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#### Abstract

The crystal structure of a pure synthetic fayalite has been refined from three dimensional X ray intensity data measured at $20^{\circ}, 300^{\circ}, 600^{\circ}$, and $900^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Cell dimensions have been determined at $20^{\circ}, 300^{\circ}, 450^{\circ}, 600^{\circ}, 750^{\circ}$, and $900^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Comparison of the structures with those of other Mg - Fe olivines is consistent with a slight preference of Fe for the smaller but more distorted M1 site. With increasing temperature, the $M 1-\mathrm{O}$ and $M 2-\mathrm{O}$ distances tend to become more regular while the central bond angles of the octahedra show increasing distortion.


## Introduction

Being a major constituent of the upper mantle and of basic igneous rocks of the Earth and Moon, the forsterite-fayalite crystalline solution series has been the subject of much recent crystal-chemical investigation. Crystalline solution between the two endmembers appears to be very nearly, but not perfectly, ideal (Williams, 1972). Cell dimensions have been found to differ only slightly from linearity between the end members $\mathrm{Mg}_{2} \mathrm{SiO}_{4}$ and $\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{SiO}_{4}$ (Yoder and Sahama, 1957; Jambor and Smith, 1964; Louisnathan and Smith, 1968; and Fisher and Medaris, 1969). The olivine crystal structure was first determined by Bragg and Brown (1926). Recently there have been several modern refinements of the crystal structures at different compositions, primarily with $\mathrm{Fa}<50$ : $\mathrm{Fa}_{10}, \mathrm{Fa}_{46}, \mathrm{Fa}_{50}, \mathrm{Fa}_{96}$ (Birle et al, 1968); $\mathrm{Fa}_{26}, \mathrm{Fa}_{51}$ (Finger, 1970); $\mathrm{Fa}_{01}, \mathrm{Fa}_{40}, \mathrm{Fa}_{30}, \mathrm{Fa}_{32}$ (Wenk and Raymond, 1973); $\mathrm{Fa}_{18}, \mathrm{Fa}_{29}, \mathrm{Fa}_{31}$ (Brown and Prewitt, 1973); $\mathrm{Fo}_{100}$ and $\mathrm{Fa}_{60}$ (Smyth and Hazen, 1973). In these crystal structure studies, Finger, Wenk and Raymond, and Prewitt and Brown have noticed a small but significant preference of Fe for the smaller, but more distorted, M1 site, with M1 containing two to five percent more iron than $M 2$. In these studies the greatest preference of Fe for $M 1$ has been found in volcanic specimens while metamorphic olivines tend toward complete disorder. Mössbauer $\gamma$ resonance spectroscopy studies (Bush, Hafner, and Virgo, 1970; Virgo and Hafner, 1972) have confirmed a small preference of Fe for one of the two $M$ sites in some olivines. Shinno et al (1974) conclude from a

[^0]Mössbauer study of heated natural olivines that the preference of Fe for M 1 increases with increasing temperatures and have reported reverse order (more Fe in M 2 ) in some low temperature magnesian olivines.

There have also been several studies of the effects of increasing temperatures on the olivine structure. Thermal expansion curves for olivines of several compositions have been determined (Kozu, Ueda, and Tsurumi, 1934; Rigby, Lovell, and Green, 1945, 1946; Skinner, 1962). The olivine structure has recently been refined at elevated temperatures for several compositions: $\mathrm{Fo}_{100}$ and $\mathrm{Fa}_{60}$ (Smyth and Hazen, 1973); and $\mathrm{Fa}_{30}$ (Brown and Prewitt, 1973). Both reports indicate slightly increased order of Fe in $M 1$ with increasing temperature. The former authors attributed this to possible oxidation of the sample, while the latter authors noted that it could be accounted for by an increased angular distortions of $M 1$ relative to $M 2$ with increasing temperature. I have undertaken the study of the crystal structure of a pure synthetic fayalite at elevated temperatures in order to provide a useful point for comparison with other olivine crystal structures.

