A refinement of the structure of cubanite, CuFe₂S₃*

By J. T. Szymański

Mineral Sciences Division, Mines Branch, Department of Energy, Mines and Resources, Ottawa, Ontario**

(Received 16 July 1973)

Auszug

Die Kristallstruktur von Cubanit CuFe₂S₃ wurde auf Grund der Intensitäten von 1790 beobachteten Interferenzen bis zu R = 0,045 (und bis zu R = 0,096für alle 3301 möglichen Interferenzen) verfeinert. Die Verfeinerung führte zu Atomabstands- und Bindungswinkel-Werten, die viel genauer als die bisher mitgeteilten sind. Die Deformation der Tetraeder um die Metallatome läßt sich durch Abstoßungskräfte zwischen den Eisenatomen in den Mittelpunkten zweier Tetraeder mit gemeinsamer Kante erklären. Diese Kante ist 2,804(1) Å lang. Die Metall-Schwefel-Abstände sind: Cu-S = 2,276(1) bis 2,326(1) Å, Fe-S = 2,258(1) bis 2,304(1) Å. Die Mehrdeutigkeit der Bestimmung der Raumgruppe, *Pemn* oder Pc_{21n} , wurde untersucht und die frühere Wahl der zentrosymmetrischen Raumgruppe *Pemn* als richtig bestätigt.

Abstract

The crystal structure of cubanite, CuFe_2S_3 , has been refined to an R value of 0.096 (all 3301 data) and 0.045 (1790 "observed" data only), from multiple sets of four-circle diffractometer x-ray intensity data, collected from a spherical crystal. The anisotropic full-matrix least-squares refinement has yielded a set of bond lengths and angles which are much more precise than those of previous workers. The distortions from tetrahedral symmetry about the metal atoms are consistent with a repulsive force between Fe atoms, 2.804(1) Å apart, in adjacent edge-sharing Fe-S coordination tetrahedra. The Cu—S lengths range from 2.276(1) to 2.326(1) Å, and the Fe—S bonds from 2.258(1) to 2.304(1) Å. The ambiguity in the choice of space group between Pemn and $Pc2_1n$ has been investigated, and the earlier choice of the centric space group Pemn is favoured as being correct.

Introduction

The crystal structure of cubanite was first determined by BUERGER (1945, 1947). The present re-examination was undertaken as part of

^{*} Mineral Research Program – Sulphide Research Contribution No. 78.

^{**} Ottawa, Ontario, Canada K1A 0G1.

an overall crystallographic and mineralogical investigation into the central region of the Cu—Fe—S system. It was intended primarily that the study of cubanite, a mineral for which the stoichiometry was well-established, should provide accurate information about the atomic parameters and thus assist in the identification of metal sites in related minerals such as talnakhite, Cu₉Fe₈S₁₆, (HALL and GABE, 1972), mooihoekite, Cu₉Fe₉S₁₆, (HALL and ROWLAND, 1973), and haycockite, Cu₈Fe₁₀S₁₆, (CABRI and HALL, 1972).

Most minerals in the central region of the Cu--Fe-S system are antiferromagnetic. Cubanite is of particular interest because it exhibits weak ferromagnetism (PEACOCK and YATSEVITCH, 1936), which has recently been attributed to the canting of spins in the structure (FLEET, 1970; TOWNSEND *et al.*, 1973). At temperatures above 200°C, natural orthorhombic cubanite undergoes a transformation to a cubic polymorph with a sphalerite-like cell (CABRI *et al.*, 1973; FLEET, 1970; SZYMAŃSKI, 1974). This transformation has so far proved to be irreversible in the laboratory, yet it is the orthorhombic form that is found in nature. This raises the question as to the origin of cubanite, frequently found in ore deposits as laths in a chalcopyrite matrix, and the reasons for the apparent irreversibility of the transformation.

Cubanite has already been re-examined by a number of workers, including AZAROFF and BUERGER (1955) and FLEET (1970). However, these studies did not provide atomic parameters of an accuracy which is suitable for comparison with the recent study of chalcopyrite, CuFeS₂ (HALL and STEWART, 1973). Furthermore, the original assignment of cubanite to the centric space group Pcmn (BUERGER, 1947), rather than to the non-centric $Pc2_1n$, was not based upon a quantitative analysis, but in the absence of evidence to the contrary, on a preference for "the more natural space group". This was an aspect of structure which deserved serious consideration, because all subsequent structural work on cubanite had been performed on the tacit assumption that the centric space group was correct.

The structure of cubanite was described by BUERGER as being made up of slabs of a wurtzite-like structure (ignoring here the difference between copper and iron atoms), which are parallel to (010), have a width of b/2, and are connected *via* inversion centres so that there is edge-sharing between adjacent iron coordination tetrahedra. In the wurtzite structure, the coordination tetrahedra all point one way, but in cubanite, the tetrahedra point one way in one slab b/2 wide, and in the opposite way in the adjacent slabs (Fig. 1).

Experimental

The two crystals used in this analysis were obtained from specimens donated by Dr. L. J. CABRI of this Division, and by Dr. J. D. Scorr of Queen's University, Kingston, Ontario. Both specimens originated from a vug from the same locality.

The crystal data are as follows:

Source: Strathcona Mine, Sudbury, Ontario.

Microprobe analysis in atomic 0/0: Cu: 16.8(1), Fe: 33.3(2), S: 50.0(2); Chemical composition Cu_{1.01}Fe_{2.00}S_{3.00}.

Cubanite, CuFe₂S₃. Formula weight: 271.43.

Crystal System: orthorhombic.

Systematic absences: 0kl, k = 2n + 1; hk0, h + k = 2n + 1.

Space group: Pcmn (Pnma with cba), or

 $Pc 2_1 n$ (*Pna* 2_1 with *bca*) from systematic absences; *Pcmn* favoured from structure analysis.

