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Abstract: Although the thermodynamic properties of sulfuric acid above 0.1 M and near 25°C are well established numerically, they have not been represented accurately by equations which are based upon the ionic species present, $H^+$, $HSO_4^-$, and $SO_4^{2-}$. We have developed and fitted such equations over the range from 0 to 6 M in a system compatible with those for fully dissociated, strong electrolytes. The enthalpy is treated as well as the activity and osmotic coefficients. These equations also establish the solute standard state and the relationship between the properties of sulfuric acid in that state with those for the pure acid. Among the results obtained (for 25°C) are the dissociation constant 0.0105 and the heat of dissociation -5.61 kcal mole$^{-1}$ for $HSO_4^-$, and the entropy of $SO_4^{2-}$, 4.2 ± 0.2, and of $HSO_4^-$, 32.1 ± 0.3 cal K$^{-1}$ mole$^{-1}$. Also for the reaction $H_2SO_4(\lambda) = 2H^+(aq) + SO_4^{2-}(aq)$, $\Delta H^o = -22,844$, $\Delta G^o = -12,871$ cal mole$^{-1}$.
In view of the great practical importance of sulfuric acid, it is desirable to have the most accurate and convenient expression of its thermodynamic properties. Above 0.1 M these properties are now well established,\textsuperscript{1-6} but there is still considerable uncertainty about the properties of very dilute solutions and the related solute standard state. In this research we have the dual purposes, first to establish as accurately as possible the thermodynamic properties of dilute sulfuric acid, and second to provide a convenient yet accurate analytical representation of the properties of this acid in a form compatible with that used for other electrolytes\textsuperscript{7-9} and over as wide a range of concentration as is feasible.

The thermodynamic treatment of sulfuric acid has been unusually difficult because the dissociation constant of \( \text{HSO}_4^- \) lies in the most troublesome region where methods fail that were successful for weaker acids.\textsuperscript{10,11} The preceding paper of this series\textsuperscript{12} considered this general problem with phosphoric acid as an example. Sulfuric acid is even more troublesome in view of the higher charge on the sulfate ion and the correspondingly larger changes in its activity coefficient.

**General Equations**

The statistical mechanical basis for the form of equation for a complex electrolyte was given in the first paper of this series.\textsuperscript{7} The general framework is that of the McMillan-Mayer theory of solutions and the equation relating intermolecular forces and distributions to the osmotic pressure.\textsuperscript{13} Our basic equation is
where $G^\text{ex}$ is the excess Gibbs energy for a solution containing $n_w$ kg of solvent and $n_i$, $n_j$, etc., moles of solute species $i$, $j$, etc. Here $f(I)$ is a function of ionic strength (and temperature and solvent properties) expressing the effect of long-range electrostatic forces between ions and including, of course, the Debye-Hückel limiting law. Short-range interactions of solute species lead to the terms $\lambda_{ij}(I)$ for binary interactions and $\mu_{ijk}$ for ternary interactions; the theoretical basis for expecting an ionic-strength dependence for $\lambda_{ij}$ was given earlier and this has been fully confirmed empirically. The $\lambda$ and $\mu$ matrices are symmetric, i.e., $\lambda_{ij} = \lambda_{ji}$, etc.

**Equations for Sulfuric Acid**

The intermediate thermodynamic derivations of activity and osmotic coefficients and the definitions of experimentally measurable parameters and convenient empirical forms have been given previously. For example, for univalent ions a measurable combination of $\lambda$'s is $B_{\text{MX}} = \lambda_{\text{MX}} + 1/2 \lambda_{\text{MM}} + 1/2 \lambda_{\text{XX}}$. We shall move directly to the results appropriate for a solution of sulfuric acid with stoichiometric molality $m$ and molality $m_H$ of $H^+$, $m_1 = 2m-m_H$ of $\text{HSO}_4^-$, and $m_2 = m-m_1$ of $\text{SO}_4^{2-}$. With two different anions this is a mixed electrolyte for our equations even though the second anion arises from a dissociation equilibrium of the first. For the osmotic coefficient $\phi'$ on a mixed electrolyte basis one finds

\[
\frac{G^\text{ex}}{RT} = n_w f(I) + \frac{1}{n_w} \sum_{ij} \lambda_{ij}(I) n_i n_j + \frac{1}{n_w^2} \sum_{ijk} \mu_{ijk} n_i n_j n_k
\]
\[
\phi' - 1 = (\Sigma m) - 1 \left\{ 2 If + 2m_H[m_1(B_{H1}^\phi + m_HC_{H1}^\phi) + \\
m_2(B_{H2}^\phi + m_HC_{H2}^\phi/2^{1/2})] + m_1m_2(\theta_{12} + m_H\psi_{H12}) \right\}
\]
\[
f^\phi = -A_\phi[I^{1/2}/(1 + 1.2I^{1/2})]
\]
\[
B_{MX}^\phi = \beta_{MX}^{(0)} + \beta_{MX}^{(1)} \exp(-\alpha I^{1/2})
\]

where the ionic strength \( I = m + 2m_2 \), \( A_\phi \) is the Debye-Hückel limiting-law parameter for the osmotic coefficient (see Appendix for numerical values), \( \alpha \) is a general empirical parameter equal to 2 throughout this work, while \( \beta_{MX}^{(0)} \) and \( \beta_{MX}^{(1)} \) are specific parameters for the appropriate sum of \( \lambda_{ij} \) for binary interactions \( M-X, M-M, \) and \( X-X \) where the cation \( M \) is always \( H \) and the anion \( X \) is either \( HSO_4^- = 1 \) or \( SO_4^{2-} = 2 \). Also \( C_{MX}^\phi \) is the corresponding third virial coefficient for triple interactions \( \mu_{ijk} \) for MMX and MXX; \( \theta_{12} \) is the difference in binary interaction \( \lambda_{ij} \) of \( HSO_4^- \) with \( SO_4^{2-} \) from the appropriate average of \( HSO_4^- - HSO_4^- \) and \( SO_4^{2-} - SO_4^{2-} \) interactions; while \( \psi_{H12} \) is the corresponding difference in triple interactions \( \mu_{ijk} \) involving a hydrogen ion together with two anions.

