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Numerous studies of liquid mixtures have been made, with the main object of obtaining an understanding of molecular interactions in condensed systems. For binary mixtures, there is now a wealth of experimental data available for tests of models and theories (Rowlinson, 1969; Hildebrand and Scott, 1964). Much of the information is in the form of measured or derived thermodynamic quantities such as vapor pressures, heats of mixing, activity coefficients, excess thermodynamic functions, etc.

Considerably less is known about solid mixtures except possibly about metal alloys or solutions. The reason is that solid mixtures are subject to greater complexities. Whereas, in liquids, molecules of different shapes and sizes can usually be accommodated without much structural difficulty, crystalline solids need to conform to definite structures and thus can not sustain any appreciable amount of strain or distortion without undergoing phase separation. Thus, unless the mixture is composed of rather similar molecules, the range of homogeneous solid mixtures is expected to be small.

There is also an additional experimental difficulty. The attainment of equilibrium within a solid phase depends on diffusion which is a relatively slow process. Therefore, it can often be a serious impediment to experiment just ensuring that the solid phase has reached true equilibrium. For example, in a study of solid solutions
of $N_2$ and CO (Morrison, et al., 1968), it was found that equilibrium times were a few hours near the triple point and were estimated to be as long as a month at $T = 0.8 \times T$ (triple point).

One way of overcoming the equilibrium problem is to design experiments in which only tiny amounts of solid are used. While this rules out calorimetric experiments, vapor pressure measurements are unaffected. A modified dew point method of measuring vapor pressures of small specimens of solid mixtures has been used successfully (Sommers, 1952; Morrison, et al., 1968) but the atoms and molecules were very simple: e.g. $^3$He, $^4$He, $N_2$ and CO.

The purpose of the work described in this thesis was to see if the dew point method could be applied to binary systems of larger and more complex molecules. The system of benzene-cyclohexane was chosen for several reasons, e.g., (i) the molecules are of similar size; (ii) the crystal structures of the pure solids are not vastly different (cubic versus orthorhombic) at higher temperatures; (iii) much information is available on the thermodynamics of liquid mixtures of the two components, some of it having been obtained by the dew point method (Brewster and McGlashan, 1973).

As will be seen in the experimental section, a suitable technique for measuring vapor pressures has been developed. Thus, in the temperature region $229 \, K < T < 273 \, K$, vapor pressures for the pure components and total vapor pressures for four mixtures were obtained. Subsequently, the primary experimental data are analysed formally to obtain activity coefficients and excess thermodynamic functions.

It was soon clear that the solid mixtures displayed far from ideal behavior. The dependence of total vapor pressure on vapor or solid composition was found to be very unusual, when compared with
the simple behavior of the liquid mixtures. Also, the mixtures behaved very differently in the extreme regions, of less than 20% and of more than 80% of benzene in the vapor. This might be due to structural effects and some speculation is indulged in.
### Table 1

#### List of Symbols

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$Y_1, Y_2$</td>
<td>mole fractions of component 1 (benzene) and 2 (cyclohexane) in the vapor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$x_1, x_2$</td>
<td>mole fractions in the condensed phase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$p$</td>
<td>total vapor pressure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P_1, P_2$</td>
<td>partial vapor pressures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$p^o_1, p^o_2$</td>
<td>vapor pressures of pure components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$n_1, n_2$</td>
<td>numbers of moles in the condensed phase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\gamma_1, \gamma_2$</td>
<td>activity coefficients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\mu_1, \mu_2$</td>
<td>chemical potentials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\mu^E_1, \mu^E_2$</td>
<td>excess chemical potentials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\mu^E$</td>
<td>molar excess Gibbs energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$S^E$</td>
<td>molar excess entropy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H^E$</td>
<td>molar excess Helmholtz energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R$</td>
<td>molar gas constant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T$</td>
<td>temperature in Kelvins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\bar{V}_g$</td>
<td>molar volume of the vapor phase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\bar{V}_c$</td>
<td>molar volume of the condensed phase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\bar{V}_c^o, \bar{V}_c^o$</td>
<td>molar volumes of the condensed phase for pure components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$B_{11}, B_{22}$</td>
<td>molar second virial coefficients of pure components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$B_{12}$</td>
<td>molar second virial coefficient for interactions between unlike molecules.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER II

