

# On the foundation of thermodynamics by microcanonical thermostatics. The microscopic origin of condensation and phase separations.

D.H.E. Gross

*Hahn-Meitner Institute and Freie Universität Berlin,  
Fachbereich Physik. Glienickerstr. 100; 14109 Berlin, Germany\**

Conventional thermo-statistics address infinite homogeneous systems within the canonical ensemble. However, some 170 years ago the original motivation of thermodynamics was the description of steam engines, i.e. boiling water. Its essential physics is the separation of the gas phase from the liquid. Of course, boiling water is inhomogeneous and as such cannot be treated by conventional thermo-statistics. Then it is not astonishing, that a phase transition of first order is signaled canonically by a Yang-Lee singularity. Thus it is only treated correctly by microcanonical Boltzmann-Planck statistics. This is elaborated in the present paper. It turns out that the Boltzmann-Planck statistics is much richer and gives fundamental insight into statistical mechanics and especially into entropy. This can be done to a far extend rigorously and analytically. The deep and essential difference between “extensive” and “intensive” control parameters, i.e. microcanonical and canonical statistics, is exemplified by rotating, self-gravitating systems. In this paper the necessary appearance of a convex entropy  $S(E)$  and the negative heat capacity at phase separation in *small as well macroscopic systems independently of the range of the force* is pointed out. The appearance of a critical end-point for the liquid-gas transition in the  $p - E$  or  $V - E$  phase diagram can be easily explained as well the non-existence of a critical end-point of the solid-liquid transition.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Since the beginning of thermodynamics in the first half of the 19. century its original motivation was the description of steam engines and the liquid to gas transition of water. Here water becomes inhomogeneous and develops a separation of the gas phase from the liquid, i.e. water boils.

A little later statistical mechanics was developed by Boltzmann[1] to explain the microscopic mechanical basis of thermodynamics. Up to now it is generally believed that this is given by the Boltzmann-Gibbs canonical statistics. As traditional canonical statistics works only for homogeneous, infinite systems, phase separations remain outside of standard Boltzmann-Gibbs thermo-statistics, which, consequently, signal phase-transitions of first order by Yang-Lee singularities.

It is amusing that this fact that is essential for the original purpose of thermodynamics to describe steam engines was never treated completely in the past 150 years. The system must be somewhat artificially split into (still macroscopic and homogeneous) pieces of each individual phase [2]. The most interesting configurations of two coexisting phases cannot be described by a single canonical ensemble. Important inter-phase fluctuations remain outside, etc. This is all hidden due to the restriction to homogeneous systems in the thermodynamic limit.

Also the second law can rigorously be formulated only microcanonically: Already Clausius [3] distinguished between external and internal entropy generating mecha-

nisms. The second law is only related to the latter mechanism [4], the internal entropy generation. Again, canonical Boltzmann-Gibbs statistics is insensitive to this important difference.

For this purpose, and also to describe small systems like fragmenting nuclei or non-extensive ones like macroscopic systems at phase-separation, or even very large, self-gravitating, systems, we need a new and deeper definition of statistical mechanics and as the heart of it: of entropy. For this purpose it is crucial to avoid the thermodynamic limit.

The main aspects of this new thermodynamics were described in [5–7] and especially were introduced to the chemists community in [8, 9]. I will repeat here only the basic arguments. Additionally, I will stress the fact that negative heat capacity and convex entropy can be seen at proper phase transitions of 1. order, i.e. at phase *separation*, in small as well in macroscopic systems independently whether they have long or short range interactions. As there was a hot discussion at this conference about this point, it seems necessary to repeat the arguments here.

## II. WHAT IS ENTROPY?

Entropy,  $S$ , is the characteristic entity of thermodynamics. Its use distinguishes thermodynamics from all other physics; therefore, its proper understanding is essential. The understanding of entropy is sometimes obscured by frequent use of the Boltzmann-Gibbs canonical ensemble, and the thermodynamic limit. Also its relationship to the second law is beset with confusion between external transfers of entropy  $d_e S$  and its internal production  $d_i S$ .

The main source of the confusion is of course the lack

---

\*Electronic address: gross@hmi.de; URL: <http://www.hmi.de/people/gross/>

of a clear *microscopic and mechanical* understanding of the fundamental quantities of thermodynamics like heat, external vs. internal work, temperature, and last not least entropy, at the times of Clausius and possibly even today.

Clausius [3] defined a quantity which he first called the “*value of metamorphosis*”, in German “*Verwandlungswert*” in [3]. Eleven years later he [10] gave it the name “entropy”  $S$ :

$$S_b - S_a = \int_a^b \frac{dE}{T}, \quad (1)$$

where  $T$  is the absolute temperature of the body when the momentary change is done, and  $dE$  is the increment (positive resp. negative) of all different forms of energy (heat and potential) put into resp. taken out of the system.

From the observation that heat does not flow from cold to hot (see section III, formula 8, however section IV) he went on to enunciate the second law as:

$$\Delta S = \oint \frac{dE}{T} \geq 0, \quad (2)$$

which Clausius called the *uncompensated metamorphosis*. As will be worked out in section IV the second law as presented by eq.(2) remains valid even in cases where heat flows from low to higher temperatures.

Prigogine [4], c.f. [2], quite clearly stated that the variation of  $S$  with time is determined by two, crucially different, mechanisms of its changes: the flow of entropy  $d_e S$  to or from the system under consideration; and its internal production  $d_i S$ . While the first type of entropy change  $d_e S$  (that effected by exchange of heat  $d_e Q$  with its surroundings) can be positive, negative or zero, the second type of entropy change  $d_i S$  is fundamentally related to its spontaneous internal evolution (“*Verwandlungen*”, “*metamorphosis*” [3]) of the system, and states the universal irreversibility of spontaneous transitions. It can be only positive in any spontaneous transformation.