In addition we have the dissociation equilibrium

\[
HSO_4^- = H^+ + SO_4^{2-}
\]

\[
K_2 = \frac{m_Hm_2}{m_1}\left(\frac{\gamma_H\gamma_2}{\gamma_1}\right)
\]

with the familiar dissociation constant \( K_2 \) and the activity coefficients of the various ions. These activity coefficients
can be expressed in terms of the same parameters as appear in equations (1) to (4).

These equations contain two different expressions for the short range interaction of $H^+$ with $SO_4^-$; one is the association to $HSO_4^-$ represented by $1/K_2$, the other the second virial coefficient $B_{H2}$ containing $\beta_{H2}^{(0)}$ and $\beta_{H2}^{(1)}$. If this series of equations is expanded in powers of $m^{1/2}$, the coefficient of the term in $m$ involves a sum with terms in $1/K_2$ and $(\beta_{H2}^{(0)} + \beta_{H2}^{(1)})$ indicating a redundancy at this order. Higher order terms, however, do not maintain this redundancy, and it is possible to include $\beta_{H2}^{(0)}$ or $\beta_{H2}^{(1)}$ or both, if desired.

In sulfuric acid above 0.1 M the more abundant anion is $HSO_4^-$ and the osmotic coefficient has been observed to behave very much like that of $HCl$ or a similar acid. Thus we may expect that the parameters most important for this concentration range will be $\beta_{H1}^{(0)}$ and $\beta_{H1}^{(1)}$ which relate to the short-range interaction of $H^+$ with $HSO_4^-$. Thus we expect $K_2$ to be most important for the very dilute range with $\beta_{H1}^{(0)}$ and $\beta_{H1}^{(1)}$ becoming important at higher concentrations.

There remain in equations (2) through (4) six additional parameters which might have significant effect at least at very high concentration. In exploratory calculations it was soon discovered that $\beta_{H2}^{(1)}$ was so nearly redundant to $1/K_2$ and $\beta_{H2}^{(0)}$ that it was best omitted. Also it was found that $\theta_{12}$ and $\psi_{H12}$ were not needed. Good results were obtained with either the combination $\beta_{H2}^{(0)}$ and $C_{H2}^\phi$ or with $C_{H1}^\phi$ and $C_{H2}^\phi$ but the former proved to be slightly superior and was adopted. The equations then reduce to
\[ \phi' - 1 = (\Sigma m_i)^{-1} \{ 2I_1^\phi + 2m_H (m_1 B_{H1}^\phi \\
+ m_2 (\beta_{H2}^{(0)} + m_H C_{H2}^{\phi} / 2^{1/2}) ) \} \] (7)

with \( B_{H1}^\phi \) still represented by the two-term expression

\[ B_{H1} = \beta_{H1}^{(0)} + \beta_{H1}^{(1)} \exp(-2I^{1/2}). \] (4a)

The corresponding equations for the two combinations of activity coefficients of interest are

\[
\ln(\gamma_H^2 \gamma_{SO_4}^2) = 6f^Y + 4m_1 B_{H1} + (4m_2 + 2m_H) \beta_{H2}^{(0)} \\
+ (8m_2 + 2m_H) m_H C_{H2} + 6m_2 m_1 B_{H1}^{'}
\] (8)

\[
\ln(\gamma_H^{YSO_4}/\gamma_{HSO_4}) = 4f^Y + 2(m_1 - m_H) B_{H1} + 2(m_2 + m_H) \beta_{H2}^{(0)} \\
+ 2m_H(2m_2 + m_H) C_{H2} + 4m_1 m_H B_{H1}^{'}
\] (9)

\[ f^Y = -A_\phi \left[ I^{1/2} / (1 + 1.2 \ I^{1/2}) + (2/1.2) \ln(1 + 1.2 \ I^{1/2}) \right] \] (10)

\[ B_{H1} = \beta_{H1}^{(0)} + (\beta_{H1}^{(1)} / 2I) \left[ 1 - (1 + 2I^{1/2}) \exp(-2I^{1/2}) \right] \] (11a)

\[ B_{H1}^{'} = (\beta_{H1}^{(1)} / 2I^{1/2}) \left[ -1 + (1 + 2I^{1/2} + 2I) \exp(-2I^{1/2}) \right] \] (11b)

\[ C_{H2} = C_{H2}^{\phi} / 2^{3/2}. \] (12)

The stoichiometric activity and osmotic coefficients for sulfuric acid (on the basis of complete dissociation) are

\[ \gamma_+^3 = (\gamma_H^2 \gamma_{SO_4})(m_H^2 m_2 / 4m^3) \] (13)

\[ \phi = \phi'(\Sigma m_i) / 3m. \] (14)
The total excess Gibbs energy per mole of solute is given by the thermodynamic relationship

\[ G_{ex}/n_2 = 3RT(\ln \gamma_+ + 1-\phi). \]  

Equations for the various molal enthalpy functions can be derived from the temperature derivatives of the Gibbs energy functions. For example

\[ \bar{L}_1 = (M_w m/1000)(3RT^2) \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial T} \]  

\[ \bar{L}_2 = -3RT^2 \frac{\partial}{\partial T} \ln \gamma_+ \]  

\[ \phi_L = 3RT^2(\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial T} - \frac{\partial}{\partial T} \ln \gamma_+) \]

where \( M_w \) is the molecular weight of the solvent.

