

Enthalpy of Lithium Fluoroborate from 298–700K

Enthalpy and Entropy of Fusion

ARTHUR S. DWORKIN

Chemistry Division, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, TN 37830

The enthalpy and entropy of LiBF_4 have been measured from 298–700K with a copper block drop calorimeter. The enthalpy and entropy of melting of LiBF_4 are $3460 \text{ cal mol}^{-1}$ and $5.94 \text{ cal deg}^{-1} \text{ mol}^{-1}$, respectively. No evidence for a transition between room temperature and the melting point was found. The results are compared with those for the other alkali metal fluoroborates.

We have examined the effect of the differences in structure and cation size on the enthalpy and entropy of fusion and transition in the alkali fluoroborates sodium through cesium (4). Lithium fluoroborate with its much smaller cation differs from the other fluoroborates in that it has at room temperatures a hexagonal structure type, probably that of SiO_2 (1). A recent paper (2) reports that there is no transition in LiBF_4 between room temperature and the melting point while another (6) reports a transition at 115°C . We, therefore, have measured the enthalpy of LiBF_4 from room temperature up to about 40°C above its melting temperature to complete our thermochemical studies of the alkali metal fluoroborates.

EXPERIMENTAL

The copper block drop calorimeter used for the measurements and the experimental procedure have been described in detail previously (5). Briefly, the experiment is performed by measuring the temperature rise of a copper block when an equilibrated encapsulated sample is dropped into a well in the block from the constant temperature zone of a controlled tube furnace. The enthalpy equivalent of the calorimeter relates the temperature rise of the block to the enthalpy of the sample and was determined with a NBS sample of synthetic sapphire using the same procedure as described above. The temperature of the sample was measured to $\pm 0.1^\circ\text{C}$ with a calibrated platinum (90% platinum–10% rhodium) thermocouple. The temperature rise of the block was measured to $\pm 0.001^\circ\text{C}$ with a calorimetric-type, platinum-sheathed platinum resistance thermometer. The LiBF_4 was sealed in an inner platinum liner to prevent attack on the Inconel capsule especially designed for our enthalpy apparatus. The enthalpy of the empty Inconel capsule was measured in a separate series of experiments. The enthalpy of the platinum (7) amounted to only about 15% of that of the salt. Both the platinum and Inconel capsules were welded closed in a helium dry box.

A thermal analysis was performed to determine the melting point of LiBF_4 as well as to examine the possible transition behavior. For this experiment, the LiBF_4 was sealed in a nickel capsule in the same manner as above. The capsule was mounted in an enclosed argon-filled stainless steel tube in a Nichrome-wound Marchall furnace. Temperatures were measured with a Pt(Pt–10% Rh) thermocouple placed in a well extending about 1.5 cm into the capsule from the bottom. The signal from the couple was fed into a Rubicon potentiometer and then into a Brown recorder with a chart span of 1 mV thus permitting temperature-time curves to be recorded during the heating and cooling cycles.

The LiBF_4 , purchased from Foote Mineral Co., was prepared in an anhydrous solvent and never came into contact with air;

the salt was always transferred in a dry box filled with helium. It was also subjected to a dynamic vacuum at room temperature for 24 hr before encapsulation. The only appreciable impurity was LiF. A chemical analysis performed in the ORNL Analytical Chemistry Division showed that our sample contained 3 mol % LiF. The analytical method entails a titration with thorium nitrate solution performed immediately after sample dissolution. The indicator used is methyl thymol blue with the pH of the solution adjusted to 3.35. The BF_4^- ion is hydrolyzed so slowly in cold water (8) that the degree of hydrolysis during the time of analysis is immeasurable within the accuracy of the titration (better than $\pm 2\%$). The indicated free fluoride, therefore, comes almost entirely from excess LiF.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The measured enthalpies corrected for the contribution of the enthalpy of LiF (3) are given in Table I. The correction amounted to about 0.5% for enthalpies below the melting point and about 1.5% for those above. The following least-

Table I. Measured Enthalpies of LiBF_4

(Corrected for LiF impurity)

Temp, K	$H_T - H_{298}$, kcal mol ⁻¹	Temp, K	$H_T - H_{298}$, kcal mol ⁻¹
364.0	1.82	550.8	7.47
391.4	2.60	588.0	12.07
421.2	3.44	590.9	12.22
452.5	4.40	594.3	12.37
482.2	5.27	598.6	12.54
512.7	6.25	605.4	12.78
536.8	7.02	611.1	13.02

Table II. Smoothed Values of Enthalpy and Entropy of LiBF_4

Temp, K	$H_T - H_{298}$, kcal mol ⁻¹	$S_T - S_{298}$, cal deg ⁻¹ mol ⁻¹
298	0	0
350	1.41	4.37
400	2.85	8.20
450	4.33	11.70
500	5.85	14.90
550	7.40	17.85
583	8.43	19.67 (solid)
583	11.89	25.61 (liquid)
600	12.58	26.76
650	14.58	29.97
700	16.59	32.95

