\right)+H\left({ }^{2} S_{1 / 2}\right)$ of $35427 \mathrm{~cm}{ }^{-1}$ from an extrapolation of $\Delta G_{v}$ versus $v$; it was increased to $35450 \pm$ $100 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$ to account for the fact that $\Delta G_{v} y i e l d s$ slightly low values at high $v$. Fehlenbok (4) obtains a value of $D_{e}^{\circ}$ for $O H\left(B^{2} \Sigma^{+}\right)$of $1315 \mathrm{~cm}{ }^{-1}$ and $G(0)$ for this state of $441 \mathrm{~cm}{ }^{-1}$. Using $T_{e}\left(B^{2} \Sigma^{+}\right)$given by Rosen (5) and the zero point energy of Ho (including the Dunham correction, see Herzberg (6)) of $847.0 \mathrm{~cm}{ }^{-1}$, this yields $D_{0}^{\circ}(0 H)=$ $35451 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$ with an estimated uncertainty of $\pm 100 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$. A value of $\mathrm{D}_{0}^{\circ}(0 \mathrm{H})=35450 \pm 100 \mathrm{~cm}{ }^{-1}=101.355_{6}^{ \pm} 0.29$ kcal mol ${ }^{-1}$ was adopted. Combining the above values, one obtains $\Delta \mathrm{Hf}_{0}^{\circ}(\mathrm{OH})=9.261 \pm 0.29 \mathrm{kcal}$ mol ${ }^{-1}$ which is in good agreement with the last JANAF (7) selection.

A review of earlier work is given in references (7-9).

## *Heat Capacity and Entropy

The vibrational and rotational constants of the respective electronic levels were taken from $B$. Rosen, Spectroscopic Data Relative to Diatomic Molecules, Pergamon Press, Oxford, 1970. Comparison of the results of these calculations with those of the more exact treatment given by L. Haar, A. S. Filedman and C. W. Beckett, NBS Monograph 20, May 29, 1961, (U. S. Govt. Printing Office, Washington, D. C. 20402) suggests the errors in the tables due to approximations in our calculations may be neglected above 400 K . Below this, they may be appreciable. It is recommended that $H_{0}^{\circ}-H_{298}^{\circ}, S_{298}^{\circ}$, and $\mathcal{C}_{p}^{\circ} 298$ be taken as -2.107 kcal mol ${ }^{-1}$, 43.890 gibbs mol ${ }^{-1}$, and $7.144 \mathrm{cal} \mathrm{deg}^{-1} \mathrm{~mol}{ }^{-1}$, respectively. For causes of errors, see the text (page 256) of the table for Deuterohydroxy 1 (0 D).
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(Ideal Gas)
$\mathrm{GFW}=17,0074$

| T, ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{K}$ | giblbs/mol |  |  | kcal/mol |  |  | $\underline{L o g} \mathbf{K p}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Cp ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | $\mathrm{S}^{\circ}$ | $-\left(\mathrm{G}^{\circ}-\mathrm{H}^{\circ}{ }_{298}\right) / \mathrm{T}$ | $\mathrm{H}^{\circ}-\mathrm{H}^{\circ}{ }_{298}$ | $\Delta H 0^{\circ}$ | $\Delta \mathrm{Gf}$ |  |
| 0 | . 000 | . 000 | INFINITE | -2.192 | 9.175 | 9.175 | INFINITE |
| 100 | 7.798 | 35.725 | 50.398 | -1.467 | 9.195 | 8.894 | -19.439 |
| 200 | 7.356 | 40.985 | 44.541 | -. 711 | 9.281 | 8.557 | -y.351 |
| 298 | 7.167 | 43.880 | 43.880 | . 000 | 9.318 | 8.193 | -0.005 |
| 300 | 7.165 | 43.925 | 43.881 | . 013 | 9.318 | 8.186 | -5.963 |
| 400 | 7.087 | 45.974 | 44.160 | . 725 | 9.328 | 7.906 | -4.265 |
| 500 | 7.055 | 47.551 | 44.687 | 1.4 .32 | 7.320 | 7.426 | -3.246 |
| 600 | 7.057 | 48.837 | 45.275 | 2.137 | 9.297 | 7.049 | -2.568 |
| 700 | 7.090 | 49.927 | 45.863 | 2.1445 | 9.265 | 6.677 | -2.085 |
| suo | 7.150 | 50.877 | 46.432 | 3.556 | 9.224 | 6.310 | -1.724 |
| 900 | 7.233 | 51.724 | 46.974 | 4.275 | 9.180 | 5.948 | -1.444 |
| 1000 | 7.332 | 52.491 | 47.489 | 5.003 | 9.136 | 5.592 | -1.222 |
| 1100 | 7.439 | 53.195 | 47.975 | 5.742 | 9.092 | 5.239 | -1.041 |
| 1200 | 7.547 | 53.847 | 48.437 | 6.491 | 9.050 | 4.991 | -. 891 |
| 1300 | 7.659 | 54.455 | 48.877 | 7.252 | 9.010 | 4.546 | -. 704 |
| 1400 | 7.760 | 55.027 | 49.296 | 8.023 | 8.972 | 4.204 | -. 656 |
| 1500 | 7.867 | 55.566 | 49.696 | 8. 805 | 8.936 | 3.865 | -. 563 |
| 1600 | 7.963 | 56.077 | 50.079 | 9.596 | 8.900 | 3.528 | -. 482 |
| 1700 | 8.053 | 56.563 | 50.447 | 10.397 | 8.866 | 3.194 | -. 411 |
| 1800 | 8.137 | 57.025 | 50.799 | 11.207 | 8.833 | 2.961 | -. 347 |
| 1900 | 8.214 | 57.467 | 51.139 | 12.024 | 8.900 | 2.530 | -. 291 |
| 2000 | 8. 286 | 57.891 | 51.466 | 12.949 | 8.767 | 2.200 | -. 240 |
| 2100 | 8.353 | 58.296 | 51.782 | 13.691 | 8.735 | 1.873 | -. 195 |
| 2200 | 8.415 | 58.686 | 52.087 | 14.520 | 8.701 | 1.547 | -. 154 |
| 2300 | 5.472 | 59.062 | 52.382 | 15.354 | 8.668 | 1.222 | -. 116 |
| 2400 | 8.520 | 59.424 | 52.668 | 16.214 | 8.634 | . 901 | -. 082 |
| 2500 | 8.570 | 59.773 | 52.945 | 17.069 | 8.597 | . 577 | -. 050 |
| 2600 | \$. 622 | 60.110 | 53.214 | 17.929 | 8. 561 | . 258 | -. 022 |
| 2700 | 8. 665 | 60.436 | 53.476 | 18.794 | 8. 523 | -. 060 | . 005 |
| 2800 | 8.700 | 60.752 | 53.730 | 19.662 | 8.494 | -. 378 | .030 |
| 2900 | 8.744 | 61.058 | 53.977 | 20.535 | 8.443 | -. 692 | . 052 |
| 3000 | 8.780 | 61.355 | 54.219 | 21.411 | 8.401 | -1.008 | . 073 |
| 3100 | 8.814 | 61.644 | 54.453 | 22.291 | 8. 358 | -1.321 | .093 |
| 3200 | 8.846 | 61.924 | 54.682 | 23.174 | 8.313 | -1.632 | . 111 |
| 3300 | 8.877 | 62.197 | 54.906 | 24.060 | 8. 267 | -1.942 | .129 |
| 3400 | 8.905 | 62.462 | 55.124 | 24.947 | 8. 219 | -2.252 | .145 |
| 3500 | 8.933 | 62.721 | $55.33 R$ | 25.341 | 8.169 | -2.559 | .160 |
| 3600 | 5.959 | 62.973 | 55.546 | 26.735 | 8.118 | -2.864 | .174 |
| 3700 | 8.985 | 63.21 A | 55.750 | 27.633 | 8.065 | -3.168 | .187 |
| 3800 | 9.009 | 63.458 | 55.950 | 28.532 | 8.011 | -3.470 | .200 |
| 3900 | 9.032 | 63.693 | 56.14 b | 29.434 | 7.955 | $-3.773$ | . 211 |
| 4000 | 9.055 | 63.922 | 56.337 | 30.339 | 7.998 | -4.073 | . 223 |
| 4100 | 9.070 | 64.146 | 56.525 | 31.245 | 7.839 | -4.371 | . 233 |
| 4200 | 9.097 | 64.365 | 56.709 | 32.154 | 7.779 | -4.668 | . 243 |
| 4300 | 9.113 | 64.579 | 56.889 | 33.755 | 7.717 | -4.963 | . 252 |
| 4400 | 9.133 | 64.789 | 57.005 | 33.978 | 7.654 | -5.259 | . 201 |
| 4500 | 9.157 | 64.994 | 57.240 | 34.892 | 7.599 | -5.552 | . 270 |
| 4600 | 9.170 | 65.195 | 57.411 | 35.809 | 7.524 | -5.840 | . 277 |
| 4700 | 9.195 | 65.393 | 57.579 | 36.728 | 7.456 | -6.130 | . 285 |
| 4800 | 9.213 | 65.587 | 57.744 | 37.648 | 7.399 | -6.419 | . 292 |
| 4900 | 9.231 | 65.777 | 57.906 | 38.570 | 7.320 | -6.707 | . 299 |
| 2000 | 9.249 | 65.764 | 59.065 | 39.494 | 7.250 | -6.995 | . 306 |
| 5100 | 9.267 | 66.147 | 59.222 | 40.420 | 7.179 | -7.270 | . 312 |
| 5200 | 9.254 | 66.327 | 5月.376 | 41.348 | 7.107 | -7.561 | . 318 |
| 5300 | 9.301 | 66.504 | 54.528 | 42.277 | 7.035 | -7.839 | . 323 |
| 5400 | 9.319 | 66.579 | b8.677 | 43.2n8 | 6.961 | -8.123 | . 329 |
| 5500 | 9.330 | 66.850 | 54.824 | 44.141 | 6.888 | -8.399 | . 334 |
| 5600 | 9.352 | 67.019 | 58.969 | 45.075 | 6.913 | -8.679 | . 339 |
| 5700 | 9.369 | 67.184 | 50.111 | 45.711 | 6.738 | -8.954 | . 343 |
| 5801 | 9.386 | 67.347 | 59.252 | 46.949 | 6.662 | -9.228 | . 348 |
| 勺700 | 9.403 | 67.507 | 59.391 | 47.898 | 5.586 | -9.501 | . 352 |
| GU00 | 7.420 | 67.665 | 50.527 | 45.929 | 6.510 | -9.774 | . 356 |

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { RIDE (SH) } \\
& \mathrm{S}_{298.15}^{\circ}=46.74 \mathrm{cal}^{-1} \mathrm{~mol} \\
& -1^{\ddagger}
\end{aligned} \quad \Delta \mathrm{Kf}_{298.15}^{\circ}=33.3 \pm 1.2 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{~mol}^{-1}
$$

Electronic States and Molecular Constants

| State | E, cm ${ }^{-1}$ | g | ${ }_{\omega_{e}, \mathrm{~cm}}{ }^{-1}$ | $\chi_{X_{e}{ }^{\omega} e^{, c m}{ }^{-1}}$ | $\mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{e}, \mathrm{cm}}{ }^{-1}$ | $\alpha_{e}, \mathrm{~cm}{ }^{-1}$ | $r_{e}, \AA$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{x}^{2} \mathrm{II}_{i}$ | $\left\{\begin{array}{c}0 \\ 377.01\end{array}\right.$ | $\left.\begin{array}{l} 2 \\ 2 \end{array}\right\}$ | 2689.6 | 45.5 | 9.601 | 0.285 | 1.345 |
| $\mathrm{A}^{2} \Sigma^{+}$ | 30663 | 2 | 1979.8 | 97.65 | 8.521 | 0.464 | 1.423 |
| $B^{2} \Sigma$ | 59622 | 2 | 2670.6 | 56.8 | 8.785 | 0,259 | 1.428 |
| $C^{2} \Delta$ | [63900] | 47 |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{D}^{2} \Delta$ | 71195 | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{E}^{2} \Sigma$ | 71318 | 2 \} | [ 2689.6] | [45.5] | [9.601] | [0.285] |  |
| $\mathrm{F}^{2} \Delta$ | 76708 | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{G}^{2} \Delta$ | 79343 | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{H}^{2} \Delta$ | 80848 | 4 J |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\sigma=1$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Heat of Formation

