## Isothermal diffusion measurement on the system water-sodium salicylate-sodium chloride at $25^{\circ}$ at one composition

A. DESHMUKH AND R. FLEMING

The main and cross-term diffusion coefficients for the system water-sodium-salicylate-sodium chloride have been measured at the compositon $0.05 \mathrm{~g} \mathrm{cc}^{-1}$, and the results indicate that sodium chloride is effective in producing a flow of sodium salicylate at this concentration. Density, refractive index, partial specific volumes and gravitational data are also reported. The system has been assumed to be 3-component.

THE Goüy interferometric technique has been used to measure the main and cross-term diffusion coefficients for the system watersodium salicylate-sodium chloride. The initial results indicate that the flow interaction of both solutes is taking place. Such studies provide basic information about diffusional processes in the system and may be of use in describing the flow of these substances in a biological environment.

## Theory

In an isothermal system where there are more than two components and where the components do not diffuse independently, the solute flows can be described by the expression (Baldwin, Dunlop \& Gosting, 1955)

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(\mathrm{J}_{1}\right)_{\mathrm{v}}=-\sum_{\mathrm{j}=1}^{\mathrm{r}}\left(\mathrm{D}_{1 \mathrm{j}}\right)_{\mathrm{v}} \frac{\partial \rho_{\mathrm{i}}}{\partial \mathrm{x}} \quad(\mathrm{i}=1,2, \ldots, \mathrm{r}) \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

in which $\rho_{1}$ is the concentration of component $i$ in $\mathrm{g} \mathrm{cc}^{-1},\left(\mathrm{D}_{1 \mathrm{j}}\right)_{\mathrm{v}}$ are the diffusion coefficients corresponding to the volume fixed reference frame and have the units of $\mathrm{cm} \mathrm{sec}{ }^{-1}$, and $\mathrm{J}_{1}$ is the flow of component i in units of $\mathrm{g} \mathrm{cm}^{2} \mathrm{sec}^{-1}$. The summation is taken over r solutes.

Thus the flow of sodium salicylate which in this paper has been given the subscript 1 is described by the equation

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(\mathrm{J}_{1}\right)_{\mathrm{v}}=-\mathrm{D}_{11} \frac{\partial \rho_{1}}{\partial \mathrm{x}}-\mathrm{D}_{12} \frac{\partial \rho_{2}}{\partial \mathrm{x}} \quad \ldots \quad \ldots \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

and the flow of sodium chloride, which has been given subscript 2

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(\mathrm{J}_{2}\right)_{\mathrm{v}}=-\mathrm{D}_{21} \frac{\partial \rho_{1}}{\partial \mathrm{x}}-\mathrm{D}_{22} \frac{\partial \rho_{2}}{\partial \mathrm{x}} \quad \ldots \quad . \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

For the small concentration differences used in these differential diffusion experiments, the volume fixed reference frame can be considered to be identical with the cell (or apparatus)-fixed reference frame (Kirkwood, Baldwin \& others, 1960). Because of its greater ionic radius, the salicylate ion would be expected to diffuse slower than the smaller sodium and
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chloride ions. Furthermore, from a priori considerations of ionic mobilities the flow of salicylate $\left(\mathrm{J}_{1}\right)_{\mathrm{v}}$ produced by the flow of sodium chloride will be large and the cross-term diffusion coefficient $\left(D_{12}\right)_{v}$ finite. Conversely, the flow of sodium chloride $\left(\mathrm{J}_{2}\right)_{\mathrm{v}}$ due to the salicylate gradient will be small and the cross-term diffusion coefficient $\left(D_{21}\right)_{v}$ correspondingly small but non-zero.

## APPARATUS

The optical beam of the diffusiometer consists of two rigid cast-iron beds, of uniform box-like construction 3.2 m and 1.8 m in length, purchased from Hilger and Watts. These kinematically mounted beds rest on a platform of braced iron girders whose weight is evenly distributed on eight Barrymount type SM4-8 spring mountings. This method of support ensures that the rigid substructure has a minimal sensitivity to extraneous vibration. Light from a water-cooled 100 watt mercury-vapour G.E.C. lamp passes through a Wratten No. 77A filter which isolates the mercury green line at $5460.7 \AA$ before being brought to a focus on a Hilger and Watts source slit ( 1 division $=0.005 \mathrm{~mm}$ ). The image of the slit is focussed on a photographic plate by a 101.5 cm focal length acromatic doublet objective lens, 11 cm in diameter and corrected to $\frac{1}{8}$ th wavelength at $5460 \cdot 7 \AA$.