Table III. Enthalpies and Entropies of Melting and Transition of Alkali Metal Fluoroborates

	T_m, K	$\Delta H_m, kcal$ mol ⁻¹	$\Delta S_m, cal$ deg ⁻¹ mol ⁻¹	T_{tr}, K	$\Delta H_{tr}, kcal$ mol ⁻¹	$\Delta S_{tr}, cal$ deg ⁻¹ mol ⁻¹	$\Delta S_m + \Delta S_{tr},$ cal deg ⁻¹ mol ⁻¹
LiBF ₄	588	3.46	5.94	5.9
NaBF ₄	679	3.25	4.78	516	1.61	3.1	7.9
KBF ₄	843	4.30	5.10	556	3.30	5.9	11.0
RbBF ₄	855	4.68	5.5	518	2.86	5.5	11.0
CsBF ₄	828	4.58	5.5	443	1.94	4.4	9.9

squares equations represent the corrected enthalpy data for LiBF₄ in cal mol⁻¹:

$$H_T - H_{298} = -11,440 + 31.89 T + 1.0 \times 10^{-3} T^2 + 5.50 \times 10^5 T^{-1} \quad (298-583K)$$

$$\Delta H_{fusion} = 3460 \text{ cal mol}^{-1}; \Delta S_{fusion} = 5.94 \text{ cal deg}^{-1} \text{ mol}^{-1} \quad (583K)$$

$$H_T - H_{298} = -11,490 + 40.1 T \quad (583-700K)$$

A computer program was used to obtain the least-squares equations given above and the smoothed values of enthalpy and entropy given in Table II. The program sets $\Delta H = 0$ at 298K and fixes C_p at 298K by an input parameter. Since no room temperature values of C_p have been reported, we estimated values for C_p at 298°K by extrapolation of our high-temperature data. The average % deviation of the data from the equations,

$$\left(\sum \frac{*enthalpy_{obsd} - enthalpy_{calcd}^*}{enthalpy_{calcd}} \times 100/n \right)$$

is 0.4% in the solid and 0.1% in the liquid. An overall accuracy of $\pm 0.8\%$ is estimated for the enthalpy measurements and an accuracy of $\pm 1-2\%$ is estimated for the enthalpy of fusion.

We found no evidence for a transition either in the enthalpy measurements or in a separate thermal analysis experiment. LiBF₄ is hygroscopic and must be handled in a dry inert atmosphere as it was in our work and in that of ref. 2. However, this was not the case in the work reported in ref. 6 where, in fact, the LiBF₄ was ground to a fine powder in the open and heated in an open system for their differential thermal analysis experiments. Our thermal analysis experiment showed two breaks at 304° and 300°C. The breaks most

probably indicate the LiBF₄ liquidus and the eutectic in the LiBF₄-LiF system. From the liquidus temperature, the mol % LiF impurity, and the heat of fusion of LiBF₄, the true temperature of fusion is calculated to be 310°C. The eutectic concentration can also be estimated to be ~5 mol % LiF.

Table III compares the enthalpies and entropies of fusion and transition for the alkali metal fluoroborates. The high-temperature forms of the fluoroborates of sodium through cesium acquire considerable entropy at the transition temperature probably due to anionic rotational or librational disorder (4). Their entropy of melting, therefore, is lower than that for LiBF₄, although the sum of the entropy of transition and melting ($\Delta S_m + \Delta S_{tr}$) is higher than that for LiBF₄. NaBF₄ differs in both high- and low-temperature structure from the other fluoroborates (4) as well as from LiBF₄. This is reflected in its intermediate value for $\Delta S_m + \Delta S_{tr}$.

LITERATURE CITED

- (1) Brunton, G., Reactor Chem. Div., Oak Ridge National Lab., private communication, 1971.
- (2) Cantor, S., McDermott, D. P., Gilpatrick, L. O., *J. Chem. Phys.*, **52**, 4600 (1970).
- (3) Douglas, T. B., Dever, J. L., *J. Amer. Chem. Soc.*, **76**, 4826 (1954).
- (4) Dworkin, A. S., Bredig, M. A., *J. Chem. Eng. Data*, **15**, 505 (1970).
- (5) Dworkin, A. S., Bredig, M. A., *J. Phys. Chem.*, **64**, 269 (1960).
- (6) Marano, R. J., Shuster, E. R., *Thermochim. Acta*, **1**, 521 (1970).
- (7) Stull, D. R., Sinke, G. C., *Advan. Chem. Ser.*, **18**, 152, 1956.
- (8) Wamser, C. A., *J. Amer. Chem. Soc.*, **73**, 409 (1951).

RECEIVED for review September 17, 1971. Accepted January 7, 1972. Research sponsored by the U. S. Atomic Energy Commission under contract with Union Carbide Corp.