

# Heat Capacity in Bits

P. Fraundorf

*Physics & Astronomy, U. Missouri-StL (63121)*

*Physics, Washington U. (63110),*

*St. Louis, MO, USA*

(March 24, 2022)

Information theory this century has clarified the 19th century work of Gibbs, and has shown that natural units for temperature  $kT$ , defined via  $1/T \equiv dS/dE$ , are energy per nat of information uncertainty. This means that (for *any* system) the total thermal energy  $E$  over  $kT$  is the log-log derivative of multiplicity with respect to energy, and (for *all*  $b$ ) the number of base- $b$  units of information lost about the state of the system per  $b$ -fold increase in the amount of thermal energy therein. For “un-inverted” ( $T > 0$ ) systems,  $E/kT$  is also a temperature-averaged heat capacity, equaling “degrees-freedom over two” for the quadratic case. In similar units the work-free differential heat capacity  $C_v/k$  is a “local version” of this log-log derivative, equal to bits of uncertainty gained per 2-fold increase in temperature. This makes  $C_v/k$  (unlike  $E/kT$ ) independent of the energy zero, explaining in statistical terms its usefulness for detecting both phase changes and quadratic modes. From UMStL-CME-94a09pf.

05.70.Ce, 02.50.Wp, 75.10.Hk, 01.55.+b

## I. INTRODUCTION

Those conceptual approaches to a subject that offer both wider applicability, and reduced algorithmic complexity, might be called “deep simplifications”. Minkowski’s approach to special relativity via the metric equation is a classic example. The first impressions of “superfluous erudition”<sup>1</sup> have now been eclipsed, by uses for Minkowski’s perspective in developing general relativity<sup>2</sup> as well as first introductions to space-time<sup>3–5</sup>.

Similarly, the communication-theory insights of Shannon<sup>6</sup> led Jaynes<sup>7</sup> in the middle of this century to clarify the distinction in thermal physics between “describing the dice” (i.e. physical description), and “taking the best guess” (the “gambling theory” part). Thus for example, the 1st through 3rd laws of thermodynamics help “describe the dice”, while the zeroth law, as well as the Boltzmann (canonical) and Gibbs (grand canonical) factors, are “dice-independent” tools of statistical inference<sup>8</sup>. Hence we can (with increasing help from undergraduate texts<sup>9–15</sup>) deepen understanding (including the physical intuition of computer science and biology students on matters of “code”) by disclosing that entropy  $S$  is a measure of statistical uncertainty, expressible using information units as well as in J/K. From this, it follows that temperature (i.e. the reciprocal of uncertainty slope  $1/T \equiv dS/dE$ ) can be measured in units of energy per unit information (e.g. room temperature  $\approx \frac{1}{40}$  eV per nat). Thus heat capacities (i.e.  $dE/dT$ ), normally understood in units of energy per degree Kelvin, may find themselves measured in units of information alone! As we will show, this is part of a larger trend in statistical physics to shift the focus from temperature (or its reciprocal) to the physical dependence of multiplicity (or entropy) on variables conserved in the interaction between complex systems.

But, what is the *physical* meaning of a heat capacity without reference to historical temperature units? Bits of what? An answer to this question (something any student might ask) does not appear to be common knowledge among physics teachers, so we outline an answer here. We show further why total thermal energy over  $kT$  *for any system* serves at once: (i) as the instantaneous exponent of energy in the expression for accessible state multiplicity, (ii) as a measure of the number of bits of (micro-canonical) uncertainty added per two-fold increase in thermal energy, and (iii) *for quadratic systems* as the number of degrees freedom over two.

## II. DESCRIBING THE DICE

The dice of thermal physics are usually physical systems capable of accomodating thermal energy (as well as other quantities that may be conserved, like volume and particles) in a *multiplicity* of ways. This multiplicity is itself the key to understanding, particularly when systems are seen from the (micro-canonical) vantage point of the conserved quantities *per se*. For example, many gases, liquids, and solids behave over some of their temperature range as though multiplicity ( $\Omega$ ) is proportional to  $E^{\frac{\nu N}{2}}$ , where  $E$  is thermal energy,  $N$  is the number of molecules, and  $\nu$  is the number

of ways to store thermal energy per molecule. Such systems are called “quadratic”, since the proportionality results from a “sum of squares” connection between  $E$  and the state coordinates involved in storing energy.