The previous JANAF (1) selection for $\Delta \mathrm{Hf}_{298}^{\circ}$ of $\mathrm{HS}(\mathrm{g})$ was Mackle's (2) estimate of $34.6 \pm 4$ kcal which he derived from the average of three independent determinations, Of these, the uncertainty in the determination involving the calculation of $\Delta H f{ }_{298}^{\circ}$ of $\mathrm{HS}(\mathrm{g})$ from $\Delta \mathrm{Hf}_{298}^{\circ}$ of $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{~S}(\mathrm{~g})$, the ionization potential of $\mathrm{HS}(\mathrm{g})$, and the appearance potential of $\mathrm{HS}^{+}(\mathrm{g})$ from $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{~S}(\mathrm{~g})$ can be reduced. A summary of previous work on the ionization potential is given below. From the spectroscopic and photoionization work we arrive at a value of $\Delta \mathrm{Hf}_{0}^{\circ}$ for the reaction $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{~S}=\mathrm{HS}+\mathrm{H}$ of $89.02 \pm 1.15$ kcal mol ${ }^{-1}$. Using the appropriate thermal functions for each of the species (see tables for $H_{2} S$, HS, and $H$ (1)) and the selected heats of formation of $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{~S}(\mathrm{~g}), \mathrm{H}(\mathrm{g})$ of $-4.90 \pm 0.2 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}^{-1}$ (see $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{~S}(\mathrm{~g})$ table) and $52.103 \pm 0.001$ kcal mol ${ }^{-1}(8)$, one obtains $-33.3 \pm 1.2 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}^{-1}$ for $\Delta \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{f}}^{\circ} \mathrm{C} 98$ of $\mathrm{HS}(\mathrm{g})$ versus Mackle's (2) value of $33.7 \pm 3 \mathrm{kcal}$ mol ${ }^{-1}$ for this determination. The new value is preferred because it is based on photoionization rather than electron impact studies.

| Source | Method | Potential (EV) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{HS} \rightarrow \mathrm{HS}^{+} \mathrm{e}^{-}$: |  |  |
| Morrow (3) (1966) | Rydberg Extrapolation | $10.40 \pm 0.03$ |
| Palmer and Lossing (4) (1962) | Electron Impact | $10.5 \pm 0.1$ |
| $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{~S} \rightarrow \mathrm{HS}^{+}+\mathrm{H}+\mathrm{e}^{-}$: |  |  |
| Dibeler and Liston (5) (1968) | Photoionization | $14.27 \pm 0.04 *$ |
| Dibeler and Rosenstock (6) (1963) | Electron Impact | $14.43 \pm 0.1$ |
| Palmer and Lossing (4) (1962) | Electron Impact | $14.43 \pm 0.1$ |
| Neuert and Clasen (7) (1952) | Electron Impact | $15.2 \pm 0.5$ |

*The uncertainty given by the authors was doubled because the threshold value was not corrected to absolute zero.
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${ }^{*}$ Heat Capacity and Entropy
Calculations were made as described in JANAF Thermochemical Tables, 2nd Edition, NSRDS-NBS 37, June, 1971
(U. S. Govt. Printing Office, Washington, D. C., 20402) but using the vibrational and rotational constants at the respective electronic levels taken from B. Rosen, Spectroscopic Data Relative to Diatomic Molecules, Pergamon Press, Oxford, 1970. Comparison of the results of the more exact treatment of L. Haar, A. S. Friedman, and C. W. Beckett, NBS Monograph 20, May 29, 1961 (U. S. Govt. Printing Office, Washington, D, C., 20402) with those given in the previous JANAF (loc. cit.) calculations (both used the same molecular constants for the ground state) suggests errors in our calculations are negligible above 400 K . Below this, they can be appreciable. In particular, it is recommended that $0.045 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}{ }^{-1}, 0.012 \mathrm{gibbs} / \mathrm{mol}$, and $-0.028 \mathrm{cal} \mathrm{mol}^{-1} \mathrm{deg}^{-1} \mathrm{be}$ added to our values of $\mathrm{H}_{0}^{\circ}-\mathrm{H}_{298}^{\circ}$, $\mathrm{S}_{298}^{\circ}$, and C $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{p}}^{\circ} 298$.

| T，${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{K}$ | gibbs／mol |  |  | ＿．．．．．．．．．．．cal／mol |  |  | $\underline{\log } \mathbb{K}_{p}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Cp ${ }^{\circ}$ | $\mathrm{S}^{\circ}$ | $-\left(\mathrm{G}^{\circ}-\mathrm{H}^{\circ} 288\right) / \mathrm{T}$ | $\mathbf{H}^{\circ}-\mathrm{H}^{\circ} \mathbf{2 9 8}$ | $\Delta H H^{\circ}$ | $\Delta \mathrm{Gf}^{\circ}$ |  |
| 0 | ．UuU | ． 000 | INFINITE | $-2.215$ | 33.149 | 33.149 | INFINITE |
| 100 | 7．21＋ | 38.378 | 53.629 | －1．525 | 33.317 | 30.079 | －67．703 |
| 200 | 7.815 | 43.610 | 47.443 | －． 7607 | 33.361 | 23.515 | －31．209 |
| 293 | 7.755 | 46.730 | 46.730 | ． 000 | 33.300 | 26.295 | －19．275 |
| 300 | 7.752 | 45.779 | 45.730 | ． 714 | 33.298 | 25.252 | －17．124 |
| 400 | 7.575 | 48.993 | 47.032 | ． 791 | 32.618 | 23.044 | －13．082 |
| 500 | 7.477 | 50.662 | 47.596 | 1.533 | 32.093 | 21．837 | －9．545 |
| 500 | 7.464 | 52.022 | 48.224 | 2.279 | 31．522 | 19.833 | －7．224 |
| 700 | 7.517 | 53.176 | 4R．351 | 3.027 | 31.219 | 17.925 | －3．596 |
| 500 | 7.511 | 54.186 | 49.456 | 3.794 | 17.798 | 14.782 | －4．038 |
| 900 | 7.724 | 55.089 | 50.033 | 4.550 | 17.770 | 14.407 | －3．499 |
| 1000 | 7.845 | 55.909 | 50.580 | 5.329 | 17.749 | 14．035 | －3．067 |
| 1100 | 7．95．3 | 56.662 | 51.099 | 6． 119 | 17.733 | 13.563 | $-2.715$ |
| 1200 | B．05y | 57.357 | 51.59 ？ | 6.970 | 17.723 | 13.295 | －2．421 |
| 1300 | 8.170 | 58.009 | 52.061 | 7.732 | 17.719 | 12.927 | －2．173 |
| 1400 | 5.263 | 58.619 | 52.50 R | 9.554 | 17.716 | 12.558 | －1．960 |
| 1500 | 9．346 | 59.191 | 32.934 | 9.384 | 17.715 | 12.189 | －1．776 |
| 1000 | 8.422 | 59.732 | 53.342 | 10.223 | 17.717 | 11.921 | －1．6́15 |
| 1700 | 8.491 | 60.244 | 53.733 | 11.0 亿9 | 17.720 | 11.452 | －1．472 |
| 1500 | 9.553 | 60.732 | 54.109 | 11．9？1 | 17.724 | 11.083 | －1．346 |
| 1900 | 8.6 UG | 61.196 | 54.470 | 12．779 | 17.729 | 10.715 | －1．233 |
| 2000 | 9.66 U | 61.639 | 54.817 | 13.643 | 17.734 | 10.345 | －1．130 |
| 2100 | 9.747 | 62．06？ | 55.152 | 14.511 | 17．739 | 9.975 | －1．038 |
| 2200 | 4.750 | 62.469 | 55.475 | 15.394 | 17.743 | 9.606 | －． 954 |
| 2300 | 9.790 | 62．95R | 55.789 | 16.261 | 17.748 | 9.236 | －． 878 |
| 2400 | 4.820 | 63.233 | 56.090 | 17.142 | 17.752 | 8.957 | －． 807 |
| 2500 | 8.850 | 63.594 | 56.383 | 18.026 | 17.756 | 9.495 | －． 743 |
| 2600 | 8.896 | 63.942 | 56.668 | 18.914 | 17.760 | 8． 125 | －． 683 |
| 2700 | 8.925 | 64.278 | 56.943 | 19.904 | 17.763 | 7.754 | －． 628 |
| 2500 | 3.9511 | 64.603 | 57.211 | 20.699 | 17.765 | 7.381 | －． 576 |
| 2900 | 内．975 | 64.919 | 57.471 | 21.594 | 17.767 | 7.012 | －． 528 |
| su0u | 9.001 | 65.222 | 57.725 | 22.473 | 17.758 | 6.541 | －． 484 |
| 3100 | 9.024 | 65.519 | 57.971 | 23.394 | 17.770 | 6.270 | －． 442 |
| 3200 | 9.047 | 65.805 | 53.212 | 24.298 | 17.770 | 5.899 | －． 403 |
| 3300 | 9.065 | 66.093 | 59.446 | 25.204 | 17.770 | 5.527 | －． 306 |
| 3400 | 9.089 | 65.355 | 58.675 | 26.112 | 17.770 | 5.157 | －．332 |
| 3500 | $9.14 y$ | 66.618 | 58.898 | 27．721 | 17.757 | 4.785 | －． 299 |
| ． 3600 | 9．123 | 66.475 | 59.116 | 27.733 | 17．765 | 4.414 | －． 268 |
| 3700 | y．1＋7 | 67.125 | 59.329 | 28.447 | 17.761 | 4.045 | －． 239 |
| 3300 | 9.160 | 67.370 | 59.537 | 29.753 | 17.757 | 3.674 | －． 211 |
| 3900 | 9.1 ¢ट | 67.608 | 59.741 | 30.590 | 17.751 | 3.302 | －． 185 |
| 4000 | 9.200 | 67.1841 | 59.941 | 31.599 | 17.746 | 2.035 | －． 100 |
| 4100 | 9.217 | 68.068 | 60.136 | 32.520 | 17.739 | 2.563 | －． 137 |
| 4200 | 9.233 | 68.290 | 50.328 | 33.442 | 17.731 | 2． 194 | －． 114 |
| 4300 | 7.2 .50 | 69.509 | 60.516 | 34.365 | 17.723 | 1.023 | －． 093 |
| 4400 | 9.265 | 68.721 | 60.700 | 35.292 | 17.713 | 1.453 | －． 072 |
| 4500 | 9．2ヶ゙く | 68.929 | 60.830 | 36.220 | 17.703 | 1．084 | －．053 |
| 4600 | 9．29．2 | 69.133 | 61.057 | 37．149 | 17.692 | ． 715 | －． 034 |
| 4100 | 2.314 | 69.333 | 61.231 | 39.079 | 17.691 | ． 346 | －． 010 |
| 4300 | 9．330 | 69.530 | 61.402 | 39.111 | 17.665 | －． 025 | ． 001 |
| 4900 | 9.340 | 69.722 | 61.570 | 39.245 | 17.656 | －． 389 | .017 |
| bu0u | $9.30{ }^{\text {c }}$ | 69.911 | 61.735 | 40.381 | 17.642 | －． 761 | .033 |
| 5104 | 9.370 | 70.097 | 61.897 | 41．0．19 | 17.527 | －1．120 | ． 048 |
| beou | $9.39+$ | 70.279 | 62.057 | 42.756 | 17.613 | －1．494 | ．003 |
| 5300 | 9．411 | 70.453 | 62.213 | 43.636 | 17.598 | －1．961 | ． 077 |
| 5400 | 9．4\％ | 70.634 | 62.309 | 44.633 | 17.582 | －2． 228 | ． 090 |
| bsuo | 9.44 c | 70.807 | 62.520 | 45.591 | 17.565 | －2．595 | ． 143 |
| 2ó00 | 9．4by | 70.977 | 62.609 | 46．5？7 | 17.549 | －2．961 |  |
| 5700 | － $0.47 \%$ | 71.145 | 62.815 | 47.473 | 17.531 | －3．328 | ． 128 |
| 3300 | 9．4y | 71.310 | 62.901 | 48.422 | 17.513 | －3．694 | ． 139 |
| bэou | $9.50 y$ | 71.477 | 63.104 | 49.372 | 17.495 | －4．062 | － 150 |
| 01100 | $9.5 c i$ | 71.632 | 63.245 | 50.323 | 17.477 | －4．424 | ． 161 |

```
\(\mathrm{D}_{0}^{\circ}=103.266 \pm 0.003 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}^{-1}\)
Ground State Configuration \({ }^{1}{ }_{\Sigma}{ }_{g}^{+}\)
\(\omega_{\mathrm{e}}=4405.3 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} \quad \omega_{e^{x}} e^{=125.325 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}}\)
\(B_{e}=60.848 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} \quad \alpha_{e}=3.0664 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}\)
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \Delta H f_{298.15}^{\circ}=0 \\
& S_{298.15}^{\circ}=31.208 \pm 0.01 \mathrm{cal}^{\circ} \mathrm{deg}^{-1} \mathrm{mo1} 1^{-1} \\
& \mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{e}}=0.04644 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} \quad \sigma=2 \\
& r_{e}=0.7417 \AA
\end{aligned}
\]
```


