1241

TABLE I.

Latent heat of Fusion in gram calories per 1 gram of metal.

Latent heat of fusion	Author	Largest difference in percentages
15.7	Joannis 1)	16
13.61	Bernini 2)	
5.86	Rudberg 3)	\
5.37	Person 4)	
5.37	Mazzotto 5)	20
5.32	Spring 6)	
6.45	ROBERTSON 7)	1
31.7	Joannis 1)	١,
17.75	Bernini <sup>2</sup> )	80
27.5	Ezer Griffiths 8)	)
13.3	RUDBERG 3)	•
14.25	Person 4)	
14.65	Spring 6)	10
13.6	Mazzotto 5)	
14.05	Robertson 7)	[]
	15.7 13.61 5.86 5.37 5.37 5.32 6.45 31.7 17.75 27.5 13.3 14.25 14.65 13.6	15.7 Joannis 1) 13.61 Bernini 2) 5.86 Rudberg 3) 5.37 Person 4) 5.37 Mazzotto 5) 5.32 Spring 6) 6.45 Robertson 7) 31.7 Joannis 1) 17.75 Bernini 2) 27.5 Ezer Griffiths 8) 13.3 Rudberg 3) 14.25 Person 4) 14.65 Spring 6) 13.6 Mazzotto 5)

Utrecht, March 1915.

VAN 'T HOFF-Laboratory.

Physics. — "On the Kinetic Interpretation of the Osmotic Pressure."

By Prof. P. Ehrenfest. (Communicated by Prof. H. A. LORENTZ).

(Communicated in the meeting of March 27, 1915).

The fact that the dissolved molecules of a diluted solution exert on a semi-permeable membrane in spite of the presence of the solvent exactly the same pressure as if they alone were present and that in the ideal gas state — this fact is so startling that attempts have

<sup>1)</sup> Ann. de chim. et de phys. (6) 12, 381 (1887).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>) Nuov. Cim. (5) 10, 1 (1905); Physik. Zeitschr. 7, 168 (1906).

<sup>3)</sup> Pogg. Ann. 19, 133 (1830).

<sup>4)</sup> Ann. de chim. et de phys. (3) 24, 129 (1848).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5)</sup> Mem. Ist. Lombardo 16, 1 (1891).

<sup>6)</sup> Bulletin Acad. Roy. de Belg. (3) 11, 400 (1886).

<sup>7)</sup> Journ. chem. Soc. 81, 1233 (1902).

<sup>8)</sup> Proc. Roy. Soc. London 89, (A) 119, (1914).

been repeatedly made to get\_a kinetic interpretation that was as lucid as possible. With regard to its contents the following discussion is closely connected with the well-known work of L. Boltzmann<sup>1</sup>), H. A. Lorentz<sup>2</sup>), O. Stern<sup>3</sup>), G. Jager<sup>4</sup>), and particularly that of P. Langevin<sup>5</sup>)<sup>6</sup>). By making use of the virial thesis and of the remarkable property which is further on formulated by equation (1), it is, however, possible to simplify the derivation.

Let in an infinitely extended mass of water through a closed surface  $\Omega$  a region G of the volume V be distinguished by the following definition: let inside  $\Omega$  besides the water molecules (W) also n sugar molecules  $(S_1, \ldots, S_h, \ldots, S_n)$  be present, outside it only watermolecules. The surface  $\Omega$  may possess the following properties (of a "semi-permeable membrane"): whenever the centre of gravity of a molecule S is about to pass through  $\Omega$ , the molecule is perfectly elastically reflected by  $\Omega$ ;  $\Omega$  does not exert any forces on the molecules W, however. We want to know the pressure P (osmotic pressure), which  $\Omega$  experiences per cm<sup>2</sup> through the collisions of the sugar molecules.

CLAUSIUS' virial thesis, applied only to the sugar molecules, requires that:

$$2\overline{L} + \Sigma_h (\overline{X_h x_h + Y_h y_h + Z_h z_h}) = 0 . . . . . (A)$$

Here

 $x_h, y_h, z_h$  are the coordinates of the centre of gravity of the h<sup>th</sup> sugar molecule at an arbitrary moment t;

 $X_h$ ,  $Y_h$ ,  $Z_h$  are the resultants  $^7$ ) of all forces acting at the moment t on the h<sup>th</sup> sugar molecule;

L the kinetic energy of the translation of all the molecules S added together at the moment t.

