

The crystal structure of manganese metagermanate, MnGeO_3 *

By **J. H. FANG**** and **W. D. TOWNES**

Institute for Exploratory Research, US Army Electronics Command
Fort Monmouth, New Jersey

and **P. D. ROBINSON**

Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, Illinois

(Received 20 November 1968)

Auszug

Die Kristallstruktur von MnGeO_3 wurde auf Grund von zwei unabhängigen Meßreihen der Intensitäten von *hkl*-Interferenzen bis zum Wert $R = 0,08$ verfeinert. Die Gitterkonstanten sind $a = 19,267 \text{ \AA}$, $b = 9,248 \text{ \AA}$, $c = 5,477 \text{ \AA}$; $Z = 16$; Raumgruppe *Pbca*. Die Verbindung ist isotyp mit Enstatit, MgSiO_3 . Die Ketten von GeO_4 -Tetraedern werden durch Oktaeder um die Mn-Atome verbunden. Die mittleren Abstände sind: Ge—O = $1,75 \text{ \AA}$ und Mn—O = $2,21 \text{ \AA}$.

Abstract

The crystal structure of manganese metagermanate, MnGeO_3 , has been refined. Two independent sets of three-dimensional x-ray intensities were measured. The crystallographic data are: $a = 19.267 \text{ \AA}$, $b = 9.248 \text{ \AA}$, $c = 5.477 \text{ \AA}$; $Z = 16$ and space group *Pbca*. The compound is isotypic with enstatite, MgSiO_3 . Using the positional parameters of enstatite as a starting point, the structure was refined to $R_F = 0.08$.

The essential feature of the structure is the linkage of GeO_4 tetrahedra to form single chains running parallel to the *c* axis. The chains are bound together by manganese octahedra. There are two crystallographically different chains, arranged with the vertices of alternate tetrahedra pointing in opposite directions. Average Ge—O and Mn—O distances are 1.75 \AA and 2.21 \AA , respectively.

Introduction

Crystal structures of pyroxene-group minerals are of great interest because they form an important group of rock-forming ferromagnesian silicates. Recent development of single-crystal counter diffractometers, coupled with high-speed electronic computers, rejuvenated interest in

* Presented at the ACA Atlanta, Georgia Meeting, January 1967.

** Permanent address: Department of Geology, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, Illinois 62903.

Table 1. *Crystal data for MnGeO₃*

System:	Orthorhombic
Space group:	<i>Pbca</i>
Cell parameters:	$a = 19.267 \pm .006 \text{ \AA}$ $b = 9.248 \pm .003$ $c = 5.477 \pm .002$
Number of formulae per unit cell:	$Z = 16$
Calculated density:	4.777 g/cm ³
Linear absorption coefficient for MoK α :	181.6 cm ⁻¹

these structures among mineralogists. A good review of the present status of refinement of these minerals has been given by PREWITT and PEACOR (1964).

During the phase studies of GeO₂—MnGeO₃ by TAUBER, KOHN, WHINFREY and BABBAGE (1963), single crystals of MnGeO₃ were grown and determined to be isotypic with enstatite, MgSiO₃. Since no structural work had been reported on germanium analogues of the pyroxene structures, this investigation was undertaken to provide precise information for the crystal structure of MnGeO₃, in the hope that meaningful correlations and comparisons could be made between the isotypic germanates and silicates.

The crystallographic data of MnGeO₃ are shown in Table 1.

Intensity measurement

Two sets of intensities were measured independently. One set (data I) was taken with a General Electric XRD-6 diffractometer equipped with a Datex semi-automatic remote controller. The dimensions of the first crystal were $0.006 \times 0.012 \times 0.016$ cm. The stationary-crystal, stationary-counter technique was used with a pair of balanced filters. Reflections up to $2\theta = 60^\circ$ were measured employing MoK α radiation. Peak intensities were counted at a fixed time of 20 seconds. A standard reflection, 600, was measured each day throughout the experiment and the fluctuations in the intensities were found to be within 5%. Intensities were corrected for absorption, Lorentz and polarization effects, using the Los Alamos program (LARSON, CROMER and ROOF, JR., 1964).

The second set (data II) was measured with an automated Buerger diffractometer. A different crystal ($0.01 \times 0.021 \times 0.025$ cm) was selected. Details of the data collection are described elsewhere (ROBINSON and FANG, 1969).

