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#### Abstract

The synthetic calcium phosphate-sulfate hydrate, $\mathrm{Ca}_{2} \mathrm{HPO}_{4} \mathrm{SO}_{4} \cdot 4 \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$, is monoclinic, space group $C c, a=5.721(5), b=30.992(5), c=6.250(4) \mathrm{A}$, and $\beta=117.26(6)^{\circ}, Z=4$. The structure has been determined by the Patterson method and refined by full-matrix leastsquares method to a conventional $R=0.068$, using 268 independent reffections. The structure possesses four sheet-structure units parallel to ( 010 ), in which Ca atoms are coordinated by six oxygen atoms belonging to $(\mathrm{P}, \mathrm{S}) \mathrm{O}_{4}$ tetrahedra and two water molecules at the surface of the sheet. Each sheet unit is analogous to those of brushite and gypsum, but there is a different mode of sheet stacking from those in brushite and gypsum. The mean $T$-O bond lengths, 1.50 A at $T(1)$ site and 1.49 A at $T(2)$ site, are close to an average distance of $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{O}(1.54 \mathrm{~A})$ and $\mathrm{S}-\mathrm{O}(1.46 \mathrm{~A})$ bond lengths. The distribution of P and S atoms in $T$ sites seems to be random.


## Introduction

Ardealite, $\mathrm{Ca}_{2} \mathrm{HPO}_{4} \mathrm{SO}_{4} \cdot 4 \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$, is a rare phos-phate-sulfate mineral first described by Schadler (1932) from Cioclovina cave, Transylvania. This original material is found in close association with gypsum, $\mathrm{CaSO}_{4} \cdot 2 \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$, and brushite, $\mathrm{CaHPO}_{4}$. $2 \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$. Recently, one of the authors (T. Sakae) found ardealite from the Onino-Iwaya limestone cave at Hiroshima Prefecture, Japan (in preparation).

Beevers (1958) and Hill and Hendricks (1936) pointed out that, because of a close similarity in their chemical compositions, ardealite may belong to a solid solution between brushite and gypsum. In the crystal structures of brushite (Jones and Smith, 1962) and gypsum (Atoji and Rundle, 1958), the corrugating sheets stack along the $b$ axis. O'Daniel (1939) and Baynham and Raistrick (1960), however, reported
that X-ray powder diffraction patterns of ardealite, brushite, and gypsum are considerably different from each other. Ferraris (1969) insisted that brushite and gypsum are not in a strict isostructural relation because of the different space groups: Ia for brushite and $I 2 / a$ for gypsum. Recent X-ray and neutrondiffraction analyses have revealed that the configuration of water molecules in brushite (Curry and Jones, 1971) is quite different from that of gypsum (Cole and Lancucki, 1974). The crystal-chemical relation a mong ardealite, brushite, and gypsum is a matter for further research.

The study of the crystal structure of ardealite is significant and interesting. It was difficult, however, to obtain a single crystal of ardealite for structural determination. Single crystals obtained from synthetic material have been used in this structure deter-
mination. These synthetic crystals almost agree with natural ardealite in various properties, but are slightly different from ardealite in their X-ray powder patterns.

## Experimental

## Material

$\mathrm{Ca}(\mathrm{OH})_{2}, \mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{HPO}_{4} \cdot 12 \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$, and $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$ were used as starting materials. Each of these were made up in water solutions with the same mole concentrations. These solutions were mixed with each other in the mole ratio of $\mathrm{Ca} /(\mathrm{P}+\mathrm{S})=1$. The pH values of the mixed solutions were controlled by adding dilute hydrochloric acid. Varying the conditions from pH 2 to $5 ; \mathrm{P} / \mathrm{S}, 0 / 10$ to $10 / 0$; mole conc., 0.25 to 0.5 ; temperatures, $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ to $50^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, three-component mixtures of brushite, ardealite-like material, and gypsum were not found in precipitates although two-component mixtures were found. In the series of syntheses at pH 4 , precipitates are brushite plus ardeal-ite-like material ( $\mathrm{P} / \mathrm{S}=6 / 4$ ), ardealite-like material plus gypsum ( $\mathrm{P} / \mathrm{S}=5 / 5$ ), and gypsum ( $\mathrm{P} / \mathrm{S}=4 / 6$ ), as revealed by X-ray powder diffraction analysis. A crystalline precipitate from a solution with $\mathrm{P} / \mathrm{S}=9 / 1$ and $\mathrm{pH}=3$, after standing for 43 days at $20^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, consisted of the ardealite-like material free from brushite and gypsum, as revealed by X-rays. This crystalline precipitate was used for the present study.