In taking the temperature derivative of equations (7), (8), (13), and (14) one must recognize that \( \beta, m_H, m_1, m_2 \) are temperature dependent through the change in dissociation of \( HSO_4^- \). Any one can be chosen to express this effect and the others related thereto; we used \( \frac{\partial m_1}{\partial T} \) but indicate derivatives at constant composition with the subscript \( I \).

One obtains

\[ \bar{L}_1 = \frac{M_w RT^2}{1000} \left\{ 2I(\frac{\partial f^\phi}{\partial T}) + 2m_H \left( m_1 \left( \frac{\partial \beta H_1^\phi}{\partial T} \right) + m_2 \left( \frac{\partial \beta H_2^\phi}{\partial T} \right) \right) + m_1 \left( \frac{\partial \beta H_1^\phi}{\partial T} \right) I \right. 

+ \frac{m_2 m_H}{2^{1/2}} \left( \frac{\partial C_{H_2}^\phi}{\partial T} \right) I - \left( \frac{\partial m_1}{\partial T} \right) \left[ 1 + 4f^\phi + 4I \left( \frac{\partial f^\phi}{\partial T} \right) \right] 

- 4m_2 \beta H_1^\phi - 4m_1 m_1 \left( \frac{\partial \beta H_1^\phi}{\partial T} \right) + 2I \beta H_2^\phi + 2^{1/2} m_H (m_H + 2m_2) C_{H_2}^\phi \right\} \]  

(19)
The change of dissociation with temperature is obtained from equations (6) and (9). After several steps one finds

$$\ln K_2 = -RT^2(6\frac{\partial f_Y}{\partial T} I + 4m_1(\frac{\partial B_{H1}}{\partial T} I) + (4m_2+2m_H)\frac{\partial \beta(0)}{\partial T} I$$

$$+ m_H(8m_2+2m_H)(\frac{\partial C_{H2}}{\partial T} I) + 6m_1m_H(\frac{\partial B_{H1}}{\partial T} I)$$

$$- \frac{\partial m_1}{\partial T}\left[\frac{2}{m_H} + \frac{1}{m_2} + 12\frac{\partial f_Y}{\partial T} - 4B_{H1} - (8m_2+4m_2) B'_{H1}\right]$$

$$+ 6\beta(0) + (8m_2+2m_H) C_{H2} - 6m_1m_H B''_{H1}]$$

with

$$B''_{H1} = (\beta_{H1}/I^3)[1+(1+2I^{1/2} + 2I + I^{3/2}) e^{-2I^{1/2}}].$$

The heat of dissociation is contained in the above, since

$$\frac{\partial \ln K_2}{\partial T} = \Delta H_2/RT^2.$$
solution of equation (6). After each cycle the improved $m_1$ is used to recalculate the ionic strength, which appears throughout the equations, for the next cycle. Thus the solution for known parameters is relatively easy.

The problem of finding the best parameters to fit an array of various types of experimental data is much more difficult, since this is not only a non-linear problem, but there is also the non-linear auxiliary condition of equation (6). The non-linear least-squares equations were used with the derivatives with respect to the various parameters including the indirect dependence through equation (6). While simultaneous optimization of 19 parameters was possible, we found it preferable to use a series of fixed values for $K_2$ at $25^\circ$ with least-squares optimization of the remaining 18 parameters.

Experimental Data

There are three cells each of which yields the thermodynamic properties of sulfuric acid:

Pt, $H_2|H_2SO_4(m)|PbSO_4, Pb, Hg$ (A)

Pt, $H_2|H_2SO_4(m)|Hg_2SO_4, Hg$ (B)

Pt, $H_2|H_2SO_4(m)|PbO_2, PbSO_4, Pt$ (C)

For cells A and B the equation for the e.m.f. is

$$E = E^\circ - \frac{(RT/2F)}{2} \ln(4m^{3/2})$$

(24)

while for cell C the corresponding equation is

$$E = E^\circ + \frac{(RT/2F)}{2} \ln(4m^{3/2}/a_w^2)$$

(25)
where \( a_w \) is the activity of the water which is given by

\[
\ln a_w = -3m\phi/55.5.
\]  

(26)

For cells B and C there are extensive investigations of Wynne-Jones and collaborators\(^3\),\(^4\) over a series of temperatures and from 0.1 to over 7 M. In addition at 25° there are measurements of Covington, Dobson, and Wynne-Jones\(^14\) for dilute solutions from 0.007 to 0.1 M. These data have been shown to be consistent to high accuracy as between cells B and C and, in the range above 0.1 M, also with the osmotic data of Shankland and Gordon\(^1\) and of Stokes.\(^2\) Furthermore, Giauque and associates\(^5\),\(^6\) have measured the entropies of various sulfuric acid hydrates by third law methods and combined these results with other entropy and enthalpy data to check accurately the temperature coefficient of cell C.