Refinement of the structure

Since the isotypism between MnGeO_3 and enstatite, MgSiO_3 , had been established, the structure refinement was initiated using LINDEMANN'S (1961) coordinates for enstatite. The least-squares program used in the refinement was coded by BUSING, MARTIN and LEVY (1962). Form factors for O^{2-} were those of SUZUKI (1960) and those for Mn^{2+} and Ge^{4+} were taken from the International tables for x-ray crystallography (1962). Using data I, after six isotropic cycles, the R value for 694 observed reflections (of unit weight) dropped from 35% to 8.6%. Using data II, the R value improved from 34% to 8.0%. Anisotropic refinement was attempted, but the coefficients of all oxygen atoms failed the positive-definite test. Table 2 lists the atomic coordinates and the isotropic temperature factors obtained from data II. Data II gave an improved R value as well as smaller standard deviations. Observed and calculated structure factors (from data II) are given in Table 3. To aid in the comparison among different atomic designations used by various authors, the following tabulation is given:

Site nomenclatures

This study	BURNHAM (1967)	LINDEMANN (1961)	GHOSE (1965)
Mn(1)	M 1	Mg ₁	M _I
Mn(2)	M 2	Mg ₂	M _{II}
Ge(1)	SiB	Si ₁	Si ₁
Ge(2)	SiA	Si ₂	Si ₂
O(1)	O 1-B	O ₂	O ₁
O(2)	O 2-B	O ₃	O ₅
O(3)	O 3-B	O ₁	O ₃
O(4)	O 1-A	O ₄	O ₄
O(5)	O 2-A	O ₅	O ₂
O(6)	O 3-A	O ₆	O ₆

Discussion of the structure

The general feature of the structure is the linkage of GeO_4 tetrahedra through sharing of two out of four corners to form a single, continuous chain parallel to the c axis. Chains repeat at every third tetrahedron and are bound together by octahedrally coordinated Mn atoms. Thus another way of describing the structure is that it is composed of alternate layers of Ge tetrahedra and Mn octahedra.

Table 2. *Final coordinates of MnGeO₃*

Atom	<i>x</i>	<i>y</i>	<i>z</i>	<i>B</i>
Mn(1)	.1238(2)	.3465(4)	.3588(5)	.28(4) Å ²
Mn(2)	.3777(2)	.4819(4)	.3515(5)	.34(4)
Ge(1)	.4728(1)	.1631(3)	.2981(3)	.13(3)
Ge(2)	.2702(1)	.3438(3)	.0340(3)	.12(3)
O(1)	.0621(8)	.1575(21)	.1890(26)	.72(21)
O(2)	.0685(8)	.5161(18)	.1856(26)	.51(21)
O(3)	.4442(8)	.3098(17)	.1097(24)	.41(20)
O(4)	.1802(6)	.3356(19)	.0224(21)	.13(16)
O(5)	.1923(8)	.0083(18)	.0467(24)	.44(20)
O(6)	.3962(7)	.2787(16)	.3137(24)	.24(18)

Table 4 summarizes the bond lengths and angles, calculated by ORFFE (BUSING, MARTIN and LEVY, 1964). It is noted that the mean values for the two independent Ge(1)—O and Ge(2)—O distances are in close agreement. However, the mean value of the Ge—O (bridge) distances is 1.797 Å, appreciably longer than the mean Ge—O (unlinked) distance of 1.715 Å. This is consistent with the results reported for CoGeO₃ (PEARCOR, 1968) where the difference is 0.06 Å, and for NaFeGe₂O₆ (SOLOV'eva and BAKAKIN, 1968) where the difference is about 0.1 Å. Such a difference can be explained in terms of the *d-p* π bonding theory suggested by CRUICKSHANK (1961). Although his treatment is for the Si—O bond, the identical electronic configuration (of *s* and *p* suborbitals) of Si and Ge permits the same interpretation as far as their bonding characteristics are concerned. In pyroxenes (metasilicates), it is found that the Si—O (bridge) bonds tend to be about 0.05 Å longer than Si—O (unlinked) bonds, where the Si—O—Si angle is about 135°. If this angle were about 120° (oxygen atoms in ideal close packing), the calculated difference would be about 0.14 Å. Thus CRUICKSHANK interpreted the smaller actual difference to be partly due to the opening of Si—O—Si angles. A similar situation occurs in MnGeO₃, where the proximity to 120° (Ge—O—Ge is 126°) is reflected in the difference of 0.08 Å between the bridging and non-bridging Ge—O distances.

The O—O—O angles, which are indicative of the "straightness" of the chains, are listed in Table 4-VI. The values show different degrees of straightness of the two chains.