The water bath has a capacity of 100 litres and is controlled to better than ( $25 \pm 0.01^{\circ}$ ). It has four optical flat windows 2 cm thick, 11 cm in diameter and corrected to $\frac{1}{20}$ th of a wavelength at $5460 \cdot 7 \AA$. The frame holding the 11 cm Tiselius cell is similar to that described by Gosting, Hanson \& others (1949), and by Dunlop \& Gosting (1953; 1955).

## Experimental

A rough boundary was formed in the Tiselius cell between the upper solution A and the lower more dense solution B. This crude boundary was then brought down through the cell and sharpened at the optic axis position by siphoning off the liquids through a stainless-steel capillary at a rate of approximately 1.4 to $1.6 \mathrm{ml} / \mathrm{min}$. When 80 ml of liquid had been collected the flow was stopped, the capillary was withdrawn and the top and bottom sections of the Tiselius cell were closed. Photographs of the interference pattern were taken at times $\mathrm{t}^{\prime}$ after stopping the flow from the stainless-steel capillary. Usually 10 to 12 photographs were taken on Kodak Ortho 800 plates. Measurements of the distance of the fringe minima from the optic axis were made to 0.001 mm using a Gaertner M2001P toolmakers' microscope, and $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{t}}$, the maximum displacement of light according to ray optics at time $t^{\prime}$ is found by the customary extrapolation procedure. For each photograph a preliminary value of $\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{a}}{ }^{\prime}$, the reduced height-area ratio, was calculated using the relation

$$
\begin{equation*}
D_{a}^{\prime}=\frac{J_{m_{2}} \lambda^{2} b^{2}}{C_{t^{2}} t^{\prime} 4 \pi} \ldots \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$
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where $\mathrm{J}_{\mathrm{m}}$ is the total number of fringes in the pattern, $\lambda=5460.7 \times$ $10^{-8}$ and $b$ is the optical lever distance from the centre of the Tiselius cell to the photographic plate emulsion ( $b=260 \cdot 1973 \mathrm{~cm}$ ).

The integral number of fringes was counted directly from an early pattern, the fractional part being measured using horizontal Rayleigh slits. A plot of $D_{a}^{\prime}$ versus $\frac{1}{t^{\prime}}=0$ was made using a least-squares procedure to obtain a value of $\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{a}}$ the reduced-height area ratio, corrected for any initial imperfections in the boundary. Values of the starting time correction $\Delta t$, obtained from the slope of this graph varied between 6.7 and 14.5 sec . A fringe-deviation graph was plotted of $\Omega_{\mathrm{j}}$ the average value of the reduced fringe deviation against $f(\zeta)$ the reduced fringe number, where

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Omega_{\mathrm{j}}=\mathrm{e}^{-(\bar{\zeta}) 2}-\mathrm{Y}_{\mathrm{j}} / \mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{t}} \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

in which $Y_{j}$ is the fringe displacement from the optic axis and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{f}(\zeta)=\frac{\mathrm{j}+0.75}{\mathrm{~J}_{\mathrm{m}}} \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

in which j has an integral value greater than 6 .
The area of the fringe deviation graph Q where

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{Q}=\int_{0}^{1} \Omega_{\mathrm{j}} \mathrm{df}(\zeta) \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

was calculated using Simpson's $\frac{1}{3}$ rd rule. Mean values of $\Omega_{j}$ were read at intervals of 0.025 along the $f(\zeta)$ axis from a large scale fringedeviation graph and calculation of the four diffusion coefficients $\left(D_{11}\right)_{v}$ was then made by the method of Fujita \& Gosting (1960).