THERMODYNAMICS OF A BINARY SOLUTION

In the dew point method, the point at which a relatively large amount of vapor of known composition \((y_1', y_2')\) is in equilibrium with a small amount of solid is determined. Therefore, the measurable variables are \(p\), \(T\) and \(y_1\) (or \(y_2\)). Then, the Gibbs-Duhem relation allows one to derive \(x_1\) and \(x_2\) from them, as is shown in the following:

At constant \(T\), the Gibbs-Duhem relation becomes

\[
\sum_i n_i \, d \mu_i = V_{dp} .
\]  

(1)

For a solution, if the vapor in equilibrium with it can be assumed to be ideal,

\[
d \mu_i^{\text{soln}} = RT \, d \ln p_i .
\]  

(2)

Substituting (2) into (1) gives

\[
RT \sum_i n_i \, d \ln p_i = V_{dp} .
\]  

(3)

Dividing both sides of (3) by \(\sum_i n_i\) gives

\[
\sum_i x_i \, d \ln p_i = \frac{V_{dp}}{RT \sum_i n_i} = \frac{V_c \, dp}{RT} .
\]  

(4)

Again, if the vapor can be assumed to be ideal, i.e., \(RT = pV_g\), (4) becomes

\[
\sum_i x_i \, d \ln p_i = \frac{V_c}{V_g} d \ln p .
\]  

(5)

Since for a binary system,

\[
p_1 = p y_1 \quad \text{and} \quad p_2 = p y_2 .
\]  

(6)
combination of (5) and (6) allows rewriting of (5), in terms of the
total vapor pressure, as
\[ x_1 \frac{d \ln p}{d y_1} + x_2 \frac{d \ln p}{d y_2} = \frac{\bar{V}_c}{\bar{V}_g} \frac{d \ln p}{d} . \] (7)
For most cases, \( \bar{V}_c \ll \bar{V}_g \) and thus (7) becomes, after rearrangement,
\[ \left( \frac{\partial \ln p}{\partial y_1} \right)_T = \frac{y_1 - x_1}{y_1 y_2}, \] (8)
as a good approximation.

As long as the vapor can be regarded as ideal, it is rather
simple to obtain the excess thermodynamic functions, \( \overline{G}^E, \overline{S}^E, \overline{H}^E \), etc.,
which describe the departure from the ideal mixture. Under this
situation, we can obtain
\[ \begin{align*}
\mu_1^E &= RT \ln \gamma_1 \quad \text{and} \quad \mu_2^E = RT \ln \gamma_2 \\
\overline{G}^E &= x_1 \mu_1^E + x_2 \mu_2^E
\end{align*} \] (9),
with the activity coefficients defined as
\[ \gamma_1 = \frac{p y_1}{p_1^0 x_1} \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma_2 = \frac{p y_2}{p_2^0 x_2}. \] (10)
The other excess functions are derived in the standard way, e.g.,
\[ \overline{S}^E = -\left( \frac{\partial \overline{G}^E}{\partial T} \right)_{p,x}. \] (11)

When the vapor may not be treated as ideal, the \( \gamma_1 \)'s (as well
as the \( x \)'s) must be obtained from expressions more complicated than (10)
(than (8) for the \( x \)'s) (see Brewster and McGlashan, 1973, for example):
\[ \begin{align*}
\ln \gamma_1 &= \ln \left( \frac{p y_1}{p_1^0 x_1} \right) + \frac{(p-p_1^0) (B_{11} - \bar{V}_c_1^0)}{RT} + \frac{2 y_1^2 \delta_{12} \cdot p}{RT} \\
\ln \gamma_2 &= \ln \left( \frac{p y_2}{p_2^0 x_2} \right) + \frac{(p-p_2^0) (B_{22} - \bar{V}_c_2^0)}{RT} + \frac{2 y_2^2 \delta_{12} \cdot p}{RT}
\end{align*} \] (12),
where $\delta_{12} = B_{12} - \frac{(B_{11} + B_{22})}{2}$.