## Intensity Measurement and Structure Refinements

Crystals up to 1 mm in greatest dimension were grown from a pure fayalite melt at $1210^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ in a gasmixing furnace at an oxygen fugacity near the quartz-fayalite-iron buffer. The composition of the crystals was confirmed by microprobe analysis to be pure $\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{SiO}_{4}$ with impurities less than 0.1 percent.

A roughly equant anhedral crystal fragment approximately $150 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ in greatest dimension was selected for study. One-hundred-hour precession

Table 1. Intensity Measurement and Refinement

|  | $20 \circ \mathrm{C}$ | 300 C | 600 C | 900 C |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Intensity Measurement |  |  |  |  |
| Radiation |  |  |  |  |
| KV/Ma | $40 / 16$ | $40 / 16$ | $40 / 16$ | $40 / 16$ |
| 2ө Monochromator | $11.6^{\circ}$ | $11.6^{\circ}$ | $11.6^{\circ}$ | 11.60 |
| 2ө Scan Speed (o/min) | 0.5 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| Maximum 2日 (o) | 75 | 60 | 60 | 60 |
| No. measurements | 978 | 558 | 570 | 573 |
| No. observations (I>3o) | 625 | 359 | 335 | 306 |
| Refinement |  |  |  |  |
| No. intensities rejected | 4 |  |  |  |
| R | .047 | .049 | .053 | .074 |
| R (wt) | .044 | .041 | .044 | .055 |

camera exposures on each major axis confirmed the space group as $P b n m$ with no evidence of the super cell reflections reported by Eliseev (1958). The crystal was remounted in an evacuated silica-glass capillary according to the method described by Smyth (1972). Intensity data were measured at $20^{\circ}, 300^{\circ}, 600^{\circ}$, and $900^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ using a Picker FACS-1 computer-controlled diffractometer. Using the heater described by Smyth (1972) equipped with a feed-back controller, the temperature was maintained to $\pm 5^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ at $300^{\circ}$ and $600^{\circ}$ and to $\pm 15^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ at $900^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ during intensity measurement. Details of each set of intensity measurements are given in Table 1. Cell dimensions (Table 2) were calculated from a least squares fit to the diffractometer angles obtained by manually centering twelve strong diffraction peaks at $20^{\circ}, 300^{\circ}$, $450^{\circ}, 600^{\circ}, 750^{\circ}$, and $900^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$.

All intensities were corrected for Lorentz and polarization effects and for absorption differences using numerical integration techniques (Burnham, 1966). Based on the calculated linear absorption coefficient $96.7 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$, transmission factors varied

Table 2. Cell Dimensions of Fayalite

| Temperature | - $\left(\begin{array}{l}\text { ( } \\ \text { ) }\end{array}\right.$ | $\underline{\mathrm{b}}$ ( A ) | c ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ) | Vol. ( ${ }^{0}{ }^{3}$ ) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $20^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | 4.818 (2) | 10.471(3) | $6.086(2)$ | $307.02(8)$ |
| $300{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | 4.825 (1) | 10.491 (2) | $6.100(1)$ | $308.80(7)$ |
| $450{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | $4.836(2)$ | $10.498(3)$ | $6.709(2)$ | 310.12 (9) |
| $600^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | 4.841 (1) | 10.521 (2) | $6.126(1)$ | 311.96 (7) |
| $750^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | 4.851 (2) | 10.540 (3) | $6.139(2)$ | $313.83(9)$ |
| $900^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | $4.860(1)$ | 10.559(2) | $6.150(1)$ | 315.64 (7) |
| TEC | 9.9 (3)* | 9.5 (3)* | 11.9 (4)* | 3.19 (3)** |