Chemical composition of the product is as follows: $\mathrm{CaO}, 32.5 ; \mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}, 20.9 ; \mathrm{SO}_{3}, 23.2$; ignition loss (below $600^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ), 22.9; total, 99.5 (weight percent). Several crystals in the product were analyzed semiquantitatively by the point-analysis method employing Hitachi-Kevex Sem. Each of them had the mole ratio of $\mathrm{Ca}: \mathrm{P}: \mathrm{S}=2: 1: 1$. Although the chemical compositions of the crystals are uniform, Weissenberg photographs of the crystals show some differences. Throughout the photographs the cell dimensions are the same but the extinctions are different. Among them a crystal showing the extinctions set out below was used for the data collection. Crystals with other extinctions are also being studied. Further, the single crystal was analyzed by the point analysis method, which confirmed that it had the mole ratio of $\mathrm{Ca}: \mathrm{P}: \mathrm{S}=2: 1: 1$. The chemical formula was therefore assumed to be $\mathrm{Ca}_{2} \mathrm{HPO}_{4} \mathrm{SO}_{4} \cdot 4 \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$.

## Data collection

The crystal is a triangular plate (fragment) approximately 0.015 mm thick, 0.06 mm along the $a$ axis and 0.09 mm along the $c$ axis. The systematic extinctions
$h k l$ with $h+k=2 n+1$ and $0 k 0$ with $k=2 n+1$ lead to the space group of $C c$ or $C 2 / c$. The occurrence of $0 k 0$ reflections with $k=4 n$ only ( $040,080,0120$, etc.) suggest that the periodicity along the $b$ axis occurs at four times the elementary unit, as described later. Lattice parameters are determined and refined to $a=$ $5.721(5), b=30.992(5), c=6.250(4) \mathrm{A}, \quad \beta=$ $117.26(6)^{\circ}$ by least-squares method, using 16 reflections measured on a Phillips four-circle diffractometer (graphite-monochromatized $\mathrm{Mo} K \alpha$ radiation).

For intensity measurement the $\omega-2 \theta$ scanning technique was employed $\left(0.05^{\circ}\right.$ per second in $\left.\omega\right)$. Scanning width was defined as $a+b(\tan \theta)$ where $a=1.5$ and $b=0.5$. The crystal was so small that 400 reflections to $\sin \theta / \lambda=0.7$ were collected with monochromatized $\mathrm{Mo} K \alpha$ radiation. Finally, 268 independent reflections of $\left|F_{0}\right|$ greater than $4\left|\sigma F_{0}\right|$ were used for the following structure determination. The data were corrected for Lorentz polarization factors, but not for absorption ( $\mu=15.35 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$ ).

## Structure analysis

The lattice parameters of the present crystal are similar to those of gypsum and brushite (Table 1), except the $b$ dimension, which is nearly equal to the sum of the $b$ dimensions of gypsum and brushite. One-dimensional Patterson synthesis along the $b$ axis shows a similar pattern to those of gypsum and brushite, but with a repeat of one-fourth of the $b$ dimension. The results lead to an assumption that the crystal has also a sheet structure, in which each sheet stacks along the $b$ axis with a four-fold periodicity in contrast to a two-fold periodicity in gypsum and brushite.

The space group is $C c$ in brushite ( $I a$ by Jones and Smith, 1962) and C2/c in gypsum (I2/a by Atoji and Rundle, 1958), and $C c$ or $C 2 / c$ in the present crystal. If the structure is a sheet structure analogous to those of gypsum and brushite, a possible space group for the crystal is $C c$ rather than $C 2 / c$, because the symmetry of the structure may be reduced on account of the presence of H atoms, as in the case of brushite. Thus the space group $C c$ was examined in the first step of the crystal structure analysis ${ }^{1}$.

A structure model having the space group Cc may be constructed in the following two ways: (1) onesheet structure unit is located between $n$ and $c$ glide