Cell dimensions: a = 6.467(1), b = 11.117(6), c = 6.231(2) Å at 20 °C using $\lambda(MoK\alpha_1) = 0.70926$ Å.

Linear absorption coefficient: μ (MoK α) = 124.8 cm⁻¹.

Density: $D_{calc} = 4.024 \text{ g. cm}^3$; Z = 4.

Intensity data: Crystal 1, 3516 reflections, measured once, 1965 observed.

Crystal 2, 3301 reflections, measured four times, 1790 observed.

Most cubanite crystals examined from the first batch were twinned on the (110) plane. The one untwinned fragment of suitable size that was found, was used in the initial analysis (crystal 1). It was an irregular hexagonal plate, approximately 0.2 mm across, and between 0.05 and 0.10 mm thick. A complete octant of x-ray intensity data was collected on a Picker four-circle diffractometer to a 2θ limit of 120° using graphite-monochromated MoK α radiation. Generalized Gaussian absorption corrections (GABE and O'BYRNE, 1970) were applied to the data, and of the 3516 reflections measured, 1965 were considered to be observed above the $10^{0}/_{0}$ significance level, *i.e.*, I (net) > 1.65 $\sigma(I)$. Details of the refinement, the scattering curves, and the programs used were identical to those used for the second crystal, and are described later.

During the course of intensity measurement with crystal 1, several unsatisfactory aspects became apparent. It was found that three "systematically absent" reflections were, in fact, visible on the x-ray

220

precession films taken of this crystal, but were not observed on the diffractometer, while for four other "systematically absent" reflections, the reverse was the case. Examination of one such reflection, 010, on the diffractometer showed that rotation of the crystal about the diffraction vector k by 0.1° caused the reflection to disappear and then to reappear at a different intensity on a further rotation of 1°. Still further rotation of 0.2° made the reflection disappear again. This behaviour was attributed to severe Renninger effects due undoubtedly to the very small mosaic spread of the crystal. Detailed examination of several small-angle, medium-intensity reflections showed that they had peak widths at half-height of about 0.10° in 2θ . It was, therefore, expected that extinction effects would also be serious, and this was borne out in the later refinement. In addition to this, the uneven and curved nature of the crystal "faces" made the generalized Gaussian corrections that were applied, unreliable. Pending the finding of a better crystal, the data were processed and refined. The final parameters obtained in the centric refinement are listed in Table 1 as Data Set III. for comparison with the more accurate analysis which followed.

In due course, a second, larger fragment of cubanite was identified as being a single crystal (labelled crystal 2) and was ground to a sphere 0.15 ± 0.01 mm diameter using the BOND (1951) method. During the detailed preliminary photographic examination of the crystal, and in the course of subsequent data collection, no evidence was found of the Renninger effects observed with crystal 1. The mosaic spread of diffraction peaks was considerably larger than with the first crystal, due probably to the mechanical shocks associated with the grinding of the sphere. The crystal was mounted in a general orientation on a Picker four-circle diffractometer, and intensity data were collected to a 2θ limit of 116° using graphite-monochromated MoK α radiation and a θ -2 θ scan mode. A scan speed of 2°/min was used, with the 2 θ peak base width of 2.8° increasing with 2 θ to account for dispersion. Backgrounds were measured for 45 seconds on each side of the peak.

The cell parameters and standard deviations were obtained from a least-squares refinement of the 2θ , γ , and ω values (BUSING, 1970) of 42 reflections with clearly resolved α_1, α_2 doublets in the 2θ range 58 to 71°. The α_1 component was used in the cell refinement procedure. The parameters were refined as a triclinic cell, and it was found that the maximum deviation from orthogonality was 0.004° . The *hkl* and *hkl* octants of intensity data were each measured twice. Three standards were measured after every fifty reflections to maintain a check