[^1]Table 3. Positional and Thermal Parameters

|  |  | $20^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | $300^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | $600^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | $900^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| M1 | $x$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | r | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | z | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | $\beta_{11}$ | 0.0035 (3) | 0.0075 (5) | 0.0129(6) | $0.0190(11)$ |
|  | $\beta_{22}$ | 0.0019 (1) | 0.0038 (1) | $0.0060(1)$ | $0.0079(2)$ |
|  | $\mathrm{B}_{3}$ | $0.0035(2)$ | 0.0072 (3) | 0.0111 (4) | $0.0199(7)$ |
|  | $\beta_{12}$ | $0.0002(2)$ | 0.0005 (3) | 0.0003 (4) | $0.0004(6)$ |
|  | $\mathrm{B}_{13}$ | -0.0006 (3) | -0.0009 (5) | -0.0019(6) | -0.0030(10) |
|  | $\mathrm{B}_{23}$ | -0.0004(1) | -0.0009(2) | -0.0017(2) | -0.0027(4) |
|  | B eq. | $0.57(1)$ | 1.14(4) | 1.84(6) | 2.78 (8) |
| M2 | $\times$ | $0.9853(2)$ | 0.9859 (3) | $0.9866(4)$ | $0.9871(6)$ |
|  | Y | $0.2800(1)$ | $0.2803(1)$ | 0.2806 (1) | 0.2808 (2) |
|  | z | 1/4 | 1/4 | 1/4 | 1/4 |
|  | $8_{11}$ | 0.0045 (3) | $0.0105(6)$ | $0.0170(8)$ | $0.0249(13)$ |
|  | $\mathrm{B}_{22}$ | $0.0013(1)$ | $0.0026(1)$ | $0.0040(1)$ | $0.0051(2)$ |
|  | $\mathrm{Ba}_{3}$ | $0.0034(2)$ | 0.0065 (3) | $0.0102(5)$ | $0.0159(7)$ |
|  | $\beta_{12}$ | $0.0000(1)$ | $0.0002(2)$ | -0.0002 (3) | $0.0002(6)$ |
|  | B eq. | 0.50 (1) | $1.03(4)$ | 1.63(6) | 2.35 (8) |
| Si | k | $0.4292(4)$ | 0,4294(5) | 0.4295 (6) | $0.4288(9)$ |
|  | Y | 0.0975 (2) | 0.0976 (3) | 0.0975 (3) | 0.0971 (4) |
|  | 2 | 1/4 | 1/4 | 1/4 | 1/4 |
|  | $B_{11}$ | $0.0019(6)$ | $0.0040(9)$ | $0.0066(14)$ | $0.0095(20)$ |
|  | $B_{22}$ | $0.0012(2)$ | $0.0022(2)$ | 0.0034 (3) | $0.0037(5)$ |
|  | B33 | $0.0034(5)$ | 0.0060 (8) | $0.0077(9)$ | 0.0144 (15) |
|  | $B_{12}$ | $0.0002(3)$ | $0.0005(4)$ | $0.0001(5)$ | $0.0007(8)$ |
|  | B eq. | 0.41 (1) | 0.74 (8) | 1.09(9) | 1.57(12) |
| 01 | $x$ | $0.7687(10)$ | $0.7672(12)$ | $0.7673(15)$ | $0.7674(23)$ |
|  | Y | $0.0928(5)$ | $0.0933(6)$ | $0.0936(7)$ | 0.0941 (11) |
|  | z | 1/4 | 1/4 | 1/4 | 1/4 |
|  | $\beta_{11}$ | 0.0026 (15) | $0.0025(30)$ | $0.0126(35)$ | $0.0138(50)$ |
|  | $\mathrm{B}_{22}$ | $0.0014(4)$ | 0.0027 (7) | $0.0036(9)$ | $0.0050(14)$ |
|  | $\beta_{33}$ | $0.0049(12)$ | 0.0081 (19) | $0.0103(24)$ | $0.0156(42)$ |
|  | $\beta_{12}$ | $0.0014(8)$ | $0.0018(10)$ | $0.0019(15)$ | $0.0029(20)$ |
|  | B eq. | $0.53(2)$ | 0.87 (18) | 1.44(22) | $1.97(30)$ |
| 02 | $x$ | 0.2076 (9) | $0.2086(10)$ | $0.2094(14)$ | 0.2090 (20) |
|  | y | 0.4529(5) | $0.4529(6)$ | $0.4527(8)$ | $0.4532(10)$ |
|  | 2 | 1/4 | 1/4 | 1/4 | 1/4 |
|  | $\beta_{11}$ | $0.0006(15)$ | $0.0038(25)$ | $0.0054(32)$ | $0.0082(49)$ |
|  | $\beta_{22}$ | $0.0018(4)$ | $0.0033(6)$ | $0.0042(8)$ | $0.0050(12)$ |
|  | 833 | $0.0029(10)$ | $0.0054(15)$ | $0.0092(20)$ | $0.0172(35)$ |
|  | $8_{12}$ | -0.0006(7) | -0.0007(10) | -0.0008(12) | -0.0024(20) |
|  | $B$ eq. | 0.42 (2) | 0.87 (15) | 1.25(23) | 1.87(26) |
| 03 | $x$ | 0.2884 (7) | 0.2897 (8) | 0.2906 (10) | $0.2919(14)$ |
|  | Y | $0.1637(3)$ | $0.1630(4)$ | $0.1628(4)$ | $0.1625(6)$ |
|  | Z | $0.0383(6)$ | 0.0395 (8) | $0.0403(10)$ | $0.0443(13)$ |
|  | $B_{11}$ | $0.0035(12)$ | $0.0072(78)$ | $0.0109(20)$ | 0.0166 (35) |
|  | $B_{22}$ | $0.0011(3)$ | $0.0020(4)$ | $0.0032(5)$ | $0.0038(8)$ |
|  | 333 | $0.0045(9)$ | $0.0079(14)$ | $0.0135(20)$ | $0.0248(30)$ |
|  | $\beta_{12}$ | -0.0003 (5) | -0.0010(8) | -0.0005(10) | -0.0006(15) |
|  | $\beta_{13}$ | -0.0005 (9) | -0.0015 (16) | 0.0002 (20) | $0.0017(32)$ |
|  | $\mathrm{B}_{2} 3$ | 0.0007 (4) | 0.0011 (6) | $0.0024(8)$ | $0.0035(14)$ |
|  | $B$ eq. | 0.49(2) | 0.91 (12) | 1.48(16) | 2,34(20) |