## Heat Capacity and Entropy

Except for the changes at $100^{\circ}$ and $200^{\circ} \mathrm{K}$ noted below, the table was taken from the JANAF table for $\mathrm{H}_{2}$ (dated March 31, 1961), whose thermodynamic functions follow very closely those calculated up to 5000 K by H . W. Woolley, R. B. Scott, and F. G. Brickwedde, J. Research Nat. Bur. Standards 41, 379 (1948), who used spectroscopic constants derived from an analysis of U.V. band spectra. (As in the JANAF table, a nuclear-spin entropy of Rln 4 was omitted at all temperatures, but the entropy due to the mixing of ortho and para hydrogen, which is a consequence of nuclear spin, is included.)

The JANAF table for $\mathrm{H}_{2}$ is for "normal" $\mathrm{H}_{2}$ ( $75 \%$ ortho and $25 \%$ para) except at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{K}$, where the values are for "equilibrium" $H_{2}$ ( $100 \%$ para at that temperature). The present table eliminates that inconsistency since it applies to "equilibrium" $\mathrm{H}_{2}$ at all temperatures; the values at $100^{\circ}$ and $200^{\circ} \mathrm{K}$, which differ substantially from those for normal $\mathrm{H}_{2}$ but are not suitable for interpolation anyhow, were taken from L. Haar, A. S. Friedman, and C. W. Beckett, Nat. Bur. Standards Monograph 20 (1961), but the thermodynamic functions of the two forms differ negligibly (by less than $0.01 \%$ ) at 298.15 K and all higher temperatures.

A more practical consistent table for $\mathrm{H}_{2}$ might seem to be one for normal $\mathrm{H}_{2}$ at all temperatures, since this form of the gas is essentially the one always encountered except in its generation or catalytic ortho-para equilibration at low temperatures. However, $H_{298}^{\circ}-H_{0}^{\circ}$ is 0.156 kcal mol ${ }^{-1}$ less for the "normal" than for the "equilibrium" form, and it was considered undesirable to offer a reference table for $H_{2}$ whose use would change the difference between $\Delta H f_{0}^{\circ}$ and $\Delta H f_{298.15}^{\circ}$ for all compounds containing hydrogen by corresponding amounts. "Equilibrium" $H_{2}$ is the form which parallels the great majority of substances (those maintaining equilibrium among all rotational states).

The present reference-state table for $H_{2}$ was used in generating all tables of the present series for compounds containing the isotope ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$.

The value of $D_{0}^{\circ}$ is taken from G. Herzberg, J. Molec. Spectroscopy 33, 147 (1970).
（Ideal Gas，Reference State）GFW $=2.016$

| T，${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{K}$ | $C p^{\circ}$ | gibls／mol |  | $\mathbf{H}^{\circ}-\mathbf{H}^{\circ}{ }_{298}$ | kcal／mol <br> $\Delta H f^{\circ}$ | $\Delta \mathbf{G f}{ }^{\circ}$ | $\underline{L o g ~ K p}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\mathrm{S}^{\circ}$ | $-\left(\mathrm{G}^{\circ}-\mathrm{H}^{\circ}{ }_{283}\right) / \mathrm{T}$ |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | ．Uu0 | ． 000 | INFINITE | －2．024 | ． 000 | ． 000 | ． 000 |
| 100 | 6.728 | 24.049 | 37.118 | －1．307 | ． 000 | －cuo | .000 |
| 200 | 6.500 | 28．515 | 31.830 | －． 563 | －000 | ．OUu | ． 000 |
| 298 | 6.893 | 31.208 | 31.208 | ． 000 | ． 000 | ． 0 U0 | .000 |
| 300 | 6.894 | 31.251 | 31.209 | ． 013 | ． $0 \cap 0$ | ． 000 | ． 000 |
| 400 | 0.975 | 33.247 | 31.480 | ． 707 | ． 000 | ． 000 | ． 000 |
| 500 | 6.943 | 34.806 | 31.995 | 1.405 | ． 000 | ． 000 | .000 |
| 600 | 7.009 | 36.082 | 32.572 | 2.106 | ． 000 | ． 000 | ． 000 |
| 700 | 7.036 | 37.165 | 33.154 | 2.308 | ． 000 | ． 000 | ． 000 |
| 800 | 7.1087 | 38.107 | 33.714 | 3.514 | ． 000 | .000 | .000 |
| 900 | 7.148 | 38.946 | 34.250 | 4.226 | ． 000 | ． 000 | .000 |
| 1000 | 7.219 | 39.702 | 34.758 | 4.944 | － 000 | ． 000 | .000 |
| 1100 | 7.300 | 40.394 | 35.239 | 5.670 | － 0 Oo | ． 000 | ． 000 |
| 1200 | 7.390 | 41.033 | 35.696 | 6.404 | ． 000 | ． 000 | ． 000 |
| 1300 | $7.4 \bigcirc 0$ | 41.628 | 36.130 | 7.148 | ． 000 | ． 000 | ． 000 |
| 1400 | $7.0 \cup 0$ | 42.187 | 36.543 | 7.902 | － 0 OO | ． 000 | .000 |
| 1500 | 7.720 | 42.716 | 36.937 | 8.668 | ． 000 | ． 000 | ． 000 |
| 1000 | 7.823 | 43.217 | 37.313 | 9.446 | ． 000 | ． 000 | ． 000 |
| 1700 | 7.921 | 43.695 | 37.676 | 10.233 | ． 000 | ． 000 | ． 000 |
| 1800 | 8.016 | 44.150 | 38.022 | 11.030 | ． 000 | ． 000 | ． 000 |
| 1900 | 3.108 | 44.586 | 38.357 | 11.83 h | ． 000 | ． 000 | ． 000 |
| 2000 | 6.195 | 45.004 | 38.679 | 12．651 | － 000 | ． 000 | .000 |
| 2100 | \％． 279 | 45.406 | 38.989 | 13.475 | ． 000 | ． 000 | ． 000 |
| c200 | 8.358 | 45.793 | 39.290 | 14.307 | .000 | ． 000 | ． 000 |
| 2300 | 3.434 | 46.166 | 39.581 | 15.146 | ． 000 | ． 000 | ． 000 |
| 2400 | 8.505 | 46.527 | 39.863 | 15.993 | .000 | .000 | .000 |
| CbUU | －． 575 | 46.375 | 40.136 | 16.948 | ． 000 | ． 000 | ． 000 |
| 2600 | 3.639 | 47.213 | 40.402 | 17.708 | ． 000 | .000 | ． 000 |
| $\angle 700$ | 8.700 | 47.540 | 40.660 | 18.575 | .000 | ． 000 | ． 000 |
| 2500 | ら．7ら7 | 47.857 | 40.911 | 19.448 | .000 | .000 | ． 000 |
| 2900 | 3.810 | 49.166 | 41.157 | 20.326 | ． 000 | .000 | ． 000 |
| 3000 | 5．859 | 49.465 | 41.395 | 21.210 | .000 | ． 000 | ． 000 |
| 3100 | 5.911 | 48.756 | 41.628 | 22.098 | ． 000 | ． 000 | ． 000 |
| 3200 | 0.902 | 49.040 | 41.855 | 22.992 | ． 000 | ． 000 | .000 |
| 3300 | 9.012 | 49.317 | 42.077 | 23.891 | ． 070 | ． 000 | .000 |
| 3400 | 9.001 | 49.586 | 42.294 | 24.794 | .000 | ． 000 | ． 000 |
| 3500 | $7 \cdot 110$ | 47.850 | 42.506 | 25.703 | － 000 | ． 000 | ． 000 |
| soun | ¢． 158 | 50.107 | 42.714 | 26.516 | －00\％ | ． 000 | ． 000 |
| 3700 | 9.205 | 50.359 | 42.917 | 27.535 | ． 000 | ． 000 | ． 000 |
| 3800 | y． 252 | 50.675 | 43.115 | 28.457 | .000 | ． 000 | ． 000 |
| syou | 9． 297 | 50.846 | 43.311 | 29.385 | ． 000 | ． 000 | ． 000 |
| ＋000 | 7． 342 | 51.082 | 43.503 | 30.317 | ． 000 | ． 000 | ． 000 |
| 4100 | 9.386 | 51.313 | 43.690 | 31.253 | － 010 | ． 000 | ． 000 |
| 4200 | 9.429 | 51.540 | 43.875 | 32.194 | ． 000 | ． 000 | ． 000 |
| 4300 | 7.472 | 51.762 | 44.055 | 33.139 | ． 000 | ． 000 | .000 |
| 4400 | 9.514 | 51.980 | 44.233 | 34.088 | .000 | ． 000 | ． 000 |
| 4500 | 4．bs | 52.134 | 44.407 | 35.042 | － 000 | ． 000 | .000 |
| 4600 | 9．595 | 52.405 | 44.579 | 35.999 | ． 000 | ． 000 | ． 000 |
| 4700 | $y .634$ | 52.612 | 44.748 | 36.961 | .000 | ． 000 | .000 |
| 4800 | 9.573 | 52.815 | 44.914 | 37.926 | － 000 | ． 000 | ． 000 |
| $4 \rightarrow$ ¢ | 7．711 | 53.015 | 45.077 | 38.895 | .000 | ． 000 | .000 |
| buOu | $\bigcirc \cdot 748$ | 53.211 | 45.237 | 39.868 | ． 070 | ． 000 | ． 000 |
| 5100 | 9．705 | 53.405 | 45.396 | 40.845 | ． 000 | ． 000 | ． 000 |
| beuo | 7．822 | 53.595 | 45.552 | 41.825 | ． 000 | ． 000 | .000 |
| 5300 | 9.859 | 53.783 | 45.706 | 42.809 | － 000 | ． 000 | .000 |
| 5400 | 9.895 | 53.967 | 45.856 | 43.797 | ． 000 | ． 000 | ． 000 |
| らsuu | y．930 | 54.149 | 45.006 | 44.788 | ． 010 | .000 | ． 000 |
| boun | 7.965 | 54.329 | 45.152 | 45.783 | － $0 \cap 0$ | ． 000 | ． 000 |
| 3700 | 16.000 | 54.505 | 46.299 | 46.781 | .000 | ． 000 | ． 000 |
| bsuo | 10.034 | 54.679 | 46.441 | 47.783 | ． 000 | ． 000 | ． 000 |
| b90u | 1 U．Uの 7 | 54.851 | 46.582 | 48.788 | ． 000 | ． 000 | ． 000 |
| GU00 | 1 U .100 | 55.020 | 46.721 | 49.796 | ． 000 | ． 000 | ． 000 |

