Non-Ideality in Chemical Mixtures

Last lecture we discussed that we can estimate $\gamma_i$ with the Debye-Hückel equation:

$$-\log \gamma_i = A z_i^2 I^{1/2}$$

For sea water, the major ion content is (almost) constant so the same $\gamma_i$ parameterization works throughout the oceans.

A simple Debye-Hückel parameterization turns out to be inadequate for sea water and higher ionic strength situations, so one or another forms of extended Debye-Hückel theory are used.

**TABLE 8.1 Major Dissolved Components of Seawater for a Salinity of 35%**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ion</th>
<th>g/kg</th>
<th>mM*</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Percent Free Ion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cl$^-$</td>
<td>19.354</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Na$^+$</td>
<td>10.77</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mg$^{2+}$</td>
<td>1.290</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO$_4^{2-}$</td>
<td>2.712</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ca$^{2+}$</td>
<td>0.412</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K$^+$</td>
<td>0.399</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCO$_3^-$</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* mM = millimoles per liter at 25°C.

**Sources:** Wilson 1975; Skirrow 1975; Millero and Schreiber 1982.
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There are two closely-related $\gamma$ parameterizations:

a. the "Truesdell-Jones" Equation.

$$-\log \gamma_i = \frac{A z_i^2}{1 + B a_i}$$

where $a_i$ is ionic radius, and $A$ and $B$ are temperature dependent constants.

b. the "Davies" Equation

$$-\log \gamma_i = A z_i^2 \left[ \frac{I^{1/2}}{1 + I^{1/2}} - 0.2 I \right]$$

in the Davies equation, the "0.2 I" term attempts to account for the "Ba" term of the Truesdell-Jones equation.

Notice that the Davies approximation has no solute-specific size parameterization ($a_i$) whereas Truesdell-Jones does.
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Let’s calculate true activity of Ca\(^{2+}\) in a 0.05 m solution of CaCl\(_2\) at 25°C using extended Debye-Hückel theory (Truesdale-Jones).

\[
\text{CaCl}_2 (s) \rightleftharpoons \text{Ca}^{2+} (aq) + 2\text{Cl}^{-} (aq)
\]

a. First, we calculate Ionic Strength:

\[
I = 0.5 \sum m_i z_i^2 = 0.5 \left[ 0.05(2)^2 + 0.1(-1)^2 \right] = 0.15
\]

```plaintext
Ca^{2+} \quad \text{Cl}^{-}
```

A comparison of the “Truesdell-Jones” and Davies equations for a MgCl\(_2\) solution shows that Debye-Hückel and Davies work best at low I and Truesdale-Jones works better at high I, for this particular salt.
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b. next we get $\gamma_{Ca^{2+}}$ using... *(get values from this table)*

\[
- \log \gamma_{Ca^{2+}} = \frac{0.5085(2)^2(0.15)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{1 + (0.3281 \times 10^8)(6 \times 10^{-8})(0.15)^{\frac{1}{2}}} = \gamma_{Ca^{2+}} = 0.357
\]

c. then we get $a_{Ca^{2+}} = \gamma_{Ca^{2+}} m_{Ca^{2+}} = 0.357(0.05) = a_{Ca^{2+}} = 0.018 m$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Temperature, °C</th>
<th>B (10^{-5})</th>
<th>A (10^{-8})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0803</td>
<td>0.5241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.0801</td>
<td>0.5249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.0800</td>
<td>0.5258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.0800</td>
<td>0.5262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.5062</td>
<td>0.5772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.5582</td>
<td>0.6418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.5759</td>
<td>0.6990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.5778</td>
<td>0.6997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.5778</td>
<td>0.6997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>0.5777</td>
<td>0.6997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.5779</td>
<td>0.7002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>0.5774</td>
<td>0.6995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>0.5742</td>
<td>0.6992</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Data from Gamble and Christ (1982).*
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**What quantitative effect does ionic strength have on overall solubility of ionic compounds?**

Solubility is defined as the total amount of a material that will dissolve into a fixed amount of solvent. If we assume ideal behavior, each mole of a salt that dissolves in a liter of water will result in stoichiometric molal units of solute concentration.

