

British Association for the Advancement
of Science

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE

APPOINTED FOR THE PURPOSE OF CONSIDERING
THE SUBJECT OF

ELECTROLYSIS

IN ITS PHYSICAL AND CHEMICAL BEARINGS

From the BRITISH ASSOCIATION'S REPORT, 1886

Printed by
SPOTTISWOODE & CO., NEW-STREET SQUARE, LONDON

1887.



U 13621-44

11/1

Report of the Committee, consisting of Professors ARMSTRONG and LODGE (Secretaries), Sir WILLIAM THOMSON, Lord RAYLEIGH, Professors SCHUSTER, POYNTING, J. J. THOMSON, FITZGERALD, CRUM BROWN, RAMSAY, FRANKLAND, TILDEN, HARTLEY, McLEOD, CAREY FOSTER, ROBERTS-AUSTEN, RÜCKER, REINOLD, and S. P. THOMPSON, Captain ABNEY, Drs. GLADSTONE, HOPKINSON, and FLEMING, and Messrs. W. N. SHAW, H. B. DIXON, J. T. BOTTOMLEY, W. CROOKES, SHELFORD BIDWELL, and J. LARMOR, appointed for the purpose of considering the subject of Electrolysis in its Physical and Chemical bearings.—Edited by OLIVER LODGE.

THE members of the Committee have communicated with each other by correspondence, and have individually undertaken the investigation of various points more or less closely bearing on the subject, some of which were specified by the present editor at the conclusion of a paper on Electrolysis, printed in the annual volume for last year. (See page 765.)

The sum of 20*l.* granted to the Committee has been expended, partly in providing chemicals and simple appliances for experiments, and partly in printing and circulating various interim communications, to wit, letters among the members and letters received from foreign philosophers.

The work of the Committee is greatly facilitated by being thus able freely to communicate on matters of interest; and, inasmuch as it is thought desirable to continue this practice, and also to experiment on material of special purity, a somewhat larger grant is asked for this year. Some of the work undertaken by the members is only recently begun, and not yet reported on, but that concerning which an account has been communicated to the Committee is here appended, together with a few abstracts and translations of foreign memoirs, which it seemed desirable to bring together in an accessible form.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
1. Mr. THOMAS GRAY, On Silver and Copper Voltameters. Communicated by Sir William Thomson (reference only)	308
2. Professor ARMSTRONG, On Electrolytic Conduction and Residual Affinity (reference only).	308
3. Professor McLEOD, On Ozone formed in Electrolysis (reference only).	308
4. Professor J. J. THOMSON, On Ohm's Law in bad Conductors (note)	308
5. Dr. JOHN HOPKINSON, On Continuity of Electric Conduction (letter and abstract)	309
6. Mr. SHELFORD BIDWELL, On Thermancy and Electrolytic Conductivity	309

	PAGE
7. Dr. ARRHENIUS, Letters on Electrolysis. Communicated by the Editor . . .	310
8. Professor FITZGERALD and Mr. TROUTON, On Ohm's Law in Electrolytes . . .	312
9. Professor S. P. THOMPSON, On the Electric Resistance of Magnetite . . .	314
10. Dr. ARRHENIUS, On Conductivity of Acid Mixtures . . .	315
11. Mr. W. N. SHAW, On Verification of Faraday's Law for Silver and Copper . . .	318
12. Mr. T. C. FITZPATRICK, On the application of Alternate Currents to Conductivity Determination. Communicated by Mr. W. N. Shaw . . .	328
13. Professor F. KOHLRAUSCH, On the Conductivity of Electrolytes (abstract by Mr. Love) . . .	334
14. Dr. LODGE, Appendix to the same . . .	337
15. M. E. BOUTY, Criticism on Professor Kohlrausch's Memoir . . .	339
16. Professor F. KOHLRAUSCH, Letter on the above criticism, <i>et ceteris</i> . . .	341
17. Dr. ARRHENIUS, On Viscosity and Conduction: Conductivity of Jelly . . .	344
18. M. BOUTY, On Polarisation and Conductivity (abstract by the Editor) . . .	348
19. M. BOUTY, On the Conductivity of very dilute Salt Solutions (abstract by the Editor) . . .	350
20. MM BOUTY and FOUSSEREAU, On the use of Alternating Currents in Measuring Conductivity . . .	356
21. M. BOUTY, On Mechanical and Thermal Effects accompanying Electrolysis (abstract by the Editor) . . .	357
22. Dr. ARRHENIUS (first part), On the Conductivity of Electrolytes (analysis by the Editor) . . .	357
23. Dr. ARRHENIUS (second part), A Chemical Theory of Electrolytes (abstract and translation by the Editor) . . .	362
24. Dr. ARRHENIUS, Letter respecting the above criticism. Communicated by the Editor, with a foot-note . . .	384
25. Dr. ARRHENIUS, Letter on the Relations between Conductivity and Viscosity. Communicated by the Editor . . .	387
26. Professor WILLARD GIBBS, Letter on Electro-chemical Thermo-dynamics. Communicated by the Editor, with a note . . .	388
27. Dr. OLIVER LODGE, On the Migration of Ions and an Absolute Measure of Ionic Velocity . . .	389

Sir William Thomson communicates to the Committee Mr. Thomas Gray's paper 'On the Electrolysis of Silver and of Copper, and the application of Electrolysis to the Standardising of Electric Current and Potential Meters,' as published in the 'Philosophical Magazine' for November 1886; and remarks that it treats of questions referred to in the rest of the Report, especially to those raised by Mr. Shaw in Table IV. on p. 325.