Clausius gives an illuminating example in [3]: When an ideal gas suddenly streams under isolating conditions from a small vessel with volume  $V_1$  into a larger one ( $V_2 > V_1$ ), neither its internal energy  $U$ , nor its temperature changes, nor external work done, but its internal (Boltzmann-)entropy  $S_i$  eq.(3) rises, by  $\Delta S = N \ln(V_2/V_1)$ . Only by compressing the gas (e.g. isentropically) and creating heat  $\Delta E = E_1[(V_2/V_1)^{2/3} - 1]$  (which must be finally drained) it can be brought back into its initial state. Then, however, the entropy change in the cycle, as expressed by integral (2), is positive ( $= N \ln(V_2/V_1)$ ). This is also a clear example for a microcanonical situation where the entropy change by an irreversible metamorphosis of the system is absolutely internal. It occurs during the first part of the cycle, the expansion, where there is no heat exchange with the environment, and consequently no contribution to the integral(2). The construction by eq.(2) is correct though

artificial. After completing the cycle the Boltzmann-entropy of the gas is of course the same as initially. All this will become much more clear by Boltzmann’s microscopic definition of entropy, which will moreover clarify its real *statistical* nature:

Boltzmann[1] later defined the entropy of an isolated system (for which the energy exchange with the environment  $d_e Q \equiv 0$ ) in terms of the sum of possible configurations,  $W$ , which the system can assume consistent with its constraints of given energy and volume:

$$S = k^* \ln W \quad (3)$$

as written on Boltzmann’s tomb-stone, with

$$W(E, N, V) = \int \frac{d^{3N} \vec{p} \, d^{3N} \vec{q}}{N!(2\pi\hbar)^{3N}} \epsilon_0 \delta(E - H\{\vec{q}, \vec{p}\}) \quad (4)$$

in semi-classical approximation.  $E$  is the total energy,  $N$  is the number of particles and  $V$  the volume. Or, more appropriate for a finite quantum-mechanical system:

$$W(E, N, V) = \sum_{\substack{\text{all eigenstates } n \text{ of } H \text{ with given } N, V, \\ \text{and } E < E_n \leq E + \epsilon_0}} \quad (5)$$

and  $\epsilon_0 \approx$  the macroscopic energy resolution. This is still up to day the deepest, most fundamental, and most simple definition of entropy. *There is no need of the thermodynamic limit, no need of concavity, extensivity and homogeneity.* In its semi-classical approximation, eq.(4),  $W(E, N, V, \dots)$  simply measures the area of the sub-manifold of points in the  $6N$ -dimensional phase-space ( $\Gamma$ -space) with prescribed energy  $E$ , particle number  $N$ , volume  $V$ , and some other time invariant constraints which are here suppressed for simplicity. Because it was Planck who coined it in this mathematical form, I will call it the Boltzmann-Planck principle. It is further important to notice that  $S(E, N, V)$  is everywhere analytical in  $E$  [11]. In the microcanonical ensemble are no “jumps” or multi-valuedness in  $S(E)$ , independently of whether there are phase transitions or not, in clear contrast to the canonical  $S(T, N, V)$ . A fact which underlines the fundamental role of microcanonical statistics.

The Boltzmann-Planck formula has a simple but deep physical interpretation:  $W$  or  $S$  measure our ignorance about the complete set of initial values for all  $6N$  microscopic degrees of freedom which are needed to specify the  $N$ -body system unambiguously[12]. To have complete knowledge of the system we would need to know (within its semiclassical approximation (4)) the initial positions and velocities of all  $N$  particles in the system, which means we would need to know a total of  $6N$  values. Then  $W$  would be equal to one and the entropy,  $S$ , would be zero. However, we usually only know the value of a few parameters that change slowly with time, such as the energy, number of particles, volume and so on. We generally know very little about the positions and velocities of the particles. The manifold of all these points in the  $6N$ -dim. phase space, consistent with the given macroscopic

constraints of  $E, N, V, \dots$ , is the microcanonical ensemble, which has a well-defined geometrical size  $W$  and, by equation (3), a non-vanishing entropy,  $S(E, N, V, \dots)$ . The dependence of  $S(E, N, V, \dots)$  on its arguments determines completely thermostatics and equilibrium thermodynamics.

Clearly, Hamiltonian (Liouvillean) dynamics of the system cannot create the missing information about the initial values - i.e. the entropy  $S(E, N, V, \dots)$  cannot decrease. As has been further worked out in [13, 14] the inherent finite resolution of the macroscopic description implies an increase of  $W$  or  $S$  with time when an external constraint is relaxed. Such is a statement of the second law of thermodynamics, which requires that the *internal* production of entropy be positive for every spontaneous process. Analysis of the consequences of the second law by the microcanonical ensemble is appropriate because, in an isolated system (which is the one relevant for the microcanonical ensemble), the changes in total entropy must represent the *internal* production of entropy, see above, and there are no additional uncontrolled fluctuating energy exchanges with the environment.

### III. THE ZERO'TH LAW IN CONVENTIONAL EXTENSIVE THERMODYNAMICS

In conventional (extensive) thermodynamics thermal equilibrium of two systems (1 & 2) is established by bringing them into thermal contact which allows free energy exchange. Equilibrium is established when the total entropy

$$S_{1+2}(E, E_1) = S_1(E_1) + S_2(E - E_1) \quad (6)$$

is maximal. Under an energy flux  $\Delta E_{2 \rightarrow 1}$  from 2  $\rightarrow$  1 the total entropy changes to lowest order in  $\Delta E$  by

$$\Delta S_{1+2}|_E = (T_2 - T_1)\Delta E_{2 \rightarrow 1}. \quad (7)$$

Consequently, a maximum of  $S_{total}(E, E_1)|_E \geq S_{1+2}$  will be approached when

$$\text{sign}(\Delta S_{total}) = \text{sign}(T_2 - T_1)\text{sign}(\Delta E_{2 \rightarrow 1}) > 0. \quad (8)$$

From here Clausius' first formulation of the Second Law follows: "Heat always flows from hot to cold". Essential for this conclusion is the *additivity* of  $S$  under the split (eq.6). There are no correlations, which are destroyed when an extensive system is split. Temperature is an appropriate control parameter for extensive systems.