from 0.26 to 0.51 . All refinements of the structure models were done with a version of the full-matrix least squares refinement program Rfine (Finger, 1969). All observations were weighted according to $W=1 / \sigma_{F}{ }^{2}$ where $\sigma_{F}$ is the standard deviation based on counting statistics as described by Burnham et al (1971). All observations below the minimum observable level $(3 \sigma)$ were rejected from the normal equations matrix during refinement. Atomic scattering factors used were those given by Cromer and Mann (1968) for half-ionized atoms as derived from Hartree-Fock wave functions neglecting relativistic effects. Real and imaginary anomalous dispersion terms (Cromer and Liberman, 1968) were also in-

Table 4. Magnitude and Orientation of Thermal Vibration Ellipsoids

| Temperature | axis | M1 |  |  |  | M2 |  |  |  | Si |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | RMS Ampl. ( $\mathrm{B}^{\circ}$ ) | +a | +b | +c | RMS Amp 1. ( $\AA$ ) | +a | +b | + c | RMS Ampl. $\left(\begin{array}{l}\text { A }\end{array}\right.$ | +a | +b | +c |
| $20^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \\ & 2 \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.062(2) \\ & 0.080(2) \\ & 0.106(3) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 18(6) \\ & 73(6) \\ & 96(6) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 90(5) \\ 108(5) \\ 162(6) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 72(7) \\ 155(6) \\ 73(6) \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.072(2) \\ & 0.080(2) \\ & 0.086(2) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3(8) \\ 90 \\ 87(8) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 93(7) \\ & 90 \\ & 3(8) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 90 \\ 180 \\ 90 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.046(2) \\ & 0.080(3) \\ & 0.083(4) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6(6) \\ & 90 \\ & 84(12) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 96(8) \\ & 90 \\ & 6(71) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 90 \\ 180 \\ 90 \end{array}$ |
| $300^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \\ & 2 \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.092(3) \\ & 0.113(3) \\ & 0.149(3) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 13(8) \\ & 79(7) \\ & 97(8) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 93(7) \\ 112(7) \\ 158(8) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 77(8) \\ 156(7) \\ 70(8) \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.111(3) \\ & 0.111(4) \\ & 0.120(3) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11(22) \\ & 90 \\ & 79(17) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 101(24) \\ 90 \\ 71(19) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 90 \\ 180 \\ 90 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.067(3) \\ & 0.106(3) \\ & 0.112(4) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9(8) \\ & 90 \\ & 81(10) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 99(9) \\ & 90 \\ & 9(10) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 90 \\ 180 \\ 90 \end{array}$ |
| $600^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \\ & 2 \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.118(3) \\ & 0.142(3) \\ & 0.189(3) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 26(9) \\ & 64(9) \\ & 95(10) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 85(9) \\ & 111(9) \\ & 158(10) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 64(10) \\ 146(10) \\ 69(10) \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.140(4) \\ & 0.142(4) \\ & 0.150(4) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 90 \\ & 166(28) \\ & 76(21) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 90 \\ & 104(24) \\ & 166(22) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0 \\ 90 \\ 90 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.089(3) \\ & 0.121(3) \\ & 0.138(4) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1(9) \\ & 90 \\ & 89(9) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 91(10) \\ & 90 \\ & 1(10) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 90 \\ 180 \\ 90 \end{array}$ |
| $900^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \\ & 2 \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.146(4) \\ & 0.182(4) \\ & 0.226(4) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 17(12) \\ & 74(11) \\ & 97(12) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 86(13) \\ 126(11) \\ 144(12) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 73(13) \\ 739(11) \\ 54(12) \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.170(4) \\ & 0.173(4) \\ & 0.175(4) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 65(35) \\ 155(38) \\ 90 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 155(33) \\ 125(39) \\ 90 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 90 \\ 90 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.105(4) \\ & 0.145(4) \\ & 0.166(4) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10(12) \\ & 100(12) \\ & 90 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 100(11) \\ & 170(12) \\ & 90 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 90 \\ 90 \\ 0 \end{array}$ |