Table 5 shows the valency calculation in the usual way. Apparently, PAULING's classical electrostatic rule is satisfied on the average:

Table 4. *Interatomic distances and angles*

I. Ge(1) tetrahedron		II. Ge(2) tetrahedron	
Ge—O(1)	1.732(17) Å	Ge—O(4)	1.745(12) Å
Ge—O(2)	1.695(15)	Ge—O(5)	1.687(14)
Ge—O(3)	1.802(14)	Ge—O(6)	1.780(12)
Ge—O(3')	1.804(14)	Ge—O(6')	1.801(12)
Mean	1.758	Mean	1.753
O(2)—O(1)	2.93(2) Å	O(5)—O(4)	2.94(2) Å
O(2)—O(3)	2.78(2)	O(5)—O(6)	2.57(2)
O(2)—O(3')	2.83(2)	O(5)—O(6')	2.96(2)
O(1)—O(3)	2.90(2)	O(4)—O(6)	2.95(2)
O(1)—O(3')	2.82(2)	O(4)—O(6')	2.89(2)
O(3)—O(3')	2.96(2)	O(6)—O(6')	2.80(2)
Mean	2.87	Mean	2.85
O(2)—Ge—O(1)	117.5(8)°	O(5)—Ge—O(4)	118.0(8)°
O(2)—Ge—O(3)	105.2(8)	O(5)—Ge—O(6)	96.0(8)
O(2)—Ge—O(3')	107.9(8)	O(5)—Ge—O(6')	116.0(8)
O(1)—Ge—O(3)	110.2(8)	O(4)—Ge—O(6)	113.8(8)
O(1)—Ge—O(3')	105.5(8)	O(4)—Ge—O(6')	109.2(8)
O(3)—Ge—O(3')	110.5(8)	O(6)—Ge—O(6')	102.7(8)
Mean	109.5	Mean	109.3
III. Mn(1) octahedron		IV. Mn(2) octahedron	
Mn—O(1)	2.298(17) Å	Mn—O(1)	2.182(17) Å
Mn—O(1')	2.160(17)	Mn—O(2)	2.104(15)
Mn—O(2)	2.118(15)	Mn—O(3)	2.429(14)
Mn—O(4)	2.139(11)	Mn—O(4)	2.228(11)
Mn—O(4')	2.188(11)	Mn—O(5)	2.160(14)
Mn—O(5)	2.146(14)	Mn—O(6)	2.329(13)
Mean	2.175	Mean	2.239
O(2)—O(4)	2.86(2) Å	O(2)—O(1)	3.16(2) Å
O(2)—O(5')	3.11(2)	O(2)—O(4)	2.86(2)
O(2)—O(1')	3.19(2)	O(2)—O(6)	3.68(2)
O(2)—O(1)	3.31(2)	O(2)—O(3)	3.55(2)
O(4)—O(5')	3.23(2)	O(5)—O(1)	2.96(2)
O(4)—O(4')	3.16(2)	O(5)—O(4)	2.99(2)
O(4)—O(1)	2.94(2)	O(5)—O(6)	2.57(2)
O(5')—O(1')	2.96(2)	O(5)—O(3)	3.22(2)
O(5')—O(4')	3.04(2)	O(1)—O(4)	2.90(2)
O(1')—O(4')	2.94(2)	O(1)—O(3)	3.24(2)
O(1')—O(1)	3.22(2)	O(4)—O(6)	3.74(2)
O(4')—O(1)	2.90(2)	O(6)—O(3)	2.91(2)
Mean	3.07(2)	Mean	3.15(2)

Table 4. (Continued)

III. Mn(1) octahedron		IV. Mn(2) octahedron	
O(2)—Mn—O(4)	84.5(8)°	O(2)—Mn—O(1)	94.9(8)°
O(2)—Mn—O(5')	93.6(8)	O(2)—Mn—O(4)	82.6(8)
O(2)—Mn—O(1')	96.6(8)	O(2)—Mn—O(6)	112.2(8)
O(2)—Mn—O(1)	96.9(8)	O(2)—Mn—O(3)	102.8(8)
O(4)—Mn—O(5')	97.6(8)	O(5)—Mn—O(1)	86.0(8)
O(4)—Mn—O(4')	93.8(8)	O(5)—Mn—O(4)	85.8(8)
O(4)—Mn—O(1)	82.8(8)	O(5)—Mn—O(6)	69.6(8)
O(5')—Mn—O(1')	86.9(8)	O(5)—Mn—O(3)	89.0(8)
O(5')—Mn—O(4')	88.9(8)	O(1)—Mn—O(4)	82.3(8)
O(1')—Mn—O(4')	85.0(8)	O(1)—Mn—O(3)	89.1(8)
O(1')—Mn—O(1)	92.6(8)	O(4)—Mn—O(6)	110.4(8)
O(4')—Mn—O(1)	80.6(8)	O(6)—Mn—O(3)	75.3(8)
Mean	90.0	Mean	90.0
V. Ge—O—Ge angles		VI. O—O—O angles	
Ge(1)—O(3)—Ge(1)	123.4(7)	O(3)—O(3)—O(3)	135.0(9)
Ge(2)—O(6)—Ge(2)	129.7(7)	O(6)—O(6)—O(6)	156.8(9)