Cell A was measured over a range of temperatures and from 0.001 to 0.02 M by Shrawder and Cowperthwaite\(^15\) in 1934. This work has been ignored by many more recent workers but was recently shown by Lilley and Briggs\(^16\) to be consistent with the results of cells B and C in the region of overlap at 25° and has been discussed recently by one of us.\(^17\) The early work of Hamer\(^18\) and Harned and Hamer\(^19\) on cells C and B, respectively, has been shown by various workers\(^1\)-\(^4\),\(^6\),\(^14\) to be less accurate than the more recent data here considered.

At the very lowest concentrations the solubility of \( \text{PbSO}_4 \)\(^15\) or \( \text{Hg}_2\text{SO}_4 \)\(^20\) becomes significant and corrections were made for the primary effect of the dissolved solid.
Information about the enthalpy of sulfuric acid comes primarily from heat of dilution measurements. These include the measurements of Lange, Monheim and Robinson\textsuperscript{21} in the very dilute range, of Kunzler and Giauque\textsuperscript{22} for concentrated solutions, and of Groenier,\textsuperscript{23} and Wu\textsuperscript{24} (both students of T. F. Young) for differential dilutions at intermediate concentrations. The heat of ionization of $\text{HSO}_4^-$ has been measured calorimetrically\textsuperscript{25,26} with the results $-5.2 \pm 0.5$ and $-5.74 \pm 0.2$ kcal/mole. These approximate values were not used directly but provided a check on values of $\Delta H_2$ obtained from analysis of heat of dilution data.

In addition to the cell measurements on pure sulfuric acid, we considered the results of Nair and Nancollas\textsuperscript{27} on the cell

$$\text{Pt, } H_2 | \text{H}_2\text{SO}_4(\text{m}) \text{ HCl(m}_{3}\text{)} | \text{AgCl, Ag} \quad (D)$$

which yields directly the activity of HCl. Dunsmore and Nancollas\textsuperscript{28} made further calculations on these data. Application of our equations for mixed electrolytes to these solutions yields equations with additional terms which are given in the Appendix. It suffices to note here that the additional terms which are important are those for the interaction of $H^+$ with $Cl^-$ which are known from the properties of pure HCl. Interaction terms for $Cl^-$ with $SO_4^-$ are known to be small, and one can estimate that the corresponding terms for $Cl^-$ interaction with $\text{HSO}_4^-$ may also be neglected in good approximation at the low concentrations measured for cell D.

In contrast to the situation just described, most of the other thermodynamic data which have been used in calculating the dissociation constant for bisulfate ion involve complex
mixed solutions where unknown interactions would now be estimated to be significant and where elimination of these terms by extrapolation is uncertain. The most favorable of these cases, that for mixed solutions of \( \text{Na}_2\text{SO}_4 \) and \( \text{NaHSO}_4 \) in cell B, \(^{29}\) is discussed in the Appendix. Here the serious uncertainty is the interaction of \( \text{Na}^+ \) with \( \text{HSO}_4^- \) which is not known accurately from another source.

Evaluation of Parameters

Our first calculations dealt only with the data on cells A, B, and C for pure sulfuric acid and the osmotic coefficients at 25°. It soon became apparent that the osmotic data were less precise than the cell data; consequently, only the smoothed values of Robinson and Stokes\(^{30}\) and of Rard, et al.\(^{31}\) were retained for \( \phi \). Excellent fits were obtained for all of these cell potentials, but it was noted that \( K_2 \) was being given a value near 0.0120 which is much larger than that found in most recent work. This implied a real conflict with the data on cell D which were interpreted by Nair and Nancollas\(^{28}\) to yield \( K_2 = 0.0110 \) and by Dunsmore and Nancollas\(^{29}\) to yield \( K_2 = 0.0105 \). Further investigation indicated that all data for cells B and C and those for cell A at 0.005 M and above could be fitted with smaller values of \( K_2 \), including the value \( K_2 = 0.0105 \) which yielded the best agreement with the data on cell D when our more detailed equations were used with specific parameters for HCl (see Appendix).
The results at this point yielded two sets of parameters fitting most data equally well. Further calculations indicated the heat of dilution data were better fitted by the set of parameters including $K_2 = 0.0105$ together with appropriate temperature derivative parameters. Thus we favor these parameters ($K_2 = 0.0105$) as more probably representing the true properties of sulfuric acid below 0.005 M, but we cannot assert that this choice is absolutely certain.

In further comment on the choice of the last paragraph we note that other work in the same laboratory as that for cell A with cells also involving the PbSO$_4$, Pb electrode has been found$^{32}$ to be reliable down to 0.005 M but in significant error below that concentration. Also a very simple interpretation$^{17}$ of the data for cell A cast some doubt on the results for the most dilute solutions at the higher temperatures. In contrast, however, the concentration of sulfate ion as measured by Raman spectra by Young, Maranville, and Smith$^{33}$ is better fitted by our calculations with the higher $K_2 = 0.0120$. These concentration measurements are not very precise and the difference is not very large, hence we do not believe this is a serious objection to the smaller $K_2$. Conductance data on sulfuric acid have been interpreted by Kerker$^{34}$ to yield $K_2 = 0.0102$ and by Dunsmore and Nancollas$^{28}$ to yield $K_2 = 0.0105$ at 25° and therefore favor the smaller value of $K_2$.

