

THE THIRD LAW OF THERMODYNAMICS

B.G. KYLE

Kansas State University • Manhattan, KS 66506-5102

In sharp contrast to the first two laws, the third law of thermodynamics can be characterized by diverse expression,^[1] disputed descent, and questioned authority.^[2] Since it was first advanced by Nernst^[3] in 1906 as the Heat Theorem, its thermodynamic status has been controversial; its usefulness, however is unquestioned.

This essay addresses the question of why the third law of thermodynamics requires entropy changes to approach zero as the absolute temperature approaches zero. The putative view that the entropy is an intrinsic physical property that measures disorder and therefore must be zero for a perfect crystal has the advantage of providing a simple physical picture. Unfortunately, this view is inconsistent since it can be shown that liquids, vapors, and glasses also exhibit zero entropy at zero absolute temperature. Here it is shown that the third law should be understood in logical rather than physical terms.

The Heat Theorem was first proposed as an empirical generalization based on the temperature dependence of the internal energy change, DU , and the Helmholtz free energy change, DA , for chemical reactions involving condensed phases. As the absolute temperature, T , approaches zero, DU and DA by definition become equal, but the Heat Theorem stated that dDU/dT and dDA/dT also approach zero. These derivatives are DC_v and $-DS$, respectively. The statement that DC_v equals zero would attract little attention today in view of the abundance of experimental and theoretical evidence showing that the heat capacities of condensed phases approach zero as zero absolute temperature is approached. Even today, however, the controversial and enigmatic aspect

of the Heat Theorem is the equivalent statement

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow 0} \Delta S = 0 \quad (1)$$

In 1912 Nernst offered a proof that the unattainability of zero absolute temperature was dictated by the second law of thermodynamics and was able to show that Eq. (1) follows from the unattainability principle. The latter result seems undisputed, but Nernst was unable to convince his contemporaries of the thermodynamic grounding of the unattainability principle.

Many years of low-temperature research have firmly established the credibility of the unattainability principle, and as a result it has been proposed as the third law of thermodynamics. This proposal has the merit of having all three laws expressed in phenomenological language and, of course, it leads to the useful result stated in Eq. (1).

As a matter of convenience, it is possible to express ΔS for a process under consideration in terms of entropies of formation of participating species because in such a calculation there is a cancellation of the entropies of the constituent elements. For this reason, the entropy of an element may be assigned any value. According to Eq. (1), at zero absolute temperature the entropy changes for formation reactions will be zero and it is convenient to set elemental entropies equal to zero as recommended by Lewis and Randall.^[4] This results in the familiar statement that the entropy of every perfect crystalline substance can be taken zero at zero absolute temperature and is, of course, the convention employed in the determination of "absolute" entropies.

CONFORMANCES, EXCEPTIONS, AND INTERPRETATIONS

Undoubtedly the most convincing confirmation of the Heat Theorem involved the calculation of absolute entropies from calorimetric measurements on pure substances which were then used to calculate entropy changes for chemical reactions. These calculated values were in agreement with entropy changes determined from the temperature dependence of experimentally measured equilibrium constants.

Later, it was shown through the use of quantum statistical



Benjamin G. Kyle is Professor of Chemical Engineering at Kansas State University, where he has enjoyed over thirty years of teaching. He holds a BS from the Georgia Institute of Technology and a PhD from the University of Florida. He has not outgrown an early fascination with thermodynamics and is interested in practically all aspects of the subject. He is the author of a thermodynamics textbook published by Prentice-Hall.

© Copyright ChE Division of ASEE 1994

mechanics that spectroscopic data could be used to calculate absolute entropies in excellent agreement with those calculated from calorimetric data. Quantum statistical mechanics also provides the microscopic interpretation of zero entropy for a perfect crystal as well as quantitative corrections for those few errant substances exhibiting small positive entropy values at zero absolute temperature. The statement that the lowest energy state of the crystal is nondegenerate is easily visualized as a perfectly ordered crystal where only a single arrangement of atoms, molecules, or ions on the crystal lattice is possible. Thus, in terms of Boltzmann's famous equation

$$S = k \ell n \Omega \quad (2)$$

it may be stated that

$$\Omega_0 = 1 \quad \text{at} \quad T = 0$$

and thus, $S_0 = 0$.