				e mean isot	<u>nopic tempe</u>	nature rac						
Atom	Site	Refine- ment set*	X/a	Y/b	Z/c	$U_{11}\cdot 10^2$	$U_{22}\cdot 10^2$	$U_{33} \cdot 10^2$	$U_{12} \cdot 10^2$	$U_{13} \cdot 10^2$	$U_{23}\cdot 10^2$	< B >
Cu	4c 4a	I III IV V VI	$\begin{array}{c} 0.583 \\ 0.5792(9) \\ 0.5835(1) \\ 0.5833(1) \\ 0.5832(1) \\ 0.5834(1) \end{array}$	1/4 1/4 1/4 1/4 1/4 1/4	$\begin{array}{c} 0.127\\ 0.1205(7)\\ 0.1229(1)\\ 0.1230(1)\\ 0.1230(1)\\ 0.1230(1)\end{array}$	2.09 a 1.55(9) b 1.84(2) 1.79(2) 1.79(2) 1.79(2)	2.04(2) 1.80(2) 1.83(2) 1.81(3)	$1.61(2) \\ 1.63(2) \\ 1.64(2) \\ 1.65(2)$	0 0 0 0.16(4)	0.02(2) 0.01(2) -0.04(2) -0.03(2)	$0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ -0.21(6)$	$\begin{array}{c} 1.63 \text{ \AA}^2\\ 1.22(8)\\ 1.45\\ 1.37\\ 1.38\\ 1.38\\ 1.38\end{array}$
Fe	8d $4a$ $4a$	I II IV V VI VI	$\begin{array}{c} 0.0875\\ 0.0875(6)\\ 0.0853(1)\\ 0.0853(1)\\ 0.0853(1)\\ 0.0853(1)\\ 0.0855(2)\\ 0.0850(2) \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 0.088\\ 0.0869(3)\\ 0.0871(1)\\ 0.0870(1)\\ 0.0870(1)\\ 0.0851(3)\\ 0.4113(2) \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 0.134\\ 0.1372(5)\\ 0.1367(1)\\ 0.1367(1)\\ 0.1366(1)\\ 0.1368(3)\\ 0.1365(2) \end{array}$	2.09 ^a 1.02(6) ^b 1.10(1) 1.06(1) 1.07(1) 1.07(3) 1.10(3)	$\begin{array}{c} 1.23(1) \\ 1.07(1) \\ 1.07(1) \\ 1.10(4) \\ 1.08(4) \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 1.23(1) \\ 1.23(1) \\ 1.24(1) \\ 1.47(4) \\ 1.04(3) \end{array}$	-0.01(1) 0.00(1) -0.02(1) 0.09(3) 0.09(3)	$\begin{array}{c} -0.06(1) \\ -0.06(1) \\ -0.05(1) \\ -0.19(2) \\ 0.06(2) \end{array}$	-0.04(1) -0.04(1) -0.03(1) -0.05(3) -0.01(3)	$\begin{array}{c} 1.63 \\ 0.81(5) \\ 0.94 \\ 0.89 \\ 0.89 \\ 0.97 \\ 0.85 \end{array}$
S(1)	4c 4a	I III IV V VI	$\begin{array}{c} 0.913\\ 0.9307(18)\\ 0.9134(2)\\ 0.9129(3)\\ 0.9127(2)\\ 0.9128(2) \end{array}$	1/4 1/4 1/4 1/4 1/4 0.2484(3)	$\begin{array}{c} 0.2625\\ 0.2595(10)\\ 0.2575(2)\\ 0.2577(2)\\ 0.2579(2)\\ 0.2577(2)\\ \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 2.09^{a} \\ 0.81(18)^{b} \\ 1.27(4) \\ 1.32(4) \\ 1.31(4) \\ 1.31(3) \end{array}$	1.35(3) 1.14(3) 1.11(3) 1.10(3)	$\begin{array}{c} 1.23(3) \\ 1.19(3) \\ 1.19(3) \\ 1.22(3) \end{array}$	0 0 0 0.19(6)	$0.07(3) \\ 0.07(3) \\ 0.05(3) \\ 0.07(3)$	$0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0.12(8)$	$\begin{array}{c} 1.63 \\ 0.64(14) \\ 1.01 \\ 0.96 \\ 0.95 \\ 0.94 \end{array}$
S(2)	8d $4a$ $4a$	I III IV V VI VI	$\begin{array}{c} 0.413\\ 0.4038(10)\\ 0.4120(1)\\ 0.4120(2)\\ 0.4120(1)\\ 0.4120(1)\\ 0.4116(2)\\ 0.4125(2)\end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 0.0835\\ 0.0863(9)\\ 0.0847(1)\\ 0.0846(1)\\ 0.0846(1)\\ 0.0831(3)\\ 0.4138(3)\end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 0.274\\ 0.2672(7)\\ 0.2671(1)\\ 0.2670(1)\\ 0.2670(1)\\ 0.2669(5)\\ 0.26671(5)\\ \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 2.09^{a} \\ 1.06(11)^{b} \\ 1.21(2) \\ 1.16(2) \\ 1.15(2) \\ 1.31(5) \\ 1.01(5) \end{array}$	$1.43(2) \\ 1.24(2) \\ 1.25(2) \\ 1.27(6) \\ 1.24(7)$	1.27(2) 1.29(2) 1.28(2) 1.24(7) 1.37(7)	0.09(3) 0.05(3) 0.03(2) 0.27(6) 0.18(5)	-0.16(2) -0.20(2) -0.22(2) -0.24(4) -0.17(4)	$\begin{array}{c} 0.18(2) \\ 0.20(2) \\ 0.19(2) \\ 0.18(6) \\ 0.20(7) \end{array}$	$1.63 \\ 0.84(9) \\ 1.03 \\ 0.97 \\ 0.96 \\ 1.01 \\ 0.96$

Table 1. Comparison of refined cubanite parameters The anisotropic temperature factors are expressed in the form $T = \exp \left[-2\pi^2 (U_{11}a^{*2}h^2 + 2U_{12}a^*b^*hk + \cdots)\right]$ The mean isotropic temperature factor is $\langle B \rangle = 8\pi^2 \langle U \rangle$

*I: AZAROFF and BUERGER (1955). II: FLEET (1970): 587 observed reflections, R = 0.107.

III: This work. Refinement using spherical crystal, 1790 observed data, R = 0.050. IV: This work. Refinement using spherical crystal, 1790 observed data, R = 0.045. V: This work. Refinement using spherical crystal, all data included, 3301 reflections, R = 0.096. Final parameters of this study. VI: This work. Details as in V, but refinement in noncentric space group, $Pc2_1n$. R = 0.093. • Overall U. • Isotropic U.

222

J. T. Szymański

on crystal alignment and instrument stability. A uniform systematic decrease of about $5^{0}/_{0}$ in the intensity of all three standards was noted over the six weeks period of data collection. It was suspected that this was an instrumental problem as crystal alignment was found to be unchanged at the end of data collection. To account for this, a linear scaling procedure was applied to all the data before averaging the four equivalent data sets measured. Standard deviations were calculated for each reflection from counting statistics and the relative agreement of the four measurements. Spherical absorption corrections were applied to the data. Of the 3301 unique reflections collected, 1790 were considered observed at the $10^{0}/_{0}$ significance level.