In the present work, the maximum pressure measured was 28 Torr. From estimates of $B$'s (Dymond and Smith, 1969) for equimolar mixtures at the highest (268 K) and lowest (229 K) temperatures, the maximum contribution of the second terms on the right hand sides of (12) to the $\gamma$'s turned out to be 0.12%. Hence, corrections for gas imperfection were not needed.
CHAPTER III

EXPERIMENTAL

The essential physical measurement was the detection of the point at which a very small amount of solid was in equilibrium with vapor of known composition. This was accomplished by compressing the vapor into a cell and determining the desired point from the change of curvature of a plot of the observed pressure against the volume of the "compressor", which was a metal bellows driven by an attached micrometer screw.

Apparatus

The experimental arrangement is illustrated schematically in Figure 1. The material of construction was metal except for the Bourdon tube of the pressure gage, C. Since organic vapors obviously interact with the usual types of stopcock grease, it was necessary to use greaseless (metal) valves.

The vapor mixtures were prepared in a one-liter bulb, B, in the following way: One component (benzene) was admitted to B, with valves 1, 2 and 4 open and valve 3 closed. After the system was pumped out with valve 2 closed, the second component was added and the total pressure measured. The preparation of the vapor mixtures was done as quickly as possible (in less than 10 minutes). The accuracy of the compositions was mainly determined by the variation in room temperature,
Figure 1

Schematic drawing of the experimental arrangement

A - sample reservoirs for pure components
B - one-liter bulb for preparing mixtures
C - Bourdon pressure gage
D - metal bellows
E - micrometer screw
F - thermoelectric bath where condensation cell was mounted
since the bulb was not thermostatted. The mixtures were thoroughly mixed by freezing and evaporating them several times.

Pressures were measured to a precision of ±0.003 Torr with reference to vacuum, with a fused quartz Bourdon gage, C, (Texas Instruments Inc., model 140), which was calibrated in the range of 0 to 250 Torr by comparison with a Barocel electric manometer to an accuracy of 0.1%.

The volume of the system (~5 cm$^3$), with valves 1, 2 and 3 closed and valve 4 open, was varied by expanding or compressing the metal bellows, D, by means of the attached micrometer screw, E. It proved to be convenient to make this volume comparable to the volume of the cell, G.

The temperature of the cell was controlled by balancing heat supplied by an electrical heater against cooling by a thermoelectric bath, F, (Cole Parmer Co., model 3851), which was capable of attaining -55°C. In order to have the cell as the coldest part of the system and also to reduce the temperature gradients in the cell, an arrangement of heaters, shown in Figure 2, was adopted. Condensation was made to take place in the cell in the copper block, H, which was mounted on a piece of Styrofoam to insulate it partially from the cooler. A copper-constantan thermocouple (10 junctions) was attached to the top of the block and measured the temperature of the cell itself. Heaters were wound on the lower half of the block, on the German silver tube, I, and on the entire length of the copper tube, J. The temperature of the cooler was kept slightly lower than the desired one, an optimum amount of current was chosen for the heaters on the German silver and copper tubes and finally the heater on the block was controlled manually.
Figure 2

Condensation system

G - cell (volume ~5cm³)
H - copper block
I - German silver tube (1mm O.D., 0.1 mm wall thickness)
J - thick-walled copper tube
K - Styrofoam block
F - thermoelectric cooler
Thus, the temperature of the cell could be controlled to ±0.0002 K for periods of hours. The values (in Kelvins) of the temperature of the cell were obtained from the e.m.f. of the thermocouple by means of a standard table appropriate for the constantan wire used.