Table I gives the adopted parameters both in the form for 25° and that for temperature dependent functions; also given are the alternate parameters for 25° as discussed above.
Of the ion-interaction parameters in Table I only $\beta_{\text{H}1}^{(0)}$ for the $\text{H}^+ - \text{HSO}_4^-$ interaction is sufficiently free from ambiguity to make comparison meaningful. The value for $\text{H}^+ - \text{HSO}_4^-$, 0.2103, is similar to the $\beta^{(0)}$ values for other strong acids with large anions, for example 0.236 for HI and 0.175 for $\text{HClO}_4^-$. For $\text{H}^+ - \text{HSO}_4^-$, $\beta_{\text{H}1}^{(1)}$ (0.47) is higher than that found for the simple acids but not very different. Since we have arbitrarily suppressed some parameters and have the redundancy of $\beta_{\text{H}2}^{(0)}$, $\beta_{\text{H}2}^{(1)}$, and $1/K_2$, great caution should be used in interpreting these other quantities. None are so large as to be unreasonable, however.

The alternate set of parameters shifts each of the $E_0$ values by 1.1 mV which corresponds to a 3% increase in activity coefficients.

Table II shows the agreement with experimental cell potentials for values calculated with the adopted set in the range 0.005 to 0.1 M. Table III gives a similar comparison for the range 0.1 to 6 M but in terms of the activity coefficient; also included is the osmotic coefficient.

Tables II and III also give the fraction of sulfate dissociated from $\text{HSO}_4^-$ to $\text{SO}_4^{2-}$. This quantity is sensitive to small changes in parameters which do not seriously affect the thermodynamic properties and in particular to the choice between $C_{\text{H}1}$ or $\beta_{\text{H}2}^{(0)}$ as a parameter to be included. Hence only two significant figures are given and these results should be used with caution.
It is clear from Tables II and III that the agreement for cell potentials (or activity coefficients) at 25° is within or near to experimental accuracy. Similarly, the calculated osmotic coefficients are probably within experimental uncertainty up to 5 M. At other temperatures the agreement is almost as good with standard deviations of 0.13, 0.28, and 0.16 mV for the potential values for cell A (at and above 0.005 M) and for cells B and C (up to 6.1 M), respectively.

All of the heat of dilution data were fitted directly except for the most dilute point of Lange, et al., with a final concentration 0.00005 M, which is necessarily least accurate, and the large ratio dilutions of Groenier for which his calorimeter was much less accurate than Lange's. The standard deviations were: for 24 differential dilutions of Wu, 3.1 cal mole⁻¹; for the earlier but similar work of Groenier, with 42 points, 6.8 cal mole⁻¹; for 10 large ratio dilutions of dilute solutions by Lange, et al., 35 cal mole⁻¹, and for 6 dilutions of concentrated solutions by Kunzler and Giauque, 8.0 cal mole⁻¹. Although σ is largest for Lange's values, it is clearly within experimental error for these dilutions yielding final concentrations in the range 0.00009 to 0.002 M. The accurate, differential dilution data of Wu are well fitted with the adopted parameters, but for the alternate set with $K_2 = 0.0120$ there is a serious discrepancy in the range 0.1 to 0.6 M where all deviations are of the same sign for 11 measurements with $\sigma = 8.4$ cal mole⁻¹.
Thermodynamic Properties of Sulfuric Acid

The thermodynamic properties for cells A, B, and C at 25° are compared in Table IV with literature values. The standard potentials for cells B and C are the same within 0.1 and 0.3 mV, respectively, as those chosen by Covington, et al. For cell A our present value is very close to the value -0.3526 favored by Lilley and Briggs but differs by 1.5 mV from the value one of us obtained from the data for cell A alone - without reference to the other data considered here. This difference of 1.5 mV is essentially that of the choice between $K_2 = 0.0105$ or 0.0120 where the latter value fits cell A results down to 0.001 M but disagrees with some other results.

A more independent check is possible for the temperature coefficient of the cell potential which yields $\Delta S$ for the cell reaction. Here one has entropy values from statistical calculations or third-law methods for all of the substances involved - in particular 31.208 for $H_2(g)$, 16.71 for $H_2O(\ell)$, 35.51 for $PbSO_4(s)$, 18.17 for $Hg(\ell)$, and 47.96 for $Hg_2SO_4(s)$, all in cal K$^{-1}$ mole$^{-1}$ from the NBS Tables. Also Duisman and Giauque$^6$ give 17.156 for $PbO_2(s)$, Gallagher, et al.$^3\text{a}_1$ give 35.509 for $PbSO_4(s)$, Meads, et al.$^3\text{a}_3$ give 15.514 for $Pb(s)$, and CODATA-Part IV$^3\text{a}_8$ recommends 4.50 for $SO_4^{2-}(aq)$ from a variety of sulfate salts. Since cell A involves an amalgamated lead electrode, the value $^3\text{a}_9\Delta S = 0.93$ cal K$^{-1}$ mole$^{-1}$ must be included for conversion of pure solid lead to lead in mercury. The entropy of $H^+$ ion is zero by definition. Combination of these values yields the results in the next-to-last column of
Table IV. The agreement is very good. But it is equally justifiable to use each set of data to determine a value for the entropy of sulfate ion; the last column gives these values.

Our preferred parameters yield for the heat of dissociation of bisulfate ion $\Delta H_2 = -5.61 \text{ kcal mole}^{-1}$ in excellent agreement with the values $-5.2 \pm 0.5$ and $-5.74 \pm 0.2$ cited above.\textsuperscript{25,26}

Also one obtains $\Delta S_2^0 = -27.87 \text{ cal K}^{-1} \text{ mole}^{-1}$.

These data do not have sufficient accuracy over their limited temperature range to yield reliable second temperature derivatives and thereby heat capacities. While three-term expressions were used for the cell potentials, the resulting second derivatives do not yield meaningful $\Delta C_p$ values because only two-term expressions were used for $K_2$ and the other parameters for the aqueous phase. One could introduce independent knowledge of the heat capacity of the solution into the treatment, but the increased complexity did not seem justified.