[^0]Table 1. Crystallographic data for $\mathrm{Ca}_{2} \mathrm{HPO}_{4} \mathrm{SO}_{4} \cdot 4 \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$, brushite, and gypsum

|  | $\mathrm{Ca}_{2} \mathrm{HPO}_{4} \mathrm{SO}_{4} \cdot 4 \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ | Brushite |  | Gypsum |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | This study | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Beevers (1958) } \\ & \text { Jones + Smith } \end{aligned}$ | (1962) | ```Cole + Lancucki (1974)``` |  |
| $a$ | 5.721 (5)* A | $5.812 \pm 0.002$ | A | $5.670 \pm 0.002$ | A |
| $b$ | 30.992 (5) | $15.180 \pm 0.003$ |  | $15.201 \pm 0.002$ |  |
| c | 6.250 (4) | $6.239 \pm 0.002$ |  | $6.533 \pm 0.002$ |  |
| $\beta$ | $117.26^{\circ}$ (6) | $116.42^{\circ} \pm 0.03$ |  | $118.60^{\circ} \pm 0.07$ |  |
| Ce11 volume | 985.1(9) $\mathrm{A}^{3}$ | $493 \mathrm{~A}^{\text {a }}$ |  | $494.4 \mathrm{~A}^{3}$ |  |
| Chemical formula | $\mathrm{Ca}_{2} \mathrm{HPO}_{4} \mathrm{SO}_{4} \cdot 4 \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ | $\mathrm{CaHPO} \mathrm{C}^{2} 2 \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ |  | $\mathrm{CaSO}_{4} .2 \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ |  |
| Cel1 content | $4{ }^{4}$ | 4 |  | 4 |  |
| Space group | Cc | Ia |  | I2/a |  |
| *Estimated standa decimal place. | deviations are | n in parenthese | es and | fer to the last |  |

planes, and the mode of sheet stacking is controlled by these symmetry operations; and (2) two-sheet structure units are located on $n$ and $c$ glide planes respectively; in this case the mode of sheet stacking is not affected by the symmetry operations. In the former, a strong peak should occur at $(0,50,0)$, coordinates multiplied by 100, in three-dimensional Patterson synthesis, but such a peak could not be observed. A strong peak at $(8,17,16)$ may indicate that the positions of $\mathrm{Ca}, \mathrm{P}$, or S atoms in the adjacent sheets have shifted to $a$ and $c$ directions. Such a shift cannot be expected in the former but favors the latter. At this stage of the three-dimensional Patterson synthesis, the structure model based on the space group $C 2 / c$ was considered unlikely, because there were no 2 -fold axis symmetry peaks of $(8,17,16)$ and no related peaks on the Harker section at $b / 2$.

Note that in brushite and gypsum the sheet structure units are located on the $c$ glide plane, but those in the second proposed model for the present crystal are located both on the $c$ and $n$ glide planes. The sheet structure unit analogous to those of gypsum and brushite can be located both on $c$ and $n$ glide planes in the present cell, because of the similar cell dimensions (Fig. 1).

The mode of sheet stacking is not defined for the second proposed model, but Ca or ( $\mathrm{P}, \mathrm{S}$ ) atoms in the adjacent sheets may shift in accordance with the $(8,17,16)$ vector components found in the Patterson map. Through several trials concerning this shift, a structure reduced the conventional $R$ rapidly to 0.178 , whereas the other models hardly reduced $R$ to less than 0.26 by a diagonal least-squares method. The positional parameters were refined by full-matrix
least-squares method using Unics program (Sakurai, 1967, after Orfls written by Busing et al., 1962). The neutral atomic scattering factors (International Tables for X-ray Crystallography, 1962) were used for Ca, P, S , and O atoms. Isotropic thermal factors were set at $\mathrm{Ca}, 1.4 ; \mathrm{P}$ and $\mathrm{S}, 1.0 ; \mathrm{O}, 2.0 ; \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}, 2.5$. In the successive refinements, an averaged factor of $P$ and $S$ was used for the atoms at the $T$ sites.

The positional parameters were divided into several groups, because the number of variables were too many compared with the number of reflections. Each group of positional parameters was refined separately and resulted in a reduction of $R$ to $0.070(w R, 0.077)$. A further cycle of refinement of all positional parameters except for $\mathrm{Ca}(1)$ reduced $R$ to 0.069 ( $\mathrm{w} R, 0.077$ ), and the refinement of isotropic temperature factors reduced $R$ to 0.068 ( $w R, 0.077$ ). Refinement with anisotropic temperature factors was not attempted, because of the prohibitive number of least-squares variables necessary for such a model. At the last stage of refinements, Fourier difference synthesis showed no peak except a ripple near the $T(1)$ site, which seemed to be caused by the paucity of the data set.

The final positional parameters and isotropic temperature factors are shown in Table 2, along with their estimated standard deviations. The observed and calculated $F$ values are given in Table 3, and the interatomic distances and angles in Table 4.