**Materials**

Liquid benzene and cyclohexane that had been purified chromatographically (Benson, *et al.*, 1970), were obtained from Mr. P. J. D'Arcy of the National Research Council in Ottawa. The liquids were kept in self-sealing ampoules and were used without further purification. They were thoroughly degassed before use by freezing, pumping and melting in the sample reservoirs (A in Figure 1).

**Determination of the vapor pressures**

(a) **Pure components**

Vapor at an appropriate pressure was drawn from one of the reservoirs into the system, and compressed by means of the bellows arrangement. Frequently, no marked change in curvature of p versus volume of the "compressor" could be seen, because the vapor supersaturated (see Thomas and Staveley, 1952, for a discussion of supersaturation magnitudes for a variety of substances). This effect was overcome by surging an excess of vapor into the system until condensation occurred and then removing it. Once solid had been formed in the cell, sufficient nuclei seemed to remain to prevent subsequent supersaturation.

A typical experimental result with one of the pure components is shown in Figure 3. As should be the case, the observed vapor pressure is independent of the volume of the "compressor" when the two phases are present. The data shown were also independent of the settings of the
Figure 3

Plot of pressure against volume of the "compressor" for pure benzene at $T = 253.246$ K

- O, □ - compression
- △ - expansion
controls on the cooler and heaters on the German silver and copper tubes within moderate limits, thus indicating that temperature gradients in the condensation system (Figure 2) were being properly controlled.

(b) Mixtures

A vapor mixture of known composition was drawn from the bulb B (Figure 1) into the cell step by step until the correct amount to suit the range of the "compressor" was found.

A typical experimental result with a mixture is shown in Figure 4. Because the system solid-vapor now has two degrees of freedom, the observed vapor pressure varies with the volume of the "compressor" and it becomes more difficult to determine the dew point accurately. This is reflected in the lower accuracy that is quoted in the following section.
Figure 4

Plot of pressure against volume of the "compressor" for a vapor mixture of 49.9% of benzene in cyclohexane at $T = 248.240 \text{ K}$

- $0, \Box$ - compression
- $\Delta$ - expansion
Figure 4
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

**Primary experimental data**

Vapor pressure data for the pure components and for four mixtures are given in Table 2. The estimated accuracy of the data for the pure components is ±0.006 Torr. For the mixtures, it is estimated to be ±0.025 Torr on the average and not lower than ±0.10 Torr in the worst case. The data marked with an asterisk in the table are examples where difficulties with nucleation were most severe. They are therefore the least certain.

To compare the measured vapor pressures of pure benzene and pure cyclohexane with published values (Kiss, et al, 1972), difference plots are used. The difference between observed and calculated values is plotted as a function of temperature in Figures 5 and 6. As may be seen, the data in the present work are consistent with a smooth p-T relation within ±0.01 Torr. The other data show considerably more scatter.

For the subsequent analysis of the experimental data, e.g. for the calculation of $\gamma_i$, $G^E$, $S^E$ etc., vapor pressures at rounded values of the temperature were derived by reading the values of $(p-p_{calc})$ from large size graphs of $(p-p_{calc})$ against T. The results are given in Table 3, and those for the three temperatures 268, 256 and 248 K are plotted in Figures 7, 8 and 9. Clearly, the departure of the mixtures...
Table 2