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Point Group } C_{2 v} \\
& S_{298.15}^{\circ}=46.51 \text { gibbs mol }
\end{aligned}
$$

Electronic Levels (Quantum Weight) and Vibrational Frequencies (Degeneracies)

| $\begin{equation*} \varepsilon, \mathrm{cm}^{-1} \tag{g} \end{equation*}$ | (g) | $\omega, c^{-1}$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | (2) | 3173 (1) | 1497.2 |  | 3220 (1) |
| 10249 | (2) | 3325 (1) | 633 | (1) | [3220] (1) |

Bond Distance: $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{N}=1.024 \AA \quad$ Bond Angle: $\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{H}=103^{\circ} \quad 0=2$ Product of the Moments of Inertia: $I_{A} I_{B} I_{C}=8.742 \times 10^{-120} \mathrm{~g}^{3} \mathrm{~cm}{ }^{6}$

Heat of Formation
Direct kinetic studies [1-5] on the decomposition of hydrazine, $\mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{H}_{4}(\mathrm{~g}) \stackrel{\mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{d}}}{\stackrel{\text { of }}{ }} 2 \mathrm{NH}_{2}(\mathrm{~g})$, give activation energies which suggest $\Delta \mathrm{Hf}_{298}^{\circ}$ of $\mathrm{NH}_{2} \leq 40 \mathrm{kcal}$. The pre-exponential factor suggests ${ }_{k_{r}}^{k_{r}} 10^{7}-10^{8}$ 11ters/mol sec. This is exceptionally slow for a radical combination reaction [6] and is at variance with the most recent direct measurements of $\mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{r}}=10^{10.8} 1$ iters $/ \mathrm{mol} \sec \left(300 \mathrm{~K}, 1500 \mathrm{~mm} \mathrm{Hg}\right.$ ) [7] and $\mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{r}}=10^{9.4} 1$ iters $/ \mathrm{mol} \mathrm{sec}$ ( $300 \mathrm{~K}, 10 \mathrm{~mm} \mathrm{Hg}$ ) [8]. A possible explanation for this discrepancy is that the hydrazine decomposition studies have been carried out in the energy dependent region [9,10]. This has been confirmed on the basis of RRKM calculations. With a $\Delta H f{ }_{298}^{\circ}$ equal to 40 kcal, it is not possible to simultaneously reproduce the measured forward ( $k_{d}$ ) and backward ( $k_{r}$ ) rates by orders of magnitude. With a value of $\Delta H f_{298}^{\circ}$ of 45.5 kcal , all of the rate data can be fitted to a factor of three. For higher values of $\Delta \mathrm{Hf}_{298}^{\circ}$, the discrepancy increases.

Data on the thermal decomposition of benzylamine from toluene carrier studies [2,11] yield $\Delta H f_{298}^{\circ}=36 \mathrm{kcal}$. This technique, however, has consistently yielded erroneous rate parameters [12]. Using their very low pressure pyrolysis technique, Golden and coworkers [13] find $\Delta H_{298}^{\circ}$ of $\mathrm{NH}_{2}$ equals 47.2 kca ]. This is in reasonable agreement with the recommended value.

## Heat Capacity and Entropy

The bond distance and angle from the electronic absorption spectrum (c.f. G. Herzberg, Electronic Spectra of Polyatomic Molecules, D. Van Nostrand Co., Inc., Princeton, N. J., 1966 for references and discussion). The vibrational frequencies for the ground electronic state were obtained from the matrix isolation studies by D. E. Milligan and M. E. Jacox, J. Chem. Phys. 43, 4487 (1956). The vibrational frequencles of the upper electronic level have been obtained from both the gas phase and matrix isolated electronic absorption spectra.
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| T, ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{K}$ | $\mathrm{Cp}^{\circ}$ | gibls/mol |  | $\mathbf{H}^{\circ}-\mathbf{H}^{\circ}{ }_{298}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { kcal/mol } \\ \Delta H f^{\circ} \end{gathered}$ | $\Delta \mathrm{Gf}$ | $\log \mathrm{Kp}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\mathbf{S}^{\circ}$ | $-\left(\mathrm{G}^{\circ}-\mathrm{H}^{\circ} 298\right) / \mathrm{T}$ |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | . 000 | . 000 | INFINITE | -2.373 | 46.187 | 46.187 | INFINITE |
| 100 | 7.949 | 37.815 | 53.597 | -1.579 | 45.918 | 46.450 | -1U1.517 |
| 200 | 7.954 | 43.325 | 47.241 | -. 783 | 45.721 | 47.058 | -51.423 |
| 295 | 8.024 | 46.510 | 46.510 | . 000 | 45.500 | 47.761 | -35.010 |
| 300 | 8.027 | 46.560 | 46.510 | . 015 | 45.495 | 47.775 | -34.804 |
| 400 | 4. 221 | 48.893 | 46.827 | . 326 | 45.264 | 48.569 | -20.537 |
| 500 | 8.493 | 50.756 | 47.433 | 1.662 | 45.049 | 49.421 | -21.602 |
| 600 | 8.805 | 52.331 | 48.121 | 2.526 | 44.958 | 50.314 | -18.327 |
| 700 | 9.143 | 53.714 | 48.823 | 3.424 | 44.689 | 51.237 | -1b.997 |
| su0 | 9.492 | 54.957 | 49.513 | 4.355 | 44.543 | 52.182 | -14.255 |
| 900 | 9.842 | 56.096 | 50.182 | 5.322 | 44.418 | 53.145 | -12.905 |
| 1000 | 10.181 | 57.150 | 50.827 | 6.323 | 44.315 | 54.120 | -11.828 |
| 1100 | 10.503 | 58.136 | 51.447 | 7.359 | 44.229 | 55.105 | -10.948 |
| 1200 | 10.802 | 59.063 | 52.044 | 8.423 | 44.160 | 56.097 | -10.217 |
| 1300 | 11.079 | 59.939 | 52.619 | 9.517 | 44.105 | 57.094 | -9.598 |
| 1400 | 11.333 | 60.769 | 53.170 | 10.639 | 44.051 | 58.095 | -9.069 |
| 1 bue | 11.500 | 61.559 | 53.704 | 11.793 | 44.026 | 59.099 | -0.611 |
| 1600 | 11.781 | 62.312 | 54.218 | 12.751 | 43.997 | 60.104 | -8.210 |
| 1700 | 11.981 | 63.033 | 54.716 | 14.139 | 43.977 | 61.113 | -7.857 |
| 1800 | 12.107 | 63.723 | 55.197 | 15.346 | 43.963 | 62.120 | -7.542 |
| 1900 | 12.344 | 64.385 | 55.663 | 16.572 | 43.956 | 63.130 | -7.2.2 |
| 2000 | 12.511 | 65.023 | 56.115 | 17. ล15 | 43.955 | 64.139 | -7.009 |
| 2100 | 12.672 | 65.637 | 56.554 | 19.074 | 43.959 | 65.148 | -6.780 |
| 2200 | 12.826 | 66.230 | 56.981 | 20.349 | 43.969 | 66.157 | -6.572 |
| 2300 | 12.975 | 66.904 | 57.395 | 21.639 | 43.985 | 67.165 | -6.382 |
| 2400 | 13.120 | 67.359 | 57.799 | 22.944 | 44.009 | 68.174 | -6.208 |
| 2500 | 13.201 | 67.897 | 58.192 | 24.253 | 44.034 | 69.177 | -0.047 |
| 2000 | 15.397 | 68.420 | 58.576 | 25.596 | 44.069 | 70.184 | $-5.940$ |
| 2700 | 13.527 | 68.923 | 58.950 | 26.942 | 44.109 | 71.188 | -5.762 |
| 2900 | 13.656 | 69.423 | 59.315 | 28.301 | 44.154 | 72.188 | -5.635 |
| 2300 | 13.782 | 69.904 | 59.672 | 29.673 | 44.207 | 73.191 | -5.516 |
| 3000 | 13.901 | 70.373 | 60.021 | 31.058 | 44.265 | 74.188 | -5.405 |
| 3100 | 14.010 | 70.831 | 60.362 | 32.454 | 44.330 | 75.183 | $-5.300$ |
| 3200 | 14.120 | 71.279 | 0.695 | 33.851 | 44.399 | 76.173 | $-5.203$ |
| 3300 | 14.231 | 71.714 | 61.024 | 35.279 | 44.473 | 77.171 | -5.111 |
| 3400 | 14.331 | 72.140 | 61.344 | 36.707 | 44.553 | 78.159 | -5.024 |
| 3500 | 14.426 | 72.557 | 61.659 | 38.145 | 44.636 | 79.147 | -4.942 |
| 3600 | 14.516 | 72.965 | 61.907 | 39.592 | 44.723 | 80.132 | -4.865 |
| 3700 | 14.600 | 73.364 | 62.270 | 41.049 | 44.913 | 81.115 | -4.791 |
| 3800 | 14.679 | 73.754 | 62.567 | 42.512 | 44.907 | 32.095 | -4.722 |
| 3900 | 14.752 | 74.136 | 62.859 | 43.783 | 45.003 | 83.073 | -4.655 |
| 4000 | 14.821 | 74.511 | 63.145 | 45.462 | 45.100 | 94.047 | -4.592 |
| 4100 | 14.864 | 74.979 | 63.427 | 46.947 | 45.200 | 95.019 | -4.532 |
| 4200 | 14.942 | 75.237 | 63.704 | 48.439 | 45.301 | 95.991 | -4.475 |
| 4300 | 14.993 | 75.589 | 63.976 | 49.935 | 45.402 | 86.057 | -4.420 |
| 4400 | 15.044 | 75.934 | 64.244 | 51.437 | 45.504 | 87.921 | -4.367 |
| 4500 | 15.088 | 76.273 | 64.508 | 52.944 | 45.606 | 88.882 | -4.317 |
| 4500 | 15.127 | 76.605 | 64.767 | 54.455 | 45.709 | 89.947 | -4.269 |
| 4700 | 15.162 | 76.931 | 65.022 | 55.969 | 45.308 | 90.905 | -4.222 |
| 4800 | 15.194 | 77.250 | 65.274 | 57.497 | 45.909 | 91.761 | -4.178 |
| 4 フuU | 15.221 | 77.564 | 65.521 | 59.008 | 46.007 | 92.714 | -4.135 |
| boud | 15.245 | 77.972 | 65.765 | 60.531 | 46.104 | 93.666 | -4.094 |
| 5100 | 15.260 | 78.174 | 66.006 | 62.057 | 46.198 | 94.617 | $-4.055$ |
| b200 | 15.235 | 78.470 | 66.243 | 63.594 | 46.292 | 95.56b | -4.016 |
| 5300 | 15.297 | 78.762 | 66.476 | 65.113 | 46.382 | 96.514 | -3.980 |
| brue | 15.307 | 79.048 | 66.706 | 66.544 | 46.469 | 97.455 | -3.944 |
| bsuu | 15.316 | 79.329 | 66.933 | 68.175 | 45.554 | 99.401 | -3.910 |
| 5500 | 15.324 | 79.605 | 67.157 | 69.707 | 46.635 | 99.341 | -3.877 |
| b 700 | 15.320 | 79.876 | 67.378 | 71.240 | 46.713 | 100.284 | -3.845 |
| bsuo | 15.331 | 90.143 | 67.596 | 72.773 | 46.787 | 101.222 | -3.814 |
| b90u | 15.331 | 80.405 | 67.810 | 74.306 | 46.357 | 102.160 | -3.784 |
| 6000 | 15.329 | 90.662 | 68.02? | 75.939 | 46.924 | 103.095 | -3.755 |

Point Group $C_{2 v}$
$S_{298.15}^{0}=49.15 \mathrm{cal}^{\mathrm{deg}}{ }^{-1} \mathrm{~mol}{ }^{-1}$
$\Delta H f_{0}^{\circ}=-4.20 \pm 0.2 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}^{-1}$

Ground State Quantum Weight $=1$
Vibrational Frequencies and Degeneracies

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \frac{\omega, \mathrm{cm}}{}-1 \\
& 2614.6(1) \\
& 1182.7 \text { (1) } \\
& 2627.5(1)
\end{aligned}
$$

Bond Distance: $\mathrm{S}-\mathrm{H}=1.328 \AA$
Bond Angle: $\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{S}-\mathrm{H}=92.2^{\circ}$
Product of the Moments of Inertia: $\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{A}} \mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{B}} \mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{C}}=4.69 \times 10^{-119} \mathrm{~g}^{3} \mathrm{~cm} 6$

## Heat of Formacion

The heats of formation of $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{~S}(\mathrm{~g})$ determined by various workers including those reviewed in the previous JANAF analysis (1) were recalculated with the results shown below. No weight was given to the work performed prior to 1934 and less weight was given to the work of Kapustinskii and Kankovskii (7) because of the difficulty of establishing the state of the products.