### III. TAKING THE BEST GUESS

Application of gambling theory to physical systems begins with the question: Where might we expect to find a conserved quantity  $X$  which has been randomly (as far as we know) shared between systems for so long that prior information about the whereabouts of  $X$  is irrelevant? In the jargon of the field, this is the same as asking: Where is  $X$  likely to be *after equilibration*?

The science of decision-making in the presence of uncertainty (i.e. statistical inference or “gambling theory”) suggests that the best bet is the distribution of  $X$  that can happen in the most ways, provided there is no reason to prefer one way over another. In the jargon of probability theory, this is the recommendation: Assume equal *a priori* probabilities, when evidence to the contrary is not available.

For example, if systems A and B have a total energy  $E$  to share between them, then the best bet after equilibration will be that value of  $E_A = E - E_B$  that has the largest total multiplicity  $\Omega = \Omega_A \Omega_B$ . Setting to zero the derivative of  $\Omega$  with respect to  $E_A$ , one finds that this maximum requires that  $\frac{1}{\Omega_A} \frac{d\Omega_A}{dE_A} = \frac{1}{\Omega_B} \frac{d\Omega_B}{dE_B}$ , and hence that  $\frac{d(\ln \Omega)}{dE}$  be the same for both systems! These derivatives (and most others in this paper) are taken under “microcanonical constraints”, i.e. they are partial derivatives with other extensive quantities (like volume or number of particles) held constant.

Information theorists, of course, define the logarithm of multiplicity as uncertainty via the equation  $S = k \ln \Omega$ , and measure it in {nats, bits, bytes, or J/K} if  $k$  is  $\{1, \frac{1}{\ln 2}, \frac{1}{\ln 256}, 1.38 \times 10^{-23}\}$ , respectively. Thus the best bet for any two systems sharing a conserved quantity  $X$ , in the absence of information to the contrary, is that  $X$  will rearrange itself between the two systems until each system’s *uncertainty slope* ( $\frac{dS}{dX}$ ) has reached a common value. This is a quantitative version of the zeroth law of thermodynamics, based purely in the science of statistical inference, which applies to *any systems* sharing conserved quantities.

Of course, when energy  $E$  is the quantity shared randomly between systems, the uncertainty slope  $\frac{dS}{dE}$  is the reciprocal temperature or *coldness*  $\frac{1}{T}$ . Hence temperature is a property which signals the propensity of a system for sharing of energy thermally. For example, calculating the uncertainty slope for quadratic systems from the multiplicity given above yields the widely useful equipartition relation:  $\frac{E}{N} = \frac{\nu}{2} kT$ .

When  $V$  is the quantity shared randomly between systems, the uncertainty slope  $\frac{dS}{dV}$  is the *free-expansion coefficient* equal to  $\frac{dS}{dE} \frac{dE}{dV} = \frac{1}{T} \frac{F dx}{A dx} = \frac{P}{T}$  at equilibrium<sup>13</sup>. For an ideal gas,  $\Omega \propto V^N$ . Solving this for  $\frac{dS}{dV}$  yields the ideal gas equation of state  $PV = NkT$ . When  $N$  is the quantity shared randomly, the uncertainty slope  $\frac{dS}{dN}$  is the *chemical affinity*, equal to  $\frac{-\mu}{T}$  at equilibrium. From this, for example, reaction equilibrium constants may be calculated.

This quantitative version of the zeroth law applies to all thermal systems which equilibrate, including spin systems (like magnets) capable of population inversions and hence negative absolute temperatures. Moreover, as a theorem of statistical inference not involving energy at all, it applies also to thermally unequilibrated systems sharing other conserved quantities (even money, for example), provided the only prior information we have is how the multiplicity of ways that quantity can be distributed depends on the amount of that conserved quantity to begin with! If we have other kinds of information, such as knowledge of a system’s temperature but not its total energy, then the broader class of maximum entropy strategies in statistical inference (e.g. the canonical and grand ensembles) predict the distribution of outcomes we can expect there as well.