Refinement

From the tetrahedral coordination exhibited by copper in minerals in the Cu-Fe-S system, and from its lack of any significant magnetic moment in chalcopyrite (DONNAY et al., 1958), it is generally believed that copper is in the Cu^{1+} oxidation state. The Mössbauer spectrum of cubanite, even at 4°K, indicates that the two iron atoms are in equal oxidation states (IMBERT and WINTENBERGER, 1967). This requires that an Fe^{21/2+} oxidation state should be used for iron in order to maintain charge neutrality in the structure¹. Initially, therefore, the atomic scattering curves used in the refinement were Cu¹⁺, and an arithmetic mean of the Fe²⁺ and Fe³⁺ curves of CROMER and MANN (1968), and the S^{2-} curve of TOMILE and STAM (1958). The anomalous dispersion corrections were taken from CROMER and LIBERMANN (1970). All the structural computations were performed using the X-RAY system of programs (STEWART et al., 1972). The refinements were carried out using the full-matrix least-squares program CRYLSQ (written for the X-RAY system by F. KUNDELL) with anisotropic thermal parameters and an isotropic extinction parameter (LARSON, 1970).

The structure was initially refined in the centrosymmetric space group using the data from crystal 1, to a final residual of 0.050. However, the difference synthesis compiled at the end of the refinement

¹ The exact nature of the charge distribution in cubanite, which is a semiconductor, is not well understood, so that the use of this ionization state represents only a convenient approximation upon which to base the atomic scattering curve. In the structure analysis of the related mineral chalcopyrite (HALL and STEWART, 1973) better agreement was obtained when scattering curves of *ionized* atoms, rather than *neutral* atoms were used. Consequently, the ionized curves described above were used in this analysis.

J. T. Szymański

Table	2
-------	----------

Bond distances with standard deviations

Cu—S(1) Cu—S(2) Cu—S(1) ⁵	2.291(1) Å 2.326(1) 2.276(1)	${f Fe-S(2)}\ {f Fe-S(1)^2}\ {f Fe-S(2)^9}\ {f Fe-S(2)^{11}}\ {f Fe-S(2)^{11}}$	$\begin{array}{c} 2.264(1) \text{ \AA} \\ 2.258(1) \\ 2.304(1) \\ 2.293(1) \end{array}$
		$\rm FeFe^{3}$	2.804(1)

Bond angles with standard deviations

S(1) - Cu - S(2)	107.53(3)°	$Cu - S(1) - Fe^1$	109.70(4)°
S(1)CuS(1) ⁵	110.85(5)	$Cu - S(1) - Cu^4$	112.18(5)
S(2) -Cu-S(1) ⁵	113.03(3)	${ m Fe^1-S(1)-Cu^4}$	109.19(4)
S(2) -Cu-S(2) ⁷	104.45(5)	$\mathrm{Fe^{1}-S(1)-Fe^{6}}$	106.72(5)
S(2) -Fe-S(1) ²	110.53(4)	Cu —S(2)—Fe	107.25(4)
$S(2) - Fe - Fe^3$	125.25(3)	Cu —S(2)—Fe ⁸	111.90(4)
$S(2) - Fe - S(2)^9$	110.59(3)	Cu -S(2)-Fe ¹⁰	121.75(4)
S(2) -Fe-S(2) ¹¹	110.63(3)	Fe —S(2)—Fe ⁸	111.45(3)
$S(1)^2$ —Fe —Fe ³	124.23(4)	Fe -S(2)-Fe ¹⁰	124.04(4)
$S(1)^2 - Fe - S(2)^9$	110.33(4)	${\rm Fe^{8}-S(2)-Fe^{10}}$	75.17(3)
$S(1)^2 - Fe - S(2)^{11}$	109.80(4)		
Fe ³ -Fe-S(2) ⁹	52.24(3)		
${\rm Fe^{3}}$ $-{\rm Fe}-{\rm S(2)^{11}}$	52.59(3)		
$S(2)^9 - Fe - S(2)^{11}$	104.83(3)		

Nonbonded S—S distances across edges of coordination tetrahedra

(i). Cu tetrahedron		(ii). Fe tetrahedron	
S(2)S(2) ⁷	3.677(2) Å	$S(2) - S(1)^2$	$3.716(1){ m \AA}$
S(2) - S(1)	3.724(1)	$S(2) - S(2)^{11}$	3.747(1)
$S(2) - S(1)^9$	3.838(1)	S(2) -S(2) ⁹	3.755(1)
$S(1) - S(1)^9$	3.760(2)	$S(1)^2 - S(2)^9$	3.744(2)
		$S(1)^2 - S(2)^{11}$	3.723(2)
		S(2) ⁹ —S(2) ¹¹	3.642(1)

List of superscripts indicating symmetry operations used in text, table and Fig.2 $\,$

1.	1 + x, y, z	7. $x, \frac{1}{2} - y, z$
2.	-1 + x, y, z	8. $\frac{1}{2} - x, y, \frac{1}{2} + z$
3.	-x, -y, -z	9. $\frac{1}{2} - x, y, -\frac{1}{2} + z$
4.	$1\frac{1}{2} - x, \frac{1}{2} - y, \frac{1}{2} + z$	10. $\frac{1}{2} + x, -y, \frac{1}{2} - z$
5.	$1\frac{1}{2} - x, \frac{1}{2} - y, -\frac{1}{2} + z$	11. $-\frac{1}{2} + x, -y, \frac{1}{2} - z$
6.	$1 + x, \frac{1}{2} - y, z$	12. $\frac{1}{2} - x$, $\frac{1}{2} - y$, $-\frac{1}{2} + z$

showed significant positive and negative residuals that were beyond the random error level at the respective atomic positions. It was assumed, therefore, that despite the low residual, the systematic errors present in the data, such as those due to absorption, extinction, and the previously described Renninger effects, were limiting further reliable refinement.

