A comment on the Srivaths-Labarca Periodic Table

Eric Scerri
Department of Chemistry & Biochemistry
UCLA,
Los Angeles
CA 90095

The following aims to draw attention to an important article by Labarca and Srivaths on the placement of hydrogen and helium in the periodic table. First of all let me be clear in praising these authors for their detailed review of the variety of approaches that have been taken to this issue, ever since the discovery of the periodic system.[1]

Nevertheless I believe that the original solution that they have proposed is mistaken in a very important respect that I will try to explain below.

Labarca and Srivaths claim that there are three main criteria that have been used in order to obtain a secondary classification of the elements into a 2-dimensional periodic system. This refers to a way of thinking about the periodic system that I promoted in my 2007 book on the subject. The periodic system can be thought of as displaying both primary and secondary classification. Ordering the elements using atomic number, ever since the discoveries of Van den Broek and Moseley, unambiguously provides primary classification. Such a 'classification' if one may use the word in this context merely serves to place the elements into a one-dimensional list.

In order to recover the familiar 2-dimension grid one must also select a secondary criterion as a means of cutting the element line in several places. Cutting the element line then allows one to place several new shorter line sequences one above the other to display the places where chemical repetition occurs along the original element line.

Such a secondary criterion has traditionally been provided by chemical and physical similarities such a valences. With the discovery of atomic and electronic structure there has been a turning towards microscopic criteria such as the electronic configurations of atoms as providing the secondary criterion. However as in the case of chemical and physical properties, electronic configurations do not provide a clear-cut and unambiguous criterion. This is why other authors have been led to propose the use of yet other criteria such as electronegativity values or atomic number triads.

Whichever of these criteria might be used the debates remain open. In a somewhat desperate move, as I see it, Labarca and Srivaths now propose to avoid using one single criterion but recommend instead,

> However, if it is conceded that none of the three candidates has explanatory priority, that is, if they do not provide an unambiguous means of classifying

> elements into groups, it is then reasonable to ask why a single criterion should be privileged. This leads us to the following question: why not a new arrangement where the main secondary criteria are considered simultaneously? In other words, is it possible a new and positive secondary criterion for deciding on the placement for hydrogen and helium in the periodic system?
> (Labarca, Srivaths, 2016, 524).
>
> In the light of these arguments, as possible solution to this conundrum we propose a sort of "balance" among the main perspectives identified in the debate. This means to resist the compromise of both hydrogen and helium with any particular criteria (Labarca, Srivaths, 2016, 525).

In figure 1 below I reproduce the figure of the periodic table that the authors have proposed on the basis of their balance argument. As can be seen hydrogen has been carefully placed so that it can be said to be simultaneously among the elements in the alkali metal group and the halogen group. Similarly the element helium has been carefully placed in such a way as for it to appear simultaneously in the noble gas group as well as the alkaline earth group.

At first sight this might seem to be a perfect solution to the long-standing debate. However, as I want to now suggest this proposed solution is a blatant form of *ad hoc* maneuver. It is ad hoc for the simple reason that the solution has been especially designed to accommodate the facts and because it does not lead to any new predictions about any of the elements concerned. Let us recall that the literal meaning of the term "ad hoc" in the context of scientific theories, explanations or a system of classification in this case, to mean an explanation that is being brought to bear "to here". It is surely all too easy. The only reason why Labarca and Srivaths have proposed their design is so as to accommodate the ambiguous nature of hydrogen and helium. This compromise does not solve the problem but rather surrenders to it fully.

Nor are any of the reasons that the authors suggest to support their proposal any more convincing. For example, they state that one virtue of their approach is that it does not involve reducing the periodic table to quantum mechanics as though such a deed is inherently suspect from the outset. I am tempted to suggest that in doing so the authors are committing an even bigger mistake than proposing their ad hoc and impotent periodic table.

Unfortunately, and for several reasons that I have attempted to analyze in other publications, many philosophers of chemistry have fallen prey to the mistaken view that reductionism is inherently bad and that it must be opposed on principle.[2] What they fail to understand is that reductionism is a direction rather than a goal. They also fail to understand that the success or otherwise of reductionism is a matter of degree rather than all or nothing.



Figure 1. Reproduced from figure 8 of Labarca and Srivaths article.

---

1 M. Labarca, A. Srivaths, *Chemistry: Bulgarian Journal of Science Education*, 25, 524-530, 2016.

2 E.R. Scerri, The Gulf Between Chemistry and Philosophy of Chemistry, Then and Now, Special Issue Dedicated to Lou Massa, *Structural Chemistry,* (in press); E.R. Scerri, The Changing Views of a Philosopher of Chemistry on the Question of Reduction, in E.R. Scerri, G. Fisher eds. *Essays in the Philosophy of Chemistry*, Oxford University Press, New York, 2016.