### IV. THERMAL ENERGY OVER KT

A closer look shows that the statistical definition of temperature above can be rewritten as:

$$\frac{1}{kT} \equiv \frac{\partial(\ln \Omega)}{\partial E} = \left\{ \frac{\partial(\ln \Omega)}{\partial(\ln E)} \right\} \frac{1}{E}. \quad (1)$$

The quantity in curly brackets is the log-log derivative of multiplicity with respect to thermal energy. We can also think of this as the “instantaneous exponent” of energy in the expression of multiplicity as energy to some power, or as the slope of the multiplicity versus energy curve on a log-log plot.

Rearranging the equation yields something that looks very much like the familiar equipartition theorem, except that the relation applies to all thermal systems under conditions of maximum ignorance (i.e. at equilibrium):

$$\frac{E}{kT} = E \frac{\partial(S/k)}{\partial E} = E \frac{\partial \ln \Omega}{\partial E} \equiv \xi \stackrel{E \geq 0}{=} \left\{ \frac{\partial \ln \Omega}{\partial \ln E} \right\} = \left\{ \frac{\partial(\log_b \Omega)}{\partial(\log_b E)} \right\} \forall b \in \{R+\}. \quad (2)$$

For quadratic systems, it is easy to see that our log-log derivative is nothing more than half the number of degrees of freedom ( $\frac{\nu N}{2}$ ). For any system, however,  $\xi$  measures the instantaneous energy exponent, as well as the number of *nats* of information lost about the state of the system per *e*-fold increase in thermal energy of the system. The last term in the equality string simply notes that the value is independent of the base  $b$  of the logarithms used, provided the same base is used in numerator and denominator. Thus we can also think of  $\xi$  as the number of bits of information lost per 2-fold increase in thermal energy, or more generally the number of base- $b$  units of information lost per  $b$ -fold increase in thermal energy. In our search for the meaning of heat capacity in natural units, this is our first big clue.

Before we move on, we should also point out something that applies if our energy origin has been chosen so that  $E \rightarrow 0$  as  $T \rightarrow 0$ , something we *might* expect for a measure of thermal energy. In terms of the no-work (e.g. constant volume) heat-capacity  $C_v \equiv \frac{\partial E}{\partial T}$ , we can write:

$$\xi = \frac{E}{kT} = \frac{1}{kT} \int_0^T C_v dT \stackrel{T \geq 0}{=} \frac{1}{k\Delta T} \int_0^T C_v dT \equiv \left\langle \frac{C_v}{k} \right\rangle, \quad (3)$$

with the middle equality applying only for systems NOT in a population inversion, so that absolute temperature  $T > 0$  and  $\Delta T = T - 0 = T$ . Thus when absolute temperature is positive,  $\xi$  is a *heat capacity average* over temperatures ranging between  $T$  and absolute zero.

We've shown here that the log-log derivative of multiplicity, with respect to energy, has a simple information theoretic interpretation, and is elegantly given in natural units by  $\frac{E}{kT}$  as well. From the perspective of an experimentalist, however, it has one glaring disadvantage: *It's numeric value depends on our choice for the zero of thermal energy.*

To illustrate the problem, consider the cooling of water until it becomes ice. As water cools initially, the temperature drop per unit energy removed is roughly constant. One might easily say: "This looks like a quadratic system with about 18 degrees of freedom per molecule", so  $\xi$  must be about 9 bits per 2-fold increase in thermal energy. Then, at the freezing point, the temperature stops dropping as energy continues to be removed, suggesting a quadratic system with nearly infinite degrees of freedom! Once all is frozen, of course, temperature continues its drop, this time suggesting a quadratic system with about 8 degrees of freedom per molecule, or  $\xi$  closer to 4 bits per 2-fold increase in thermal energy! Since  $kT$  may change little during this experiment, how can  $E/kT$  be jumping around so much?

The answer of course is that these inference follow not by measuring total energy  $E$ , but only changes in energy. Moreover, in the process our preferred zero of thermal energy has been shifting about. We can see the effects of this more explicitly if we plot energy versus temperature for water, as shown in the lower left panel of Figure 1. The question then is, can we modify our estimate for the log-log derivative of thermal energy so as to reflect only data on temperature changes over a limited energy range? Such a quantity might allow us to probe the ways that thermal energy is being accomodated specifically, one energy range at a time.

