WADD TECHNICAL REPORT 60-782
PART II

VAPORIZATION OF COMPOUNDS AND ALLOYS AT HIGH TEMPERATURE

Part II. Mass Spectrometric Studies of the Vaporization of Sulphides and the Dissociation Energy of S_2

R. Colin
P. Goldfinger
M. Jeunehomme

University of Brussels
Brussels, Belgium

NOVEMBER 1960

600 — May 1961 — 29-1115

WADD TR 60-782 Pt II

ABSTRACT

The equilibria $S_2 \rightleftharpoons 2S$ and $CaS \rightleftharpoons Ca + S$ have been observed in the vapor phase above CaS. $D_o^o(S_2) = 4.4 \pm 0.2$ e.v., $D_o^o(SO) = 5.4 \pm 0.2$ e.v., $D_o^o(CaS) = 3.7 \pm 0.2$ e.v., and $\Delta H_{298}^{vap}(CaS) = 5.9 \pm 0.2$ e.v. have been determined mass spectrometrically.

PUBLICATION REVIEW

This report has been reviewed and is approved.

FOR THE COMMANDER:

W. G. RAMKE
Chief, Ceramics and Graphite Branch
Metals and Ceramics Laboratory
Materials Central

TABLE OF CONTENTS

MASS SPECTROMETRIC STUDIES OF THE VAPORIZATION OF SULPHIDES AND THE DISSOCIATION ENERGY OF S_2.

DISCUSSION

The disagreement between second and third law values of the dissociation energy of S_2 ($D_c^o(S_2)$) obtained from equilibrium measurements has been emphasized many years ago[1]. A relationship was also pointed out between the heat of combustion of SO, $D_o^o(O_2)$, $D_o^o(SO)$, and $D_o^o(S_2)$, which should permit one to choose one of the values allowed by observed predissociations for $D_o^o(S_2)$ and $D_o^o(SO)$. Recent measurements[2] do not seem to settle the question[3].

In the vapour phase above CaS we have observed by mass spectrometry[4] the dissociation $S_2 \rightleftharpoons 2S$, and $CaS \rightleftharpoons Ca + S$ and have calculated $D_o^o(S_2) = 4.4 \pm 0.2$ e.v., $D_o^o(SO) = 5.4 \pm 0.2$ e.v. $D_o^o(CaS) = 3,7 \pm 0.2$ e.v. and $\Delta H_{298}^{vap}(CaS) = 5.9 \pm 0,2$ e.v.

The mass spectrometric method has been described previously [4,5]. The sample was heated in a molybdenum Knudsen cell ; provisions were made to distinguish between residual gas molecules and those of the beam which passes through a cooled collimation system : ion intensities were measured with an electron multiplier. Absolute values of partial vapour pressures were obtained from $P_i = I_i T/S_i$; I_i is the measured current corresponding to a species i, T the absolute temperature of the Knudsen cell, and S_i the sensitivity for i :

$$(6) \quad S_i = (M_i/2\pi R)^{1/2}(s/G_i) \sum_i I_i T^{1/2} \Delta t;$$

M_i is its molecular mass, R the gas constant, s the area of the effusion orifice and t the time necessary to evaporate the weight G_i of species i . Brightness temperatures of a small threaded hole at the bottom of the Knudsen cell have been measured with an optical pyrometer; emissivity and window corrections were made. [7]

Dissociation energies were calculated from:

$$D_0^O = - RT\ln K + T\Delta((F_T^O - H_O^O)/T) \text{ (3d law) and :}$$

$$D_T^O = Rd\ln K/d(1/T) \text{ (2d law) using free energy fun-}$$

ctions taken from Stull and Sinke[8], or for CaS,

calculated by comparison of oxides and sulphides,

assuming $\omega_e = 390 \text{ cm}^{-1}$, $r_e = 2.3$ A and that only

the $^1\Sigma$ ground state is important.

Ionization cross sections were taken from
Otvos and·Stevenson[9] and it was assumed that
those of molecules are equal to the sum of those of
the constituent atoms. The mass effect and the
molecular effect of the multiplier[10] were considered
to compensate each other. A possible error of 20°
in the temperature measurement would lead to an
uncertainty of 12 % in the second law and of 1%
in the third law values ; instead of the assump-
tions made above, it may be reasonable that the
product of ionization cross section and multiplier
gain is the same for the atom and for the molecule[11]:

in that case the 3d law D_O^O values of Table I are
increased by about $+$ 3.5 kcal. and $\Delta H_{298}^{vap}(CaS)$
diminished by the same amount.

The data of Table I and $\Delta H_{298}^{vap}(Ca)^{(8)}$ = 42.2 kcal.
$\Delta H_{298}^O (1/2\ S_2)$ = 15.4 kcal, the standard heat of
formation $\Delta H_{298\ f.}^O (CaS)$ = 110.0 $\pm$ 2 kcal[12] permit
one to calculate $\Delta H_{298}^{vap}(CaS)$ = 136 kcal. The value
obtained from this cycle is considered as more
reliable than that given in table I (see remark
table I).