Thomsen (2) (1882)
Thomsen (3) (1882)
Pollitzer (4) (1909)
Lewis and Randall (5) (1918)
Zeumer and Roth (6) (1934)
Kapustinskil and Kankovskii (7) (1958)
*Equations may not be balanced.

| Reaction* | $\left.\frac{\Delta H f{ }_{298}}{\text { [from }}(1)\right]$ | $\frac{(\text { kcal mol }}{}{ }^{-1} \text { ) }$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{~S}(\mathrm{~g})+\mathrm{HI}_{3}(\mathrm{aq})=3 \mathrm{HI}(\mathrm{aq})+\mathrm{S}(\mathrm{amph})$ | ---- | -4.4, -5.1 if S (rhombic) |
| $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{~S}(\mathrm{~g})+\mathrm{O}_{2}(\mathrm{~g})=\mathrm{SO}_{2}(\mathrm{~g})+\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4} \cdot \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ | ---- | -2.0 |
| $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{~S}(\mathrm{~g})+\mathrm{I}_{2}(\mathrm{C})=2 \mathrm{HI}(\mathrm{g})+\mathrm{S}(\mathrm{rh})$ | ---- | -4.7, -4.0 if S (amph) |
| $3 \mathrm{~S}(\mathrm{liq})+2 \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(\mathrm{g})=\mathrm{SO}_{2}(\mathrm{~g})+2 \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{~S}(\mathrm{~g})$ | ---- | -3.6 $\pm 0.2$ |
| $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{~S}(\mathrm{~g})+\mathrm{O}_{2}(\mathrm{~g})=\mathrm{SO}_{2}(\mathrm{~g})+\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4} \cdot \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ | $-4.80 \pm 0.15$ | -4.89 $\pm 0.24$ |
| $\begin{aligned} \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{~S}(\mathrm{~g})+\frac{30}{2} 2(\mathrm{~g})= & \mathrm{SO}_{2}(\mathrm{~g})+\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(\mathrm{l}) \\ & +\mathrm{S}(\text { rhombic }) \end{aligned}$ | -4.94士0.08 | $-4.92 \pm 0.08$ |

## Heat Capacity and Entropy

The thermodynamic functions were taken from the JANAF table for $H_{2} \mathrm{~S}(\mathrm{~g})$ dated Dec. 31, 1965, which in turn were calculated by the rigid-rotor, harmonic-oscillator approximation below $298^{\circ} \mathrm{K}$. Gordon had calculated $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{p}}^{\circ}$ from $298^{\circ}$ to 6000 K by a method which takes into account second-order corrections for vibrational anharmonicity, vibrationrotation interaction, and centrifugal stretching. The spectroscopic constants used were taken from H. C. Allen, E. K. Plyler, J. Chem. Phys. 24, 35 (1956), and H. C. Allen, E. K. Plyler, J. Chem. Phys. 25, 1132 (1956).
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(Ideal Gas)
GFN $=34.076$

| T, ${ }^{\circ} \mathbf{K}$ | $\mathbf{C p}^{\circ}$ | gibbs/moi$\mathrm{S}^{\circ} \quad-\left(\mathrm{G}^{\circ}-\mathrm{H}^{\circ}{ }^{\circ}{ }^{2} 88\right) / \mathrm{T}$ |  | $\mathbf{H}^{\circ}-\mathbf{H}^{\circ} \text { а9в }$ | $\begin{gathered} -\mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol} \\ \Delta H P^{\circ} \end{gathered}$ | $\Delta \mathbf{G r}{ }^{\circ}$ | $\log \mathrm{Kp}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | . 000 | . 000 | INFINITE | -2. 381 | -4.204 | -4.204 | INFINITE |
| 100 | 7.949 | 40.359 | 56.219 | -1.586 | -4.290 | -5.624 | 12.292 |
| 200 | 7.978 | 45.872 | 49.827 | -. 791 | -4.532 | -6.879 | 7.517 |
| 298 | 8.172 | 49.151 | 49.151 | . 000 | -4.900 | -7.975 | 5.845 |
| 300 | 8.176 | 49.202 | 49.152 | . 015 | -4.908 | -7.994 | 5.823 |
| 400 | 8.504 | 51.597 | 49.474 | - 849 | -5.867 | -8.937 | 4.883 |
| 500 | 8.889 | 53.536 | 50.100 | 1.718 | -6.635 | -9.616 | 4.203 |
| 600 | 9.306 | 55.193 | 50.813 | 2.628 | -7.282 | -10.149 | 3.697 |
| 700 | 9.737 | 56.660 | 51.546 | 3.580 | -7.832 | -10.558 | 3.296 |
| 800 | 10.162 | 57.988 | 52.269 | 4.575 | -21.368 | -12.182 | 3.328 |
| 900 | 10.567 | 59.209 | 52.973 | 5.612 | -21.481 | -11.027 | 2.678 |
| 1000 | 10.943 | 60.342 | 53.655 | 6.687 | -21.565 | -9.861 | 2.155 |
| 1100 | 11.261 | 61.401 | 54.311 | 7.799 | -21.62? | -8.688 | 1.726 |
| 1200 | 11.584 | 62.396 | 54.943 | 8.943 | -21.656 | -7.509 | 1.368 |
| 1300 | 11.853 | 63.334 | 55.553 | 10.115 | -21.673 | -6.329 | 1.064 |
| 1400 | 12.092 | 64.221 | 56.141 | 11.312 | -21.677 | -5.149 | . 804 |
| 1500 | 12.303 | 65.063 | 56.708 | 12.532 | -21.671 | -3.969 | . 578 |
| 1600 | 12.491 | 65.863 | 57.255 | 13.772 | -21.657 | -2.790 | .381 |
| 1700 | 12.653 | 66.625 | 57.784 | 15.030 | -21.635 | -1.609 | . 207 |
| 1800 | 12.808 | 67.353 | 58.296 | 16.303 | -21.609 | -. 434 | . 053 |
| 1900 | 12.941 | 68.049 | 58.791 | 17.590 | -21.578 | . 743 | -. 085 |
| 2000 | 13.063 | 68.716 | 59.270 | 18.891 | -21.543 | 1.917 | -. 209 |
| 2100 | 13.171 | 69.356 | 59.736 | 20.203 | -21.507 | 3.088 | -. 321 |
| 2200 | 13.270 | 69.971 | 60.187 | 21.525 | -21.469 | 4.260 | -. 423 |
| 2300 | 13.360 | 70.563 | 60.626 | 22.856 | -21.430 | 5.427 | -. 516 |
| 2400 | 13.444 | 71.133 | 61.051 | 24.197 | -21.389 | 6.597 | -. 601 |
| 2500 | 13.520 | 71.684 | 61.466 | 25.545 | -21.349 | 7.759 | -. 678 |
| 2600 | 13.590 | 72.215 | 61.869 | 26.900 | -21.308 | 8.925 | -. 750 |
| 2700 | 13.655 | 72.729 | 62.261 | 28.263 | -21.266 | 10.086 | -. 816 |
| 2800 | 13.715 | 73.227 | 62.644 | 29.631 | -21.226 | 11.243 | -. 878 |
| 2900 | 13.771 | 73.709 | 63.018 | 31.005 | -21.185 | 12.406 | -. 935 |
| 3000 | 13.824 | 74.177 | 63.382 | $32 \cdot 385$ | -21.145 | 13.562 | -. 988 |
| 3100 | 13.874 | 74.631 | 63.737 | 33.770 | -21.103 | 14.718 | -1.038 |
| 3200 | 13.921 | 75.073 | 54.085 | 35.160 | -21.064 | 15.870 | -1.084 |
| 3300 | 13.965 | 75.502 | 54.425 | 36.554 | -21.025 | 17.024 | -1.127 |
| 3400 | 14.007 | 75.919 | 64.756 | 37.953 | -20.986 | 18.179 | -1.169 |
| 3500 | 14.047 | 76.326 | 65.081 | 39.356 | -20.950 | 19.328 | -1.207 |
| 3600 | 14.085 | 76.722 | 65.399 | 40.762 | -20.914 | 20.479 | -1.243 |
| 3700 | 14.122 | 77.108 | 65.710 | 42.173 | -20.881 | 21.632 | -1.278 |
| 3800 | 14.156 | 77.485 | 66.015 | 43.586 | -20.848 | 22.780 | -1.310 |
| 3900 | 14.190 | 77.854 | 66.315 | 45.004 | -20.817 | 23.924 | -1.341 |
| 4000 | 14.223 | 78.213 | 66.607 | 46.424 | $-20.788$ | 25.076 | -1.370 |
| 4100 | 14.254 | 75.565 | 66.895 | 47.848 | -20.759 | 26.219 | -1.398 |
| 4200 | 14.285 | 78.909 | 67.177 | 49.275 | -20.733 | 27.365 | -1.424 |
| 4300 | 14.314 | 79.245 | 67.453 | 50.705 | -20.700 | 28.510 | -1.449 |
| 4400 | 14.343 | 79.575 | 67.725 | 52.138 | -20.685 | 29.651 | -1.473 |
| 4500 | 14.371 | 79.897 | 67.992 | 53.574 | -20.664 | 30.798 | -1.496 |
| 4600 | 14.397 | 80.213 | 68.254 | 55.012 | -20.644 | 31.943 | $-1.518$ |
| 4700 | 14.423 | 80.523 | 68.512 | 56.453 | -20.626 | 33.086 | -1.538 |
| ¢,300 | 14.450 | 80.827 | 68.765 | 57.897 | -20.609 | 34.220 | -1.558 |
| 7900 | 14.475 | 81.125 | 69.014 | 59.343 | -20.594 | 35.374 | -1.578 |
| 3000 | 14.500 | 81.418 | 69.260 | 60.792 | -20.581 | 36.509 | -1.596 |
| 5100 | 14.523 | 81.705 | 69.500 | 62.243 | -20.570 | 37.657 | -1.614 |
| b200 | 14.548 | 81.988 | 69.739 | 63.597 | -20.559 | 38.794 | -1.630 |
| 5300 | 14.571 | 82.265 | 69.972 | 65.153 | -20.550 | 39.939 | -1.647 |
| 5400 | 14.594 | 82.538 | 70.203 | 66.611 | -20.544 | 41.075 | -1.662 |
| S500 | 14.616 | 82.305 | 70.429 | 68.071 | -20.539 | 42.210 | -1.678 |
| 3600 | 14.639 | 83.069 | 70.652 | 69.534 | -20.536 | 43.300 | -1.692 |
| 5700 | 14.0301 | 83.328 | 70.872 | 70.999 | -20.534 | 44.503 | -1.706 |
| 5800 | 14.682 | 83.584 | 71.090 | 72.466 | -20.534 | 45.638 | -1.720 |
| 5900 | 14.705 | 83.835 | 71.303 | 73.936 | -20.534 | 46.779 | -1.733 |
| 6000 | 14.725 | 84.082 | 71.514 | 75.407 | -20.537 | 47.923 | -1.746 |