## V. INSTANTANEOUS HEAT CAPACITIES

The no-work (e.g. constant volume) instantaneous heat capacity, in natural units, can be written in terms above as:

$$\frac{C_v}{k} \equiv \frac{\partial E}{k \partial T} = \frac{\partial}{\partial T} [\xi T] = \left[ 1 + T \frac{\partial}{\partial T} \right] \xi = T \frac{\partial \ln \Omega}{\partial T} = T \frac{\partial (S/k)}{\partial T}. \quad (4)$$

Here  $T$  is absolute temperature in any units you like, and the partials are taken with work parameters (like volume) held constant.

This quantity has an interesting property. If we define thermal energy  $E$  as a difference between total energy  $U$  and a specified "zero thermal energy" origin  $U_o$ , i.e. as  $E \equiv U - U_o$ , then it is easy to see that  $C_v \equiv \frac{\partial E}{\partial T}$  is independent of our choice for  $U_o$ . Thus, although  $\xi$  obviously depends on one's choice of  $U_o$ ,  $C_v$  does not.

To see what  $C_v$  actually measures, let's suppose that we have a quadratic system whose multiplicity obeys  $\Omega = \left( \frac{U - U_1}{\varepsilon_o} \right)^{\frac{\nu N}{2}}$ . It then follows simply that  $\frac{S}{k} = \frac{\nu N}{2} \ln \left( \frac{U - U_1}{\varepsilon_o} \right)$ ,  $\frac{\partial S}{\partial E} = \frac{\nu N}{2(U - U_1)}$ ,  $\frac{U - U_1}{kT} = \frac{\nu N}{2} = \frac{C_v}{k}$ . Thus  $\frac{C_v}{k}$  estimates not  $\frac{U}{kT}$  but  $\frac{U - U_1}{kT}$ , where  $U_1$  is the "true origin" of thermal energy for this quadratic system. This is illustrated in Figure 2, which plots for an ideal monatomic gas (the classical quadratic system) the same quantities plotted for water in Fig. 1. If the system is not simply quadratic (e.g. if it has phase changes, modes of energy storage which freeze out, etc.), then  $\frac{C_v}{k}$  is simply a local estimate of thermal energy over  $kT$ , under the quadratic assumption. Thus  $\frac{C_v}{k}$  modifies the log-log derivative of multiplicity with respect to energy, by combining it with its rate of increase per *e*-fold change in temperature, to yield an estimate of  $\frac{U - U_1}{kT}$ , where  $U_1$  is a zero of thermal energy determined by assuming that the locally-measured log-log derivative of multiplicity is constant down to  $T = 0$ .

This observation also provides a different perspective on the mechanism by which heat capacity blows up during a phase change. Thermal energy over  $kT$  (or the log-log derivative of multiplicity) of course should have no singularities in it, since both energy and  $\frac{1}{kT}$  are expected to be finite for finite systems. It is thus the 2nd term in the two-term expression for heat capacity above, namely the temperature derivative, that provides the instability. Discontinuous shifts in the locally-inferred energy zero ( $U_1$ ) on which heat capacity is based during a phase change thus, via this second term, also cause heat capacity to become singular.

Returning to Figure 1, this raises the interesting question: *Does the thermal energy of steam increase, decrease, or go negative, when it condenses to water?* From the above, we can see that it of course decreases (perhaps even goes negative) if one's "zero of thermal energy" is held constant, since steam loses the latent heat of vaporization when it condenses, bringing its total energy down. However, because the specific heat of water at boiling is higher than that for steam, energy of random motion measured with respect to our locally-inferred zero of thermal energy (e.g. at 100C) actually goes up! In other words, a small part of the binding energy, liberated when water molecules fall into the potential well of their neighbors, goes to /em increase the energy of random motion in the condensed phase relative to that available to particles in uncondensed gas!

## VI. BEYOND EQUIPARTITION

The observations above suggest that introductory texts might consider highlighting  $\frac{C_v}{k}$  per molecule in natural units for common substances, with no apology for the fact that it is near but not exactly half-integral in many cases. After all, thermal energy may not have the same access to all molecules, all of the time. This quantity nonetheless provides deep insight into the relationship between uncertainty and thermal energy.