Table 5. The valency sums of oxygen atoms

Oxygen atoms	Balancing cations	Valencies charge coordination number	Total charges	Type
O(1)	Ge(1)	1	2.00	II
	2 Mn(1)	2/3		
	Mn(2)	1/3		
O(2)	Ge(1)	1	1.67	III
	2 Mn(1)	2/3		
O(3)	2 Ge(1)	2	2.33	I
	Mn(2)	1/3		
O(4)	Ge(2)	1	2.00	II
	2 Mn(1)	2/3		
	Mn(2)	1/3		
O(5)	Ge(2)	1	1.67	III
	Mn(1)	1/3		
	Mn(2)	1/3		
O(6)	2 Ge(2)	2	2.33	I
	Mn(2)	1/3		

tetrahedral linking (Type I) oxygen atom O(3) and O(6), is compensated by Mn(2)—O(3) and Mn(2)—O(6), the two longest bonds in the Mn(2) octahedra, and the two longest bonds in the Ge(1) and Ge(2) tetrahedra Ge(1)—O(3) and Ge(2)—O(6). Thus, if the lengthening of the bonds is taken into account, PAULING's rule is well satisfied.

Acknowledgments

The authors are obliged to A. TAUBER for supplying us single crystals of MnGeO₃ and to Dr. J. A. KOHN for his support and enthusiasm. We also thank Professor D. R. PEACOR for reviewing the manuscript.

References

- C. W. BURNHAM (1967), Ferrosilite. Geophysical Laboratory Annual Report, 1965—1966, Carnegie Institution. 286.
- W. R. BUSING, K. O. MARTIN and H. A. LEVY (1962), ORFLS, a FORTRAN crystallographic least-squares program. Oak Ridge National Laboratory, ORNL-TM-305.
- W. R. BUSING, K. O. MARTIN and H. A. LEVY (1964), ORFFE, a FORTRAN crystallographic function and error program. Oak Ridge National Laboratory, ORNL-TM-306.
- D. W. J. CRUICKSHANK (1961), The role of 3*d*-orbitals in π -bonds between (a) silicon, phosphorous, sulphur, or chlorine and (b) oxygen or nitrogen. Jour. Chem. Soc. [London], 5486—5504.
- S. GHOSE (1965), Mg²⁺—Fe²⁺ order in an orthopyroxene, Mg_{0.93}Fe_{1.07}Si₂O₆. Z. Kristallogr. **122**, 81—99.
- A. C. LARSON, D. T. CROMER and R. B. ROOF, JR. (1964), An integrated series of crystallographic computer programs: II. Processing collected intensity data. Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory, LA-3043.
- W. LINDEMANN (1961), Beitrag zur Enstatitstruktur. N. Jahrb. Miner. **10**, 226—233.
- D. R. PEACOR (1968), The crystal structure of CoGeO₃. Z. Kristallogr. **126**, 299—306.
- C. T. PREWITT and D. R. PEACOR (1964), Crystal chemistry of the pyroxenes and pyroxenoids. Amer. Mineralogist **49**, 1527—1542.
- P. D. ROBINSON and J. H. FANG (1969), The crystal structure of tamarugite. Amer. Mineralogist **54**, 19—30.
- L. P. SOLOV'eva and V. V. BAKAKIN (1968), X-ray study of the sodium-iron metagermanate NaFeGe₂O₆. Soviet Physics—Crystallography **12**, 517—520.
- J. SUZUKI (1960), Atomic scattering factor for O²⁻. Acta Crystallogr. **13**, 270.
- A. TAUBER, J. A. KOHN, C. G. WHINFREY and W. D. BABBAGE (1963), The occurrence of an enstatite phase in the subsystem GeO₂—MnGeO₃. Amer. Mineralogist **48**, 555—564.