It is further easy to see that *the heat capacity of an extensive system with  $S(E, N) = 2S(E/2, N/2)$  is necessarily positive*

$$C_V(E) = \partial E / \partial T = - \frac{(\partial S / \partial E)^2}{\partial^2 S / \partial E^2} > 0: \quad (9)$$

The combination two pieces of  $N/2$  particles each, but with different energy per particle, one at  $e_a = e_2 - \Delta e/2$

and a second at  $e_b = e_2 + \Delta e/2$ , must lead to  $S(E_2, N) \geq S(E_a/2, N/2) + S(E_b/2, N/2)$ , the simple algebraic sum of the individual entropies because by combining the two pieces one normally loses information. This, however, is equal to  $[S(E_a, N) + S(E_b, N)]/2$ , thus  $S(E_2, N) \geq [S(E_a, N) + S(E_b, N)]/2$ . I.e. *the entropy  $S(E, N)$  of an extensive system is necessarily concave,  $\partial^2 S / \partial E^2 < 0$  and eq. 9 follows.* In the next section we will see that therefore *extensive systems cannot have phase separation, the characteristic signal of transition of first order.*

### IV. NO PHASE SEPARATION WITHOUT A CONVEX, NON-EXTENSIVE $S(E)$

At phase separation the weight  $e^{S(E)-E/T}$  of the configurations with energy  $E$  in the definition of the canonical partition sum

$$Z(T) = \int_0^\infty e^{S(E)-E/T} dE \quad (10)$$

becomes *bimodal*, at the transition temperature it has two peaks, the liquid and the gas configurations which are separated in energy by the latent heat. Consequently  $S(E)$  must be convex ( $\partial^2 S / \partial E^2 > 0$ , like  $y = x^2$ ) and the weight in (10) has a minimum at  $E_{min}$  between the two pure phases. Of course, the minimum can only be seen in the microcanonical ensemble where the energy is controlled and its fluctuations forbidden. Otherwise, the system would fluctuate between the two pure phases by an, for macroscopic systems even macroscopic, energy  $\Delta E \sim E_{lat}$  of the order of the latent heat. The heat capacity is

$$C_V(E_{min}) = \partial E / \partial T = - \frac{(\partial S / \partial E)^2}{\partial^2 S / \partial E^2} < 0. \quad (11)$$

I.e. *the convexity of  $S(E)$  and the negative heat capacity are the generic and necessary signals of phase-separation*[5]. It is amusing that this fact, which is essential for the original purpose of Thermodynamics to describe steam engines, seems never been really recognized in the past 150 years. However, such macroscopic energy fluctuations and the resulting negative specific heat are already early discussed in high-energy physics by Carlitz [15].

The existence of the negative heat capacity at phase separation has a surprising but fundamental consequence: Combining two equal systems with negative heat capacity and different energy per particle, they will relax with a flow of energy from the lower to the higher temperature! This is consistent with the naive picture of an *energy equilibration*. Thus *Clausius' "energy flows always from hot to cold", i.e. the dominant control-role of the temperature in thermo-statistics as emphasized by Hertz [16] is violated.* Of course this shows quite clearly that *unlike to extensive thermodynamics the temperature is not the appropriate control parameter in non-extensive*

situations like e.g. at phase separations, nuclear fragmentation, or stellar systems.[17]

By the same reason the well known paradox of Antonov in astro-physics due to the occurrence of negative heat capacities must be reconsidered: By using standard arguments from extensive thermodynamics Lynden-Bell [18] claims that a system  $a$  with negative heat capacity  $C_a < 0$  in gravitational contact with another  $b$  with positive heat capacity  $C_b > 0$  will be unstable: If initially  $T_a > T_b$  the hotter system  $a$  transfers energy to the colder  $b$  and by this both become even hotter! If  $C_b > -C_a$ ,  $T_a$  rises faster than  $T_b$  and if the heat capacities don't change, this will go for ever. This is Lynden-Bells gravothermal catastrophe. This is wrong because just the opposite happens, the hotter  $a$  may even *absorb* energy from the colder  $b$  and both systems come to equilibrium at the same intermediate temperature c.f. [17, 19]. Negative heat can only occur in the microcanonical ensemble.

As phase separation exists also in the thermodynamic limit, by the same arguments as above *the curvature of  $S(E)$  remains convex,  $\partial^2 S/(\partial E)^2 > 0$ . Consequently, the negative heat capacity should also be seen in ordinary macroscopic systems studied in chemistry!* see section VIII.

Searching for example in Guggenheims book [2] one finds some cryptic notes in §3 that the heat capacity of steam at saturation is negative. No notice that *this is the generic effect at any phase separation!* Therefore let me recapitulate in the next section how chemists treat phase separation of macroscopic systems and then point out why this does not work in non-extensive systems like fragmenting nuclei, at phase separation in normal macroscopic systems, or large astronomical systems.

## V. MACROSCOPIC SYSTEMS IN CHEMISTRY

Systems studied in chemical thermodynamics consist of several *homogeneous macroscopic* phases  $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots$  cf.[2]. Their mutual equilibrium must be explicitly constructed from outside.

Each of these phases are assumed to be homogeneous and macroscopic (in the "thermodynamic limit" ( $N_\alpha \rightarrow \infty|_{\rho_\alpha=const}$ )). There is no common canonical ensemble for the entire system of the coexisting phases. Only the canonical ensemble of *each* phase separately becomes equivalent in the limit to its microcanonical counterpart.