July 31, 1972


## Heat of Formation

Second and third law analyses of the equilibrium constant data for the reaction $\mathrm{N}_{2}(\mathrm{~g})+3 / 2 \mathrm{H}_{2}(\mathrm{~g})=\mathrm{NH}_{3}(\mathrm{~g})$ cited in the previous JANAF evaluation (1) plus the more recent work of Schulz and Schaefer (6) was made using the revised thermal functions for $\mathrm{NH}_{3}(\mathrm{~g})$ (see below). All of the previously cited work in reaction calorimetry plus the early work of Berthelot (7,8) and Thomsen (9) were reevaluated. No significant differences in the third law calculations of the equilibrium data or in the corrections to the flow calorimetry data of Haber and Tamaru (12) and Wittig and Schmatz (13) were found. Thus, the 0.1 kcal discrepancy between the results of the equilibrium and reaction calorimetry measurements remains unresolved.The previous JANAF selection (1) for $\Delta \mathrm{Hf}_{298.15}^{\circ}$ of $\mathrm{NH}_{3}(\mathrm{~g}$ ) was adopted. A recent evaluation (14) which includes new indirect calorimetry measurements (unpublished) further confirms this selection.

| Source | Method | $\begin{aligned} & \Delta \mathrm{Hf}_{298}^{\mathrm{b}} \\ & \left(\mathrm{kcal}^{-1} \mathrm{~mol}\right. \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Drift } \\ & \text { (e.u.) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \Delta H F_{298}^{\circ} \\ & \text { (kcal mol } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \Delta S_{298}^{\circ} \text { (obsv cialc.) } \\ & \quad(\mathrm{e} . \mathrm{u} .) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Larson, Dodge [2] | $\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{p}}^{\circ}[4]$ from $\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{p}}(10-1,000 \mathrm{~atm}, 600-800 \mathrm{~K})$ | -10.88 | -. $07 \pm .05$ | $-10.70 \pm 0.11$ | $+0.24 \pm 0.15^{1}$ |
| Haber, Tamaru, <br> Ponnaz [3] (1915) | $\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{p}}^{\circ}[4]$ from $\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{p}}(30 \mathrm{~atm}, 800-1200 \mathrm{~K}$ ) | -10.86 | . $0 \pm .05$ | $-10.88 \pm 0.15$ | $-0.02 \pm 0.15^{2}$ |
| Haber, Mashke[5] (1915) | $\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{p}}$ (1 atm, 900-1400K) | -10.85 | -. $26 \pm .08$ | $-10.62 \pm .22$ | $0.20 \pm 0.19^{3}$ |
| Schulz, Schaefer <br> [6] (1966) | $K_{p}(1 \mathrm{~atm}, 567-673 \mathrm{~K})$ | -10.87 | (. 0 to -.3) | $-10.78 \pm .20$ | $4.4 \pm 0.3^{4}$ |
| Berthelot [7] (1880) | Indirect; Reaction of Br (aq) and NH (aq) | -11.4 |  |  |  |
| Berthelot [8] (1880) | Indirect; Reaction of 0 (g) with NH (g) | -12.1 |  |  |  |
| Thomsen [9] (1882) | Indirect; Reaction of $0(\mathrm{~g})$ with NH (g) | -11.9 |  |  |  |
| Becker and Roth [10] (1934) | Indirect; Heat of combustion oxalates, etc. | $-11.00_{2} \pm 0.15$ |  |  |  |
| Haber, Tamaru, 0 eholm [11] (1915) | Flow calorimetry at 298 K | $-11.10 \pm 0.05$ |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Haber, Tamaru [12] } \\ & \text { (1915) } \end{aligned}$ | Flow calorimetry ( $739-932 \mathrm{~K}$ ) | $-10.97 \pm 0.008$ |  |  |  |
| Wittig, Schmatz [13] $(1959)$ | Flow calorimetry at 823K | $-10.99 \pm 0.05$ |  |  |  |
| *Second law analysis, ca <br> (2) $-1.236+0.00404$ (T- | calculations made assuming $\Delta C$ cal mol 1000), (3) $-0.855+0.00305\left(\mathrm{~T}^{\mathrm{R}} 1100\right)$, (4) | $\begin{aligned} & -1 \text { is given by } \\ & -3.287+0.00651 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { (1) }-2.672+0 \\ & (T-600) . \end{aligned}$ | $.00591(\mathrm{~T}-700)$ |  |

## Heat Capacity and Entropy

The thermodynamic functions differ from those of the JANAF table of Sept. 30, 1965, in being taken directly from the later and more complete work of L. Haar, J. Research Nat. Bur. Standards 72A, 207 (1968). Haar treated in detail the contribution of the highly anharmonic out-of-plane vibrational mode, including its large coupling with rotation and its coupling with the other vibrational modes. Haar's values of $C_{p}^{\circ}$ pass through a shallow maximum between 4000 and 500 K , and were extrapolated from 5000 to 6000 K by assuming a constant value ( 19.300 cal deg ${ }^{-1}$ mol ${ }^{-1}$ ). A summary of Haar's estimated uncertainties and of the differences of the JANAF table from the present table (in cal deg ${ }^{-1}$ mol ${ }^{-1}$ )
is as follows:

Uncertainties (Haar, loc.cit.)

| $\mathrm{T},{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{K}$ |
| :--- |
| 1000 |
| 3000 |
| 5000 |


$\frac{C_{p}^{\circ}}{\frac{p .006}{}}$| 0.10 |
| :--- |
| 0.6 |

$\frac{S^{\circ}}{0.006}$
0.06
0.4

JANAF table - this table

| $\frac{\mathrm{C}^{\circ} \mathrm{P}}{}$ | $\frac{\mathrm{S}^{\circ}}{-0.034}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| -0.033 |  |
| +.142 | -.122 |
| +1.775 | +.265 |

It may be noted that these tables for $\mathrm{NH}_{3}$ assume equilibrium among all rotational states. Separation of $\mathrm{NH}_{3}$ into ortho and para forms has not so far been observed.
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Amonia (NHH3)
$G F W=17.0307$

| T, ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{K}$ | $\mathrm{Cp}^{\circ}$ | gibbs/mol |  | $\mathbf{H}^{\circ}-\mathbf{H}^{\circ}{ }_{298}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Kcal/mol } \\ \Delta H f^{\circ} \end{gathered}$ | $\Delta \mathbf{G f}^{\text {P }}$ | $\log \mathrm{Kp}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $S^{\circ}$ | $-\left(\mathrm{G}^{\circ}-\mathrm{H}^{\circ} 298\right) / \mathrm{T}$ |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | . 000 | . 000 | INFINITE | -2.401 | -9.299 | -9.299 | INFINITE |
| 100 | 7.955 | 37.220 | 53.321 | -1.610 | -9.930 | -8.136 | 17.782 |
| 200 | 8.068 | 42.753 | 46.809 | -. 811 | -10.445 | -6.142 | 6.712 |
| 298 | 8.521 | 46.047 | 46.047 | . 000 | -10.970 | -3.919 | 2.873 |
| 300 | 8.533 | 46.100 | 46.048 | . 016 | -10.980 | -3.875 | 2.823 |
| 400 | 9.253 | 48.650 | 46.390 | . 904 | -11.482 | -1.430 | . 781 |
| 500 | 10.049 | 50.800 | 47.062 | 1.869 | -11.917 | 1.134 | -. 496 |
| 600 | 10.825 | 52.701 | 47.846 | 2.913 | -12.279 | 3.780 | -1.377 |
| 700 | 11.557 | 54.425 | 48.665 | 4.032 | -12.576 | 6.481 | -2.024 |
| 800 | 12.245 | 56.014 | 49.486 | 5.223 | -12.816 | 9.220 | -2.519 |
| 900 | 12.894 | 57.494 | 50.294 | 6.480 | -13.006 | 11.987 | -2.911 |
| 1000 | 1こ. 501 | 58.884 | 51.084 | 7.800 | -13.150 | 14.772 | -3.228 |
| 1100 | 14.068 | 60.198 | 51.854 | 9.179 | -13.254 | 17.570 | -3.491 |
| 1200 | 14.591 | 61.445 | 52.601 | 10.612 | -13.323 | 20.376 | -3.711 |
| 1300 | 15.071 | 62.632 | 53.328 | 12.096 | -13.361 | 23.185 | -3.898 |
| 1400 | 15.510 | 63.765 | 54.033 | 13.625 | -13.373 | 25.997 | -4.058 |
| 1500 | 15.909 | 64.849 | 54.718 | 15.196 | -13.365 | 28.810 | -4.198 |
| 1600 | 16.271 | 65.888 | 55.384 | 16.805 | -13.341 | 31.619 | -4.319 |
| 1700 | 16.599 | 66.884 | 56.032 | 18.449 | -13.299 | 34.430 | -4.426 |
| 1800 | 16.896 | 67.841 | 56.661 | 20.124 | -13.244 | 37.234 | -4.521 |
| 1900 | 17.165 | 68.762 | 57.274 | 21.828 | -13.176 | 40.038 | -4.605 |
| 2000 | 17.407 | 69.649 | 57.871 | 23.556 | -13.099 | 42.837 | -4.681 |
| 2100 | 17.627 | 70.504 | 58.452 | 25.308 | -13.014 | 45.631 | -4.749 |
| 2200 | 17.825 | 71.328 | 59.019 | 27.081 | -12.922 | 48.422 | -4.810 |
| 2300 | 18.004 | 72.125 | 59.571 | 28.873 | -12.824 | 51.208 | -4.866 |
| 2400 | 18.166 | 72.894 | 60.111 | 30.681 | -12.721 | 53.992 | -4.917 |
| 2500 | 18.314 | 73.639 | 60.637 | 32.505 | -12.617 | 56.765 | -4.962 |
| 2600 | 18.445 | 74.360 | 61.151 | 34.343 | -12.508 | 59.541 | -5.005 |
| 2700 | 18.564 | 75.058 | 61.653 | 36.194 | -12.397 | 62.309 | -5.044 |
| 2800 | 18.673 | 75.735 | 62.144 | 38.056 | -12.285 | 65.072 | -5.079 |
| 2900 | 18.769 | 76.392 | 62.624 | 39.928 | -12.171 | 67.837 | -5.112 |
| 3000 | 18.858 | 77.030 | 63.094 | 41.810 | -12.058 | 70.591 | -5.143 |
| 3100 | 18.936 | 77.650 | 63.553 | 43.699 | -11.943 | 73.343 | -5.171 |
| 3200 | 19.005 | 78.252 | 64.003 | 45.596 | -11.831 | 76.093 | -5.197 |
| 3300 | 19.069 | 78.838 | 64.444 | 47.500 | -11.721 | 78.841 | -5.221 |
| 3400 | 19.122 | 79.408 | 64.876 | 49.410 | -11.611 | 81.581 | -5.244 |
| 3500 | 19.172 | 79.963 | 65.299 | 51.324 | -11.506 | 84.322 | -5.265 |
| 3600 | 19.216 | 80.504 | 65.714 | 53.244 | -11.403 | 87.058 | -5.285 |
| 3700 | 19.252 | 81.031 | 66.121 | 55.167 | -11.305 | 89.793 | -5.304 |
| 3800 | 19.283 | 81.545 | 66.520 | 57.094 | -11.209 | 92.524 | -5.321 |
| 3900 | 19.309 | 82.046 | 66.912 | 59.024 | -11.119 | 95.254 | -5.338 |
| 4000 | 19.331 | 82.535 | 67.296 | 60.956 | -11.034 | 97.979 | -5.353 |
| 4100 | 19.349 | 83.013 | 67.674 | 62.890 | -10.954 | 100.703 | -5.368 |
| 4200 | 19.361 | 83.479 | 68.044 | 64.825 | -10.880 | 103.428 | -5.382 |
| 4300 | 19.371 | 83.935 | 68.409 | 66.762 | -10.811 | 106.146 | -5.395 |
| 4400 | 19.375 | 84.380 | 68.767 | 68.699 | -10.748 | 108.863 | -5.407 |
| 4500 | 19.377 | 84.816 | 69.119 | 70.637 | -10.693 | 111.579 | -5.419 |
| 4600 | 19.373 | 85.241 | 69.464 | 72.574 | -10.642 | 114.301 | -5.431 |
| 4700 | 19.367 | 85.658 | 69.804 | 74.512 | -10.600 | 117.017 | -5.441 |
| 4800 | 19.357 | 86.066 | 70.139 | 76.447 | -10.565 | 119.731 | - 5.452 |
| 4900 | 19.343 | 86.465 | 70.468 | 78.382 | -10.536 | 122.445 | -5.461 |
| 5000 | 19.325 | 86.856 | 70.793 | 80.318 | -10.513 | 125.153 | -5.470 |
| 5100 | 19.300 | 87.238 | 71.111 | 82.248 | -10.503 | 127.869 | -5.480 |
| 5200 | 19.300 | 87.613 | 71.425 | 84.178 | -10.497 | 130.582 | -5.488 |
| 5300 | 19.300 | 87.981 | 71.734 | 86.108 | -10.498 | 133.297 | -5.497 |
| 5400 | 19.300 | 88.341 | 72.038 | 88.038 | -10.505 | 136.005 | -5.504 |
| 5500 | 19.300 | 88.696 | 72.338 | 89.968 | -10.517 | 138.722 | -5.512 |
| 5600 | 19.300 | 89.043 | 72.633 | 91.898 | -10.536 | 141.431 | -5.520 |
| 5700 | 19.300 | 89.385 | 72.924 | 93.828 | -10.560 | 144.150 | -5.527 |
| 5800 | 19.300 | 89.721 | 73.211 | 95.758 | -10.590 | 146.862 | -5.534 |
| 5900 | 17.300 | 90.051 | 73.493 | 97.688 | -10.624 | 149.578 | -5.541 |
| 6000 | 19.300 | 90.375 | 73.772 | 99.618 | -10.664 | 152.291 | -5.547 |