In the case of “ideal” CaCl$_2$:

\[ K_{sp} = m_{Ca^{2+}} m_{Cl^{-2}} \]

But with non-ideal ions, the solution upon dissolution reflects ion activities:

\[ K_{sp-ia} = a_{Ca^{2+}} a_{Cl^{-2}} \]

*note: I’ve renamed the equilibrium constant for the non ideal case with the “ion-activity” subscript so we can keep track of it in equations on the next page.*
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To quantify the effect of $I$, we need to calculate $\gamma_{Cl^-} = 0.720$ (in the same manner we used for $\gamma_{Ca^{2+}}$, but using $z = 1$ and $a = 3 \times 10^{-8}$).

$$K_{sp-ia} = a_{Ca^{2+}} a_{Cl^-} = (\gamma_{Ca^{2+}} m_{Ca^{2+}})(\gamma_{Cl^-} m_{Cl^-})^2$$

$$K_{sp-ia} = \gamma_{Ca^{2+}} \gamma_{Cl^-}^2 \cdot m_{Ca^{2+}}m_{Cl^-}$$

$$K_{sp-ia} = \gamma_{Ca^{2+}} \gamma_{Cl^-}^2 \cdot K_{sp}$$

$$K_{sp} = (0.357) \cdot (0.720)^2 \cdot K_{sp}$$

$$K_{sp-ia} = 5.40 K_{sp-ia}$$

Thus, at $I = 0.15$ (a typical stream water value) we predict that the solubility of CaCl$_2$ is 5.4 times higher due to non-ideality than it would be if the dissolved ions behaved ideally.
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The last example we looked at was a simplified case, where all of the Ionic Strength of a solution came from one salt.

Systems with multiple salts are more common in nature. Nevertheless, the parameterizations of $\gamma_i$ work the same.

Our parameterizations predict that double charged ions would have much lower activities than singly charged ones, so that these are the ions that have the biggest non-ideality effects (e.g., Ca$^{2+}$ and Mg$^{2+}$ more so than Na$^+$ or K$^+$, and the same for negatively charged ions).

Relative $\gamma_i$ as a function of $I$ (e.g., going from $I = 0.15$ to $I = 0.7$)

$\gamma_i$ depends on $I$ differently in each parameterization. However, in general, one can show with these various equations that activity for the same ions goes down by roughly

- 10% for single charged ions
- 35% for doubly charged ions
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Other Types of Solubility

Solutions are not limited to aqueous/gaseous examples.

Mixtures apply to the solid state as well.

We can use chemical potential arguments and solubility relationships any time a solute (or group of solutes) is dissolved in a solvent (the dominant phase in the mixture),..
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Other Types of Solubility

One common use of this theory is to solubility of ions in mineral phases. This applies to:

1. **Trace element** substitution into minerals.

2. **Solid solutions** such as in the olivine system of Forsterite, Mg$_2$SiO$_4$ -- Fayalite, Fe$_2$SiO$_4$

Such solubility is often temperature or pressure dependent, giving us a means to estimate temperature (thermometry) or pressure (barometry) or both (thermobarometry) in some cases.

---

**Thermodynamics of Chemical Mixtures**

1. **Trace element** substitutions are typically at high dilution. Take the example of Co solubility in the minerals biotite and hornblende.

   $\mu_{Co} = \mu_{Co}^* + RT \ln a_{Co}/a_{tot}$ at high dilution, $a_{tot} \approx 1$ so $\mu_{Co} = \mu_{Co}^* + RT \ln a_{Co}$

   at chemical equilibrium between biotite and hornblende:
   
   $\mu_{Co}^{Bi} = \mu_{Co}^{Hbl}$ and $\mu_{Co}^{Bi}/\mu_{Co}^{Hbl} = 1$

   Thus
   
   $1 = (\mu_{Co}^{Bi} + RT \ln a_{Co}^{Bi})/(\mu_{Co}^{Hbl} + RT \ln a_{Co}^{Hbl})$

   rearranging...
   