From that point, only the data obtained with the spherical crystal 2 were used in the refinement. At first this was carried out using an anisotropic full-matrix least-squares procedure, considering only the observed reflections and those whose calculated values were greater than the locally observable threshold minimum. The results of this refinement are given in Table 2 as Data Set IV. Subsequently, the refinement was repeated with all data at the actual mean observed values given in Table 3, and the results appear as Data Set V in Table 2. The final residuals obtained were 0.045 for observed only and 0.096 for all data, respectively.

The precision of the intensity data was considered adequate for an attempt to resolve the space group ambiguity between Pcmn and $Pc2_1n$. Refinement of the structure assuming the space group $Pc2_1n$ entails removal of the constraints of the mirror plane in the space group Pcmn. Thus two iron atoms and two sulfur atoms, related by the mirror in Pcmn, become independent, and the sulfur atom on the mirror plane is permitted to move away. (The copper atom was placed in the plane y = 1/4 and thus specified the origin of the noncentric polar space group). In changing to the noncentric space group, the number of refinement parameters is increased from 32 to 55.

Starting from the refined parameters of Pcmn, the excessive number of 13 cycles of full-matrix least-squares refinement with $Pc2_1n$ were required before all the calculated shifts were less than one half of a standard deviation. The shifts oscillated from one cycle to the next despite the inclusion of a large "damping factor" which indicated that the refinement was ill-conditioned. In addition, the standard deviations at the end of the refinement were all larger than in the centric space group. The corresponding parameters for atoms previously related by the mirror plane in Pcmn were highly correlated, and for some of these parameters the standard deviations were larger by a factor of five. Finally, the refined acentric model did not differ from the centric model in a rational way. Bond lengths, previously equivalent in Pcmn, now differed by as much as 0.03 Å (10σ), and there appears to be no explanation for such differences in the way that the variation in metal-

k P, P,

Table 3. Observed and calculated structure factors ($\times 10$) F F °, Fe k F_o F_e k Fo F. k
 F.
 0*

 0*
 30*

 35*
 55*

 14*
 34*

 35*
 55*

 15*
 1*

 189
 3730

 126*
 12*

 125*
 12*

 125*
 135

 137
 13*

 137
 13*

 137
 13*

 137
 13*

 137
 13*

 137
 13*

 137
 13*

 137
 13*

 137
 13*

 137
 13*

 137
 13*

 137
 13*

 137
 13*

 137
 13*

 137
 13*

 130*
 13*

 131
 13*

 131
 13*

 131
 13*

 131
 13*

 131
 13*

 131
 13*

 131
 13*

 132* Fc F. k $\begin{array}{c} \mathbf{3} \\ \mathbf{4} \\ \mathbf{5} \\ \mathbf{4} \\ \mathbf{7} \\ \mathbf{7} \\ \mathbf{8} \\ \mathbf{9} \\ \mathbf{1} \\ \mathbf{3} \\ \mathbf{5} \\ \mathbf{5} \\ \mathbf{1} \\ \mathbf{3} \\ \mathbf{5} \\ \mathbf{5} \\ \mathbf{5} \\ \mathbf{1} \\ \mathbf{1} \\ \mathbf{3} \\ \mathbf{5} \\ \mathbf{5} \\ \mathbf{5} \\ \mathbf{1} \\ \mathbf{1} \\ \mathbf{1} \\ \mathbf{5} \\ \mathbf{5} \\ \mathbf{5} \\ \mathbf{1} \\ \mathbf{1} \\ \mathbf{5} \\ \mathbf{5} \\ \mathbf{5} \\ \mathbf{1} \\ \mathbf{1} \\ \mathbf{5} \\ \mathbf{5} \\ \mathbf{5} \\ \mathbf{1} \\ \mathbf{1} \\ \mathbf{5} \\ \mathbf{5} \\ \mathbf{5} \\ \mathbf{1} \\ \mathbf{5} \\ \mathbf{5} \\ \mathbf{5} \\ \mathbf{5} \\ \mathbf{1} \\ \mathbf{5} \\ \mathbf{$ $\begin{array}{c} \mathbf{3}, \mathbf{44}\\ \mathbf{6}, \mathbf{7}, \mathbf{6}\\ \mathbf{6}, \mathbf{6}, \mathbf{5}, \mathbf{9}\\ \mathbf{2}, \mathbf{4}, \mathbf{9}\\ \mathbf{11}\\ \mathbf{12}\\ \mathbf{201}\\ \mathbf{11}\\ \mathbf{13}\\ \mathbf{106}\\ \mathbf{11}\\ \mathbf{223}\\ \mathbf{11}\\ \mathbf{11}\\ \mathbf{11}\\ \mathbf{11}\\ \mathbf{201}\\ \mathbf{14}\\ \mathbf{5}\\ \mathbf{57}\\ \mathbf{223}\\ \mathbf{11}\\ \mathbf{11}\\ \mathbf{11}\\ \mathbf{222}\\ \mathbf{223}\\ \mathbf{10}\\ \mathbf{11}\\ \mathbf{11}\\ \mathbf{222}\\ \mathbf{223}\\ \mathbf{10}\\ \mathbf{11}\\ \mathbf{11}\\ \mathbf{223}\\ \mathbf{11}\\ \mathbf{11}\\ \mathbf{11}\\ \mathbf{223}\\ \mathbf{11}\\ \mathbf{$ 20 21 22 23 24 25 $\begin{array}{c} 6295\\ 7682\\ 8376\\ 4214\\ 1378\\ 95562\\ 97682\\ 14214\\ 1378\\ 987\\ 14214\\ 1378\\ 987\\ 1987\\ 1424\\ 1437\\ 1552\\ 213\\ 1987$ 0 k 8 10381 13090 13090 13090 13090 13090 13090 13090 13090 114 13095 104030 104030 104030 104030 10507 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 11 4 13 127 18 27

k F_o F_c 0

0 k

226

Table 3. (Continued)