$$
\mathrm{S}_{298.15}^{\circ}=53.019 \text { cal } \mathrm{K}^{-1} \mathrm{~mol}^{-1}
$$

$$
\Delta \mathrm{Hf}_{298.15}^{\circ}=1.2 \pm 0.3 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mc} 1^{-1}
$$

Electronic States and Molecular Constants

| State | $\underline{\varepsilon, \mathrm{cm}}{ }^{-1}$ | $g$ | $\underbrace{\omega_{e}, c m^{-1}}$ | $\chi_{\mathrm{x}^{\omega} \mathrm{e}, \mathrm{cm}}$ | $\mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{e}}, \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$ | $\alpha_{e}, c m-1$ | $\underline{r_{e}, \AA}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{X}^{3} \Sigma^{-}$ | 0 | 3 | 1148.19 | 6.12 | 0.72082 | 0.00574 | 1.4811 |
| $\mathrm{a}^{1} \triangle$ | 6350 | 2 | [1148.19] | [6.12] | 0.7119 | [0.00574] | 1.494 |
| $\mathrm{b}^{1} \Sigma^{+}$ | 10510 | 1 | 1067.66 | 7.8 | 0.70261 | 0.00635 | 1.5005 |
| $\mathrm{A}^{3} \mathrm{I}_{0}$ | 38292 | 6 | 415.2 | 1.6 | 0.6067 | 0.0194 |  |
| $\mathrm{A}^{3} \Pi_{1}$ | 38455 | 6 | 413.3 | 1.6 | 0.6107 | 0.0194 | 1.6094 |
| $\mathrm{A}^{3} \mathrm{I}_{2}$ | 38616 | 6 | 412.7 | 1.7 | 0.6164 | 0.0204 |  |
| $B^{3} \Sigma^{-}$ | 41629 | 3 | 630.4 | 4.8 | 0.502 | 0.0062 | 1.775 |
| $\mathrm{C}^{3} \mathrm{II}$ | 42200 | 6 | 170 | [0] | [0.5] | [0] | 2.2 |

## Heat of Formation

The selection for $\Delta H f_{0}^{\circ}$ of $S O(g) 1.2 \pm 0.3 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}{ }^{-1}$, was derived from one of the two independent means, pointed out by Okabe, J. Chem. Phys. 56, 3378 (1972), that employs principally spectroscopic data: $\Delta H f_{0}^{\circ}(S O)=1 / 2 D_{0}^{\circ}\left(S_{2}\right)+1 / 2 D_{0}^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{O}_{2}\right)-\mathrm{D}_{0}^{\circ}(\mathrm{SO})+1 / 2 \Delta H f_{0}^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{S}_{2}\right)$. The data employed are as follows. Ricks and Barrow, Can. J. Phys. 47, 2423 (1969) give $D_{0}^{\circ}\left(S_{2}\right)=100.69 \pm 0.01 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}^{-1}$. Brix and Herzberg, Can. J. Phys. 32, 110 (1954), give $\mathrm{D}_{0}^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{O}_{2}\right)=117.97 \pm 0.046 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}{ }^{-1}$. On the basis of analysis of spectroscopic data to 1964, JANAF (Thermochemical Tables, 2nd Edition, NSRDS-NBS 37) gives $D_{0}^{\circ}(S 0)=123.5 \pm 0.3$ (?) kcal mol ${ }^{-1}$. NBS Tech. Note $270-3$ gives $\Delta H f_{0}^{\circ}\left(S_{2}\right)=30.65 \pm 0.2 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}{ }^{-1}$. Assuming the dissociation products of So are $\mathrm{S}\left({ }^{1} \mathrm{D}_{2}\right)$ and $\mathrm{O}\left({ }^{3} \mathrm{P}\right)$, R . Colin, Can. J. Phys. 47, 979 (1969) concludes $D_{0}^{\circ}(S O)=123.56 \pm 0.23 \mathrm{kcal}$ mole ${ }^{-1}$. A systematic error of 0.65 kcal is incurred if the assumption is wrong. Support for this assumption is as follows: 1) Okabe, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 93, 7095 (1971) concludes that $\mathrm{D}_{0}^{\circ}(0 \mathrm{~S}-0)=130.06 \pm 0.5 \mathrm{kcal}$ mol ${ }^{-1}$ assuming the predissociation of $\mathrm{SO}_{2}$ is to ground state products. Using $\Delta H f_{0}^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{SO}_{2}=-70.336 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}{ }^{-1}\right.$ from NBS-NSRDS TN $270-3$ and the relation: $\triangle H f_{0}^{\circ}(S 0)=D_{0}^{\circ}(0 S-0)-$
 of $\mathrm{SO}, 217.00 \pm 0.7 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}^{-1}$, (see Okabe, J. Chem. Phys. 56, 3378 (1972)) corresponds to the minimum energy for the reaction: $\mathrm{OSCl}_{2}=\operatorname{SO}\left(\mathrm{A}^{3} \Pi_{0}\right)+2 \mathrm{Cl}\left({ }^{3} \mathrm{P}_{3} / 2\right)$ and using $108.43 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}{ }^{-1}$ for the difference in energy between the
 This is based on $\Delta H f_{0}^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{OSCl}_{2}\right)=-50.07 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}{ }^{-1}\left(\mathrm{NSRDS}-\mathrm{NBS} \mathrm{TN} \mathrm{270-3)}\right.$ and $\mathrm{D}_{0}^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right)=57.177 \pm 0.005 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}{ }^{-1}$ given by Douglas, Moller, and Stoicheff, Can. J. Phys. 4l, 1174 (1963); 3) Re-examination of the photoionization-yield curves of $\mathrm{SO}_{2}^{+}$and $\mathrm{SO}^{+}$obtained by Dibeler and Liston, J. Chem. Phys. 49, 482 (1968), suggests that their reported threshold for $\mathrm{SO} \rightarrow \mathrm{SO}^{+}+0+\mathrm{e}^{-}$should be increased from $15.81 \pm 0.02 \mathrm{eV}$ to 16.00 eV . Using the latter and the ionization energy of $S 0$ given by jonathan et al, Chem. Phys. Letters 9, 217 (1971) of $10.34 \pm 0.02 \mathrm{eV}$ and the relation: $\Delta H f_{0}^{\circ}(S O)=D_{0}^{\circ}(\mathrm{SS}-0)-1 / 2 \mathrm{D}_{0}^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{O}_{2}\right)+\Delta H f_{0}^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{SO}_{2}\right)$, one obtains $\Delta H f_{0}^{\circ}(\mathrm{SO})=1.20 \pm 0.5 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}{ }^{-1}$.

## Heat Capacity and Entropy

The vibrational and rotational constants of the respective electronic levels were taken from B. Rosen, Spectroscopic Data Relative to Diatomic Molecules, Pergamon Press, Oxford, 1970.
(Ideal GAs) $\quad G F W=48.0634$