The horizontal line expresses: taking a mean of a very long time  $\theta$ . Let us now follow the  $h^{\text{th}}$  molecule S during the time  $\theta$ . The force  $X_h$ ,  $Y_h$ ,  $Z_h$  on the  $h^{\text{th}}$  molecule is owing to three causes:

- 1. to the collisions on the surface  $\Omega \to X_h'$ ,  $Y_{h'}$ ,  $Z_{h'}$ ;
- 2. to the attraction and repulsion by all the other molecules  $S \rightarrow X_h''$ ,  $Y_h''$ ,  $Z_h''$ ;

<sup>1)</sup> L. Boltzmann, Z f. ph. Ch. 6 (1890) 474; 7 (1891) 88. [Wiss. Abh. No. 93, 94].

<sup>; 2)</sup> H. A. LORENTZ, Z, f. ph. Ch. 7 (1891) 36. [Abbandl. I, p. 175].

<sup>3)</sup> O. STERN, Z. f. ph. Ch. 81 (1912) 441.

<sup>4)</sup> G. Jäger, Ann. de Phys. 41 (1913) 854.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup>) P. Langevin, Journ. Ch. phys. 10 (1912) 524; 527.

<sup>6)</sup> Cf. also Ph. Kohnstamm, These Proc. 7, 729.

<sup>7)</sup> We suppose for the sake of simplicity that the molecules are centres of force of one dimension.

3. to the attraction and repulsion by all the molecules  $W \to X_h^m$ ,  $Y_h^m$ ,  $Z_h^m$ .

During the greater part of  $\theta$  the  $h^{\text{th}}$  molecule S is found in volume elements far inside the region G, and only during a very small part of  $\theta$  in the periferic volume elements of G close to the surface  $\Omega$ . Let us now first direct our attention to a volume element dv dy dz far in the interior of the region G, far from  $\Omega$ . Repeatedly the molecule  $S_h$  is found for a short time in this element.

In this we find that:

$$X_{h}'' + X_{h}'''$$
,  $Y_{h}'' + Y_{h}'''$ ,  $Z_{h}'' + Z_{h}'''$ 

assumes now positive, now negative values of rapidly varying amount, and — because we are far from  $\Omega$ , in the midst of the homogeneous solution — equally frequently equally large positive as negative values. Because besides  $X_h'$ ,  $Y_{h'}$ ,  $Z_{h'}$  are always zero, it is clear that the mean contribution to the virial yielded by the  $h^{th}$  molecule S, i. e.  $S_h$ , during its residence in an "internal" volume element dx dy dz of the region G, is:

$$dx\,dy\,dz\,[x\,\overline{X}_h+y\,\overline{Y}_h+z\,\overline{Z}_h]=0\quad .\quad .\quad .\quad (1)$$

and likewise for every "internal" volume-element. This is no longer the case for "peripheric" volume elements close to the surface  $\Omega$ . Here in the direction of the normal to  $\Omega$  the symmetry is disturbed:

- 1. The force exerted at the impact by  $\Omega$  on the molecule  $S_h$  is always directed inward;
- 2. The joint molecules S, which act on  $S_h$  all lie on one side of  $\Omega$  (the inside);
- 3. On account of the presence of the molecules S the concentration of the water on the inside of  $\Omega$  is different from that on the other side.

Let us now add the contributions yielded by all the molecules S during their presence in all the "peripheric" volume elements to the second term of the equation (A): Thus we get corresponding to the above mentioned three kinds of forces an expression with three terms:

$$\sum_{h} (X_h x_h + Y_h y_h + Z_h z_h) = W' + W'' + W''' . . . . (2)$$

If the concentration  $C_s$  of the molecules decreases to zero, W' becomes small of the same order of magnitude as  $C_s$ , on the other hand W'' and W''' of higher order.

<sup>1)</sup> We draw attention to the fact, that this holds as well for repulsive as for attractive forces.