k F _o F _c	k F _o F _c	k F _o F _e	k F _o F _e	k F _o F _c	k F _o F _c	k F _p F _c	k F _o F _e	
19 52 37	18 0* 11	5 26* 9	3 27* 2	7 111 100	4 k 4	18 0* 22	6 55* 68	
2 k 11	20 34* 2	7 27* 9	4 10* 20 5 0* 14	4 k 0	0 277 272	20 58 25	8 20* 5	
0 200 189 1 276 285	21 0* 9 22 23* 6	8 0* 8 9 55 50	6 0*25 7 0*17	0 1387 1488 2 40 33	1 27* 46 2 11* 13	21 71 68 22 31* 10	9 41* 38 10 0* 35	
2 115 115 3 266 262	23 24* 2 24 34* 6	10 19* 8 11 0* 5	8 39* 14 9 0* 2	4 60 57 6 1271 1219	3 39*29 4 57 33	4 k 8	11 37* 15	
4 131 114	25 20* 3	12 33* 9	10 0* 16	8 103 75	5 34* 44	0 475 469	13 . 31* 5	
6 181 165	20 0- 1 3 k 2	14 21* 5	12 39* 17	12 744 732	7 25* 40	2 49* 36	14 0* 4	
7 287 275 8 78 89	0 425 442	15 51* 30 16 0*' 4	13 0* 12 14 0* 8	14 65 64 16 115 98	8 42* 28 9 34* 15	3 218 232 4 0* 13	0 211 213	
9 222 214 10 85 87	1 117 116 2 1130 1159	17 27* 2 18 35* 4	15 0* 2 16 0* 10	18 357 372 20 51* 44	10 78 65 11 38* 31	5 114 117 6 411 409	1 26* 25 2 18* 14	
11 140 142	3 1086 1054	19 0* 4	17 28* 4	22 80 75 24 154 171	12 109 97	7 141 146	3 106 106	
13 216 215	5 58 55	21 28* 15	19 6* 8	4 k 1	14 0* 22	9 177 179	5 56 19	
14 40^ 55	7 122 114	23 37* 1	20 0^) 3 k 10	0 376 431	16 88 71	11 66 69	6 192 193 7 23* 27	
16 57 53 17 68 67	8 682 660 9 792 780	24 0* 1	0 0* 23	1 785 784 2 43 46	17 0* 16 18 47* 60	12 279 281 13 113 111	8 5* 3 9 85 85	
2 k 12	10 763 744 11 27* 3	0 436 443	1 80 84 2 113 119	3 288 265 4 40* 27	19 0* 7 20 0* 16	14 42* 34 15 115 112	10 19* 35 11 29* 12	
0 68 66 1 0* 6	12 239 220 13 77 79	1 205 209 2 777 799	3 354 361 4 134 131	5 620 587 6 280 263	21 0* 11 22 44* 58	16 14* 28	4 k 14	
2 52* 3	14 273 269	3 266 278	5 55 62	7 645 622	23 38* 7	18 157 161	0 64 44	
4 0* 10	16 418 410	5 167 164	7 101 90	9 201 189	24 0~ 30 4 k 5	20 36* 23	2 62 48	
5 25* 10 6 66 59	17 0* 20	6 391 389 7 178 189	8 97 82 9 282 289	10 85 74 11 288 285	0 1217 1258	21 63 60	3 60 42 4 74 56	
7 0* 4 8 0* 10	19 46* 48 20 94 91	8 528 525 9 206 215	10 134 116 11 34* 34	12 93 82 13 374 368	1 270 245 2 0* 13	0 199 194	5 70 62	
9 45* 47 10 8* 10	21 200 207	10 641 639	12 0* 9	14 59 34	3 123 127	1 231 239	5 k 0	
11 0* 10	23 32* 17	12 283 278	14 63 41	16 72 86	5 198 194	3 40* 27	3 991 978	
12 57 45	24 95 95 25 0* 26	14 258 257	16 89 87	18 34* 46	7 195 190	5 207 201	5 90 92 7 38* 26	
14 22* 11 15 0* 35	3 k 3	15 99 115 16 392 402	17 0* 12 18 12* 19	19 199 203 20 0* 21	8 30* 39 9 88 81	6 184 174 7 209 213	9 692 673 11 81 82	
2 k 13	0 60 62	17 44* 46 18 170 172	19 63 59	21 74 76 22 46* 74	10 115 121	8 45* 35	13 75 60	
0 240 237	2 21* 28	19 65 89	3 k 11	23 13* 33	12 691 691	10 121 121	17 42* 56	
2 35* 11	4 43 30	21 32* 44	1 46* 6	25 85 106	14 45* 49	12 121 131	21 181 180	
3 127 123 4 51* 24	6 54 50	22 210 224 23 18* 17	2 1* 13 3 46* 6	4 k 2	15 0* 29 16 104 116	13 144 148 14 32* 7	23 0* 35 25 50* 44	
5 48* 25 6 223 215	7 0* 13 8 15* 18	3 k 7	4 0* 13 5 27* 5	0 579 588 1 587 557	17 25* 43 18 377 375	15 49* 15 16 101 105	5 k 1	
7 56 33 8 19* 0	9 81 67 10 12* 22	0 26* 10 1 0* 13	6 38* 22 7 0* 6	2 54 44 3 215 211	19 57 68 20 62 41	17 72 63 18 88 85	0 288 294	
9 96 98 10 34* 34	11 42* 4 12 24* 31	2 14* 12 3 0* 13	8 32* 10 9 17* 5	4 63 60 5 446 411	21 26* 2 22 71 88	19 90 84 20 42* 7	2 639 624	
11 22* 16	13 43* 9	4 32* 12	10 30* 11	6 530 505	23 19* 13	4 k 10	4 657 643	
2 k 14	15 55 38	6 37* 9	12 12* 16	8 32* 12	4 k 6	0 180 182	6 268 247	
0 43* 38	17 29* 1	8 61 9	13 32* 4	9 150 144 10 20* 49	0 152 168	1 80 54 2 30* 31	7 61 67 8 387 379	
1 70 70 2 32* 40	18 21* 16 19 32* 5	9 0* 10 10 37* 9	15 0* 3 16 40* 8	11 203 196 12 339 328	1 411 425 2 83 98	3 0* 12 4 · 56 37	9 81 72 10 463 446	
3 42* 27 4 58 48	20 0* 4 21 33* 18	11 47* 5	17 0* 2	13 258 259	3 250 260 4 91 104	5 42* 41	11 32* 27	
5 58 58	22 35* 8	13 38* 10	3 K 12	15 101 97	5 337 335	7 51* 55	13 106 88	
7 66 66	24 44* 8	15 0* 5	1 58 23	17 77 76	7 379 379	9 0* 3	15 44* 35	
3 k 0	2,5 2,5 5 3 k 4	17 29* 2	2 Jy 22 3 146 134	19 135 149	9 205 204	11 0* 24	10 267 263	
1 64 70	0 143 140	18 0* 1 19 46* 6	4 43* 11 5 0* 6	20 0* 9 21 56 65	10 87 84 11 193 191	12 126 119 13 59 46	18 114 108 19 82 84	
3 2633 2572 5 224 215	1 42 41 2 46 56	20 23* 2 21 0* 2	6 108 96 7 0* 43	22 0* 18 33 0* 22	12 90 95 13 263 263	14 32* 10 15 30* 8	20 44* 61 21 51* 31	
7 127 117 9 1874 1867	3 653 656 4 54 48	22 17* 1	8 54 25 9 120 109	24 65 74 25 70 82	14 28* 37 15 134 133	16 60 30	22 137 146	
11 197 193 13 187 176	5 106 106	3 k 8 0 437 440	10 0* 10	4 k 3	16 50* 58	18 82 73	24 70 62	
15 1022 1019	7 81 66	1 86 67	12 78 77	0 1332 1391	18 47* 43	4 k 11	2> 5/ 65 5 k 2	
19 156 160	9 379 356	2 249 256 3 879 900	14 46* 21	2 159 154	19 153 157 20 34* 16	0 164 160	0 142 138	
21 467 485 23 74 79	10 17* 37 11 91 84	4 279 288 5 93 98	3 k 13	3 463 459 4 70 74	21 85 76 22 7* 36	2 106 94 3 227 216	1 17* 36 2 416 407	
25 105 113 3 k 1	12 73 55 13 131 118	6 382 383 7 0* 8	0 0* 5 1 0* 2	5 617 592 6 1155 1164	23 17* 27	4 100 93 5 194 193	3 372 344 4 429 419	
0 90 48	14 0* 36 15 179 177	8 169 169 9 686 687	2 24* 4 3 33* 3	7 667 661	4 K / 0 70 57	6 144 141 7 941 936	5 35* 16	
1 0* 17	16 0* 13	10 240 247	4 43* 4 5 0* 1	9 347 329	1 215 224	8 85 74	7 39* 39	
3 75 49	18 49* 38	12 257 264	6 0* 5	11 307 301	3 145 144	10 78 71	9 272 256	
5 25* 14	20 30* 18	14 91 84	8 26* 4	13 429 422	4 57 69 5 173 168	11 126 119 12 99 97	10 289 288 11 7* 2	
6 47 36 7 46 12	21 97 105 22 47* 7	15 426 424 16 179 172	9 31* 3 10 0* 2	14 100 103 15 211 204	6 24* 57 7 219 210	13 190 186 14 40* 46	12 76 86 13 46* 29	
8 82 13 9 43* 30	23 13* 35 24 0* 25	17 54* 63 18 136 153	11 0* 1	16 39* 47 17 118 119	8 70 73	15 123 123	14 114 108	
10 40* 16	25 79 89	19 45* 56	א נא 14 נא נ	18 370 370	10 22* 30	4 k 12	16 176 171	
12 12* 21	3 k 5	21 216 223	1 96 95	20 56 62	12 46* 43	0 93 75	17 24* 7 18 49* 61	
14 0* 6	1 15* 11	3 k 9	2 134 133 3 74 78	21 115 117 22 49* 47	13 167 161 14 41* 45	1 14* 14 2 16* 17	19 0* 19 20 59 37	
15 40* 23 16 45* 10	2 7* 10 3 68 67	0 0* 29 1 51* 17	4 154 141 5 85 72	23 47* 34 24 156 167	15 96 98 16 0* 4	3 62 43 4 31* 30	21 77 70 22 94 97	
17 35* 4	4 17* 11	2 36* 19	6 69 61	25 118 129	17 0* 36	5 31* 17	23 45* 7	