In shifting the focus from historical temperature units to the multiplicities which underlie our inferences, we can say that both  $\xi$  and  $\frac{C_v}{k}$  measure bits of uncertainty per 2-fold increase in energy for *all* physical systems, with respect to their respective choices for energy origin. In this sense, they represent physical quantities like degrees freedom, but with wider applicability. After all, *degrees freedom* presumes not only multiplicities that are linear with energy on a log-log plot (like a high-temperature Einstein solid), but it also presumes quadratic energies (i.e. energies proportional to a sum of squares of some "randomly-occupied" coordinates of state). The idea that "every active coordinate gets  $\frac{kT}{2}$ ", as we show below, even more strongly resists extension to systems with one or more entropy maxima. We begin, however, with a non-quadratic example of less drastic proportion.

### A. Debye Solids

The Debye heat capacity of a solid is one case where  $\frac{C_v}{k}$  depends strongly on temperature<sup>9</sup>. In the Debye low temperature limit, one has  $E = \frac{6N}{2} \frac{\pi^4 T^3}{5\theta^3} kT$ , so that  $\xi = \frac{6N}{2} \frac{\pi^4 T^3}{5\theta^3}$ , while  $\frac{C_v}{k} = \frac{6N}{2} \left( \frac{\pi^4 T^3}{5\theta^3} + T \frac{3\pi^4 T^2}{5\theta^3} \right) = 4 \frac{6N}{2} \frac{\pi^4 T^3}{5\theta^3}$ . Here of course,  $\theta$  is the Debye temperature related to the density and speed of sound in the solid. Note that in this limit, only a quarter of  $\frac{C_v}{k}$  comes from equipartition ( $\frac{E}{kT}$ ), the remaining three quarters from the time derivative of  $\frac{E}{kT}$  (in effect, from the unfreezing of new modes of energy accomodation). As you can see from Figure 1, such unfreezing is associated with a lowering of the thermal energy zero locally referenced by the heat capacity. Thus attempts to infer  $\xi$  from the heat capacity by assuming that  $\xi \simeq \frac{C_v}{k}$  yield a 4-fold overestimate of the number of degrees of freedom! This overestimate decreases as temperatures work themselves up to and beyond the Debye temperature  $\theta$  of the solid, as illustrated in Figure 1 for temperatures well above  $\theta$ . There in the high temperature limit,  $\xi \simeq \frac{C_v}{k} \simeq 3N$ , as one expects from a classical lattice model above with  $\Omega \propto E^{3N}$ .

### B. Two-State Paramagnets

A system more challenging to the traditional interpretation of "degrees freedom" is that for a system of  $N$  half-integral spins (i.e. a two-state paramagnet) of orientation energy  $\varepsilon$ . I like it because, as Dan Schroeder says<sup>14</sup>, "it forces us to think primarily in terms of entropy rather than temperature". Begin with any system whose energy-storing coordinates (e.g. displacements in a potential field) in practice have an upper limit on the amount of energy they'll accomodate. As long as energy is low enough that no single coordinate approaches the maximum value, then we may well find behavior very much like that of the systems discussed above.

However, when individual coordinate energies begin to approach their maximum (this happens quickly for two-state paramagnets whose coordinates accomodate but one unit of energy), things change fundamentally. In particular, there

will be but one way (neglecting degeneracies) for the system to store the maximum amount of energy (namely when each of the coordinates is fully energized). With but one way to accomodate either minimum energy or maximum energy, multiplicities will approach 1 at both endpoints of the continuum. Since large systems may have many ways to store intermediate amounts of energy, multiplicity (and entropy) as a function of system energy will have a maximum (or *maxima*) somewhere between. At such maxima,  $\frac{dS}{dE} \equiv \frac{1}{kT}$  will be zero, while on their high-energy side  $\frac{dS}{dE} \equiv \frac{1}{kT}$  will be negative (signaling “population-inverted” states not accessible by thermal contact with reservoirs at positive absolute temperature).

Taylor-expanding to second order about the energy ( $E_{S \max}$ ) of such multiplicity maxima gives  $S(E)$  in the neighborhood as  $S(E_{S \max}) + \frac{1}{2}A(E - E_{S \max})^2$ , where  $A \equiv \left(\frac{d^2S}{dE^2}\right)_{E=E_{S \max}} < 0$ . Hence for energies near  $E_{S \max}$ ,  $\frac{dS}{dE} \equiv \frac{1}{kT} \simeq A(E - E_{S \max})$ . Thus deviations from  $E_{S \max}$  are negative at positive absolute temperature, and (for small deviations at least) are proportional to reciprocal temperature  $\beta \equiv \frac{1}{kT}$ , as illustrated in Figure 3. Of course, this law was discovered by Pierre Curie in experimental study of magnetization, and bears his name.