The canonical partition sum of *each* phase  $\alpha$  is defined as the Laplace transform of the underlying microcanonical sum of states  $W(E)_\alpha = e^{S_\alpha(E)}$  [20, 21]

$$Z_\alpha(T_\alpha) = \int_0^\infty e^{S_\alpha(E) - E/T_\alpha} dE. \quad (12)$$

The mean canonical energy is

$$\langle E_\alpha(T_\alpha) \rangle = T_\alpha^2 \partial \ln Z_\alpha(T_\alpha) / \partial T_\alpha. \quad (13)$$

In chemical situations proper the assumption of homogeneous macroscopic individual phases is of course accept-

able. In the thermodynamic limit ( $N_\alpha \rightarrow \infty|_{\rho_\alpha=const}$ ) of a *homogeneous* phase  $\alpha$ , the canonical energy  $\langle E_\alpha(T_\alpha) \rangle$  becomes identical to the microcanonical energy  $E_\alpha$  when the temperature is determined by  $T_\alpha^{-1} = \partial S_\alpha(E, V_\alpha) / \partial E_\alpha$ . The relative width of the canonical energy is

$$\Delta E(T)_\alpha = \frac{\sqrt{\langle E_\alpha^2 \rangle_T - \langle E_\alpha \rangle_T^2}}{\langle E_\alpha \rangle_T} \propto \frac{1}{\sqrt{N_\alpha}}. \quad (14)$$

The heat capacity at constant volume is

$$C_\alpha|_{V_\alpha} = \frac{\langle E_\alpha^2 \rangle_{T_\alpha} - \langle E_\alpha \rangle_{T_\alpha}^2}{T_\alpha^2} \geq 0. \quad (15)$$

Only in the thermodynamic limit ( $N_\alpha \rightarrow \infty|_{\rho_\alpha=const}$ ) does the relative energy uncertainty  $\Delta E_\alpha \rightarrow 0$ , and the canonical and the microcanonical ensembles for each homogeneous phase ( $\alpha$ ) become equivalent. This equivalence is the only justification of the canonical ensemble controlled by intensive temperature  $T$ , or chemical potential  $\mu$ , or pressure  $P$ . I do not know of any microscopic foundation of the canonical ensemble and intensive control parameters apart from the limit.

The positiveness of any canonical  $C_V(T)$  or  $C_P(T)$  (15) is of course the reason why the inhomogeneous system of several coexisting phases ( $\alpha_1 \& \alpha_2$ ) with an overall *negative* heat capacity cannot be described by a *single common* canonical distribution [5, 22].

## VI. NEW KIND OF PHASES WELL SEEN IN HOT NUCLEI OR MULTI-STAR SYSTEMS.

The new lesson to be learned is that if one defines the phases by individual peaks [35] in  $e^{S(E) - E/T}$  in (10), then there exist also *inhomogeneous phases* like in fragmented nuclei or stellar systems. The general concept of thermostatics becomes enormously widened.

Now, certainly neither the phase of the whole multi-fragmented nucleus nor the individual fragments themselves can be considered as macroscopic homogeneous phases in the sense of chemical thermodynamics (ChTh). Consequently, (ChTh) cannot and should not be applied to fragmenting nuclei and the microcanonical description is ultimately demanded. This becomes explicitly clear by the fact that the configurations of a multi-fragmented nucleus have a *negative* heat capacity at constant volume  $C_V$  and also at constant pressure  $C_P$  (if at all a pressure can be associated to nuclear fragmentation [5]). Meanwhile experimental evidences of negative heat capacities have accumulated: Nuclear fragmentation e.g. [23], atomic clusters e.g. [24], astrophysics e.g. [25], conventional macroscopic systems at phase separation e.g.[2].

The existence of well defined peaks (i.e. phases as defined above) in the event distribution of nuclear fragmentation data is demonstrated very nicely in [26] from various points of view. A lot more physics about the

mechanism of phase transitions can be learned from such studies.

## VII. APPLICATION IN ASTROPHYSICS

The necessity of using “extensive” instead of “intensive” control parameter is explicit in astrophysical problems. E.g.: for the description of rotating stars one conventionally works at a given temperature and fixed angular velocity  $\Omega$  c.f. [27]. Of course in reality there is neither a heat bath nor a rotating disk. Moreover, the latter scenario is fundamentally wrong as at the periphery of the disk the rotational velocity may even become larger than velocity of light. Non-extensive systems like astro-physical ones do not allow a “field-theoretical” description controlled by intensive fields !

E.g. configurations with a maximum of random energy

$$E_{random} = E - \frac{\Theta\Omega^2}{2} - E_{pot} \quad (16)$$

and consequently with the largest entropy are the ones with smallest moment of inertia  $\Theta$  compact single stars. Just the opposite happens when the angular-momentum  $L$  and not the angular velocity  $\Omega$  are fixed:

$$E_{random} = E - \frac{L^2}{2\Theta} - E_{pot}. \quad (17)$$

Then configurations with large moment of inertia are maximizing the phase space and the entropy. I.e. eventually double or multi stars are produced, as observed in reality.

In figure 1 one clearly sees the rich and realistic microcanonical phase-diagram of a rotating gravitating system controlled by the “extensive” parameters energy and angular-momentum. [28]

## VIII. NEGATIVE HEAT CAPACITY AT PHASE-SEPARATION CAN ALSO BE SEEN IN MACROSCOPIC SYSTEMS INDEPENDENTLY OF THE RANGE OF THE INTERACTION.

The “convex intruder” in  $S(E)$  with the depth  $\Delta S_{surf}(E_{min})$  has a direct physical significance: Its depth is the surface entropy due to constraints by the existence of the inter-phase boundary between the droplets of the condensed phase and the gas phase and the corresponding correlation.  $\Delta S_{surf}(E_{min})$  is directly related to the surface tension per surface atom (with number  $N_{surf}$ ) of the droplets.

$$\sigma_{surf}/T_{tr} = \frac{\Delta S_{surf}(E_{min})}{N_{surf}} \quad (18)$$

In my paper together with M.Madjet [29] we have compared the values of  $\Delta S_{surf}(E_{min})$  calculated by Monte-Carlo using a realistic short range interaction with the




FIG. 1: Phase diagram of rotating self-gravitating systems in the energy-angular-momentum ( $E, L$ )-plane. DC: region of double-stars, G: gas phase, SC: single stars. In the mixed region one finds various exotic configurations like ring-systems in coexistence with gas, double stars or single stars. In this region of phase-separation the heat capacity is negative and the entropy is convex. The dashed lines  $E - L = 1$  (left) and  $E = L$  (right) delimit the region where calculations were carried out.

values of the surface tension of the corresponding macroscopic system. Table (I) shows the scaling behavior of  $\Delta S_{surf}(E_{min})$  with the size  $N$  of the system.