15*

Table 3. (Continued) Fc F_c F_c $\begin{array}{c} \mathbf{k} & \mathbf{F}_{0} \\ \mathbf{i} & \mathbf{i} & \mathbf{j} & \mathbf{i} & \mathbf{j} & \mathbf{i} & \mathbf{j} & \mathbf{j} \\ \mathbf{i} & \mathbf{i} & \mathbf{j} & \mathbf{j} & \mathbf{j} & \mathbf{j} \\ \mathbf{i} & \mathbf{i} & \mathbf{j} & \mathbf{j} & \mathbf{j} & \mathbf{j} \\ \mathbf{i} & \mathbf{i} & \mathbf{j} & \mathbf{j} & \mathbf{j} \\ \mathbf{i} & \mathbf{i} & \mathbf{j} & \mathbf{j} & \mathbf{j} \\ \mathbf{i} & \mathbf{i} & \mathbf{j} & \mathbf{j} & \mathbf{j} \\ \mathbf{i} & \mathbf{i} & \mathbf{j} & \mathbf{i} & \mathbf{j} \\ \mathbf{i} & \mathbf{i} & \mathbf{i} & \mathbf{j} & \mathbf{i} \\ \mathbf{i} & \mathbf{i} & \mathbf{i} & \mathbf{i} & \mathbf{i} \\ \mathbf{i} & \mathbf{i} & \mathbf{i} & \mathbf{i} & \mathbf{i} \\ \mathbf{i} \\ \mathbf{i} & \mathbf{i} \\ \mathbf{i} \\ \mathbf{i} \\ \mathbf{i} & \mathbf{i} \\ \mathbf{i}$
 k
 Fo
 Fe