|  |  | 01 |  |  |  | 02 |  |  |  | 03 |  |  |  |
| Temperature | axis | RMS Ampl. ( $\AA$ ) | +a | +b | +c | RMS Ampl. ( $\AA$ ) | +a | +b | +c | RMS Amp 1. ( A ) | +a | +b | +c |
| $20^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \\ & 2 \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.033(4) \\ & 0.096(4) \\ & 0.100(4) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 28(8) \\ & 90 \\ & 62(12) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 118(8) \\ & 90 \\ & 28(14) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 90 \\ 180 \\ 90 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.020(4) \\ & \begin{array}{l} 0.073(4) \\ 0.101(4) \end{array} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9(6) \\ & 90 \\ & 81(9) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 81(6) \\ 90 \\ 171(8) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 90 \\ 180 \\ 90 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.062(3) \\ & 0.068(4) \\ & 0.100(4) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 26(78) \\ & 113(16) \\ & 100(9) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 65(22) \\ & 43(24) \\ & 58(8) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 95(27) \\ 124(26) \\ 34(8) \end{array}$ |
| $300^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \\ & 2 \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.037(5) \\ & 0.123(5) \\ & 0.128(6) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 19(9) \\ & 90 \\ & 71(17) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 109(8) \\ & 90 \\ & 19(19) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 90 \\ 180 \\ 90 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.065(6) \\ & 0.101(6) \\ & 0.137(5) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 7(8) \\ 90 \\ 83(9) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 83(9) \\ 90 \\ 173(10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 90 \\ 180 \\ 90 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.083(5) \\ & 0.097(5) \\ & 0.134(4) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 31(12) \\ 173(14) \\ 109(10) \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 59(17) \\ & 47(19) \\ & 58(17) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 89(16) \\ 128(18) \\ 38(12) \end{array}$ |
| $600^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \\ & 2 \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.110(6) \\ & 0.140(7) \\ & 0.153(7) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 30(10) \\ & 90 \\ & 60(15) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 120(9) \\ & 90 \\ & 30(18) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 90 \\ 180 \\ 90 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.078(7) \\ & 0.132(7) \\ & 0.154(8) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6(8) \\ & 90 \\ & 84(11) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 84(9) \\ & 90 \\ & 174(12) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 90 \\ 180 \\ 90 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.107(6) \\ & 0.119(6) \\ & 0.175(6) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 133(19) \\ 137(22) \\ 91(11) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 129(28) \\ 55(24) \\ 58(14) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 68(24) \\ 112(24) \\ 32(12) \end{array}$ |
| $900^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \\ & 2 \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.114(9) \\ & 0.173(9) \\ & 0.179(9) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 26(12) \\ & 90 \\ & 64(23) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 116(11) \\ & 90 \\ & 26(21) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 90 \\ 180 \\ 90 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.089(9) \\ & 0.173(9) \\ & 0.181(9) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 17(10) \\ 107(16) \\ 90 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 73(12) \\ & 17(19) \\ & 90 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 90 \\ 90 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.126(8) \\ & 0.146(8) \\ & 0.228(7) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 122(28) \\ 148(26) \\ 87(21) \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 142(27) \\ 69(27) \\ 70(19) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 71(27) \\ & 98(20) \\ & 21(20) \end{aligned}$ |

