

This agrees with the relation analogous to (5), and the corresponding T variation, only if T is very low (it being only in this circumstance that the weak long range part of the interaction exercises a controlling influence). However the discrepancy is slight: a $T^{2/3}$ instead of a $T^{1/2}$ variation when T is high.

¹J. Troe, *J. Chem. Phys.* **66**, 4758 (1977).

²D. R. Bates, *J. Phys. B* **12**, 4135 (1979) and **13**, 2147 (1980).

³E. Herbst, *J. Chem. Phys.* **72**, 5284 (1980).

⁴A. Dalgarno in *Interactions between Ions and Molecules*, edited by P. Ausloos (Plenum, New York, 1974), p. 341.

⁵D. R. Bates, *Proc. Roy. Soc. London Ser. A* **360**, 1 (1978).

COMMENTS

The significance of Weinhold's length

Peter Salamon

Department of Mathematics, Arizona State University, Tempe, Arizona 85281

Bjarne Andresen

Physics Laboratory II, H. C. Ørsted Institute, Copenhagen, Denmark

Paul D. Gait

Physical Chemistry Laboratory, Oxford University, Oxford, England

R. Stephen Berry

Université de Paris-Sud, Orsay, France and Department of Chemistry, The University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois 60637

(Received 10 March 1980; accepted 8 April 1980)

Weinhold¹ proposed that a metric for the space of thermodynamic states is $\eta_{ij} = \partial^2 U / \partial X_i \partial X_j$, where X_i and X_j are extensive variables. Here we present an interpretation of the physical significance of this quantity as a metric, and clarify the two different ways in which η_{ij} has been used. The usual interpretation² of η_{ij} is as a second fundamental form, giving the "distance" between the surface of energy U , a function of the extensive variables $X_1 = S, X_2, \dots, X_n$,

$$U = U(X_1, \dots, X_n), \quad (1)$$

and the plane tangent to this surface at U_0 , where η_{ij} is evaluated. Thus, for a displacement of the system from the state specified by X_1^0, \dots, X_n^0 to the state at X_1, \dots, X_n , the difference between U and the plane tangent to U at U_0 , is, to second order,

$$U - U_0 = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j} \frac{\partial^2 U}{\partial X_i \partial X_j} (X_i - X_i^0)(X_j - X_j^0). \quad (2)$$

Because the value of this form is the "distance" between the point (X_1, \dots, X_n, U) and the tangent plane, it can be identified as the availability of the system that can come from its displaced state into equilibrium with an environment at (X_1^0, \dots, X_n^0) .³ In this regard, η_{ij} is a second fundamental form.

Weinhold showed¹ that the laws of thermodynamics assure that η_{ij} also has the positivity required of a metric or first fundamental form on the surface of thermodynamic states.⁴ This property enabled him to re-

derive thermodynamic relations using simple geometric arguments.

Equation (2) shows that the length computed with η_{ij} treated as a second fundamental form is the availability. More precisely, when the displacements $(X_i - X_i^0)$ are small enough for Eq. (2) to hold, *as they are for fluctuations*, $\frac{1}{2} \sum \eta_{ij} (X_i - X_i^0)(X_j - X_j^0)$ gives the availability. This is the well-established physical interpretation of η_{ij} taken locally, i.e., in the vicinity of a single point on the surface.

Next we examine the physical significance of the lengths of paths based on η_{ij} as a metric taken globally. This interpretation follows from the general relation between length and metric, and from using η_{ij} as Weinhold does, as a first fundamental form. We shall see that the result is a change of velocity characteristic of the type of path.

Consider for simplicity a system of one component so $X_1 = S$ and $X_2 = V$ are the only independent extensive variables. Suppose further that the trajectory of the system is given parametrically as $S = S(\xi)$, $V = V(\xi)$. Then the length of the path from the state p_0, V_0 to p_1, V_1 is

$$L = \int_0^1 \left[\eta_{11} \left(\frac{dS}{d\xi} \right)^2 + 2\eta_{12} \frac{dS}{d\xi} \frac{dV}{d\xi} + \eta_{22} \left(\frac{dV}{d\xi} \right)^2 \right]^{1/2} d\xi. \quad (3)$$

Dimensionally, L is the square root of energy, or, if U is given as specific energy (energy per unit mass), then L has the dimensions of velocity.