Measured Vapor Pressures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T (K)</th>
<th>p (Torr)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) pure benzene</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228.692</td>
<td>0.481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233.684</td>
<td>0.805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238.604</td>
<td>1.299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243.170</td>
<td>2.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>248.240</td>
<td>3.210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>253.246</td>
<td>4.983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>255.726</td>
<td>6.176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>258.189</td>
<td>7.587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260.635</td>
<td>9.278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>263.065</td>
<td>11.245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>265.747</td>
<td>13.918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268.144</td>
<td>16.696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270.527</td>
<td>19.937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>273.160</td>
<td>24.188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) pure cyclohexane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>231.637</td>
<td>1.383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>237.453</td>
<td>2.245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243.170</td>
<td>3.545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>248.240</td>
<td>5.196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>253.246</td>
<td>7.505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>257.370</td>
<td>10.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>258.189</td>
<td>10.551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>263.065</td>
<td>14.602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>266.014</td>
<td>17.602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268.144</td>
<td>20.064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270.527</td>
<td>23.265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>273.160</td>
<td>27.284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) y_1 = 0.236</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228.988</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233.100</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238.317</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243.170</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>248.800</td>
<td>5.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>253.522</td>
<td>7.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>258.462</td>
<td>11.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>263.603</td>
<td>15.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268.939</td>
<td>21.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>273.160</td>
<td>27.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T (K)</td>
<td>p (Torr)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228.692</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233.975</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238.604</td>
<td>2.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243.170</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>248.240</td>
<td>6.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>252.970</td>
<td>8.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>258.189</td>
<td>12.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>263.065</td>
<td>16.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268.144</td>
<td>22.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(d) \( y_1 = 0.499 \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T (K)</th>
<th>p (Torr)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>228.958</td>
<td>0.93*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233.100</td>
<td>1.48*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238.317</td>
<td>2.44*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243.170</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>248.800</td>
<td>5.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>253.522</td>
<td>7.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>258.462</td>
<td>11.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>263.603</td>
<td>15.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268.939</td>
<td>21.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>273.160</td>
<td>28.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(e) \( y_1 = 0.684 \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T (K)</th>
<th>p (Torr)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>228.692</td>
<td>0.72*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233.684</td>
<td>1.17*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238.604</td>
<td>1.84*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243.170</td>
<td>3.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>248.240</td>
<td>4.89*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>253.246</td>
<td>7.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>258.189</td>
<td>10.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>263.065</td>
<td>14.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268.144</td>
<td>19.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(f) \( y_1 = 0.850 \)

* difficulties with nucleation (see text).
Figure 5

A comparison of the measured vapor pressures of pure benzene with published values

- O - present results
- Δ - reference (Kiss et al, 1972)

$\ln p_{\text{calc}} \text{(Torr)} = 23.3922 - 5517.59/T$
A comparison of the measured vapor pressures of pure cyclohexane with published values

O - present results

Δ - reference (Kiss, et al, 1972)

\ln p_{calc} (\text{Torr}) = 19.9526 - 4544.67/T
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$y_1$</th>
<th>229 K</th>
<th>238 K</th>
<th>248 K</th>
<th>256 K</th>
<th>264 K</th>
<th>268 K</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>9.11</td>
<td>15.50</td>
<td>19.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.236</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>15.68</td>
<td>19.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.499</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>5.94</td>
<td>10.40</td>
<td>17.27</td>
<td>22.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.684</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>9.41</td>
<td>15.84</td>
<td>20.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.850</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>8.87</td>
<td>15.09</td>
<td>19.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>6.32</td>
<td>12.14</td>
<td>16.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3
Vapor pressures at rounded values of the temperature
Figure 7

Vapor pressure as a function of $x_1$ or $y_1$ for $T = 268 \text{ K}$

--- O ---  p versus $y_1$

--- - - - ---  p versus $x_1$

------------------ ideal solution
Figure 7
Figure 8

Vapor pressure as a function of $x_1$ or $y_1$ for $T = 256 \, K$

--- $0$ --- $p$ versus $y_1$

--- --- --- $p$ versus $x_1$

--- . . . --- ideal solution
Figure 9

Vapor pressure as a function of $x_1$ or $y_1$ for $T = 246$ K

--- O --- $p$ versus $y_1$

--- - - - --- $p$ versus $x_1$

--- . . . . . . . ideal solution
from ideal behavior (dot-dashed curves) is considerable. It would appear that the dilute mixtures of benzene in cyclohexane (for \( y_1 < 0.2 \)) behave more simply than those of the reversed composition, i.e. \( y_1 > 0.8 \). The reason can only be speculated about. Cyclohexane is a plastic crystal and has a cubic structure in the temperature range investigated here. This probably means that the molecules can reorient fairly easily in the solid and therefore a few benzene molecules may not be troublesome. Solid benzene, on the other hand, has a more complicated structure that undoubtedly depends on strongly directional interactions. It is perhaps not surprising then that the addition of a second component produces a markedly non-ideal mixture.