Table 6. Metal-Oxygen Distances $(\AA)^{*}$

|  | $20^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | $300^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | $600^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | $900^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| M1 Octahedron |  |  |  |  |
| M1-01 [2]** | 2.121 (5)*** | 2.132(6) | $2.141(7)$ | 2.152(11) |
| M1-02 [2] | 2.131(4) | $2.132(5)$ | $2.138(7)$ | $2.147(10)$ |
| M7 -03 [2] | 2.219 (3) | 2.222 (4) | 2.230 (5) | 2.243(7) |
| Mean M1-0 | 2.157 | 2.162 | 2.170 | 2.181 |
| M2 Octahedron |  |  |  |  |
| M2-01 [1] | $2.221(5)$ | 2.229 (6) | $2.235(7)$ | 2.242(11) |
| M2-03 [1] | $2.103(3)$ | 2.105 (4) | 2.108(5) | $2.176(7)$ |
| M2-03 [2] | $2.080(3)$ | $2.090(4)$ | $2.102(5)$ | $2.129(7)$ |
| M2-03 [2] | 2.296 (3) | 2.305 (4) | 2.313(5) | 2.315(7) |
| Mean M2-0 | 2.179 | 2.187 | 2.196 | 2.208 |
| Si Tetrahedron |  |  |  |  |
| Si-01 [1] | 1.636(5) | 1.630(6) | $1.635(7)$ | 1.646(11) |
| Si-02 [1] | 1.652(4) | $1.658(5)$ | $1.664(7)$ | 1.660 (10) |
| Si-03 [2] | $1.612(3)$ | $1.604(4)$ | 1.605 (5) | 1.587 (7) |
| Mean Si-0 | 1.628 | 1.624 | 1.627 | 1.620 |

* Distances not corrected for themal motion.
** Figures in brackets are multiplicity of bond in polynedron.
**Figures in parentheses are the estimated standard deviation in termis of the last decimal place cited.
cluded in each cycle of refinement. The initial model used for the refinement of the room temperature structures was that given for fayalite $\left(\mathrm{Fa}_{96}\right)$ by Birle et al (1968). The structure models at each elevated