A set of four experiments were made with $\alpha_{1}$ equal to approximately $0.0,0.2,0.8$ and 1.0 where $\alpha_{1}$ the refractive index fraction is defined by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\alpha_{1}=\frac{R_{i} \Delta \rho_{1}}{\sum_{j=1}^{2} R_{j} \Delta \rho_{j}} \quad(i=1,2) \quad \ldots \quad \ldots \quad . \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

and where $R_{1}$ and $R_{2}$, the refractive index increments are given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{n}\left(\rho_{1}, \rho_{2}\right)=\mathrm{n}\left(\tilde{\rho}_{1}, \tilde{\rho}_{2}\right)+\mathbf{R}_{1}\left(\rho_{1}-\tilde{\rho}_{1}\right)+\mathbf{R}_{2}\left(\rho_{2}-\tilde{\rho}_{2}\right) \tag{9}
\end{equation*}
$$

In equation (9), $n\left(\rho_{1}, \rho_{2}\right)$ is the refractive index of the solutions with the concentrations of the solutes $\rho_{1}, \rho_{2} ; \mathbf{n}\left(\tilde{\rho}_{1}, \tilde{\rho}_{2}\right)$ is the refractive index of the solution when $\rho_{1}=\tilde{\rho}_{1}$ and $\rho_{2}=\tilde{\rho}_{2}$. In all experiments $\Delta \rho_{1}+\Delta \rho_{2}=$ $0.01 \mathrm{~g} \mathrm{cc}^{-1}$ which gave a convenient number of fringes ( $\mathrm{J} \bumpeq 90$ ).

The concentration increment between upper and lower solutions

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Delta \rho_{\mathrm{I}}=\left[\left(\rho_{1}\right)_{\mathrm{B}}-\left(\rho_{1}\right)_{\mathrm{A}}\right] \quad(\mathrm{i}=1,2) \ldots \tag{10}
\end{equation*}
$$

The first two experiments were made with $\alpha_{1}$ equal to zero and unity respectively. Sufficient data were then available to solve the equation

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{\lambda}{\mathrm{a}}\left(\frac{\mathrm{~J}_{\mathrm{m}}}{\Delta \rho_{1}+\Delta \rho_{2}}\right)=\left(\frac{\Delta \rho_{1}}{\Delta \rho_{1}+\Delta \rho_{2}}\right)\left(\mathrm{R}_{1}-\mathrm{R}_{2}\right)+\mathrm{R}_{2} \quad \ldots \tag{11}
\end{equation*}
$$
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simultaneously for $R_{1}$ and $R_{2}$. In equation (11), the internal width, $a$, of the diffusion cell, is 2.4979 cm . These values of the refractive index increments were then used to calculate the concentrations required to yield solutions for which $\alpha_{1}=0.2$ and $\alpha_{1}=0.8$.

By inserting the four experimentally determined values of $\alpha_{1}$ and $D_{a}$ in equation (12), and applying a least squaring procedure, values for the coefficients $I_{a}$ and $S_{a}$ were obtained together with a smoothed value for $\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{a}}$.

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{1}{\sqrt{D_{a}}}=I_{a}+S_{a} \alpha_{1} \tag{12}
\end{equation*}
$$

Fujita \& Gosting (1960) have shown that the term $Q / \sqrt{ } D_{a}$ can be related to the four diffusion coefficients and $\alpha_{1}$ by the following expression

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{E}=\frac{\mathrm{Q}}{\sqrt{\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{a}}}}=\mathrm{E}_{0}+\mathrm{E}_{1} \alpha_{1}-\mathrm{E}_{2} \alpha_{1}^{2} \tag{13}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since $I_{a}$ and $S_{a}$ are themselves functions of $\left(D_{1 j}\right)_{v}$, it is necessary to use a method of successive approximations to derive accurate values for $\mathrm{E}_{0}, \mathrm{E}_{1}$ and $\mathrm{E}_{2}$, from which the four $\left(\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{ij}}\right)_{\mathrm{v}}$ values can be calculated.
By measuring the slope of the graph $\frac{E-E_{0}}{\alpha_{1}}$ a first approximation for $E_{2}$ is obtained, the preliminary value for $E_{0}$ being taken as the experimental value of $\mathrm{Q} / \sqrt{ } \mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{a}}$ at $\alpha_{1}=0$.

After rearrangement of terms, equation (13) will yield first approximations for the ratios $E_{0} / E_{2}$ and $E_{1} / E_{2}$, which can be smoothed by a least squaring procedure and from which approximate values of $\left(D_{1 j}\right)_{v}$ can be derived. Since $\mathrm{E}_{2} \propto \mathrm{~S}_{\mathrm{a}}^{2}$ (Fujita \& Gosting, 1960) an improved value of $E_{2}$ can then be computed together with subsequent values of $E_{0} / E_{2}$ and $E_{1} / E_{2}$, until the values of $\left(D_{1 j}\right)_{v}$ from two successive calculations agree to within $\left(0.0001 \times 10^{-5}\right)$. These calculations were carried out using the Atlas computer of the University of London Institute of Computer Science.