Derivation of the compositions of the solid phases

With liquid mixtures, it is usually possible to measure the three quantities \( p, x \) and \( y \) independently and equation (8) can then be used to test for thermodynamic consistency. But, in the present experiments, the solid compositions cannot be measured directly. Therefore, they have to be calculated from equation (8). Values of \( \frac{3 \ln p}{\partial y_1} \) at several values of \( y_1 \) were obtained from a smooth curve drawn through plotted points of \( p \) against \( y_1 \) within experimental error, as is shown in Figures 7, 8 and 9.

Insufficient experimental information was obtained to allow the shape of the curve of \( p \) against \( y_1 \) to be determined in the region \( y_1 > 0.8 \). Thus, it was possible to obtain estimates of \( x_1 \) only in the range \( x_1 < 0.75 \).
Activity coefficients and excess Gibbs energies

At the three temperatures, activity coefficients and excess Gibbs energies were calculated from equations (9) and (10) for some selected values of $x$ and $y$ obtained from Figures 7, 8 and 9. The results are given in Tables 4, 5 and 6.

Graphs of $\gamma_1$ and $\gamma_2$ against $x_1$ are shown in Figures 10, 11 and 12. Each pair of isothermal activity coefficient curves satisfy the following rules, which are based directly on the Gibbs-Duhem relation:

(i) The curves for $\gamma_1$ and $\gamma_2$ as functions of $x_1$ have opposite slopes at each composition.

(ii) Where the curve for one component shows a maximum, that for the other component shows a minimum.

(iii) The gradient $\gamma_1 / \gamma_2$ remains finite as $x_1$ tends to zero. This may be regarded as conformity to Henry's law.

(iv) $\left( \frac{\partial \gamma_2}{\partial x_2} \right)_T \rightarrow 0$ as $x_2 \rightarrow 1$. This is required by Raoult's law.

As can be seen from Figure 13, in the solid composition range $x_1 < 0.75$, the excess Gibbs energies show positive deviations from ideal behavior at the three temperatures. That this would be the derived result is evident from the fact that the measured vapor pressures of the mixtures exceed those of hypothetical ideal mixtures (dot-dashed curves in Figures 7, 8 and 9).

The temperature dependence of the excess Gibbs energy at each fixed composition is related to the excess entropy by equation (11). However, only a crude estimate of $\tilde{S}^E$ can be made because of the size of the uncertainties in $S^E$. $\tilde{S}^E$ is obviously positive throughout the range
Table 4

Activity coefficients and excess Gibbs energies at $T = 268$ K for some selected values of $x$ and $y$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$x_1$</th>
<th>$y_1$</th>
<th>$\gamma_1$</th>
<th>$x_2$</th>
<th>$y_2$</th>
<th>$\gamma_2$</th>
<th>$E^E$ (J/mole)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>1.20±0.01</td>
<td>0.900</td>
<td>0.900</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>41.4±2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.190±0.008</td>
<td>0.190</td>
<td>1.21±0.05</td>
<td>0.810±0.008</td>
<td>0.810</td>
<td>1.00±0.01</td>
<td>81.1±0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.223±0.023</td>
<td>0.339</td>
<td>1.90±0.22</td>
<td>0.777±0.023</td>
<td>0.661</td>
<td>0.88±0.02</td>
<td>98 ±39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.250±0.009</td>
<td>0.392</td>
<td>2.03±0.05</td>
<td>0.750±0.009</td>
<td>0.608</td>
<td>0.87±0.02</td>
<td>168 ±33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.387±0.017</td>
<td>0.457</td>
<td>1.57±0.07</td>
<td>0.613±0.017</td>
<td>0.543</td>
<td>0.98±0.03</td>
<td>358 ±17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.485</td>
<td>0.485</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>0.515</td>
<td>0.515</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>427 ±2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.628±0.002</td>
<td>0.532</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>0.372±0.002</td>
<td>0.468</td>
<td>1.38±0.01</td>
<td>421 ±2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.720</td>
<td>0.600</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0.280</td>
<td>0.400</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>351 ±6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5
Activity coefficients and excess Gibbs energies at T = 256 K for some selected values of x and y