## Discussion and description of the crystal structure

The crystal structure is shown in Figure 2(3), where a unit cell is projected along the $c$ axis and compared with the crystal structures of gypsum and brushite [Fig. 2(1) and 2(2)]. The sheets on the $c$ glide planes
are similar to each other. The sheet on the $n$ glide plane in the present structure was assumed to be identical to that on the $c$ glide plane, and the refined structure does not differ significantly from the assumed one (Fig. 1). The main difference among the three crystal structures is in the mode of sheet stackings. In the crystal structures of gypsum and brushite, the mode of sheet stackings is controlled by the $a$ glide symmetry, but in the present crystal structure it is not defined by such a symmetry operation. This difference causes the different configurations of the water molecules described later.
$T$-O bond lengths at $T(1)$ site range from 1.47 to 1.54 A with a mean of 1.50 A , and at $T(2)$ site from 1.47 to 1.53 A with a mean of 1.49 A . There are no significant differences between the two. The mean distances are close to an average value of 1.50 A between the mean P-O bond length, 1.540 A in brushite, and the mean S-O bond length, 1.459A in gypsum.

Calculation of structure factor multiplicities for $T(1)$ and $T(2)$ gave the values of 1.008 and 0.984 respectively, which are near unity. These values ought to be 1.033 and 0.967 respectively in a structure having a completely ordered distribution of $P$ and $S$ atoms in the $T$ sites. On the other hand, the isotropic temperature factor of $T(2)$ is three times that of $T(1)$, as shown in Table 2. The result suggests that there is a ordering of $\mathbf{P}$ and S atoms in the $T$ sites. Refinement based on the ordered structure model did not reduce $R$ to less than 0.071 . These facts, with the result of the Fourier difference synthesis, suggest that at this stage

Table 2. Positional and isotropic thermal atomic parameters for $\mathrm{Ca}_{2} \mathrm{HPO}_{4} \mathrm{SO}_{4} \cdot 4 \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$

|  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Atom | x | y | z | B |
| $\mathrm{Ca}(1)$ | 0.500 | 0.0383 | 0.250 | $1.5(2)$ |
| $\mathrm{Ca}(2)$ | $.590(3)$ | $.2120(3)$ | $.428(4)$ | $1.1(2)$ |
| $\mathrm{T}(1)$ | $.999(4)$ | $.0388(4)$ | $.747(5)$ | $0.6(2)$ |
| $\mathrm{T}(2)$ | $.592(4)$ | $.2111(4)$ | $.937(4)$ | $1.6(2)$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| $0(1)$ | $.942(7)$ | $.0700(10)$ | $.549(7)$ | $1.7(6)$ |
| $0(2)$ | $.038(6)$ | $.0632(11)$ | $.976(7)$ | $1.8(5)$ |
| $0(3)$ | $.771(7)$ | $.0098(10)$ | $.676(7)$ | $2.0(5)$ |
| $0(4)$ | $.257(7)$ | $.0151(10)$ | $.828(8)$ | $2.0(6)$ |
| $0(5)$ |  |  |  |  |
| $0(6)$ | $.412(6)$ | $.1852(11)$ | $.714(7)$ | $3.1(6)$ |
| $0(7)$ | $.735(7)$ | $.1809(11)$ | $.140(7)$ | $2.0(5)$ |
| $0(8)$ | $.432(6)$ | $.2354(11)$ | $.872(7)$ | $2.2(5)$ |
|  |  |  | $.2399(10)$ | $.001(7)$ |
| $\mathrm{W}(1)$ | $.373(7)$ | $.0875(14)$ | $.493(9)$ | $2.6(5)$ |
| $\mathrm{W}(2)$ | $.614(7)$ | $.0931(12)$ | $.019(8)$ | $2.0(6)$ |
| $\mathrm{W}(3)$ | $.227(7)$ | $.1620(14)$ | $.200(9)$ | $3.1(6)$ |
| $\mathrm{W}(4)$ | $.940(7)$ | $.1554(13)$ | $.654(8)$ | $3.1(6)$ |

[^1]

Fig. 1. Projection of the crystal structure onto (1) $c$ glide plane and (2) $n$ glide plane along the $b$ axis. The sheet structure on $c$ glide plane (1) also appears in (2), as is easily shown by selecting $a^{\prime}$ and $c^{\prime}$ axes. The dark tetrahedra lie below the planes.
there seems to be no ordering in the distribution of $\mathbf{P}$ and S atoms in the $T$ sites.