## MATERIALS

Sodium salicylate and Analar sodium chloride were purchased from British Drug Houses Ltd. The molecular weights were taken to be $160 \cdot 11$ and 58.45 respectively.

## SOLUTIONS

To prepare these solutions at the appropriate concentrations it was necessary to predict the densities of the solutions within a few parts in a hundred thousand. Previous experiments on the binary system watersodium salicylate (unpublished) showed that the densities could be predicted in the region of $\bar{\rho}_{1}=0.05 \mathrm{~g} \mathrm{cc}^{-1}$ by the equation

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{d}=0.99724_{3}+0.4056_{5} \rho_{1}-0.00049_{3} \rho_{1}{ }^{2}+0.00021_{3} \rho_{1}{ }^{3} \ldots \tag{14}
\end{equation*}
$$

which was obtained by the method of least squares.
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The density of a $0.05 \mathrm{~g} \mathrm{cc}^{-1}$ solution of sodium chloride was estimated using the relation (Woolf, Miller \& Gosting, 1962)

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{d}=\mathrm{d}_{0}+\frac{\mathrm{C}_{2}}{1000}\left(\mathrm{M}_{2}-\mathrm{d}_{0} \phi_{2}\right) \tag{15}
\end{equation*}
$$

in which $\mathrm{d}_{0}$ the density of pure water at $25^{\circ}$ was taken as $0.997048 \mathrm{~g} \mathrm{cc}-{ }^{1}$, $\mathrm{c}_{2}$ is the molar concentration and $\mathrm{M}_{2}$ the molecular weight of sodium chloride. $\phi_{2}$, the partial molal volume was calculated from the formula (Harned \& Owen, 1958)

$$
\begin{equation*}
\phi_{2}=16.50+2.034 \mathrm{C}_{2}^{1 / 2}+0.0121 \mathrm{C}_{2}^{3 / 2} \tag{16}
\end{equation*}
$$

In this way the contributions of sodium chloride and sodium salicylate to the density of a solution containing $0.05 \mathrm{~g} \mathrm{cc}^{-1}$ of each solute could be estimated. The predicted value was tested experimentally and the differences between the two values was noted, and for solutions at other concentrations $\left(\alpha_{1}=0, \alpha_{1}=1\right)$ the difference was subtracted from the predicted densities using equations (15) and (16).

The density of each ternary mixture was measured in triplicate at $25^{\circ} \mathrm{C} \pm 0.01$ using matched, single stem, Pyrex glass pycnometers which were weighed against a calibrated, sealed tare of similar shape filled with air-free double distilled water, whose density was taken as $0.997048 \mathrm{~g} \mathrm{cc}^{-1}$.

By applying multilinear regression analysis to the density data obtained from the measurement of the two solutions in which $\alpha_{1}=0$ and $\alpha_{1}=1$ respectively the expression

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{d}=0.99854_{8}+0.39713_{8} \rho_{1}+0.65696_{0} \rho_{2} \tag{17}
\end{equation*}
$$

was obtained for the density of a ternary water-sodium salicylate-sodium chloride solution. This relationship was used to predict the densities of solutions in which $\alpha_{1}=0.2$ and $\alpha_{1}=0.8$. Analysing the density data from experiments ( $10-12$ ) in a similar way produced a refined expression

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{d}=0.99855_{0}+0.39341_{3} \rho_{1}+0.66044_{0} \rho_{2} \quad \ldots \tag{18}
\end{equation*}
$$

for the density of the solution in terms of $\rho_{1}$ and $\rho_{2}$. The average deviation of values predicted by equation (18) and the experimentally obtained density measurements is $\pm 0.0018 \%$.

All solutions were prepared by weighing in air and were subsequently corrected for weight in vacuo.