Exceptions to S_0 equal to zero are explained in terms of "frozen-in" disorder. For example, a linear molecule such as carbon monoxide can take two possible orientations on a lattice site, CO, or OC. Orientations on adjacent sites such as COOC or OCCO represent a slightly higher energy state than ordered orientations such as COCO and are therefore favored at higher temperatures. While the tendency is for the crystal to move toward the low-energy ordered state on cooling, the rate at which molecular orientations proceed slows to a standstill and a state of "frozen-in" disorder results at zero absolute temperature. If the orientations of the CO molecule were completely random, there would be 2^N possible configurations on a lattice of N sites (two possibilities per site). Setting $\Omega_0 = 2^N$ in Eq. (2) leads to $S_0 = R \ell n 2$, which is also seen to be the entropy change on forming an equimolar binary mixture. The value of $R \ell n 2$ is extremely close to the observed difference between calorimetric and spectroscopic absolute entropies.

The vast majority of substances conform to S_0 equal to zero and can be visualized as forming crystals of perfect order ($\Omega_0 = 1$). The few exceptions can be explained in terms of "frozen-in" disorder in a manner similar to that described for carbon monoxide. Here there is seen to be a close correspondence between entropy and disorder in a spatial sense. Unfortunately, there are other systems conforming to the Heat Theorem that place a strain on this interpretation. We now examine these systems.

Measurements of phase equilibrium data for pure substances show that the slope of the solid-vapor coexistence curve for many substances and the slope of the liquid-vapor coexistence curves for ^4H and ^3He approach zero as zero absolute temperature is approached.^[5] From the Clapeyron equation,

$$\frac{dP}{dT} = \frac{\Delta S}{\Delta v} \quad (3)$$

and the fact that Δv is finite, it can be concluded that Eq. (1) applies to these phase changes. Both helium isotopes remain liquid under their own vapor pressure down to zero Kelvin and both require a pressure considerably higher than their

vapor pressures in order to form a solid phase. The appropriate calculations show^[5] that Eq. (1) also applies to the solid-liquid phase transition. Thus, if the Lewis and Randall convention is used, pure liquids and vapors also have zero entropies. While it may be possible to argue that these systems are nondegenerate in their lowest energy state, the simple picture of zero entropy corresponding to perfect spatial order does not seem appropriate, at least in a physical sense.

The interpretation is further strained when the behavior of glasses in the low-temperature limit is considered. The Maxwell relationship

$$\left(\frac{\partial S}{\partial P}\right)_T = -\left(\frac{\partial V}{\partial T}\right)_P \quad (4)$$

together with Eq. (1) leads to

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow 0} \left(\frac{\partial V}{\partial T}\right)_P = 0 \quad (5)$$

Thermal coefficients of expansion for many substances have been measured at temperatures approaching absolute zero. As expected, Eq. (5) is obeyed by crystalline solids, but one may be surprised to learn that it is also obeyed by glasses.^[6] Here, a microscopic physical interpretation hardly seems possible.

Systems comprised of liquids, vapors, and glasses strain to the breaking point the putative association of zero entropy with perfect spatial order. These are the systems that prompt us to ask, "Is there a microscopic physical interpretation of the Heat Theorem applicable to all systems?" One could argue that the association of entropy with spatial order is naive and that $\Omega_0 = 1$ only means that the system is nondegenerate (only a single quantum state is available to it). For example, both Fermi-Dirac and Bose-Einstein gases have been shown to be nondegenerate^[7] and therefore have $S_0 = 0$. In the case of crystalline solids, $\Omega_0 = 1$ can be interpreted physically as spatial order, but no much microscopic description of the gases in physical terms is possible. Instead, Ω_0 can only be seen as a logical construct that allows a mathematical treatment of the system. The answer to the question is, "No! Only an explanation in logical terms is possible." This is yet another instance of our inability to obtain a microscopic view of entropy in anything other than logical terms.^[8]

If there is no physical microscopic interpretation of the Heat Theorem, then what is the basis for its existence? As will be shown below, the answer is that Eq. (1) is dictated by the logical structure of thermodynamics.

THE CLASSICAL THERMODYNAMIC VIEW

The absolute temperature scale is defined in terms of the performance of a Carnot engine

$$\frac{T_1}{T_2} = \frac{|Q_1|}{|Q_2|} \quad (6)$$

where $|Q_2|$ is the input heat at T_2 and $|Q_1|$ is rejected heat at T_1 . Instrumental in the derivation of Eq. (6) is a second-law state-

ment such as, "It is impossible to completely convert heat into work in a cyclic process." Equation 6 is therefore subject to this constraint and would not be valid for $T_1 = 0$ where $|Q_1|$ would be zero. Therefore, the logical structure of thermodynamics does not permit zero absolute temperature, and since the laws of thermodynamics are based on statements from the physical world and have proven reliable in dealing with the physical world, it may be stated that zero absolute temperature is unattainable. Thus, it is not necessary to propose the unattainability principle as a third law of thermodynamics.