Table 7. Selected Bond Angles (degrees)

|  | $20^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | $300^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | $600^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | $900^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| M1 Octahedron |  |  |  |  |
| 01-M1-03 [2]* | 84.25(13)** | 84.29(16) | 84.22(19) | 83.81 (29) |
| 01-M1-03 ${ }^{\text {[2] }}$ | 95.75(13) | 95.71 (16) | 95.78(19) | 96.19(29) |
| 01-MT-02 [2] | 86.63(13) | 86.69(16) | 86.59(19) | 86.59(29) |
| 01-M1-02 ${ }^{1}$ [2] | 93.38(13) | 93.31 (16) | 93.41 (19) | 93.41 (29) |
| 02-M1-03 [2] | $71.92(11)$ | 71.70 (13) | 71.61 (18) | 70.85 (26) |
| 02-M1-03 ${ }^{1}$ [2] | 108.08(11) | 108.30(13) | 108.39(18) | 109.15(26) |
| Mean 0-M1-0 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 |
| $\sigma^{2 * * *}$ | 135.0 | 137.6 | 139.3 | 157.5 |
| M2 Octahedron |  |  |  |  |
| 01-M2-03 [2] | 80.25 (13) | 80.26(16) | $80.26(19)$ | 80.21 (29) |
| 01-M2-03 ${ }^{11}$ [2] | 92.04 (13) | 92.05(16) | 92.01 (19) | 92.02(29) |
| 02-M2-03 [2] | 97.63(11) | 97.73(13) | 97.71 (18) | 97.95(26) |
| 02-M2-03 ${ }^{112}$ [2] | 89.34(11) | 89.25(13) | 89.27(18) | $89.14(26)$ |
| 03-M2-03 ${ }^{1}$ [1] | 68.22(8) | 67.69(10) | 67.48(13) | 66.26 (18) |
| 03-M2-03 ${ }^{11}$ [2] | 88.11 (8) | $88.23(10)$ | 88.22 (13) | 88.41 (18) |
| 03-M2-03 ${ }^{111}$ [1] | 115.05(8) | 115.37(10) | $115.60(13)$ | 116.44(18) |
| Mean 0-M2-0 | 89.83 | 89.84 | 89.84 | 89.85 |
| $\sigma^{2}$ | 129.5 | 133.3 | 135.2 | 145.0 |
| Si Tetrahedron |  |  |  |  |
| 01-Si-02 [1] |  |  | 112.42(19) |  |
| 01-Si-03 [2] | 115.71 (13) | $115.61(16)$ | 115.43 (19) | $115.30(29)$ |
| 02-Si-03 [2] | 103.06(11) | 102.88 (13) | 102.87(18) | 103.23(26) |
| 03-Si-03 ${ }^{1}$ [1] | 106.04(8) | $106.29(10)$ | 106.36(13) | 105.71(18) |
| Mean O-Si-0 | 109.23 | 109.22 | 109.23 | 109.24 |

* Figures in brackets are multiplicity of angle in polyhedron.
** Figures in parentheses are the estimated otandard deviation in terms of the last deoimal plaoe oited.
***octahedrat angle variance $\sigma_{B}^{2}=\sum_{i=1}^{12} \frac{\left(\theta_{i}-90^{\circ}\right)^{2}}{11}$ (Robinson et az., (2971).


Fig. 1. A plot of the mean $M 1-\mathrm{O}$ and M2-O distances versus bulk composition for several modern refinements of the olivine structure at $20^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Symbols: open circle, Birle et al (1968); solid circle, Wenk and Raymond (1972); open square, Brown and Prewitt (1973); solid square, Finger (1970); open triangle, Smyth and Hazen (1973); and solid triangle, this work. The broken lines indicate the strictly linear trend between the end points.
temperature were then each refined in turn from the model obtained at the next lower temperature. Final weighted and unweighted $R$ factors are presented in Table 1. Final positional and thermal parameters are presented in Table 3. The magnitudes and orientations of thermal vibration ellipsoids are given in Table 4. The final observed and calculated structure factors are available as Table 5. ${ }^{2}$

## Discussion

Cation-oxygen distances are presented in Table 6 and oxygen-cation-oxygen angles are presented in Table 7. Comparison of the room temperature fayalite structure with those of previously determined olivines reveals some aspects of the forsterite-fayalite crystalline solution series. Figure 1 is a plot of the mean M1-O and M2-O distances as a function of composition. The $M 2-\mathrm{O}$ distances exhibit a nearly linear relationship; however, there is considerable scatter in the intermediate olivines most likely due to variable small amounts of Ca , which should show a

[^2]MI


Fig. 2A. An $a$-axis projection of the $M 1$ coordination polyhedron (site symmetry $\overline{1}$ ) showing the $M 1-\mathrm{O}$ distances at $200^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ (upper) and $900^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ (lower).