The partial specific volumes of solvent and solutes were calculated using equations (Dunlop \& Gosting, 1959)

$$
\begin{array}{rrr}
\dddot{v}_{i}=\frac{1-H_{1}}{d-\left(\mathrm{H}_{1} \rho_{1}+\mathrm{H}_{2} \rho_{2}\right)} & (\mathrm{i}=1,2) & \ldots \\
\mathrm{d}=\rho_{0}+\rho_{1}+\rho_{2} & \ldots & \ldots \\
\mathrm{v}_{0} \rho_{0}+\overline{\mathrm{v}}_{1} \rho_{1}+\overline{\mathrm{v}}_{2} \rho_{2}=1 & \ldots & \ldots  \tag{21}\\
. .
\end{array}
$$

where d is the density of the solution in $\mathrm{g} \mathrm{cc}^{-1}, \mathrm{H}_{1}$ is a density derivative
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and the subscripts 0,1 and 2 refer to water, sodium salicylate and sodium chloride respectively. The partial specific volume and density results are reported in Table 1.

TABLE 1. partial specific volume and density data for the system: waterSODIUM SALICYLATE-SODIUM CHLORIDE AT $25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$

| Experiment No. | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\left(\rho_{1}\right)_{A}$ | $0.044864_{3}$ | 0.046198 。 | 0.049167 | $0.050005_{8}$ |
| $\left(\rho_{8}\right)_{A}$ | 0.049845 , | 0.048802 。 | 0.045829 \% | 0.045023 ، |
| $\mathrm{d}_{\wedge}$ | 1.04910, | 1.04896 | 1.04813, | $1.04796_{8}$ |
| $\left(\rho_{1}\right)_{\text {m }}$ | $0.054833_{8}$ | 0.053801 , | 0.050826 | 0.050000 |
| $\left(\rho_{\mathrm{z}}\right)_{\text {b }}$ | 0.049886, | 0.051197 | 0.054165 , | 0.055025 |
| $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{H}}$ | 1.05309. | 1.05354 | 1.05428، | 1.05457. |
| $\mathrm{H}_{1}$ | 0.3934 | $0=\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ $\mathbf{A}=$ upper solution <br> $1=$ Salicylate $\mathbf{B}=$ lower solution <br> $2=\mathrm{NaCl}$  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{H}_{2}$ | 0.660 |  |  |  |
| $\overline{\mathrm{v}}_{\text {o }}$ | $1.0014_{4}$ |  |  |  |
| $\overline{\mathbf{v}}_{2}$ | $0.607{ }_{6}$ |  |  |  |
| $\dot{v}_{2}$ | 0.340, |  |  |  |
| Units: concentrations ( $\rho_{1}, \rho_{2}$ ), $\mathrm{g} \mathrm{cc}^{-1}$; partial specific volumes ( $\mathbf{v}_{1}$ ), ce $\mathrm{g}^{-1}$ density ( $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{A}}, \mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{p}}$ ), $\mathrm{g} \mathrm{cc}^{-1}$. |  |  |  |  |

## Discussion

The values for the refractive index derivatives $R_{1}$ and $R_{2},\left(D_{1 j}\right)_{v}$ and areas of the fringe deviation graphs are reported in Table 2. (Lines $8-9,10-13$, and 4 respectively.)

TABLE 2. DIFFUSION DATA FOR TERNARY SYSTEM WATER-SODIUM SALICYLATESODIUM CHLORIDE AT $25^{\circ}$ AT ONE COMPOSITION

| 1 | Experiment No. | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | J expt. | $90 \cdot 13$ | 85.78 | 75.90 | 71.80 |
| 3 | $J_{\text {caic. }}$ | $90 \cdot 16$ | 85.77 | 74.95 | 71.92 |
| 4 | Qexpt. $\times 10^{4}$ | $12 \cdot 24$ | $25 \cdot 63$ | 10*s | -44.80 |
| 5 | $\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{a}} \times 10^{6}$ | 0.7860 | 0.86730 | $1 \cdot 2358{ }_{0}$ | 1.4060. |
| 6 | $\mathrm{Da}_{\mathrm{a} \text { calc. }} \times 10^{3}$ | 0.7845 7 | 0.86971 | 1.2334, | 1.4072. |
| 7 | $\alpha_{1}$ | 0.9967 | 0.7991 | 0.1996 | -0.0007 |
| 8 | $\mathbf{R}_{1}$ | 0.19706 | $\begin{aligned} & 0=\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O} \\ & 1=\text { Salicylate } \\ & 2=\mathrm{NaCl} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \tilde{\rho}_{1}=0.05 \\ & \tilde{\rho}_{z}=0.05 \end{aligned}$ |
| 9 | $\mathrm{R}_{2}$ | 0.15731 |  |  |  |
| 10 | $\left(\mathrm{D}_{11}\right)_{\mathrm{v}} \times 10^{6}$ | $0.7688_{6} 70.001$, |  |  |  |
| 11 | $\left(\mathrm{D}_{12}\right)_{\mathrm{v}} \times 10^{5}$ | $0_{0.076} \mp 0.001_{8}$ |  |  |  |
| 12 | $\left(\mathrm{D}_{21}\right)_{\mathrm{v}} \times 10^{5}$ | $0.029 . \pm 0.003_{8}$ |  |  |  |
| 13 | $\left(\mathrm{D}_{22}\right)_{v} \times 10^{5}$ | $1 \cdot 258{ }_{3} \pm 0.003_{4}$ |  |  |  |
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The Tiselius cell was found to have a small positive area $Q^{\prime}$ when fringe deviation graphs were plotted for data obtained from the binary system water-sodium salicylate (unpublished). Values of Q measured for the ternary system were then adjusted by subtracting $0.2 \times 10^{-4}$ from each observed value.