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$X_1$</th>
<th>$Y_1$</th>
<th>$\gamma_1$</th>
<th>$X_2$</th>
<th>$Y_2$</th>
<th>$\gamma_2$</th>
<th>$\Delta G^E$ (J/mole)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.090±0.006</td>
<td>0.095</td>
<td>1.54±0.11</td>
<td>0.910±0.006</td>
<td>0.905</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>89.8±0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.170±0.003</td>
<td>0.208</td>
<td>1.81±0.03</td>
<td>0.830±0.003</td>
<td>0.792</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>173±11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.213±0.005</td>
<td>0.300</td>
<td>2.12±0.05</td>
<td>0.787±0.005</td>
<td>0.700</td>
<td>0.93±0.01</td>
<td>215±4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.246±0.011</td>
<td>0.400</td>
<td>2.61±0.12</td>
<td>0.754±0.011</td>
<td>0.600</td>
<td>0.89±0.01</td>
<td>207±22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.300±0.008</td>
<td>0.430</td>
<td>2.34±0.07</td>
<td>0.700±0.008</td>
<td>0.570</td>
<td>0.92±0.01</td>
<td>423±7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.370±0.025</td>
<td>0.448</td>
<td>1.99±0.12</td>
<td>0.630±0.025</td>
<td>0.552</td>
<td>1.00±0.04</td>
<td>544±38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.474</td>
<td>0.474</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>0.526</td>
<td>0.526</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>658±4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.576±0.028</td>
<td>0.499</td>
<td>1.42±0.08</td>
<td>0.424±0.028</td>
<td>0.501</td>
<td>1.35±0.08</td>
<td>704±3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.745±0.014</td>
<td>0.570</td>
<td>1.20±0.03</td>
<td>0.255±0.014</td>
<td>0.430</td>
<td>1.84±0.08</td>
<td>623±27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6

Activity coefficients and excess Gibbs energies at $T = 248$ K for some selected values of $x$ and $y$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$x_1$</th>
<th>$y_1$</th>
<th>$\gamma_1$</th>
<th>$x_2$</th>
<th>$y_2$</th>
<th>$\gamma_2$</th>
<th>$\Delta G^E$ (J/mole)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.100±0.001</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>2.08±0.03</td>
<td>0.900±0.001</td>
<td>0.875</td>
<td>0.99±0.01</td>
<td>136±7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.200±0.009</td>
<td>0.273</td>
<td>2.38±0.13</td>
<td>0.800±0.009</td>
<td>0.727</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>311±9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.300±0.002</td>
<td>0.406</td>
<td>2.49±0.01</td>
<td>0.700±0.002</td>
<td>0.594</td>
<td>0.96±0.01</td>
<td>503±19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.350±0.007</td>
<td>0.451</td>
<td>2.42±0.08</td>
<td>0.650±0.007</td>
<td>0.549</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>600±6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.380±0.009</td>
<td>0.472</td>
<td>2.35±0.05</td>
<td>0.620±0.009</td>
<td>0.528</td>
<td>0.99±0.01</td>
<td>651±23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.495</td>
<td>0.495</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>0.505</td>
<td>0.505</td>
<td>1.16±0.01</td>
<td>810±7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.600±0.015</td>
<td>0.519</td>
<td>1.63±0.03</td>
<td>0.400±0.015</td>
<td>0.481</td>
<td>1.39±0.06</td>
<td>876±11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.700±0.023</td>
<td>0.542</td>
<td>1.44±0.04</td>
<td>0.300±0.023</td>
<td>0.458</td>
<td>1.74±0.15</td>
<td>872±5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.760±0.005</td>
<td>0.594</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>0.240±0.005</td>
<td>0.406</td>
<td>1.86±0.05</td>
<td>838±4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 10