Equation (1) can be derived from the unattainability principle^[9] by considering the arbitrary process $\alpha \rightarrow \beta$, which could be a chemical or physical transformation or a change in a thermodynamic property (e.g., intensity of magnetization). The entropies of the system in these states are

$$S^\alpha = S_0^\alpha + \int_0^T \frac{C_\alpha}{T} dT \quad (7)$$

$$S^\beta = S_0^\beta + \int_0^T \frac{C_\beta}{T} dT$$

The mathematical formalism of thermodynamics allows these equations to be written as if $T = 0$ were possible. But a more rigorous approach that uses the limit as T approaches zero yields the same result when the heat capacity takes the form

$$C = aT^b \quad (a > 0) \\ (b > 0) \quad (8)$$

For a reversible adiabatic process between states a and b occurring near zero absolute temperature, we use Eq. (7) to write

$$S_0^\alpha + \int_0^{T'} \frac{C_\alpha}{T} dT = S_0^\beta + \int_0^{T''} \frac{C_\beta}{T} dT \quad (9)$$

If the process began in state a at T' and ended in state b at $T'' = 0$, we would have

$$S_0^\beta - S_0^\alpha = \int_0^{T'} \frac{C_\alpha}{T} dT > 0 \quad (10)$$

but because $T'' = 0$ is not possible, the following holds

$$S_0^\beta - S_0^\alpha \leq 0 \quad (11)$$

Considering the reverse process that proceeds from T'' to $T' = 0$, we can, in the same manner, show that it is necessary for

$$S_0^\beta - S_0^\alpha \geq 0 \quad (12)$$

These two inequalities can be satisfied only when

$$S_0^\beta = S_0^\alpha$$

and it is seen that Eq. (1) follows from the unattainability principle. Thus, Eq. (1) arises from the second law and is needed to preserve the logical structure of thermodynamics; a third law is therefore unnecessary.

ADDRESSING PREVIOUS ARGUMENTS

Two types of arguments found in the literature should be addressed: those that attempt to show that the attainment of zero absolute temperature is not prohibited by the second law, and those that attempt to show that existence of a reservoir at zero absolute temperature does not threaten the second law.

Using a heat capacity described by Eq. (8) and applying the mathematical formalism of thermodynamics down to and including zero absolute temperature, it has been shown that this temperature can be reached in a finite number of steps^[10] or that the work required to reduce a system^[11] to this temperature is finite.^[12] As previously noted, the mathematical formalism is such that the use of $T = 0$ instead of $T \rightarrow 0$ gives the appearance of being permissible. A similar condition probably obtains for these arguments which, despite their apparent cogency, are incomplete because the possibility that the existence of a reservoir at zero absolute temperature might pose a threat to the second law was not examined.

Nernst's proof that the unattainability principle is required by the second law was based on the argument that if a reservoir at zero absolute temperature existed, it would be possible to operate a Carnot engine using this reservoir to convert heat taken in at a higher temperature completely into work. This is essentially the argument presented here. The two most damaging objections against this position were based on possible operating difficulties associated with the Carnot cycle.^[13-15]

The first objection calls into question the possibility of carrying out an isothermal process at zero absolute temperature because the effects of heat leaks and frictional heat are much more pronounced at this extreme. This is an objection of degree rather than principle and should carry no weight when it is recognized that the logical structure constituting thermodynamics rests on such idealizations as reversibility, isothermality, and adiabaticity. As these idealizations can never be realized in the physical world, it seems pointless to argue that they would be more difficult to achieve at low temperature.

The second objection points to the ambiguity associated with the isothermal step in the Carnot cycle presumed to occur at zero absolute temperature. Because no heat is rejected, this step would be adiabatic as well as isothermal, but it would not necessarily be isentropic for it can only be said that the entropy change is $0/0$. It has been argued that when a system attempting to follow a Carnot cycle reaches zero absolute temperature, the second law is not threatened because there is no assurance that the system would take the isothermal path and complete the cycle rather than take the adiabatic path and return to a previous state. The emphasis here is misplaced! Because a single violation would vitiate the second law, concern should be directed to the possibility, no matter how small, that the system would take the isothermal path. There is no assurance that this would not occur, and therefore the unattainability principle is needed.