TABLE I: Parameters of the liquid–gas transition of small sodium clusters (in the MMMC-calculation [5, 29] several clusters coexist) in comparison with the bulk for a rising number  $N$  of atoms,  $N_{surf}$  is the average number of surface atoms (estimated here as  $\sum N_{cluster}^{2/3}$ ) of all clusters with  $N_i \geq 2$  together.  $\sigma/T_{tr} = \Delta s_{surf} * N/N_{surf}$  corresponds to the surface tension. Its bulk value is adjusted to agree with the experimental values of the  $a_s$  parameter which we used in the liquid-drop formula for the binding energies of small clusters, c.f. Brechignac et al. [30], and which are used in this calculation [5] for the individual clusters.

	$N$	200	1000	3000	bulk
<b>Na</b>	$T_{tr}$ [K]	940	990	1095	<b>1156</b>
	$q_{lat}$ [eV]	0.82	0.91	0.94	<b>0.923</b>
	$s_{boil}$	10.1	10.7	9.9	<b>9.267</b>
	$\Delta s_{surf}$	0.55	0.56	0.44	
	$N_{surf}$	39.94	98.53	186.6	$\infty$
	$\sigma/T_{tr}$	2.75	5.68	7.07	<b>7.41</b>

Roughly  $\Delta S_{surf}(E) \propto N^{2/3}$  and one may argue that this will vanish compared to the ordinary leading volume term  $S_{vol}(E) \propto N$ . However, this is not so as  $S_{vol}(E)$  at energies inside the phase-separation region (the convex intruder) is the concave hull of  $S(E)$  (its slope gives the Maxwell construction of the caloric curve  $T(E)$ ). It is a




FIG. 2: Microcanonical Monte-Carlo (MMC) [5, 29] simulation of the entropy  $s(e)$  per atom ( $e$  in eV per atom) of a system of  $N = 1000$  sodium atoms at an external pressure of 1 atm. At the energy  $e \leq e_1$  the system is in the pure liquid phase and at  $e \geq e_3$  in the pure gas phase, of course with fluctuations. The latent heat per atom is  $q_{lat} = e_3 - e_1$ . **Attention:** the curve  $s(e)$  is artificially sheared by subtracting a linear function  $25 + e * 11.5$  in order to make the convex intruder visible.  $s(e)$  is always a steep monotonic rising function. We clearly see the global concave (downwards bending) nature of  $s(e)$  and its convex intruder. Its depth is the entropy loss due to additional correlations by the interfaces. It scales  $\propto N^{-1/3}$ . From this one can calculate the surface tension per surface atom  $\sigma_{surf}/T_{tr} = \Delta S_{surf} * N/N_{surf}$ . The double tangent (Gibbs construction) is the concave hull of  $s(e)$ . Its derivative gives the Maxwell line in the caloric curve  $e(T)$  at  $T_{tr}$ . In the thermodynamic limit the intruder would disappear and  $s(e)$  would approach the double tangent from below, not of course  $S(E)$ , which remains deeply convex: The probability of configurations with phase-separations is suppressed by the (infinitesimal small) factor  $e^{-N^{2/3}}$  relative to the pure phases and the distribution remains *strictly bimodal in the canonical ensemble* in which the region  $e_1 < e < e_3$  of phase separation gets lost.

straight line and its curvature  $\partial^2 S_{vol}/\partial E^2 \equiv 0$ . Consequently for large  $N$

$$\begin{aligned} \partial^2 S/\partial E^2 &\sim \partial^2 S_{vol}/\partial E^2 + \partial^2 \Delta S_{surf}/\partial E^2 + \dots \\ &\simeq \partial^2 \Delta S_{surf}/\partial E^2 \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

and the depth of the intruder  $\Delta S_{surf}(E_{min}) = \sigma/T_{tr} * N_{surf} \sim N^{2/3}$  goes to infinity in the thermodynamic limit. Of course, the ubiquitous phenomena of phase separation exist only by this reason. It determines the (negative) heat capacity as in eq.(11). The physical (quite surprising) consequences are discussed in [7, 9].

## IX. THE MICROSCOPIC ORIGIN OF THE CONVEXITIES OF $S(E)$ AND OF PHASE-SEPARATION

Many applications of microcanonical thermodynamics to realistic examples of hot nuclei, atomic clusters, and rotating astrophysical systems have been presented during the past twenty years which demonstrate convex intruders in the microcanonical entropy and, consequently, negative heat capacities. Such are reviewed in the publication list on the web site <http://www.hmi.de/people/gross/> and elsewhere[31–33]. Here we shall illuminate the general microscopic mechanism leading to the appearance of a convex intruder in  $S(E, V, N, \dots)$  as far as possible by rigorous and analytical methods. This is the generic signal of phase transitions of first order and of phase-separation within the microcanonical ensemble. Assume the system is classical and obeys the Hamiltonian:

$$H = \sum_i^N \frac{p_i^2}{2m} + \Phi^{int}[\{\vec{r}\}] \quad (20)$$

$$\Phi^{int}[\{\vec{r}\}] := \sum_{i < j} \phi(\vec{r}_i - \vec{r}_j)$$

In this case the system is controlled by energy and volume. For what follows it is important to stress that  $\Phi^{int}[\{\vec{r}\}]$  is *independent* of the energy as control parameter. The topology of its attractive pockets is also independent of the available volume  $V$ .