For two-state paramagnets,  $A = -\frac{1}{N\varepsilon_B^2}$  and  $E_{S \max} = \frac{N\varepsilon_B}{2}$ , where  $\varepsilon_B$  is the energy of alignment per spin (magnetic moment times magnetic field strength). Thus for  $E$  near  $E_{S \max}$ ,  $\frac{C_v}{k} \simeq N\varepsilon_B^2\beta^2 > 0$ , while  $\frac{E - E_{S \max}}{kT} \simeq -N\varepsilon_B^2\beta < 0$ . Since  $\beta$  for these systems may be positive or negative,  $\xi$  will be negative for some  $\beta$  values regardless of our choice of the thermal energy zero! Although negative “degrees freedom” may cause discomfort for some, a negative value for  $\xi$  should disturb no one since, to paraphrase a related comment by Schroeder<sup>14</sup>, there’s no law of physics guaranteeing that there will not be fewer ways to distribute energy, as more energy is added.

In fact, as we now know, temperature and reciprocal temperature are simply different forms for the Lagrange multiplier that characterizes a system’s willingness to share thermal energy<sup>7,8</sup>. Systems, like these spin systems, capable of taking on (and sharing energy from) negative absolute temperature states show clearly that for them reciprocal temperature has more fundamental significance, and that the “absolute zeros” of temperature (approached from negative or positive directions) are indeed at opposite ends of a continuum<sup>16</sup>. But if reciprocal temperature is more fundamental, our instantaneous no-work heat capacity should be no less simply connected to the log-log derivative via reciprocal temperature. Rearrangement of the equation above shows that indeed this is the case.

$$\frac{C_v}{k} = -\beta^2 \frac{\partial E}{\partial \beta} = -\beta^2 \frac{\partial}{\partial \beta} \left[ \left\{ \frac{\partial \ln \Omega}{\partial \ln E} \right\} \frac{1}{\beta} \right] = \left[ 1 - \beta \frac{\partial}{\partial \beta} \right] \left\{ \frac{\partial (\ln \Omega)}{\partial (\ln E)} \right\} = -\beta \frac{\partial \ln \Omega}{\partial \beta} = -\beta \frac{\partial (S/k)}{\partial \beta}. \quad (5)$$

Had we historically adopted as our measure of “willingness to share energy” some other power of the uncertainty slope, say  $\gamma \equiv \beta^a$  where  $a \neq -1$ , the instantaneous heat capacity would have remained proportional to the log-log derivative of multiplicity with respect to that measure as well.

This version of the relation now lets us simplify our perspective on entropy maxima. In the continuum (Stirling) approximation for spin system accessible states  $\Omega$ , and measuring energy from the “low-energy side”, equation (1) yields  $E \simeq N\varepsilon/(1 + e^x)$  where  $x \equiv \varepsilon/kT$ , so that  $\frac{E}{kT} = Nx/(1 + e^x)$  and  $\frac{C_v}{k} = [x/(1 + e^x)]^2 e^x N$ . Here of course,  $\varepsilon/kT$  takes on positive and negative values, ranging from around  $+\ln(N)$  to  $-\ln(N)$  respectively for orientation energies  $E$  with allowed values from 0 to  $N\varepsilon$ . As you can see from the plot in Fig. 3, again  $\frac{C_v}{k}$  overestimates  $\frac{E}{kT}$  at low temperatures (high values of  $\varepsilon/kT$ ), although the estimate becomes exact when  $\varepsilon/kT$  decreases to around  $x \equiv \frac{\varepsilon}{kT} \cong 1.279$  (the solution of  $e^{-x} = x - 1$ ). After this  $\frac{C_v}{k}$  underestimates  $\frac{E}{kT}$ , which begins to decrease as  $x$  decreases and  $T$  increases from this point.

All of this switches again when  $\frac{\varepsilon}{kT}$  passes through zero, since  $\frac{C_v}{k}$  remains positive while the change in uncertainty per  $e$ -fold increase in energy ( $\frac{E}{kT} \equiv \xi$ ) becomes negative since uncertainty about the system state *decreases* with added energy past this point. Also, of course, average heat capacity goes to zero and no longer equals  $\frac{E}{kT}$ , since the average must be obtained piecewise when temperature (unlike reciprocal temperature) breaches the discontinuity from plus infinity to minus infinity. Thus in addition to information units for heat capacity, we gain from this approach a way to visualize the limits of equipartition, and minimize consternation over negative degrees of freedom (e.g. for spin and virial systems) as well.