Both of these inoperability objections seem to demand a premature reality check. I would argue that the Carnot engine is simply a concept that is part of the logical, mathematical formalism of thermodynamics and it is rather the final result of the argument which should be subjected to a reality check. In this regard, it should be noted that the observed conformance to Eq. (5) may be taken as proof that the concept of a Carnot engine is viable in the limit as T approaches zero. This is because the Maxwell relation, Eq. (4), can be derived through the agency of a Carnot cycle as was originally shown by Maxwell himself.^[16]

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this essay is to demonstrate that Eq. (1) can be understood only in a logical sense, and to that end a derivation showing its descent from the second law has been presented. As this derivation is essentially an elaboration of Nernst's original derivation which was never fully accepted, it is reasonable to expect that it could suffer the same fate. Nevertheless, whether Eq. (1) is regarded as deriving from the second law, or whether it is regarded as an additional statement required to save the second law, it is still possible to see it as a logical requirement. At the very least, it could be stated that Eq. (1) is necessary to define the limiting entropy change, which we have seen would otherwise have the indeterminate form $0/0$. By reversing the argument presented here, it is easily seen that the unattainability principle follows from Eq. (1).

Although Eq. (1) has now been given thermodynamic justification, its exceptions seem uncomfortably numerous for a thermodynamic relationship, and it is therefore appropriate to examine its applicability. This problem has been addressed by Simon^[17] and resolved by the following statement:

At absolute zero the entropy differences vanish between all those states of a system between which a reversible transition is possible in principle even at the lowest temperature.

Simon's statement is completely general. In regard to the behavior of glasses the statement of Fowler and Guggenheim^[9] is more specific:

For any isothermal process involving only phases in internal equilibrium or, alternatively, if any phase is in frozen metastable equilibrium, provided the process does not disturb this frozen equilibrium, $\lim_{T \rightarrow 0} \Delta S = 0$.

Simon assigned unquestioned thermodynamic status to Eq. (1) and pointed out that the restrictions made explicit in his statement are implicitly made in applying any other thermodynamic relationship. The question is not whether Eq. (1) is valid, but whether the application of thermodynamics to a particular system is valid. Valid thermodynamic systems must exist in equilibrium states and thus be capable of undergoing reversible processes. As Eq. (1) is applied only under the most stringent conditions where "frozen-in"

nonequilibrium states are not unexpected, it is natural that it will not seem to possess the unexceptional status accorded to the other laws and relations of thermodynamics. This is a problem in the application of thermodynamics, however, and should not call the validity of Eq. (1) into question.

Because of the widespread use of the Lewis and Randall convention leading to the convenience of "absolute" entropies, and because of the remarkable success in calculating these values via the methods of quantum statistical mechanics, we are tempted to regard entropy as an intrinsic property of matter and thereby seek a physical microscopic interpretation such as $S_0 = 0$ for perfect spatial order. But we have seen for the case of liquids, gases, and glasses, that this is not a fruitful approach.

Equation (1) is the most general statement and has been shown to be simply a necessary logical statement. This suggests the view that entropy is merely a defined state function embedded in the logical-mathematical structure of thermodynamics. Thus, it seems appropriate that quantum statistical mechanics yields a representation of entropy in logical rather than physical terms. Because classical thermodynamics neither provides nor requires physical visualization of its functions, entropy is no less useful for want of a microscopic physical interpretation. While this view of entropy does not provide the insight available through a physical microscopic interpretation, it is at least free of contradictions.

REFERENCES

1. For a sampling of expressions, see E.M. Loebl, *J. Chem. Ed.*, **37**, 361 (1960)
2. For extreme positions, see E.D. Eastman, *Chem. Rev.*, **18**, 257 (1936)
3. All of Nernst's work in this area is covered in W. Nernst, *The New Heat Theorem*, Dutton, New York, NY (1926)
4. Lewis, G.N., and M. Randall, *Thermodynamics and the Free Energy of Chemical Substances*, Chap. 31, McGraw-Hill, New York, NY (1923)
5. Beattie, J.A., and I. Oppenheim, *Principles of Thermodynamics*, Chap. 11, Elsevier, Amsterdam, Holland (1979)
6. White, G.K., *Cryogenics*, **4**, 2 (1964)
7. Wilson, A.H., *Thermodynamics and Statistical Mechanics*, Chap. 6, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, England (1957)
8. Kyle, B.G., *Chem. Eng. Ed.*, **23**(4), 250 (1989)
9. Fowler, R., and E.A. Guggenheim, *Statistical Thermodynamics*, Chap. 5, pg. 224, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, England (1956)
10. Simon, F.E., *Low Temperature Physics*, Chap. 1, Academic Press, London, England (1952)
11. The heat capacity of the system was assumed to follow Eq. (8)
12. See reference 1
13. Epstein, P.S., *Textbook of Thermodynamics*, Chap. 15, Wiley, New York, NY (1937)
14. Pippard, A.B., *The Elements of Classical Thermodynamics*, Chap. 5, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, England (1957)
15. Boas, M.L., *Am. J. Phys.*, **28**, 675 (1960)
16. Nash, L.K., *J. Chem. Ed.*, **41**, 368 (1964)
17. Simon, F.E., *Physica*, **10**, 1089 (1937) \square