In view of the interrelationship between parameters it is not useful to set limits of error for most of the individual parameters in Table I. The uncertainties in $E_0$ values are about 0.3 mV provided the "adopted set" is essentially correct. Alternate $E_0$ values for $K_2 = 0.0120$ are also given. Even excluding this alternate choice, the value of $K_2$ is uncertain by a few percent since other parameters can be adjusted to retain the fit at finite concentration.

Table V presents a survey of various properties of aqueous sulfuric acid as calculated from our equations and parameters. For accurate values at other concentrations the equations should be used.
By comparison of our values in Table V at finite concentrations from 1 to 4 M with those of Giauque, et al., one obtains the difference between the properties of sulfuric acid in the solute standard state and those for the pure liquid. Thus for the reaction

$$\text{H}_2\text{SO}_4(\ell) = 2\text{H}^+(\text{aq}) + \text{SO}_4^{2-}(\text{aq})$$

we find

$$\Delta G^\circ = -12871 \text{ cal mole}^{-1}$$
$$\Delta H^\circ = -22844 \text{ cal mole}^{-1}$$
$$\Delta S^\circ = -33.45 \text{ cal mole}^{-1} \text{ K}^{-1}.$$  

If one adds the entropy of pure liquid H$_2$SO$_4$, 37.501, to this value for $\Delta S^\circ$, one obtains for the entropy of aqueous SO$_4^{2-}$ the value 4.05 (since the entropy of H$^+$ is zero by definition). This result agrees reasonably well with those obtained earlier by a different method and we conclude that $S^\circ(\text{SO}_4^{2-}) = 4.2 \pm 0.2 \text{ cal mole}^{-1} \text{ K}^{-1}$. Combination of this value with $\Delta S^\circ_2$ yields for the entropy of HSO$_4^{2-}$ the value $32.1 \pm 0.3 \text{ cal K}^{-1} \text{ mole}^{-1}$.

The consistency of data in the 1-4 M range is excellent with variations of only a few calories in the $\Delta H^\circ$ and $\Delta G^\circ$ values. However, our absolute knowledge for the dilute range is uncertain to the extent of about 15 cal for $\Delta G^\circ$ and 40 cal for $\Delta H^\circ$ if our adopted parameters are essentially correct. If the alternate set were correct these differences become about 50 and 200 cal, respectively.
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Appendix

Values for the Debye-Hückel parameter $A_\phi$ are well-known,\textsuperscript{11,30} the precise values used here were obtained from a careful evaluation of the data on the density and dielectric constant over a very wide temperature range. The resulting equations, valid to $300^\circ C$, are presented elsewhere.\textsuperscript{41} A very much simpler equation is adequate for the temperature range 0-55$^\circ C$.

$$A_\phi = 0.3770 + 4.684 \times 10^{-4} (T-273.15)$$
$$+ 3.74 \times 10^{-6} (T-273.15)^2.$$ \hspace{1cm} (A-1)

The value of the parameter for the enthalpy at 25$^\circ C$ is $A_H = 697.5$ cal mole$^{-1}$.

For the mixed electrolyte solutions of cell D, $H_2SO_4(m)$, $HCl(m_3)$, additional terms arise for interactions of $Cl^-$. Since all of the solutions are very dilute, third virial coefficients may be omitted. Also we neglect terms for interactions of ions of the same sign since these are known\textsuperscript{9} to be small for $Cl^-SO_4^-$ and expected to be small also for $Cl^-HSO_4^-$. One then obtains

$$\frac{1}{2} \ln (\gamma_H \gamma_{Cl}) = f^Y + (m_3^+ m_H) B_{HCl} + m_1 B_{H1}$$
$$+ m_2 \beta_{H2}^{(0)} + m_1 m_3 B_{HCl}' + m_1 m_1 B_{H1}' \hspace{1cm} (A-2)$$

$$\ln (\gamma_H \gamma_{SO_4} / \gamma_{HSO_4}) = 4f^Y + 2m_3 B_{HCl} + (m_1 - m_H) B_{H1}$$
$$+ (m_H^+ m_2) \beta_{H2}^{(0)} + 4m_1 m_3 B_{HCl}' + m_1 B_{H1}' \hspace{1cm} (A-3)$$
Other equations continue to apply but $m_H$ and $I$ must include, of course, the contribution $m_3$ from the HCl. The potential for cell D is then

$$E - E_0 = -(RT/F) \ln(m_H m_3) + \ln(\gamma_{HCl})$$

(A-4)

While the parameters for HCl at 25° are known, they were re-evaluated as a function of temperature by least-squares analysis of the results of Gupta, Hills, and Ives. The results can be expressed as

$$\beta_{HCl}^{(0)} = 0.1754 - 0.0004286 (T - 298.15)$$

(A-5)

$$\beta_{HCl}^{(1)} = 0.3004 - 0.00406 (T - 298.15) + 7.89 \times 10^{-6} (T^2 - 298.15^2)$$

(A-6)

These equations (valid 0-50°C) give slightly different values for the parameters at 25° from those given in the earlier treatment which included additional data for HCl; the difference is negligible.

The potential for cell D was calculated with the above parameters for HCl and those of Table I for $H_2SO_4$. For the set with $K_2 = 0.0105$ the standard deviation at 25°C was 0.05 mV while at both 0° and 45° the standard deviation was 0.06 mV. In contrast to this excellent agreement, calculations with $K_2 = 0.0120$ yield systematic disagreement rising from 0.2 mV to 0.4 mV with increase in concentration.