   $1 = (1 + (RT \ln a_{Co}^{Bi})/(\mu_{Co}^{Bi}))/(1 + (RT \ln a_{Co}^{Hbl})/\mu_{Co}^{Hbl})$

   $\mu_{Co}^{Bi}$, $\mu_{Co}^{Hbl}$, and $R$ are constants, so at constant $T$ this reduces to

   $1 = (1 + C_1 \ln a_{Co}^{Bi})/(1 + C_2 \ln a_{Co}^{Hbl})$

   then

   $(1 + C_2 \ln a_{Co}^{Hbl}) = (1 + C_1 \ln a_{Co}^{Bi})$

   $C_2 \ln a_{Co}^{Hbl} = C_1 \ln a_{Co}^{Bi}$

   $C_2/C_1 = \ln a_{Co}^{Bi}/\ln a_{Co}^{Hbl}$

   raising both sides to the e power yields:

   $e^{C_2/C_1} = K \rightarrow K = a_{Co}^{Bi}/a_{Co}^{Hbl}$
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The resulting $K$ is denoted $K_D$ and is referred to as a "distribution coefficient" or "partition coefficient" of an element between the phases present. In this case, it is the $K_D$ for Co between biotite and hornblend ($K_D^{Co}$).

$K_D$ is also sometimes called a "Henry’s law distribution coefficient" because the equation above is a generalization of $K = P_i/n_i$ (aka Henry’s Law).

*We will use such $K_D$ relationships frequently this semester.*

**Non ideality:**

We do not have a simple theory for predicting $\gamma_i$ in mineral systems.

We rely on experimentally determined $a_i$ or on values estimated from like-charged elements parameterized as a function of atomic radius and mineral lattice strain considerations (discussed later this semester).

---
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2. Solid solutions The $K_D$ formulation of chemical potential also applies here. Take for example the minerals garnet and mica, which form mineral solid solutions of the type:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common</th>
<th>Biotite mica - $K(Z_3)AlSi_3O_{10}(OH)_2$</th>
<th>garnet - $Z_3Al_2Si_3O_{12}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>igneous forms</td>
<td><strong>phlogopite</strong> $K(Mg_3)AlSi_3O_{10}(OH)_2$</td>
<td><strong>pyrope</strong> $Mg_3Al_2Si_3O_{12}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>annite</strong> $K(Fe_3)AlSi_3O_{10}(OH)_2$</td>
<td><strong>almandine</strong> $Fe_3Al_2Si_3O_{12}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because a range of stoichiometric and non-stoichiometric forms of either mineral are possible (e.g., $(Mg_3Fe_{1-x})_3Al_2Si_3O_{12}$), we think of the solid solution as arising from an exchange reaction with

$$K_D = \left(\frac{a_{Fe}}{a_{Mg}}\right)_{garnet} / \left(\frac{a_{Fe}}{a_{Mg}}\right)_{biotite}$$
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Here’s how we derive that equilibrium constant expression:

The simplified chemical reaction is

\[ \text{Mg-garnet} + \text{Fe-biotite} \leftrightarrow \text{Fe-garnet} + \text{Mg-biotite} \]

By the definition of equilibrium constant, we know:

\[
K_{eq} = \frac{a_{\text{Fe}\text{garnet}} a_{\text{Mg}\text{biotite}}}{a_{\text{Mg}\text{garnet}} a_{\text{Fe}\text{biotite}}} = \frac{(a_{\text{Fe}}/a_{\text{Mg}})_{\text{garnet}}}{(a_{\text{Fe}}/a_{\text{Mg}})_{\text{biotite}}} = K_D \text{ as on the prior slide.}
\]
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**Pressure and Temperature Effects**

Most chemical reactions have temperature and pressure dependent \( K_{eq} \):

\[
\frac{d(\ln K)}{dT} = \frac{\Delta H^o}{RT^2}
\]

The change in \( K_{eq} \) as a function of temperature is related to the enthalpy change inversely related to Temperature-squared.