The range of accuracy indicated for the values of $\left(D_{1 j}\right)_{v}$ were calculated by changing the value of $Q$ by its anticipated error of $\pm 1 \times 10^{-4}$ and evaluating the corresponding values for the diffusion coefficients. As $\rho_{2} \rightarrow 0$ at constant $\rho_{1}$, the main diffusion coefficient $\left(D_{11}\right)_{v}$ approaches $\left(\mathrm{D}_{1}\right)_{\mathrm{m}}$, the binary mutual diffusion coefficient for water-sodium salicylate. Similarly, as $\rho_{1} \rightarrow 0$ at constant $\rho_{2},\left(\mathrm{D}_{22}\right)_{v}$ approaches $\left(\mathrm{D}_{2}\right)_{\mathrm{m}}$, the binary mutual diffusion coefficient for water-sodium chloride. Measurement of these limiting values of $\left(D_{11}\right)_{v}$ and $\left(D_{22}\right)_{v}$ will involve further experiments on this system at other compositions combined with data obtained from tracer diffusion studies. The literature value (Vitagliano \& Lyons, 1955) for $\left(\mathrm{D}_{2}\right)_{\mathrm{m}}$ at this concentration is $=1.456_{0} \times 10^{-5} \mathrm{~cm}^{2} \mathrm{sec}^{-1}$, whilst the result obtained from preliminary experiments carried out on the binary system water-sodium salicylate for a mean concentration of $0.05 \mathrm{~g} \mathrm{cc}^{-1}$ is $0.913_{9} \times 10^{-5} \mathrm{~cm}^{2} \mathrm{sec}^{-1}$. These values may be compared with lines 13 and 10 respectively of Table 2.

Since $\left(D_{12}\right)_{v}$ and $\left(D_{21}\right)_{v}$ are both positive and significantly different from zero, a concentration gradient of either solute contributes significantly to the flow of the other solute. In particular, at solute concentrations of $0.05 \mathrm{~g} \mathrm{cc}^{-1}$ a concentration gradient of sodium chloride is about $\frac{1}{10}$ th as effective in producing a flow of salicylate as the concentration gradient of sodium salicylate.

Clearly, because of the difference in the ionic mobilities of the ions involved, electrostatic potential gradients are set up in the system due to the flows. In experiment (12) the $\mathrm{Cl}^{-}$ions tend to move faster than the $\mathrm{Na}^{+}$ions and in this process some $\mathrm{Na}^{+}$ions were transported with salicylate ${ }^{-}$ions. Similarly, some $\mathrm{Cl}^{-}$ions were transported with $\mathrm{Na}^{+}$ ions in experiment (9).

In ternary systems the condition

$$
\begin{equation*}
\rho_{\mathrm{B}}>\rho_{\mathrm{A}} \quad . . \quad . . \quad . . \tag{22}
\end{equation*}
$$

does not by itself ensure that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial \mathrm{x}}\right)_{\mathrm{t}}>0 \quad \ldots \quad \ldots \quad \ldots \tag{23}
\end{equation*}
$$

The latter inequality is a necessary and sufficient condition for the gravitational stability $\left(G_{\alpha}, G_{\beta}\right)$ of the diffusing columns of liquid.
$G_{\alpha}$ and $G_{\beta}$ have been calculated using equations (24-30) derived by Wendt (1962).