For the buffer solutions, $Na_2SO_4(m_4)$, $NaHSO_4(m_5)$ in cell B the equations include terms for the interaction of $Na^+$ with $SO_4^{2-}$, which are known, and for $Na^+$ with $HSO_4^-$.
which are not known. For the latter one may take the parameters\(^8\) for NaClO\(_4\) as a rough estimate. Now the molality of HSO\(_4^-\), \(m_1 = m_5 - m_H\) and for SO\(_4^{2-}\), \(m_2 = m_4 + m_H\) while for Na\(^+\), \(m_{Na} = 2m_4 + m_5\). With very dilute solutions we again omit third virial coefficients and terms for interactions of ions of the same sign and obtain

\[
\ln(\gamma_{H^+SO_4}) = 6f^Y + 4m_1 B_{H1} + 2[m_{Na} B_{Na2} \\
+ (m_H + 2m_2) \beta_{H2}^{(0)}]
\]  \hspace{1cm} (A-7)

\[
\ln(\gamma_{H^+SO_4}/\gamma_{HSO_4}) = 4f^Y + 2[(m_1 - m_H) B_{H1} \\
+ (m_H + m_2) \beta_{H2}^{(0)} + m_{Na} (B_{Na2} - B_{Na1})].
\]  \hspace{1cm} (A-8)

The calculated cell potentials for the buffer solutions with NaClO\(_4\) parameters assumed for NaHSO\(_4\) interactions differ by about 1 mV from those observed. This is essentially the same difference as was noted, but not emphasized, in the original paper of Covington, Dobson, and Wynne-Jones.\(^{29}\) This disagreement is decreased but not removed by the assumption of larger but still reasonable values for \(\beta^{(0)}\) and \(\beta^{(1)}\) for NaHSO\(_4\); it is not appreciably affected by shift to the alternate set of parameters in Table I for H\(_2\)SO\(_4\). This discrepancy is small, fortunately, but it is not removed by any plausible change in ionic-interaction parameters provided the consistent \(E_0\) values are used.
Table 1. Parameters for equations for $\text{H}_2\text{SO}_4(aq)$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Adopted set</th>
<th>Alternate set</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$K_2$</td>
<td>0.0105</td>
<td>0.0120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\beta_{H1}^{(0)}$</td>
<td>0.2103</td>
<td>0.2110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\beta_{H1}^{(1)}$</td>
<td>0.4711</td>
<td>0.4096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\beta_{H2}^{(0)}$</td>
<td>0.0027</td>
<td>0.0153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_{H2}^\phi$</td>
<td>0.0416</td>
<td>0.0384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$E_o(A)$</td>
<td>-0.3528</td>
<td>-0.3517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$E_o(B)$</td>
<td>0.6124</td>
<td>0.6135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$E_o(C)$</td>
<td>1.6903</td>
<td>1.6892</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part 2. Temperature dependent equations (Adopted set)

- $\ln K_2 = -14.0321 + 2825.2/T$
- $\beta_{H1}^{(0)} = 0.05584 + 46.040/T$
- $\beta_{H1}^{(1)} = -0.65758 + 336.514/T$
- $\beta_{H2}^{(0)} = -0.32806 + 98.607/T$
- $C_{H2}^\phi = 0.25333 - 63.124/T$
- $E_o(A) = 0.00589733T - 0.361098$
- $-0.00103017T \ln T$
- $E_o(B) = 0.00487142T + 0.608163$
- $-0.00085249T \ln T$
- $E_o(C) = -0.00691441T + 1.910511$
- $+0.00108398T \ln T$
Table II. Comparison of calculated and experimental properties below 0.1 M.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>m</th>
<th>fr. dis. (^a)</th>
<th>(\gamma^+)</th>
<th>(\Delta E/mV) (cell)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.615</td>
<td>-0.18 (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0728</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.560</td>
<td>0.06 (B), 0.22 (C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.515</td>
<td>-0.04 (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0103</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.510</td>
<td>-0.16 (B), 0.01 (C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0171</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.15 (B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.419</td>
<td>0.11 (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0215</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.12 (B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0401</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.36 (B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0571</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.296</td>
<td>0.32 (B), -0.01 (C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0840</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.31 (B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.095</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.2477</td>
<td>0.19 (B), 0.15 (C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.096</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.27 (B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.2438</td>
<td>-0.05 (B), 0.03 (C)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) fr. dis. is fraction of \(\text{HSO}_4^-\) dissociated.
Table III. Comparison of calculated and experimental properties above 0.1 M.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>m</th>
<th>fr.dis.(^a)</th>
<th>P.S.</th>
<th>C.D.W.(^b)</th>
<th>P.S.</th>
<th>R.S.(^{30})</th>
<th>R.H.S.(^{31})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.243(_6)</td>
<td>0.244</td>
<td>0.676</td>
<td>0.680</td>
<td>0.680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.191(_8)</td>
<td>0.192</td>
<td>0.666</td>
<td>0.668</td>
<td>0.665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.167(_6)</td>
<td>0.168</td>
<td>0.667</td>
<td>0.668</td>
<td>0.665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.153(_2)</td>
<td>0.153</td>
<td>0.672</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.143(_4)</td>
<td>0.143</td>
<td>0.678</td>
<td>0.676</td>
<td>0.675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.131(_1)</td>
<td>0.130</td>
<td>0.694</td>
<td>0.689</td>
<td>0.691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.121(_5)</td>
<td>0.121</td>
<td>0.723</td>
<td>0.721</td>
<td>0.719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.116(_0)</td>
<td>0.116</td>
<td>0.778</td>
<td>0.780</td>
<td>0.777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.117(_1)</td>
<td>0.118</td>
<td>0.843</td>
<td>0.846</td>
<td>0.843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.122(_4)</td>
<td>0.124</td>
<td>0.915</td>
<td>0.916</td>
<td>0.916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.131(_1)</td>
<td>0.132</td>
<td>0.992</td>
<td>0.991</td>
<td>0.992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.142(_5)</td>
<td>0.143</td>
<td>1.071</td>
<td>1.071</td>
<td>1.070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.156(_3)</td>
<td>0.157</td>
<td>1.149</td>
<td>1.150</td>
<td>1.148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.172(_4)</td>
<td>0.172</td>
<td>1.225</td>
<td>1.226</td>
<td>1.225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.190(_7)</td>
<td>0.190</td>
<td>1.299</td>
<td>1.303</td>
<td>1.301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.211(_3)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.369</td>
<td>1.376</td>
<td>1.374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.234(_3)</td>
<td>0.234</td>
<td>1.437</td>
<td>1.445</td>
<td>1.444</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) fr. dis. is fraction of HSO\(_4\)^\(^-\) dissociated.