## VII. SUMMARY

In short, we’ve looked here at natural (as distinct from historical) units for the common thermodynamic quantities, so that we might explore the possibility that common uses of  $T$  and  $1/T$ , as measures of “willingness to share thermal energy”, have inherited their present emphasis partly because they predate our present understanding of multiplicity (the  $W$  in  $S = k \ln W$  on Josiah Willard Gibbs’s tombstone). Heat capacity is a particularly knotty concept in this regard, since for most of us it has always been a change in energy “per degree Kelvin”. In fundamental units, if heat

capacity has any dimensions at all they are those of the base- $b$  information units, since “change in energy per unit change in energy per bit” leaves us with nothing but bits in the bargain.

We point out a simple interpretation for the result, namely that thermal energy  $E$ , divided by temperature  $T \equiv \frac{\partial E}{\partial S} \equiv \beta^{-1}$ , is fundamentally  $\frac{E}{kT} \equiv E \frac{\partial S}{\partial E}$ , i.e. the log-log derivative of multiplicity with respect to energy (e.g. a measure of the bits of uncertainty increase per two-fold increase in energy). The instantaneous no-work heat capacity in this context is  $\frac{C_v}{k} \equiv T \frac{\partial S}{\partial T} = -\beta \frac{\partial S}{\partial \beta}$ , an estimate of  $\frac{E}{kT}$  with an energy-zero inferred from the “local slope” of the log-log plot. We show that these two quantities bear a simple relationship to each other, regardless of the variable (e.g.  $T$  or  $\frac{1}{kT}$ ) chosen to keep track of a system’s willingness to share energy thermally.

The former of the quantities, namely  $\frac{E}{kT}$ , plays the role of “degrees freedom over two” in quadratic systems, but is dependent on the energy zero, and regardless can take on negative values in systems with entropy maxima. Its limitations are those of the concept of equipartition itself. The latter quantity, namely  $\frac{C_v}{k}$ , provides deep insight into the ways a system accomodates *new* thermal energy. Because these quantities are defined in terms of state multiplicity and the conserved variable being shared (in this case energy), and relatively independent of the form chosen for the Lagrange multiplier in the problem (e.g. temperature in historical units), their *analogs* in problems that involve the sharing of other conserved quantities (e.g. volume, particles, or even dollars) may be easier to recognize and put to use as well.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work has benefited indirectly from support by the U.S. Department of Energy, the Missouri Research Board, as well as Monsanto and MEMC Electronic Materials Companies. It has benefited most, however, from the interest and support of students at UM-St. Louis.

- 
- <sup>1</sup> cf. **Einstein’s 1912 Manuscript on the Special Theory: A Facsimile** (Braziller, Inc., 1996), p. 34.
- <sup>2</sup> A. Einstein, Introduction to the monograph form of “Die Grundlage der allgemeinen Relativitatstheorie”, *Annalen der Physik* **49**, 1916, 50.
- <sup>3</sup> E. F. Taylor, “The Boundaries of Nature, Special and General Relativity and Quantum Mechanics: A Second Course in Physics,” Oersted Medal Lecture, *The American Journal of Physics* **66**, 369-376 (May 1998).
- <sup>4</sup> J. S. Bell, “How to teach special relativity”, in *The Speakable and Unspeakable in Quantum Mechanics*, (Cambridge University Press, 1987).
- <sup>5</sup> cf. P. Fraundorf, “Teaching Newton with Anticipation...”, *physics/9710013* (xxx.lanl.gov archive, Los Alamos NM, 1997).
- <sup>6</sup> C. E. Shannon, *Bell System Tech. J.* **27**, 379, 623 (1949); these papers are reprinted in C. E. Shannon and W. Weaver, **The Mathematical Theory of Communication** (University of Illinois Press, Urbana, 1949).
- <sup>7</sup> cf. E. T. Jaynes, *Phys. Rev.* **106**, 620-630 (1957) and *Phys. Rev.* **108**, 171-190 (1957).
- <sup>8</sup> cf. Michael Plischke and Birger Bergersen, **Equilibrium Statistical Physics**, (Prentice Hall, 1989), Chapter 2.
- <sup>9</sup> L. A. Girifalco, **Statistical Physics of Materials** (Wiley and Sons, New York, 1973), p. 72.
- <sup>10</sup> C. Kittel and H. Kroemer, **Thermal Physics** (W. H. Freeman, New York, 1980), p. 39.
- <sup>11</sup> K. Stowe, **Introduction to Statistical Mechanics and Thermodynamics** (Wiley & Sons, New York, 1984), p. 116.
- <sup>12</sup> David S. Betts and Roy. E. Turner, **Introductory Statistical Mechanics**, (Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1992).
- <sup>13</sup> Claude Garrod, **Statistical Mechanics and Thermodynamics**, (Oxford University Press, 1995).
- <sup>14</sup> Daniel V. Schroeder, **An Introduction to Thermal Physics** (to be published by Addison-Wesley, 1999).
- <sup>15</sup> R. Serway and R. Beichner, **Physics for Scientists and Engineers, 5th edition** (to be published by Saunders College Publishing, Philadelphia, 2000).
- <sup>16</sup> cf. Castle, Emmenish, Henkes, Miller and Rayne, **Science by degrees: Temperature from 0 to 0**, (Walker and Co., Westinghouse Search Book Series, 1965).