Professor Armstrong's paper 'On Electrolytic Conduction in relation to Molecular Composition, Valency, and the Nature of Chemical Change: being an attempt to apply a theory of "Residual Affinity,"' is published in the 'Proceedings of the Royal Society,' No. 243, 1886.

Professor McLeod's paper 'On the Electrolysis of Aqueous Solutions of Sulphuric Acid, with special reference to the forms of oxygen obtained,' is to be found in the 'Journal of the Chemical Society' for August 1886, vol. xlix.

Professor J. J. Thomson and Mr. Newall have been working at Cambridge on conduction through very bad conductors, such as olive oil, bisulphide of carbon, paraffin oil, &c. They find that for electromotive forces up to 100 volts these conductors obey Ohm's law. This result, they say, is interesting, since Quincke has lately proved that for very much greater forces these substances do not obey Ohm's law: the

departure from it being very marked. They also find that the conductivity is improved by raising the temperature. A full account of these experiments is to be communicated to the Royal Society shortly.

On Continuity of Electric Conduction. By Dr. JOHN HOPKINSON, F.R.S.

In my experiments on residual charge I touched upon the second question in Dr. Lodge's programme ('Is Ohm's law obeyed by very bad conductors?'),¹ and pointed out that Ohm's law could be regarded as a limiting case of a more general law of superposition. In the case of mechanical after-effects the law of superposition does not hold even approximately. The fourth question ('Is there any relation between optical opacity and electrolytic conductivity?') appears to me to be very intimately associated with the fact that bodies which, if they conducted, would be electrolysed do not follow Maxwell's law, whereas some other insulators do. My own present impression is that an electrical displacement in glass may, although continuous, be roughly divided into four successive stages. 1st. A yielding of the dielectric during a time corresponding to the time of wave-frequency of light, for which $K=2\frac{1}{2}$ about. 2nd. A further yielding during a time corresponding to great absorption below the red, bringing K up to from 6 to 10. 3rd. A further slow yielding, partly recoverable, hardly sensible in time less than a second or such like, and going on with diminishing amount for days. 4th. A yielding corresponding to an actual decomposition of the material. Superposition probably applies to all these continuously connected successive events. Probably if we could experiment fast enough on any ordinary electrolyte, like solution of CuSO_4 , we should find a similar succession of phenomena.

[Dr. Hopkinson's note is of extreme interest, and the references to his papers are as follows: Residual Charge in Leyden Jar, 'Phil. Trans.' January 1877; Strain in Glass Fibre, 'Proc. Roy. Soc.' October 4, 1878; Refractive Index and Specific Inductive Capacity, 'Phil. Mag.' April 1882. This last paper I may abstract thus:—

Maxwell's laws are that $\mu^2=K$, and that transparent bodies must insulate. They are true for mineral oils and solid paraffin; not true for glass, Iceland spar, and organic oils. Consider, for instance, light flint glass: K is 6.7 for disturbances whose period is longer than 10^{-5} second, and for these disturbances it behaves as an insulator. It ought, therefore, for such waves to be transparent, and to have an index 2.6. But, for disturbances of period about 10^{-15} second, its index, reckoned for very long waves by extrapolation formula, comes out about 1.5. Is there any way of accounting for this discrepancy? Yes; perhaps by the known fact that on waves *between* these two periods glass exercises a strong selective absorption, and that this is usually accompanied by anomalous dispersion; which at once renders all empirical reasoning towards the state of things for very long waves, from the observed condition for very short waves, utterly futile and misleading. Perhaps, therefore, Maxwell's law is after all obeyed by these substances for long waves; and one way to test the question is by using rays from a thermopile to a freezing mixture.

O. L.]

On Diathermancy and Electrolytic Conductivity.

By SHELFORD BIDWELL, F.R.S.

The following is one of the questions suggested by Dr. Lodge for the consideration of the Committee on electrolysis:—Is there any relation between optical opacity and electrolytic conductivity?²

Assuming that 'optical opacity' is included in the more comprehensive term 'opacity to radiation,' I have endeavoured to ascertain experimentally whether

¹ See *Brit. Assoc. Report* for 1885, p. 765.

² *Ibid.* p. 768.