Activity coefficients as functions of $x_1$ for $T = 268$ K
Figure 10
Figure 11

Activity coefficients as functions of $x_1$ for $T = 256$ K
Figure 11
Figure 12

Activity coefficients as functions of $x_1$ for $T = 248$ K
Figure 12
Figure 13

Excess Gibbs energy as a function of $x_1$ at the three temperatures

- $\bigcirc$ at $T = 268$ K
- $\Delta$ at $T = 256$ K
- $\Box$ at $T = 248$ K
Figure 13
\( x_1 < 0.75 \). For the equimolar mixture, \( S^E = 19 \) J/mole deg. Hence, at \( T = 256 \) K, we get \( H^E = G^E + TS^E = 5539 \) J/mole. Again, because of accumulating uncertainties, it is not worthwhile to deduce anything else about the behavior of \( H^E \).

**Comparison with liquid mixtures**

The extensive available data for liquid mixtures are illustrated in Figure 14 (total vapor pressure versus \( x_1 \) and \( y_1 \)) and Figure 15 (excess Gibbs energy versus \( x_1 \)). It is clear that the behavior of the liquid mixtures is rather simpler than that of the solid mixtures and therefore the derived thermodynamic quantities are more accurate. The magnitude of \( G^E \) for the solid is obviously much greater than that for the liquid and this is perhaps to be expected.
Figure 14

Vapor pressures of liquid mixtures of benzene-cyclohexane at $T = 313.15$ K

- $\bigcirc$, $\nabla$ - by Brewster and McGlashan (1973)
- $\Delta$, $\square$ - by Scatchard, et al (1939)

--- $\Delta$--- $p$ versus $y_1$

--- $\square$--- $p$ versus $x_1$

--- $\ldots$--- ideal solution
Figure 14
Figure 15

Excess Gibbs energies of liquid mixtures of benzene-cyclohexane at $T = 313.15$ K

- O  - by Brewster and McGlashan (1973)

- Δ  - by Scatchard, et al (1939)
Figure 15
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY

1. A suitable technique for measuring total vapor pressures of solid mixtures was developed.

2. Even though difficulties with nucleation were encountered, results of good accuracy were obtained.

3. The values obtained for the vapor pressures of pure solids are more precise and probably more accurate than existing values in the literature.

4. While it would have been desirable to obtain data for many more mixtures, much more time would have been required. The experiments on one mixture required several weeks.

5. Because the accuracy of the measured vapor pressures was good, it was possible to carry through the analysis of the data to obtain $\gamma$'s and $G^E$ for $x_1 < 0.8$.

6. The dependence of $\gamma_1$ and $\gamma_2$ on $x_1$ was found to be reasonable.

7. The magnitude of $G^E$ for $x_1 < 0.75$ was established in the range $248 < T < 268$ K.

8. Only rough estimates could be obtained for $S^E$ and $H^E$.

9. The behavior of the solid mixtures is evidently more complicated than that of liquid mixtures.
10. At this stage, it is premature to attempt any detailed comparison of the experimental results with predictions of theoretical models. Also, before that is attempted, one would want to obtain more experimental information.

11. It is concluded that the dew point method is capable of providing a reasonably adequate picture of the thermodynamics of solid mixtures - even of quite large molecules. It should be worth exploiting further.
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