$$
\begin{align*}
& \mathrm{G}_{\alpha}=\mathrm{H}_{1} \mathrm{~K}_{1}^{-}+\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{~K}_{2}^{-}  \tag{24}\\
& \mathrm{G}_{\beta}=\mathrm{H}_{\mathbf{1}} \mathrm{K}_{1}^{+}+\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{~K}_{2}^{+}+\sqrt{\sigma_{-} / \sigma_{+}}\left(\mathrm{H}_{\mathbf{1}} \mathrm{K}_{1}^{-}+\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{~K}_{2}^{-}\right) \tag{25}
\end{align*}
$$
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where

$$
\left.\begin{array}{l}
K_{\frac{1}{1}}^{ \pm}= \pm \frac{\left[\left(D_{22}-D_{11} \pm \mathrm{U}\right) \Delta \rho_{1}-2 \mathrm{D}_{12} \Delta \rho_{2}\right]}{4 \mathrm{U}} \\
\mathrm{~K}_{\frac{2}{2}}^{ \pm}= \pm \frac{\left[\left(\mathrm{D}_{11}-\mathrm{D}_{22} \pm \mathrm{U}\right) \Delta \rho_{2}-2 \mathrm{D}_{21} \Delta \rho_{1}\right]}{4 \mathrm{U}} \\
\sigma_{ \pm}=\frac{\left(\mathrm{D}_{11}+\mathrm{D}_{22} \pm \mathrm{U}\right)}{2 \mathrm{~S}^{2}} \quad \ldots \tag{28}
\end{array}\right] .
$$

and

$$
\begin{align*}
& \mathrm{U}=\left[\left(\mathrm{D}_{22}-\mathrm{D}_{11}\right)^{2}+4 \mathrm{D}_{12} \mathrm{D}_{21}\right]^{1 / 2}  \tag{29}\\
& \mathrm{~S}=\left(\mathrm{D}_{11} \mathrm{D}_{22}-\mathrm{D}_{12} \mathrm{D}_{21}\right)^{1 / 2} \tag{30}
\end{align*}
$$

The values obtained are summarized in Table 3.
Because

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{G}_{\alpha} \geqslant 0 \tag{31}
\end{equation*}
$$

these diffusion columns are gravitationally stable.
$\mathrm{G}_{\alpha}$ decreases rapidly with increase in $\Delta \rho_{1}$ and decrease in $\Delta \rho_{2}$, and since $\Delta \rho_{1}+\Delta \rho_{2} \bumpeq 0.01$ convective mixing would occur if $\Delta \rho_{2}$ were only slightly less than the lowest figure reported. In contrast, $\mathrm{G}_{\beta}$ decreases less rapidly with decrease in $\Delta \rho_{2}$. Thus, for the condition $G_{\beta}<0$ to obtain, $\Delta \rho_{2}$ would have to be considerably smaller than its lowest value in Table 3.

TABLE 3. DATA FOR THE GRAVITATIONAL STABILITY FOR THE EXPERIMENTS REPORTED

| Experiment No. | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\Delta \rho_{1}$ | 0.009969 。 | $0.007603_{1}$ | $0.001659_{1}$ | -0.000005. |
| $\Delta \rho_{2}$ | $0.000041_{0}$ | $0.002395_{1}$ | $0.008336_{5}$ | 0.010001 , |
| $\mathrm{G}_{\alpha}$ | 0.00022. | 0.00101. | $0.003011^{8}$ | 0.00357 \% |
| $\mathrm{G}_{\beta}$ | 0.00192, | $0.00206_{1}$ | 0.00241. | $0.00250_{7}$ |
| Units: concentration $\rho_{1}, \mathrm{~g} \mathrm{cc}^{{ }^{1}}$; $\mathrm{G} \alpha$ and $\mathrm{G} \beta, \mathrm{g}_{\mathrm{cc}}{ }^{-1}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 1=\text { Salicylate } \\ & 2=\mathrm{NaCl} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \tilde{\rho}_{1}=0.05 \\ & \tilde{\rho}_{2}=0.05 \end{aligned}$ |  |

A non-Gaussian refractive-index curve could arise from hydrolysis of the sodium salicylate producing a multicomponent system, from the concentration dependence of the solute diffusion coefficients or because refractive index and concentration are not linearly related. Unfortunately, the Goüy fringes are not markedly sensitive to skewed distributions, but it is hoped that further investigation may enable more definite conclusions to be reached about the physical state of the system.
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