To illustrate what L is, consider an ideal gas, for which

$$\eta = \begin{bmatrix} T/C_v & -p/C_v \\ -p/C_v & \gamma p/V \end{bmatrix},$$

the heat capacities are constant, $C_p - C_v = R$ and $C_p/C_v = \gamma$. For convenience, we define $\theta = mC_v/R$, half the number of quadratic degrees of freedom apart from the particle mass scaling factor m . A reversible or endoreversible⁵ process at constant volume gives

$$L^{(v)} = \int_0^1 \left[\frac{T}{C_v} \right]^{1/2} dS \\ = 2\sqrt{C_v} [\sqrt{T_1} - \sqrt{T_0}] = 2\sqrt{\frac{\theta}{3}} [v_1^2{}^{1/2} - v_0^2{}^{1/2}].$$

Note that v_1 and v_0 are gas-kinetic velocities at T_1 and T_0 , respectively. A reversible process at constant pressure gives

$$L^{(p)} = \int_0^1 \left[\frac{T}{C_v} \left[\frac{C_p}{V} \right]^2 \left(\frac{\partial V}{\partial \xi} \right)^2 - \frac{2p}{C_v} \frac{C_p}{V} \left(\frac{\partial V}{\partial \xi} \right)^2 + \frac{\gamma p}{V} \left(\frac{\partial V}{\partial \xi} \right)^2 \right]^{1/2} d\xi \\ = \int_0^1 \left(\frac{\gamma}{\gamma-1} \right)^{1/2} \sqrt{\frac{p}{V}} dV \\ = 2\sqrt{C_p} [\sqrt{T_1} - \sqrt{T_0}] = 2\sqrt{\frac{\theta+1}{3}} [v_1^2{}^{1/2} - v_0^2{}^{1/2}],$$

where we assume $C_p = (\theta+1)R/m$.

A reversible process at constant temperature gives $L=0$, as expected because U is a function only of T .

A reversible adiabatic process gives

$$L^{(s)} = \int_0^1 \left[\frac{\gamma p}{V} \left(\frac{\partial V}{\partial \xi} \right)^2 \right]^{1/2} d\xi = \frac{2}{\gamma-1} \sqrt{\gamma p_0 V_0} \left[1 - \left(\frac{p_1}{p_0} \right)^{(\gamma-1)/2\gamma} \right],$$

which is the change in flow velocity of a gas undergoing

an isentropic expansion, e.g., in a rarefaction wave.⁶ In general, L is a change in a mean velocity, but characteristic of the constraints defining the path of the integral along which the length is measured. Incidentally for a solid whose equation of state is $V = V_0[1 + \alpha(T - T_0) - kp]$, $\eta_{11} = T/C_v$ as for the ideal gas, $\eta_{12} = \alpha T/kC_v$, and $\eta_{22} = (\alpha^2 T/kC_v) + 1/V_0 k$. The length L for an isochoric process is the same as for the gas; the length L for an isentropic process is of the form $L = \int [At + B]^{1/2} dV$.

We wish to thank Michael Mozurkewich for reading the manuscript.

¹(a) F. Weinhold, *J. Chem. Phys.* **63**, 2479 (1975); (b) *ibid.* **65**, 559 (1976).

²P. Salamon, Doctoral Dissertation, The University of Chicago (1978) discusses this point specifically; standard texts on differential geometry, such as M. M. Lipschutz, *Differential Geometry* (McGraw-Hill, New York, 1969) or W. C. Graustein, *Differential Geometry* (Dover, New York, 1966), give general discussions of first and second fundamental forms. L. Tisza, *Generalized Thermodynamics* (MIT, Cambridge, Mass., 1966) discusses the subject and designates η_{ij} as the "stiffness" form.

³J. W. Gibbs, *Collected Works*, Vol. 1 (Yale Univ., New Haven, 1948); J. H. Keenan, *Thermodynamics* (MIT, Cambridge, Mass., 1970).

⁴The positivity of η fails at phase transitions; where these occur, there are lines along which η vanishes, which correspond to transformation of material from one phase to another without disrupting the equilibrium between system and environment. For further discussion see Ref. 1(b).

⁵"Endoreversible" is a term introduced by M. Rubin, *Phys. Rev. A* **19**, 1272 (1979) to characterize a thermodynamic system whose working substance undergoes reversible transformations, independent of whether the system is in equilibrium with its surroundings.

⁶E. F. Greene and J. P. Toennies, *Chemical Reactions in Shock Waves* (Edward Arnold, London, 1969), p. 109.

Comment on the structure of a simple liquid solvent near a *n*-butane solute molecule^{a)}

Lawrence R. Pratt

Department of Chemistry, University of California at Berkeley, Berkeley, California 94720

Robert O. Rosenberg and Bruce J. Berne

Department of Chemistry, Columbia University, New York, New York 10027

David Chandler

School of Chemical Sciences, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois 61801

(Received 18 March 1980; accepted 7 April 1980)

The purpose of this comment is to discuss the distribution of solvent molecules around two different conformations of an *n*-butane solute molecule. In a recent pair of publications,^{1,2} we have reported computer sim-

ulation results for a fluid containing one model *n*-butane solute species and 123 Lennard-Jones solvent particles chosen to mimic liquid CCl₄. The work presented here extends those studies by examining the distribution of