It should be namely borne in mind that:

First of all all the three W's become smaller already on account of this that in (2) the  $\sum_{k} must$  be taken over a number of molecules S, which decreases in direct ratio with  $c_s$ .

Secondly, however, W'' decreases besides on account of this that the forces  $X_h''$ ,  $Y_h''$ ,  $Z_h''$  which a certain molecule S experiences from all the other molecules S, decreases at the same time with the number of the latter to zero, likewise W''', because the difference of the concentrations of the molecules W on the two sides of  $\Omega$ , which determines x X''', y Y'', z Z''', decreases to zero at the same time with  $c_s$ . For W', which arises from the collisions of the molecules S with  $\Omega$ , there does not exist an analogous second reason to approach zero.

If therefore in the case of diluted solutions we confine ourselves in equation (A) to terms of the first order in  $c_s$ , we have:

$$2 L + W' = 0. . . . . . . (A')$$

One can now easily convince oneself that this expresses that the dissolved molecules S exert on  $\Omega$  the same pressure as when they were only enclosed in  $\Omega$  and that as an ideal gas. W' can namely be calculated from the pressure P exerted by  $\Omega$  on the sugar molecules, and becomes:

$$w' = -3 PV \dots (3)^{1}$$

Further:

when  $\alpha T$  is the mean kinetic energy per degree of freedom.

If we take particularly one gramme molecule of sugar, i.e. n equal to the Avogadro value N, and put

$$N2 \alpha T = RT$$
 . . . . . . . (5)

(A') passes into:

VAN 'T Hoff's equation for the osmotic pressure of a dilute solution. The deviations from equation (6) for solutions which are no longer exceedingly diluted, have been repeatedly treated thermodynamically. 2) O. Stern has tried to give a purely kinetic treatment in analogy with the kinetic theory of non-ideal gases. 3) Compare also

<sup>1)</sup> Comp. the perfectly analogous calculation for ideal gases L. Boltzmann. Gastheorie II, p. 143, § 50.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>) Van Laar: Z. f. phys. Ch. 15 (1894) 457; "6 Vorträge" (1906); van der Waals and Kohnstamm, Lehrbuch d. Thermodynamik.

<sup>3)</sup> loc.cit.

the indications given by Langevin. 1) For the experimental investigation we may refer to Findlay "Der osmotische Druck" (Dresden 1914).

Remarks.

For the pressure on a semi-permeable membrane in the case of very dilute solutions it is, as we see immaterial whether or no there is interaction between the molecules S and the molecules W. Certain other effects of the osmotic pressure, can, however, only be brought about in consequence of such interaction: e.g. the difference of level that comes about between the solution and the pure water, when they are in tubes open at the top, and are in communication through a semi-permeable membrane. Let us consider the following imaginary case: The "sugar" molecules have no interaction at all with the water molecules. It is clear that there cannot ensue a difference of level — the sugar simply evaporates from the solution. When a glass bell-jar is put over the two communicating tubes, the following state of equilibrium is obtained: two solutions of the same concentration on either side with an equally high level. If the two tubes are placed each under a bell-jar of its own, sugar-vapour is formed over the solution with a pressure of the same value as the osmotic pressure of the solution and no difference of level appears then either.

If the difference in level in question is to make its appearance, none of the three following factors can, indeed, be omitted: first the tendency of the sugar to spread (its kinetic pressure), secondly the cohesion of the water, thirdly the interaction of the molecules S and W, without which it would not be possible for the sugar to lift up the water.

Mathematics. — "On Nother's theorem". By Dr. W. VAN DER WOUDE. (Communicated by Prof. Jan de Vries).

(Communicated in the meeting of March 27, 1915).

§ 1. Brill and Nöther's well-known paper on algebraic functions 2) has as starting-point a theorem 3) shortly before pronounced by Nother. Its meaning may principally be indicated as follows:

"A curve  $F_{\scriptscriptstyle 2}$  may be represented by the form

$$F_3 \equiv AF_1 + BF_2$$

<sup>1)</sup> loc. cit.

<sup>2)</sup> Math. Annalen, 7 (p. 271.)

<sup>3)</sup> Math. Annalen, 6 (p. 351): "Ueber einen Satz aus der Theorie der algebraischen Funktionen."