The calcium atoms at $\mathrm{Ca}(1)$ and $\mathrm{Ca}(2)$ sites are eight-coordinated: six to the oxygens belonging to tetrahedra and two to water molecules at the surface of the sheet. Thus structural environments of the calcium atoms are similar to those in gypsum and brushite. It is found that the $\mathrm{Ca}-W$ bond lengths are
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Table 4. Selected interatomic distances and angles for $\mathrm{Ca}_{2} \mathrm{HPO}_{4} \mathrm{SO}_{4} \cdot 4 \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$


* Estimated standard deviations are given in parentheses and refer to the last decimal place.
** The shortest two distances are selected.
longer than the $\mathrm{Ca}-\mathrm{O}$ bond lengths in the present crystal structure, whereas the $\mathrm{Ca}-W$ bond lengths are shorter than the $\mathrm{Ca}-\mathrm{O}$ bond lengths in gypsum, brushite, and its arsenate analogue pharmacolite (Table 5).

The $W-W$ bond lengths in a sheet in brushite and pharmacolite are shorter than in gypsum; this bond is termed an interwater hydrogen bond by Curry and Jones (1971). In the present crystal structure a short $W(1)-W(2)$ bond length, 2.93 A , seems to be due to the interwater hydrogen bond. On the other hand the $W(3)-W(4)$ bond length, 3.04 A , is not as short, but is still shorter than 3.09A of the interwater hydrogen bond length in brushite. The $W$-O bond lengths in the present crystal structure range from 2.70 to 2.83 A . They are shorter than those in brushite (2.743.09A) and in gypsum (2.816-2.896A). Note that a short $W(1)-W(3)$ bond length, 2.83 A , making a bridge between the adjacent sheets, is unusual compared with similar bonds in the structures of gypsum, brushite, and pharmacolite.

## Conclusion

Synthetic calcium phosphate-sulfate hydrate is identical to ardealite in chemical composition. The analyzed crystal structure has some interesting crys-
tallographic properties, such as the cell dimensions being similar to gypsum and brushite but the $b$ dimension of the present crystal being twice as long as those of the two minerals, and although the contrasting sheets are analogous to those in the two minerals the mode of sheet stacking is different. The result of synthesis suggests that this compound may occur in nature. X-ray powder diffraction data are calculated from the crystal structure, and most of the powder reflections agree with those of natural ardealite in spacings and intensities. But we note that several principal reflections usually observed in the pattern of natural ardealite are missing from the calculated pattern. It is not certain whether these additional reflections are due to impurities or to the structural

Table 5. $\mathrm{Ca}-\mathrm{O}$ and $\mathrm{Ca}-W$ bond lengths for $\mathrm{Ca}_{2} \mathrm{HPO}_{4} \mathrm{SO}_{4} \cdot 4 \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$, gypsum, brushite, and pharmacolite

| $\mathrm{Ca}_{2} \mathrm{HPO}_{4} \mathrm{SO}_{4} \cdot 4 \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ |  | Gypsum |  |  | Brushite |  |  | Pharmacolite |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| This study |  | ```Cole + Lancuck1 (1974)``` |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Curry + Jones } \\ & \text { (1971) } \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Ferraris } \\ & \text { (1969) } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| $\mathrm{Ca}(1)-0$ | 2.46 A | $\mathrm{Ca}-0$ | 2.483 | A | $\mathrm{Ca}-\mathrm{O}$ | 2.508 | A | $\mathrm{Ca}-0$ | 2.550 | A |
| $\mathrm{Ca}(2)-0$ | 2.48 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{Ca}(1)-\mathrm{W}$ | 2.49 | $\mathrm{Ca}-\mathrm{W}$ | 2.380 |  | Ca-W | 2.404 |  | Ca-W | 2.413 |  |
| $\mathrm{Ca}(2)-\mathrm{W}$ | 2.50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



Fig. 2. Crystal structure of gypsum, brushite, and $\mathrm{Ca}_{2} \mathrm{HPO}_{4} \mathrm{SO}_{4} \cdot 4 \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ projected along the $c$ axis; (1) gypsum (I2/a, Cole and Lancucki, 1974), (2) brushite (Ia, Curry and Jones, 1971), (3) $\mathrm{Ca}_{2} \mathrm{HPO}_{4} \mathrm{SO}_{4} \cdot 4 \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ (Cc, this study). Large circles represent water molecules and small circles represent calcium atoms. Numbers are the $z$ coordinates of the tetrahedra, calcium, and water sites.
properties of ardealite, because we could not obtain a single crystal of ardealite for structural analysis. In this respect, we take care not to conclude that the present crystal structure is that of natural ardealite.
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[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ For the sake of the comparison of lattice parameters between the present crystal, brushite, and gypsum, $C c$ lattice was selected. When Ia lattice for the present crystal is selected, the lattice parameters are $a=6.248, c=6.250 \mathrm{~A}$, and $\beta=125.52^{\circ}$.

[^1]:    * Estimated standard deviations are given in parentheses and refer to the last decimal place.