$D_O^O(S_2)$ obtained here, combined with $\Delta H_O^O(SO)^{(2b)}$
for the reaction $1/2\ S_2 + 1/2\ O_2 \rightleftharpoons SO$ definitely
rules out a value $D_O^C(SO)$ smaller than 5.2 e.v.
There are good spectroscopic arguments for
$D_O^O(SO)$ = 5.358 e.v.[13] rather than 5.027 e.v.[3].
Our measurements are not accurate enough to permit
one to settle the question whether the predi-
ssociation at 4.41 e.v. gives the exact dissociation
of S_2[14] or an upper limit[15]; a value $D(S_2)$ $\approx$ 4.2 e.v.
would agree with our results[16]. Within the
accuracy quoted in Table I, all available data

on $D(S_2)$ and $D(SO)$ [3] except appearance potential
measurements [17] and older equilibrium measurements
(cf. 1,2,3,14) seem to be in agreement.

REFERENCES

(1) P.Goldfinger, W.Jeunehomme and b.Rosen, Nature, 138, 205 (1936).

(2) a) G.St. Pierre and J.Chipman, J.Am.Soc.,76, 4787 (1954) ; J.Metals, 8,1474 (1956) ; b) E.W.Dewing and F.D.Richardson, Trans. Faraday Soc., 54, 679 (1958).

(3) a) L.Brewer, J.Chem.Phys., 31, 1143 (1959) ; b) D.G.H. Marsden, ibid., 1143.

(4) P.Goldfinger and M.Jeunehomme "Advances in Mass Spectrometry", (Pergamon Press, London, 1959) p.534.

(5) J.Drowart and P.Goldfinger, J.Chem.Phys., 55, 721 (1958).

(6) P.Goldfinger, M.Ackerman and M.Jeunehomme, Final Technical Report, EOARDC, contract N° AF 61(052)-19 (1959) ; R.Colin P.Goldfinger, M.Jeunehomme and G.Verhaegen, A.C.S. National Meeting, Atlantic City, Sept. 13-18 1959. (to be published).

(7) M.Ackerman, F.Stafford and J.Drowart (to be published).

(8) D.R.Stull and G.C.Sinke, "Thermodynamic Properties of the Elements", American Chemical Society, November 1956.

(9) J.W.Otvos and D.P.Stevenson, J.Am.Chem.Soc., 78, 546 (1956).

(10) M.G.Inghram and R.J.Hayden, Nuclear Science
Series, Report N⁰ 14, National Research
Council, Washington, D.C.1954; M.G.Inghram,
R.J.Hayden and D.C. Hess in N.B.S. Circ. 522
Washington (1953) p.257; H.E. Stanton,
W.A. Chupka, M.G.Inghram. Rev.Sci.Instr.,
$\underline{27}$, 109 (1956).

(11) P.Schissel, J.Chem.Phys., $\underline{26}$, 1276 (1957).

(12) O.Kubatschewski and E.LL. Evans, "Metallurgical
Thermochemistry", Pergamon Press Ltd., London (1956).

(13) R.G.W. Norrish and G.A.O. Oldershaw, Proc.
Roy.Soc. (London) A. $\underline{249}$ 498 (1959).

(14) A.G.Gaydon,"Dissociation Energies," second
edition. Chapman and Hall Ltd. (London) (1953).

(15) G.Herzberg and L.G.Mundie, J.Chem.Phys.,
$\underline{8}$, 263 (1940).

(16)   A.D.Walsh in "Threshold of Space",
in Proc.Conf. on Chemical Aeronomy in Cambridge,
Mass. 1956, M.Zelikoff editor (Pergamon Press,
N.Y., 1957).

(17) L.P.Blanchard and P.Le Goff, Can.J.Chem.,
$\underline{35}$, 89 (1957) ; V.H.Dibeler, J.L.Franklin
and R.M. Reese, J.Chem.Phys., $\underline{29}$ 880 (1958).

Table I. Heats of Vaporization and Dissociation Energies of S_2 and CaS

$T^\circ K$	$\log p(S)$[*]	$\log p(S_2)$	$\log p(Ca)$	$\log p(CaS)$	$D_0^o(S_2)$ kcal	$D_0^o(CaS)$ kcal	$H_{298}^{vap}(CaS)$ kcal
1922	-5.96	-6.56	-6.15	-	100	-	-
1975	-5.46	-6.25	-5.79	-	96.5	-	-
2026	-5.34	-6.01	-5.54	-	98.0	-	-
2048	-5.04	-5.82	-5.35	-	96.4	-	-
2053	-5.03	-5.83	-5.32	-7.26	96.4	79.8	151.9
2070	-5.18	-5.88	-5.42	-7.03	98.8	84.9	149.0
2098	-4.86	-5.63	-5.13	-6.99	97.3	80.7	151.5
2143	-4.76	-5.48	-5.03	-6.66	98.9	83.7	151.6
2144	-4.60	-5.38	-4.90	-6.72	96.7	80.3	152.2
2154	-4.71	-5.44	-4.99	-	98.8	-	-
2156	-4.64	-5.38	-4.86	-6.71	96.8	80.1	152.9
2190	-4.52	-5.28	-4.75	-6.55	98.3	81.5	153.6
2223	-4.27	-5.02	-4.58	-6.27	97.4	81.3	153.7
2297	-3.98	-4.82	-4.24	-5.99	96.8	80.3	155.6
			average		97.6	81.4	152.4[**]
			slope method		108	95	129
			proposed values		101 ± 5	86 ± 5	136 ± 10

[*] Decimal logarithms of pressures in atmospheres.

[**] $F_T - H_{298}/T$ for this process in based on very scanty data on C_p (CaS) (K. K. Kelley, U.S. Bureau of Mines Bulletin 476, Washington D. C. , 1949)