FIG. 1. Plot of  $E$  versus  $kT$  (lower left),  $C_v/k$  versus  $E/kT$  (upper right), and the entropy plots whose slopes associate therewith (see text), for a steam, water, and Debye-model ice system ( $T_{Debye} = 333\text{K}$  assuming sound speed near  $3500[\text{m/s}]$ ) at 1 atmosphere. This plot illustrates the use of physical (as distinct from historical) temperature units, and of dimensionless units (base-b information units per b-fold increase in  $T$  or  $E$ ) for specific heat  $C_v/k$  and multiplicity's energy-exponent  $E/kT$ . All quantities are “per molecule” values. Note in particular how the quadratic model “energy of thermal motion” for water *increases* as water condenses from a gas to a liquid. Also note how equipartition applies only far from phase changes and “freeze out” zones, and then only if a fictitious zero for the thermal energy is chosen.

FIG. 2. Plot of  $E$  versus  $kT$  (lower left),  $C_v/k$  versus  $E/kT$  (upper right), and the entropy plots whose slopes associate therewith (see text), for an ideal (Sakur-Tetrode) monatomic 6000-atom argon gas at 1 atmosphere. This figure illustrates the form taken by the plots introduced in Fig. 1, for the case of an ideal “quadratic system”. All quantities are “per atom” values. This system behaves like many physical systems (including low-density gases and Dulong-Petit metals), but only when well away from temperatures where excitation modes are freezing out, or phase changes are imminent. On the “equipartition line” note the single point for  $C_v/k = E/kT = 3/2$ . If the zero of energy is shifted for this system (e.g. by a phase change or by quantum mechanical freezing out of excitation modes), the point stretches into a horizontal line moving between  $E/kT = 0$  and  $E/kT = 3/2$ . This line approaches its limiting value (here  $E/kT = 3/2$ ) by moving rightward (as for liquid water in Fig. 1), or by moving leftward (as for steam in Fig. 1), if the zero of energy is moved, respectively, up or down from its quadratic value.

FIG. 3. Plot of  $E$  versus  $kT$  (lower left),  $C_v/k$  versus  $E/kT$  (upper right), and the entropy plots whose slopes associate therewith (see text), for a two-state paramagnet consisting of 10 non-interacting spins. This differs from the plots in Fig. 1 and 2 in that the two left side plots use  $1/kT$  in place of  $kT$  because of its more natural mapping of inverted and uninverted population states. All quantities are “per spin” values, and of course the energy units  $e_o$  depend on both the spin magnetic moment and the magnetic field. Note in particular how the “equipartition line” seems even less relevant here, even though heat capacity remains positive as reciprocal temperature dips below zero. For virial systems (like a gravity bound gas), negative heat capacities make the concepts of equipartition and degrees-freedom even less apropos, even though the relationships shown here remain intact.

This figure "hcapfig1.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/cond-mat/9711074v2>



This figure "hcapfig2.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/cond-mat/9711074v2>

This figure "hcapfig3.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/cond-mat/9711074v2>