### A. Liquid-gas transition

The microcanonical sum of states or partition sum is:

$$\begin{aligned} W(E, N, V) &= \frac{1}{N!(2\pi\hbar)^{3N}} \times \quad (21) \\ &\int_{VN} d^{3N} \vec{r} \int d^{3N} \vec{p}_i \epsilon_0 \delta(E - \sum_i^N \frac{p_i^2}{2m_i} - \Phi^{int}[\{\vec{r}\}]) \\ &= \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{V^N \epsilon_0 (E - E_0)^{(3N-2)/2} \prod_1^N m_i^{3/2}}{N! \Gamma(3N/2) (2\pi\hbar^2)^{3N/2}} \times \\ &\int_{VN} \frac{d^{3N} \vec{r}}{V^N} \left( \frac{E - \Phi^{int}[\{\vec{r}\}]}{E - E_0} \right)^{(3N-2)/2} \quad (22) \\ &= \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &W_{id-gas}(E - E_0, N, V) \times W_{conf}(E - E_0, N, V) \\ &= e^{[S_{id-gas} + S_{conf}]} \quad (23) \end{aligned}$$

$$W_{id-gas}(E, N, V) = \frac{V^N \epsilon_0 E^{(3N-2)/2} \prod_1^N m_i^{3/2}}{N! \Gamma(3N/2) (2\pi\hbar^2)^{3N/2}} \quad (24)$$

$$W_{conf}(E - E_0, N, V) = \int_{V^N} \frac{d^{3N}r}{V^N} \Theta(E - \Phi^{int}[\{\vec{r}\}]) \times \left( 1 - \frac{\Phi^{int}[\{\vec{r}\}] - E_0}{E - E_0} \right)^{(3N-2)/2} \quad (25)$$

$V$  is the spatial volume;  $E_0 = \min \Phi^{int}[\{\vec{r}\}]$  is the energy of the ground-state of the system. The separation of  $W(E, N, V)$  into  $W_{id-gas}$  and  $W_{conf}$  is the microcanonical analogue of the split of the canonical partition sum into a kinetic part and a configuration part:

$$Z(T) = \frac{V^N}{N!} \left( \frac{mT}{2\pi\hbar^2} \right)^{3N/2} \int \frac{d^{3N}r}{V^N} e^{-\frac{\Phi^{int}[\{\vec{r}\}]}{T}} \quad (26)$$

In the thermodynamic limit, the order parameter of the (homogeneous) liquid-gas transition is the density. The transition is linked to a condensation of the system towards a larger density controlled by pressure. For a finite system, we expect analogous behavior. However, for a closed finite system, which is allowed to become inhomogeneous at phase separation, this is controlled by the available system volume  $V$  and not by intensive density or pressure. At low energies, the  $N$  particles condense into a droplet with much smaller volume  $V_{0,N} \ll V$ .  $3(N-1)$  internal coordinates are limited to  $V_{0,N}$ . Only the center of mass of the droplet can move freely in  $V$  (remember we did not fix the center-of-mass in equation eq.(21)). The system does not fill the  $3N$ -configuration space  $V^N$ . Only a stripe with width  $V_{0,N}^{1/3}$  in  $3(N-1)$  dimensions of the total  $3N$ -dim space is populated. The system is non-homogeneous even though it is equilibrated and, at low energies, internally in the single liquid phase; and it is not characterized by an intensive homogeneous density. In fact,  $W_{conf}(E - E_0, N, V)$  can be written as:

$$W_{conf}(E - E_0, N, V) = \left[ \frac{V(E, N)}{V} \right]^N \leq 1 \quad (27)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & [V(E, N)]^N \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \\ & \int_{V^N} d^{3N}r \Theta(E - \Phi^{int}[\{\vec{r}\}]) \\ & \times \left( 1 - \frac{\Phi^{int}[\{\vec{r}\}] - E_0}{E - E_0} \right)^{(3N-2)/2} \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

$$S_{conf}(E - E_0, N, V) = N \ln \left[ \frac{V(E, N)}{V} \right] \leq 0 \quad (29)$$

The first factor  $\Theta(E - \Phi^{int}[\{\vec{r}\}])$  in eq(28) eliminates the energetically forbidden regions. Only the potential holes (clusters) in the  $3N$ -dim potential surface  $\Phi^{int}[\{r\}] \leq E$  remain. Their volume  $V^N(E, N) \leq V^N$  is the accessible

part of the  $3N$ -dim-spatial volume where  $\Phi^{int}[\{r\}] \leq E$ . I.e.  $V^N(E, N)$  is the total  $3N$ -dim. eigen-volume of the condensate (droplets), with  $N$  particles at the given energy, summed over all possible partitions, clusterings, in  $3N$ -configuration space. The relative volume fraction of each partition compared with  $V^N(E, N)$  gives its relative probability.  $V^N(E, N)$  has the limiting values:

$$[V(E, N)]^N = \begin{cases} V^N & \text{for } E \text{ in the gas phase} \\ V_{0,N}^{N-1} V & \text{for } E = E_0 \end{cases}$$

$W_{conf}(E - E_0, N, V)$  and  $S_{conf}(E - E_0, N, V)$  have the limiting values:

$$W_{conf}(E - E_0) \leq 1, \Rightarrow S_{conf}(E - E_0, N) \leq 0 \rightarrow \begin{cases} 1 & E \gg \Phi^{int} \\ \left[ \frac{V_{0,N}}{V} \right]^{(N-1)} & E \rightarrow E_0 \end{cases} \quad (30)$$

$$S_{conf}(E - E_0) \rightarrow \begin{cases} 0 & E \gg \Phi^{int} \\ \ln \left\{ \left[ \frac{V_{0,N}}{V} \right]^{N-1} \right\} < 0 & E \rightarrow E_0 \end{cases} \quad (31)$$

All physical details are contained in  $W_{conf}(E - E_0, N, V)$  alias  $N \ln[V(E, N)]$ , c.f. eqs.(27-31): If the energy is high the detailed structure of  $\Phi^{int}[\{\vec{r}\}]$  is unimportant  $W_{conf} \approx 1$ ,  $S_{conf} \approx 0$ . The system behaves like an ideal gas and fills the volume  $V$ . At sufficiently low energies only the minimum of  $\Phi^{int}[\{\vec{r}\}]$  is explored by  $W_{conf}(E - E_0, N, V)$ . The system is in a condensed phase, a single liquid drop, which moves freely inside the empty larger volume  $V$ , the  $3(N-1)$  internal degrees of freedom are trapped inside the *reduced* volume  $V_{0,N} \ll V$ .