Fig. 2B. An $a$-axis projection of the $M 2$ coordination polyhedron (site symmetry $m$ ) showing the $M 2-\mathrm{O}$ distances at $20^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ (upper figure) and $900^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ (lower figure).
strong preference for $M 2$. The smaller amount of scatter shown by the M1-O distances reveals a slight concave downward curvature. This curvature is most likely due to the preference of Fe for the smaller, but more distorted $M 1$ site reported by several workers (Bush et al, 1970; Finger, 1970; Finger and Virgo, 1971; Virgo and Hafner, 1972; Wenk and Raymond, 1972). Such curvature indicates that a small preference of Fe in $\mathrm{M1}$ is common. A few more refinements of synthetic olivine structures in the composition range $\mathrm{Fa}_{60-90}$ would help to confirm this trend.

Figures 2A and 2B are $a$ axis projections of $M 1$ and $M 2$ coordination polyhedra showing the $M-\mathrm{O}$ distances at $20^{\circ}$ and $900^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. This figure illustrates that there is a slight tendency for the M2-O distances to become more regular with increasing temperature. Figure 3 contains plots of several structural


Fig. 3A. A plot of the mean M1-O distances versus temperature for several olivines. $\mathrm{Fo}_{100}$ and $\mathrm{Fa}_{80}$ are from Smyth and Hazen
(1973) and $\mathrm{Fa}_{30}$ from Brown and Prewitt (1973).
parameters of olivines as a function of temperature. Figures 3A and 3B are plots of the mean M1-O and $M 2-\mathrm{O}$ distances respectively for fayalite and the olivine structures $\left(\mathrm{Fo}_{100}, \mathrm{Fa}_{30}\right.$, and $\left.\mathrm{Fa}_{61}\right)$ previously studied at high temperatures. The smaller $M$ sites of forsterite show slightly greater expansion than the correspondingly larger $M$ sites of fayalite. $\mathrm{Fa}_{30}$ and $\mathrm{Fa}_{60}$ values show predictable intermediate trends indicating that the near ideality of forsterite-fayalite solid solutions extends to elevated temperatures. Figure 3C is a plot of the relative expansions of the


Fig. 3B. A plot of the mean M2-O distances versus temperatures for several olivines. References are the same as for Figure 2A.


Fig. 3C. A plot of the percent expansion of the mean M1-O, $M 2-\mathrm{O}$, and $\mathrm{Si}-\mathrm{O}$ distances versus temperature for fayalite.
mean M1-O, M2-O, and SiO distances. As has been noted in previous high temperature crystallographic studies of ferromagnesian silicates (Smyth, 1971, 1973, 1974; Brown and Prewitt, 1973; Smyth and Hazen, 1973; Cameron et al., 1973), the M-O distances show large positive expansions while the $\mathrm{Si}-\mathrm{O}$ distances show zero or slightly negative expansions. Figure 3D is a plot of the octahedral angle variance which Robinson et al (1971) defined as a sensitive


Fig. 3D. A plot of the octahedral angle variance (as defined by Robinson et al, 1971) versus temperature for fayalite.
measure of angular distortion in octahedral coordination polyhedra. The curves for fayalite are similar to those of Brown and Prewitt (1973) and show sharply increasing angular distortion of the $M 1$ and $M 2$ octahedra above $600^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$.

## Conclusions

The refinement of the room temperature structure of a pure fayalite has provided a useful point of comparison for the review of the iron-magnesium olivine structures. The high temperature structure refinements have shown that fayalite behaves like forsterite with increasing temperature and thus there are no radical changes in the structures up to $900^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. They have shown that with increasing temperature, the M1-O and M2-O distances tend to become slightly more regular while the octahedral angles show increasing distortion.
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