\(^b\) Reference 14 gives three sets of values differing only slightly; this is the set for cell B with E\(_0\) = 612.5 mV.
Table IV. Thermodynamic properties for cell reactions at 25°C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>cell</th>
<th>$E_0/V$</th>
<th>$\Delta S$/cal K$^{-1}$ mole$^{-1}$</th>
<th>Lit.$^a$</th>
<th>$S^o$(SO$_4^{2-}$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P.S.</td>
<td>C.D.W.</td>
<td>P.S.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>-0.3528</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-46.23</td>
<td>-45.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>0.61242</td>
<td>0.6125</td>
<td>-38.66</td>
<td>-38.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>1.69038</td>
<td>1.6901</td>
<td>15.94</td>
<td>16.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$ from literature values, see text, including $S^o$(SO$_4^{2-}$) = 4.50.
Table V. Properties of H$_2$SO$_4$ at 25°C and at rounded molalities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>m</th>
<th>$-\text{G}^{\text{ex}}$</th>
<th>$\gamma$</th>
<th>$\phi$</th>
<th>$a_w$</th>
<th>$L$</th>
<th>$-\text{L}_1$</th>
<th>$\text{L}_2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>0.9500</td>
<td>0.981</td>
<td>0.9999</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>0.0002</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0002</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>0.9253</td>
<td>0.971</td>
<td>0.9999</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>0.0006</td>
<td>393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0005</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>0.8736</td>
<td>0.949</td>
<td>0.9997</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>0.0032</td>
<td>803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>0.8151</td>
<td>0.924</td>
<td>0.9995</td>
<td>757</td>
<td>0.0097</td>
<td>1295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>0.7382</td>
<td>0.889</td>
<td>0.9990</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>0.0265</td>
<td>1936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>0.6146</td>
<td>0.833</td>
<td>0.9978</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>0.083</td>
<td>2891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>802</td>
<td>0.5146</td>
<td>0.787</td>
<td>0.9957</td>
<td>2623</td>
<td>0.171</td>
<td>3571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>1092</td>
<td>0.4190</td>
<td>0.744</td>
<td>0.9920</td>
<td>3261</td>
<td>0.317</td>
<td>4140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>1547</td>
<td>0.3098</td>
<td>0.699</td>
<td>0.9911</td>
<td>3991</td>
<td>0.638</td>
<td>4699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1934</td>
<td>0.2436</td>
<td>0.676</td>
<td>0.9635</td>
<td>4435</td>
<td>1.034</td>
<td>5008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>2341</td>
<td>0.1918</td>
<td>0.666</td>
<td>0.9283</td>
<td>4793</td>
<td>1.679</td>
<td>5259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>2582</td>
<td>0.1676</td>
<td>0.667</td>
<td>0.9825</td>
<td>4972</td>
<td>2.255</td>
<td>5389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2880</td>
<td>0.1434</td>
<td>0.678</td>
<td>0.9818</td>
<td>5172</td>
<td>3.318</td>
<td>5540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>3069</td>
<td>0.1311</td>
<td>0.694</td>
<td>0.9741</td>
<td>5292</td>
<td>4.343</td>
<td>5636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3254</td>
<td>0.1215</td>
<td>0.723</td>
<td>0.9617</td>
<td>5412</td>
<td>6.029</td>
<td>5747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3436</td>
<td>0.1160</td>
<td>0.778</td>
<td>0.9388</td>
<td>5553</td>
<td>10.23</td>
<td>5932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3534</td>
<td>0.1171</td>
<td>0.843</td>
<td>0.9129</td>
<td>5677</td>
<td>18.03</td>
<td>6177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3582</td>
<td>0.1224</td>
<td>0.915</td>
<td>0.8837</td>
<td>5809</td>
<td>31.56</td>
<td>6510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3598</td>
<td>0.1311</td>
<td>0.992</td>
<td>0.8514</td>
<td>5959</td>
<td>52.12</td>
<td>6924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3564</td>
<td>0.1563</td>
<td>1.149</td>
<td>0.7801</td>
<td>6318</td>
<td>111.9</td>
<td>7871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3476</td>
<td>0.1907</td>
<td>1.299</td>
<td>0.7041</td>
<td>6720</td>
<td>184.1</td>
<td>8764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>3357</td>
<td>0.2343</td>
<td>1.457</td>
<td>0.6274</td>
<td>7124</td>
<td>257.1</td>
<td>9503</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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