One can guess the general form of  $N \ln[V(E, N)]$ : Near the groundstate  $E \gtrsim E_0$  it must be flat  $\approx (N-1) \ln[V_{0,N}] + \ln[V - V_{0,N}]$  because the liquid drop has some eigen-volume  $V_{0,N}$  in which each particle can move (liquid). With rising energy  $\ln[V(E, N)]$  rises up to the point ( $E_{trans}$ ) where it is possible that the drop fissions into two. Here an additional new configuration opens in  $3N$ -dim configuration space: Either one particle evaporates from the cluster and explores the external volume  $V$ , or the droplet fissions into two droplets and the two CM coordinates explore the larger  $V$ . This gives a sudden jump in  $S_{conf}(E)$  by something like  $\sim \ln \left\{ \frac{V - V_{0(N-1)}}{V_{0(N-1)}} \right\}$  and similar jump upwards in the second case.

Later further such "jumps" may follow. Each of these "jumps" induce a convex upwards bending of the total entropy  $S(E)$  (eq.23). Each is connected to a bifurcation and bimodality of  $e^{S(E) - E/T}$  and the phenomenon of *phase-separation*.

In the conventional canonical picture for a large number of particles this is forbidden and hidden behind the familiar Yang-Lee singularity of the liquid to gas phase transition. In the microcanonical ensemble this is analogue to the phenomenon of multi-fragmentation in nuclear systems [5, 34]. This, in contrast to the mathematical Yang-Lee theorem, physical microscopic explanation

of the liquid to gas phase transition sheds sharp light on the physical origin of the transition, the sudden change in the inhomogeneous population of the  $3N$ -dim. configuration space.

## B. Solid-liquid transition

In contrast to the liquid phase, in the crystal phase a molecule can only move locally within its lattice cage of the size  $d^3$ , instead freely in the whole volume  $V_{0N}$  of the liquid condensate. These are deep localized holes in the potential surfaces of  $\Phi^{int}[\{\vec{r}\}]$ . I.e. in equation (31) instead we have  $S_{conf} \rightarrow \ln\{[\frac{d^3}{V_{0N}}]^{N-1}\}$ . The convexity of  $S_{conf}(E)$  is not controlled by the available volume  $V$  of the system.

## C. Conclusion

Only by treating the many-body system microcanonically the  $\sim 170$  years old challenge of thermodynamics is microscopically solved:

The essential differences between the gas, the liquid, and solid phase are the following: Whereas the gas occupies the whole container, the liquid is confined to a definite condensate volume, however this may have any shape. It is separated from the gas by a surface. The solid is also confined to definite volume but in contrast to the liquid its surface has also a definite shape. Of course *this is the standard experimental identification of the phase transition and not any singularity (Yang-Lee)*. However,

these differences cannot be seen in the canonical ensemble. As demonstrated in section VIII, microcanonically this can well be seen even in macroscopic systems with any kind of interaction, short- and long range.

The gas- liquid transition is linked to the transition from uniform filling of the container volume  $V$  by the gas to the smaller eigen-volume of the system  $V_0$  in its condensed phase where the system is inhomogeneous (some liquid drops inside the larger empty volume  $V$ ). First  $3(N-1)$ , later at higher energies less and less degrees of freedom condensate into the drop. First three, then more and more degrees of freedom (center-of-mass-coordinates of the drops) explore the larger container volume  $V$  leading to upwards jumps (convexities) of  $S_{conf}(E)$ . The volume of the container controls how close one is to the critical end-point of the transition, where phase-separation disappears. Towards the critical end-point, i.e. with smaller  $V$ , the jumps  $\ln[V - V_0] - \ln[V_0]$  become smaller and smaller. At the surface of a drop  $\Phi^{int} > E_0 = \min \Phi^{int}$ , i.e. the surface gives a negative contribution to  $S_{conf}$  in equation (28) and to  $S$  at energies  $E \gtrsim E_0$ .

In the case of the solid-liquid transition, however, the external volume,  $V$ , of the container confines only the center-of-mass position of the crystal, resp., the droplet. The entropy jumps during melting by  $\Delta S_{conf} \propto \ln[V_{0N}] - \ln d^3$ . These jumps are not controlled by the external volume  $V$  resp. the external pressure. There is no critical end-point of the solid-liquid transition-line in the  $V - E$  or  $P - E$  phase diagram.

Discussions with S.Ruffo are gratefully acknowledged.

- 
- [1] L. Boltzmann. Weitere Studien über das Wärmegleichgewicht unter Gasmolekülen. *Sitzungsbericht der Akademie der Wissenschaften, Wien*, 66:275–370, 1872.
- [2] E.A. Guggenheim. *Thermodynamics, An Advanced Treatment for Chemists and Physicists*. North-Holland Personal Library, Amsterdam, 1967.
- [3] R. Clausius. Über eine veränderte Form des zweiten Hauptsatzes der mechanischen Wärmetheorie. *Annalen der Physik und Chemie*, 93:481–506, 1854.
- [4] P. Glansdorff and I. Prigogine. *Thermodynamic Theory of Structure, Stability and Fluctuations*. John Wiley & Sons, London, 1971.
- [5] D.H.E. Gross. *Microcanonical thermodynamics: Phase transitions in "Small" systems*, volume 66 of *Lecture Notes in Physics*. World Scientific, Singapore, 2001.
- [6] D.H.E. Gross. A new thermodynamics from nuclei to stars III. cond-mat/0505450, (2005).
- [7] D.H.E. Gross. On the microscopic statistical basis of classical thermodynamics of finite systems. cond-mat/0505242, (2005).
- [8] D.H.E. Gross. Geometric foundation of thermostatics, phase transitions, second law of thermodynamics, but without thermodynamic limit. *PCCP*, 4:863–872, <http://arXiv.org/abs/cond-mat/0201235>, (2002).
- [9] D.H.E. Gross and J.F. Kenney. The microcanonical thermodynamics of finite systems: The microscopic origin of condensation and phase separations; and the conditions for heat flow from lower to higher temperatures. *Journal of Chemical Physics*, 122:224111;cond-mat/0503604, (2005).
- [10] R. Clausius. Über verschiedene für die Anwendung bequeme Formen der Hauptgleichungen der mechanischen Wärmetheorie. *Annalen der Physik und Chemie*, 125:353–400, 1865.
- [11] D.H.E. Gross. The microcanonical entropy is multiply differentiable no dinosaurs in microcanonical gravitation: No special "microcanonical phase transitions". <http://xxx.lanl.gov/abs/cond-mat/0403582:3>, (2004).
- [12] J.E. Kilpatrick. Classical thermostatics. In H. Eyring, editor, *Statistical Mechanics*, number II, chapter 1, pages 1–52. Academic Press, New York, 1967.
- [13] D.H.E. Gross. Ensemble probabilistic equilibrium and non-equilibrium thermodynamics without the thermodynamic limit. In Andrei Khrennikov, editor, *Foundations of Probability and Physics*, number XIII in PQ-QP: Quantum Probability, White Noise Analysis, pages 131–146, Boston, October 2001. ACM, World Scientific.