When \( \Delta H^o \) is independent of temperature, this becomes

\[
\ln K_2/K_1 = \frac{\Delta H^o}{R} \cdot (1/T_2 - 1/T_1)
\]

The change in \( K_{eq} \) as a function of temperature is related to the enthalpy change divided by the change in Temperature times \( R \).

and

\[
\frac{d(\ln K)}{dP} = \frac{\Delta V^o}{RT}
\]

The change in \( K_{eq} \) as a function of pressure is related to the volume change divided by the Temperature times \( R \).
**Thermodynamics of Chemical Mixtures**

These $P$ and $T$ relationships give us a geochemical means for determining the temperatures (Geothermometry) and pressures (Geobarometry) in which minerals were formed.

3 classes of reactions are used as P-T indicators

a. solid solution substitutions in minerals (e.g., like we were just discussing)

b. phase boundary changes

c. phase exsolution from a mixture (“unmixing”)

The first two types are useful for determining temperatures (or pressures) of many igneous; all three are useful in metamorphic systems.

---

**Thermodynamics of Chemical Mixtures**

For instance, the exchange reaction of Fe and Mg between the minerals garnet and biotite is used as a geothermometer because $K_D$ is temperature dependent @ $\ln K \propto 1/T$.

$$K_D = \frac{(a_{Fe}/a_{Mg})_{garnet}}{(a_{Fe}/a_{Mg})_{biotite}}$$

It is difficult to calculate the temperature dependence of this exchange from first principles, because of ion non-ideality, and because other elements besides Fe and Mg (i.e., Ca and Ti) can appreciably substitute into these minerals as “Z”.

Instead…
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Instead, the temperature dependence is parameterized using experimental measurements of $K_D^{Mg-Fe}$ at different temperatures, pressures and ion mixtures (for $Z$). The resulting data are plotted in a $1/T$ vs. $\ln K$ diagram (i.e., assuming $\Delta H_T$ is not a function of temperature), and a best-fit line through the data is then calculated.

![Graph showing $K_D$ as a function of temperature](image)

We are not limited only to mineral-mineral substitution reactions.

We can also use certain mineral-melt reactions for geothermometry or geobarometry.

For example, another useful geo-thermometer is the Fe-Mg exchange reaction between basaltic melt and olivine.
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Solid solution geothermometry is not limited to igneous and metamorphic systems.

For instance, the substitution of Sr\(^{2+}\), Mg\(^{2+}\) and U\(^{6+}\) into biogenic CaCO\(_3\) (both calcite and aragonite) is T-dependent, from which one can estimate past sea surface temperatures (SST) in paleo-oceanographic studies.

![Diagram of divalent metal partition coefficients (K\(_{d}\)) as a function of metal cation properties.](image)

Relationships between the Sr/Ca ratios in *Porites* spp. colonies against (a) incubation temperature for 5 coral colonies cultured at five temperature settings between 21°C and 29°C. The error bar indicates the deviation of triplicate analysis. The formula obtained for the Sr/Ca-temperature relationship was Sr/Ca = 10.31 – 0.057 T\(^\circ\)C; \(r = -0.83; P < 0.01\).

(b) Diagram of divalent metal partition coefficients (K\(_{d}\)) as a function of metal cation properties. The latter are represented by \(\Delta G_{f}^{n,M} \) the standard non-solvation energy of cation \(M^{2+}\), \(r_M^{2+}\) the ionic radius of \(M^{2+}\), and \(\Delta G_{f}^{f,M} \) the standard Gibbs free energy of formation of cation \(M^{2+}\) (from Inoue et al. 2007, Geophys. Res. Lett., vol. 34).
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Mineral phase boundary change example:

The presence of just one, any two, or all three of these three phases in a rock gives useful constraints on P and T of formation. This is a very useful system in metamorphosed pelitic (i.e., clay-rich) sediments.

![Phase diagram for Al\(_2\)SiO\(_5\) (kyanite-sillimanite-andalusite) as determined by Holdaway (1971).](image)

Due to sluggish reaction kinetics, the exact position of these phase boundaries remains somewhat uncertain.

\[
\text{Al}_2\text{SiO}_5 \text{ (s) (sillimanite)} \leftrightarrow \text{Al}_2\text{SiO}_5 \text{ (s) (andalusite)} \leftrightarrow \text{Al}_2\text{SiO}_5 \text{ (s) (kyanite)}
\]
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