| T, ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{K}$ | gibls $/ \mathrm{mol}$ [ |  |  | $\mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}$ - |  |  | $\log \mathrm{Kp}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Cp ${ }^{\circ}$ | $\mathrm{S}^{\circ}$ | $-\left(\mathrm{G}^{\circ}-\mathrm{H}^{\circ} 298\right) / \mathrm{T}$ | $\mathrm{H}^{\circ}-\mathrm{H}^{\circ}{ }^{\text {2 }}$ 8 | $\Delta H{ }^{\circ}$ | $\Delta \mathrm{Gf}{ }^{\circ}$ |  |
| 0 | . 000 | . 000 | INFIN1TE | -2.087 | 1.203 | 1.203 | 1NFIN1TE |
| 100 | 5.950́ | 45.364 | 59.288 | -1.392 | 1.387 | -.783 | 1.711 |
| 200 | 6.995 | 50.192 | 53.670 | -. 696 | 1.343 | -2.949 | 3.223 |
| 298 | 7.212 | 53.019 | 53.019 | . 000 | 1.200 | $-5.027$ | 3.685 |
| 300 | 7.217 | 53.064 | 53.019 | . 013 | 1.197 | -5.060 | 3.690 |
| 400 | 7.543 | 55.184 | 53.306 | . 751 | . 480 | -7.106 | 3.882 |
| 500 | 7.845 | 56.901 | 53.859 | 1.521 | -. 053 | -8.039 | 3.907 |
| 600 | 9.087 | 58.35 .3 | 54.490 | 2.318 | -. 491 | -10.674 | 3.888 |
| 700 | 8.272 | 59.615 | 55.134 | 3.137 | -. 861 | -12.317 | 3.846 |
| 300 | 8.414 | 60.729 | 55.765 | 3.971 | -14.251 | -15.199 | 4.152 |
| 900 | 8.520 | 61.727 | 56.373 | 4.318 | -14.249 | -15. 317 | 3.720 |
| 1000 | 8.617 | 62.630 | 56.954 | 5.676 | -14.246 | -15.435 | 3.373 |
| 1100 | 8.695 | 53.455 | 57.508 | 6.541 | -14.243 | -15.556 | 3.091 |
| 1200 | 8.765 | 64.214 | 58.036 | 7.414 | -14.238 | -15.675 | 2.855 |
| 1300 | 8.830 | 64.919 | 58.538 | 8.294 | -14.231 | -15.794 | 2.655 |
| 1400 | 8.894 | 65.575 | 59.018 | 9.180 | -14.224 | -15.715 | 2.484 |
| 1500 | 8.950 | 66.191 | 59.476 | 10.073 | -14.215 | -16.037 | $<.337$ |
| 1600 | 9.017 | 66.771 | 59.914 | 10.772 | -14.203 | -16.158 | 2.207 |
| 1700 | 9.078 | 67.319 | 50.333 | 11.976 | -14.189 | -16.281 | 2.093 |
| 1800 | 9.139 | 67.840 | 60.736 | 12.787 | -14.172 | -16.405 | 1.992 |
| 1900 | 9.199 | 68.336 | 61.123 | 13.704 | -14.152 | -16.528 | 1.901 |
| 2000 | 9.253 | 68.809 | 61.495 | 14.627 | -14.131 | -16.655 | 1.820 |
| 2100 | 9.315 | 69.262 | 61.855 | 15.556 | -14.106 | -16.782 | 1.747 |
| 2200 | 9.371 | 69.697 | 62.201 | 16.490 | -14.080 | -16.009 | 1.680 |
| 2300 | 9.423 | 70.115 | 62.536 | 17.430 | $-14.051$ | $-17.039$ | 1.619 |
| 2400 | 9.477 | 70.517 | 62.801 | 18.375 | -14.020 | -17.168 | 1. 563 |
| 2500 | 9.525 | 70.905 | 63.175 | 19.325 | -13.987 | $-17.301$ | 1.512 |
| 2500 | 9.573 | 71.279 | 63.479 | 20.290 | -13.952 | -17.434 | 1.465 |
| 2700 | 9.618 | 71.641 | 63.775 | 21.240 | -13.915 | -17.569 | 1.422 |
| 2800 | 9.659 | 71.992 | 64.062 | 22.203 | -13.878 | -17.707 | 1.382 |
| 2900 | 9.699 | 72.332 | 64.341 | 23.171 | -13.839 | -17.943 | 1. 345 |
| 3000 | 9.735 | 72.661 | 64.613 | 24.143 | $-13.800$ | -17.980 | 1.310 |
| 3100 | 9.769 | 72.991 | 64.878 | 25.118 | -13.758 | -18.121 | 1.277 |
| 3200 | 9.801 | 73.291 | 65.136 | 26.097 | -13.718 | -18.263 | 1.247 |
| 3500 | 9.850 | 73.593 | 65.388 | 27.078 | -13.675 | -18.407 | 1.219 |
| 5400 | 9.857 | 73.887 | 65.634 | 28.0063 | -13.633 | -18.549 | 1.192 |
| 3500 | Y.862 | 74.173 | 65.873 | 29.050 | -13.591 | -18.697 | 1.168 |
| 3600 | 9.905 | 74.452 | 66.108 | 30.039 | -13.548 | -18.842 | 1.144 |
| 3700 | 9.920 | 74.724 | 66.337 | 31.031 | -13.506 | -18.989 | 1.122 |
| 3800 | 9.945 | 74.989 | 66.561 | 32.024 | -13.463 | -19.138 | 1.101 |
| 3900 | 9.963 | 75.247 | 66.781 | 33.020 | -13.421 | -19.290 | 1.081 |
| 4000 | 9.951 | 75.500 | 66.996 | 34.017 | -13.379 | -19.438 | 1.062 |
| 4100 | 9.997 | 75.745 | 67.205 | 35.715 | -13.336 | -19.590 | 1.044 |
| 4200 | 10.012 | 75.987 | 67.412 | 36.016 | -13.294 | -19.743 | 1.027 |
| 4300 | 11.024 | 76.223 | 67.614 | 37.015 | -13.252 | -19.097 | 1.011 |
| $4+00$ | 10.043 | 76.454 | 67.813 | 38.022 | -13.211 | -20.053 | . 996 |
| 4500 | 10.056 | 76.580 | 68.007 | 39.027 | -13.170 | -20.207 | . 981 |
| 4óu | 10.074 | 76.901 | 68.195 | 40.033 | -13.128 | -20.364 | . 967 |
| 4700 | 10.094 | 77.118 | 68.386 | 41.041 | -13.085 | -20.523 | . 954 |
| 4800 | 10.107 | 77.330 | 68.570 | 42.051 | -13.043 | -20.682 | . 942 |
| 4900 | 10.125 | 77.537 | 68.751 | 43.063 | -13.000 | -20.840 | . 930 |
| sous | 10.145 | 77.744 | 58.929 | 44.076 | -12.957 | -21.004 | . 918 |
| 5100 | 10.100 | 77.945 | 69.103 | 45.092 | -12.913 | -21.162 | . 907 |
| 5200 | 10.192 | 78.143 | 69.275 | 46.110 | -12.867 | -21.325 | . 896 |
| 5300 | 10.213 | 78.337 | 69.444 | 47.131 | -12.819 | -21.487 | . 886 |
| 540u | 10.240 | 78.529 | 69.611 | 48.154 | -12.770 | -21.552 | . 876 |
| ちらUU | $110 \cdot 213$ | 78.717 | 69.775 | 49.180 | -12.719 | -21.316 | . 807 |
| 5.000 | 11).31c | 78.902 | 69.936 | 50.209 | -12.666 | -21.982 | . 858 |
| 5700 | 111.350 | 79.085 | 70.095 | 51.242 | -12.610 | -22.151 | . 849 |
| 5300 | 10.390 | 79.265 | 70.252 | 52.279 | -12.551 | -22.310 | . 841 |
| 5900 | 10.430 | 79.443 | 70.406 | 53.321 | -12.497 | -22.489 | . 833 |
| 0000 | 10.485 | 79.619 | 70.558 | 54.365 | -12.421 | -22.654 | . 825 |

# Ground State Configuration ${ }^{2} \mathrm{P}_{3} / 2$ <br> $S_{298.15}^{\circ}=37.917$ gibbs mol ${ }^{-1}$ 

$\Delta H f_{0}^{\circ}=18.34 \pm 0.12 \mathrm{kcal}_{\mathrm{mol}}{ }^{-1}$
$\Delta H f_{298.15}^{\circ}=18.84 \pm 0.12 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}^{-1}$

## Electronic Levels and Quantum Weight

Same as ref. (1)

## Heat of Formation

A review of earlier work is given in ref. (1); a value of $37.72 \pm 0.80 \mathrm{kcal}$ mol ${ }^{-1}$ for the $F_{2}$ dissociation energy, $D_{0}^{\circ}$, was selected. A review of later work, which follows, suggests the uncertainty in $D_{0}^{\circ}$ of $F_{2}$ can be significantly reduced.

From a third law analysis of the equilibrium data of Doesher (2) and Wise (3) for the reaction $\mathrm{F}_{2}(\mathrm{~g}) \rightarrow 2 \mathrm{~F}(\mathrm{~g})$, Stamper and Barrow (4) obtained $D_{0}^{\circ}\left(F_{2}\right)=\underline{36.71} \pm 0.13 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}^{-1}$. A more realistic uncertainty based on tbe analysis of ref. (1) is $\pm 0.80 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}^{-1}$.

The dissociation energy of $\mathrm{F}_{2}$ may be derived from the relation; $\mathrm{D}_{0}^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{F}_{2}\right)=2 \mathrm{D}_{0}^{0}(\mathrm{HF})+2 \Delta H f_{0}^{\circ}(\mathrm{HF})-\mathrm{D}_{0}^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{H}_{2}\right)$. The following values were employed. $D_{0}^{\circ}(\mathrm{HF})$ : Dilonardo and Douglas (5) report $D_{0}^{\circ}(\mathrm{HF})=135.33 \pm 0.17 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}-1 \mathrm{irom}$ new measurements on the emission spectrum of HF . This confirms and refines the value of $135.13 \pm 0.23 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}$ given by Johns and Barrow (6). Berkowitz et al (7) obtained $D_{0}^{\circ}(H F)=134.79 \pm 0.23 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}{ }^{-1}$ from dissociative photoionization, DI, of HF and explain the low results, $132.37 \pm 0.69 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}{ }^{-1}$, of Dibeler et al (8), who performed similar DI experiments, as due to the latter's failure to take into account the rotational excitation of the molecules undergoing ionization. $\Delta H f_{0}^{\circ}(H F):$ The value selected in ref. (1), $-65.13 \pm 0.2 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}^{-1}$, was adopted. This avoids possible circularity if the value in ref. (9) were used. (The latter is partly based on $D_{0}^{\circ}(\mathrm{HF})$ and $D_{0}^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{F}_{2}\right)$.) $\mathrm{D}_{0}^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{H}_{2}\right): 103.263 \pm 0.003 \mathrm{kcal}$ mol ${ }^{-1}$ was taken from Herzberg (10). Combining these values one obtaius $D_{0}^{\circ}\left(F_{2}\right)=\underline{37.14} \pm 0.6 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}{ }^{-1}$.

Berkowitz et al (7) obtained $19.01 \pm 0.01 \mathrm{eV}$ for the DI threshold of $\mathrm{F}_{2}\left(\mathrm{~F}_{2} \rightarrow \mathrm{~F}^{+}+\mathrm{F}+\mathrm{e}^{-}\right.$). Contribution to the $\mathrm{F}^{+}$ yield due to ion-pair formation and the effects of rotationally excited molecules were taken into account. Dibeler et al (8), who did not make such corrections, reported the low value $18.76 \pm 0.03 \mathrm{eV}$. Subtracting the ionization potential for F, 17.422 eV , given by Moore (11) from the former threshold, Berkowitz et al obtain $D_{0}^{\circ}\left(F_{2}\right)=\underline{36.67 \pm 0.23} \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}{ }^{-1}$.

Chupka and Berkowitz (12) have shown by kinetic energy measurements on positive ions formed by photoproduction of ion pairs $\left(\mathrm{H}^{+}+\mathrm{F}^{-}\right.$from HF and $\mathrm{F}^{+}+\mathrm{F}^{-}$from $\mathrm{F}_{2}$ ) tbat tbe results are consistent with the DI thresholds of Berkowitz et al (7) if $\mathrm{EA}(\mathrm{F})=3.400 \pm 0.002 \mathrm{eV}$. This is the electron affinity reported by Popp (13) and agrees with the value, $3.398 \pm 0.002 \mathrm{eV}$, determined by Milstein and Berry (14). The ion pair threshold, 15.49 eV , reported by Dibeler et al (8), for $F_{2}$ agrees with that of Berkowitz et al (7) if it is reassigned to ion-pair formation from vibrationally excited molecules $\left(F_{2}, v^{\prime \prime}=1\right)$ and yields $D_{0}^{\circ}(F)=36.43 \pm 0.69 \mathrm{kcal}^{2} \mathrm{~mol}^{-1}$.

The value of $D_{0}^{\circ}\left(F_{2}\right)=36.67 \pm 0.23 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}{ }^{-1}$ from the measurements of Berkowitz et al (7) on the DI of $F_{2}$ was adopted. The remaining values of $D_{0}^{\circ}\left(F_{2}\right)$ agree with this value within their stated uncertainties.

## Heat Capacity and Entropy

Same as ref. (1).
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$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Point Group } \mathrm{C}_{2 \mathrm{v}} \\
& \mathrm{~S}_{298.15}^{\circ}=45.106 \text { gibbs mol }
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{GFW}=18.0154 \\
& \Delta H f_{0}^{\circ}=-57.100 \mathrm{kcal} \text { mol } \\
& \Delta \mathrm{Hf}_{298.15}^{\circ}=-57.795 \pm 0.010 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{~mol}^{-1}
\end{aligned}
$$

## Vibrational Levels and Multiplicities

same as ref. (1)

## Heat of Formation

The CODATA selection (2) was adopted. Rossini $(3,4)$ determined the heat of formation of $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(l)$ by direct calorimetry to be $-285,781 \pm 41$ int. J mol ${ }^{-1}$ (1 int. $\mathrm{J}=1.00017 \mathrm{~J}$, GFW ( $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ ) $=18.0156$ ) correcting to GFW ( $\mathrm{H}_{2} 0$ ) $=$ 18.0154 and adding a correction for imperfect gases (see (5), -3.6 int. $\mathrm{J} \mathrm{mol}^{-1}$ ) yields $\Delta \mathrm{Hf} \mathrm{O}_{298}$ for $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(\mathrm{l})=$ $-68.315 \pm 0.010 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}^{-1}$. The later and less precise work of King and Armstrong (6) (an auxiliary measurement) which gave $\Delta H f_{298}^{\circ}$ of $H_{2} \mathrm{O}(\ell)=-68.32 \pm 0.08 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}^{-1}$ is in good agreement. Work before 1931 is critically reviewed by Rossini (3). The heat of vaporization of $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(\ell)$ at 298 K corrected to zero pressure was taken from Keenan et al (7); $\Delta H_{\mathrm{v} 298}^{\circ}$ of $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(\ell)=10.520 \pm 0.001 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}{ }^{-1}$. This value is in good agreement with the (recalculated) value determined by Rossini (5) from the work of Osborne, Stimson, and Ginnings (8) of $10.519 \pm 0.003 \mathrm{kcal}$ mol ${ }^{-1}$.

## Heat Capacity and Entropy

Same as ref. (1).
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