- [14] D.H.E. Gross. A new thermodynamics from nuclei to stars. *Entropy*, 6:158–179, cond-mat/0505450, (2004).
- [15] R.D. Carlitz. Hadronic matter at high density. *Phys.Rev.D*, 5:3231–3242, 1972.
- [16] P. Hertz. Über die mechanische Begründung der Thermodynamik II. *Ann. Phys. (Leipzig)*, 33:537, 1910.
- [17] D.H.E. Gross. Nuclear statistics, microcanonical or canonical? the physicists vs. the chemists approach. *Proceedings XLII International Winter Meeting on Nuclear Physics, Bormio*, 124:148; <http://arXiv.org/abs/nucl-th/0503065>, (2005).
- [18] D. Lynden-Bell and R. Wood. The gravo-thermal catastrophe in isothermal spheres and the onset of red-giant structure for stellar systems. *Mon. Not. R. astr. Soc.*, 138:495, 1968.
- [19] D.H.E. Gross. Classical equilibrium thermostatics, "sancta sanctorum of statistical mechanics", from nuclei to stars. *Physica A*, 340/1-3:76–84, cond-mat/0311418, (2004).
- [20] O. Schapiro, D.H.E. Gross, and A. Ecker. Microcanonical Monte Carlo. In P.J.-S Shiue H. Niederreiter, editor, *First International Conference on Monte Carlo and Quasi-Monte Carlo Methods in Scientific Computing*, volume 106, pages 346–353, Las Vegas, Nevada, 1995.
- [21] D.H.E. Gross and M.E. Madjet. Microcanonical vs. canonical thermodynamics. <http://xxx.lanl.gov/abs/cond-mat/9611192>, 1996.
- [22] D.H.E. Gross and M.E. Madjet. Cluster fragmentation, a laboratory for thermodynamics and phase-transitions in particular. In Abe, Arai, Lee, and Yabana, editors, *Proceedings of "Similarities and Differences between Atomic Nuclei and Clusters"*, pages 203–214, Tsukuba, Japan 97, 1997. The American Institute of Physics.
- [23] M. D'Agostino, F. Gulminelli, Ph. Chomaz, M. Bruno, F. Cannata, R. Bougault, F. Gramegna, I. Iori, N. le Neindre, G.V. Margagliotti, A. Moroni, and G. Vannini. Negative heat capacity in the critical region of nuclear fragmentation: an experimental evidence of the liquid-gas phase transition. *Phys.Lett.B*, 473:219–225, 2000.
- [24] M. Schmidt, R. Kusche, T. Hippler, J. Donges, W. Kormüller, B. von Issendorff, and H. Haberland. Negative heat capacity for a cluster of 147 sodium atoms. *Phys.Rev.Lett.*, 86:1191–1194, 2001.
- [25] W. Thirring. Systems with negative specific heat. *Z. f. Phys.*, 235:339–352, 1970.
- [26] M. Pichon et al. Bimodality in binary Au + Au collisions from 60 to 100 MeV/u. *Proceedings of the XLI winter meeting, Bormio, 26 Jan.-1 Feb. 2003*, page 149, 2003.
- [27] P.H. Chavanis and M. Rieutord. Statistical mechanics and phase diagrams of rotating self-gravitating fermions. *Astron. Astrophys.*, 412:1, arXiv:astro-ph/0302594, 2003.
- [28] E.V. Votyakov, H.I. Hidmi, A. De Martino, and D.H.E. Gross. Microcanonical mean-field thermodynamics of self-gravitating and rotating systems. *Phys.Rev.Lett.*, 89:031101–1–4; <http://arXiv.org/abs/cond-mat/0202140>, (2002).
- [29] D.H.E. Gross and M.E. Madjet. Fragmentation phase transition in atomic clusters iv — the relation of the fragmentation phase transition to the bulk liquid-gas transition. *Z.Physik B*, 104:541–551, 1997; and
- [30] C. Bréchignac, Ph. Cahuzac, F. Carlier, J. Leygnier, and J.Ph. Roux. *J.Chem.Phys.*, 102:1, 1995.
- [31] Ph. Chomaz and F. Gulminelli. Energy correlations as thermodynamical signal for phase transitions in finite systems. *Nucl. Phys. A*, 647:153–171, 1999.
- [32] Ph. Chomaz, V.Duflot, and F. Gulminelli. Caloric curves and energy fluctuations in the microcanonical liquid-gas phase transition. *preprint*, 2000.
- [33] Ph.Chomaz, F.Gulminelli, and V.Duflot. Topology of event distribution as a generalized definition of phase transitions in finite systems. *Caen preprint*, cond-mat/0010365, 2000.
- [34] D.H.E. Gross. Microcanonical thermodynamics and statistical fragmentation of dissipative systems — the topological structure of the n-body phase space. *Physics Reports*, 279:119–202, 1997. <http://xxx.lanl.gov/abs/cond-mat/9707100>.
- [35] Here I do not mean irregularities of the order of  $N^{-1/3}$  due to the discreteness of the quantum level distributions