 14
 43^{5} 20

 15
 33^{5} 21

 16
 6^{7} 11

 0
 53^{5} 21

 1
 53^{5} 21

 2
 44^{5} 20

 3
 34^{5} 38

 4
 49^{9} 9

 5
 35^{5} 18

 7
 0^{9} 2^{10}

 8
 2^{10} 12

 10
 0^{1} 11

 0
 124 112

 12
 25^{10} 13^{10}

 14
 0^{10} 12^{10}

 15
 39^{10} 13^{10}

 16
 k^{13} 1^{10}

 0
 43^{10} 1^{10}

 2
 0^{11} 1^{10}

 10
 55^{11} 10^{11}

 2
 0^{11} 1^{10}

 2
 0^{10} 1^{10}

 10
 <td k F, Fo k k $\begin{array}{c} \textbf{F} & \textbf{o} & \textbf{f} & \textbf$ F_c F, 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 7 $\begin{array}{c} 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ 22\\ 3\\ 24\\ \end{array}$ 87 186 150 75 21 32 91 90 6 012345678910112141516781920122 01234567891011214151678192012 01234567891011121415161718192012 7 171 6 1 3 1 1 7 1 01234567890111231456789012222 12 112 87 30 14 101 8 75 42 16 0 1 2 3 4 5

228

24

012345678901123456789012222

 $\begin{array}{c} \mathbf{F}_{0} \\ \mathbf{2} \\ \mathbf{5} \\ \mathbf{k} \\ \mathbf{k}$

0123456789101123456

 $\begin{array}{c} \mathbf{F}_{0} & \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} \\ \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} \\ \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} \\ \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{1} \\ \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{1} \\ \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} \\ \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} \\ \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} \\ \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} \\ \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} \\ \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} \\ \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} \\ \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} \\ \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} \\ \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} \\ \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} \\ \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} \\ \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} \\ \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} \\ \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} \\ \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} \\ \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} \\ \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} \\ \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} \\ \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} \\ \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} \\ \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} \\ \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} \\ \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} \\ \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} \\ \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} \\ \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} \\ \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7} \\ \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{7}$

Table 3. (Continued)

k

01234567890

012345678910112314566789212

0123456

F., F_c k F 1 250 9 k F_c
 P.
 P.

 75
 57

 100
 113

 110
 113

 120
 1120

 120
 1120

 120
 1120

 120
 1120

 120
 1120

 120
 1120

 120
 1120

 120
 1120

 120
 1120

 120
 1120

 120
 1120

 13
 0*

 20*
 34

 20*
 34

 21*
 220*

 34
 40*

 57
 58

 508
 526

 508
 526

 508
 526

 508
 526

 504
 527

 505
 54

 506
 526

 507
 13*

 62
 155

 514
 12

 525*
 14

 525*
 142

 526*
 k F, Fe k F, k F_o Fe F F_c 12 13 14 10 21 $\begin{array}{c} 14 & 4^{4} & 3 \\ 14 & 4^{4} & 3 \\ 15 & 9 \\ 12 & 3^{5} & 160 \\ 19 & 123 & 120 \\ 10 & k \\ 4 \\ 0 & 78 & 26 \\ 2 & 2^{4} & 28 \\ 3 & 38^{4} & 70 \\ 1 & 78 & 26 \\ 2 & 2^{4} & 28 \\ 3 & 38^{4} & 70 \\ 1 & 78 & 26 \\ 2 & 2^{4} & 28 \\ 3 & 38^{4} & 70 \\ 1 & 78 & 26 \\ 1 & 77 & 78 \\ 1 & 55 & 53 \\ 1 & 87 & 64 \\ 1 & 77 & 78 \\ 1 & 55 & 53 \\ 1 & 87 & 64 \\ 1 & 77 & 78 \\ 1 & 55 & 53 \\ 1 & 78 & 26 \\ 1 & 175 & 16 \\ 1 & 175 & 18 \\ 1 & 68 & 5 \\ 1 & 175 & 18 \\ 1 & 68 & 77 \\ 1 & 18 & 186 \\ 1 & 155 & 160 \\ 1 & 175 & 18 \\ 1 & 168 & 77 \\ 1 & 188 & 186 \\ 1 & 175 & 18 \\ 1 & 10 & k \\ 5 & 153 & 140 \\ 1 & 258 & 140 \\ 1 & 258 & 140 \\ 1 & 258 & 140 \\ 1 & 258 & 140 \\ 1 & 258 & 140 \\ 1 & 258 & 140 \\ 1 & 15 & 168 \\ 1 & 10 & k \\ 7 & 188 & 298 \\ 10 & 23 & 39^{1} \\ 1 & 52^{8} & 107 \\ 2 & 39^{1} & 107 \\ 2 & 39^{1} & 107 \\ 2 & 39^{1} & 107 \\ 2 & 39^{1} & 107 \\ 2 & 39^{1} & 107 \\ 2 & 39^{1} & 107 \\ 2 & 39^{1} & 107 \\ 2 & 39^{1} & 107 \\ 2 & 39^{1} & 107 \\ 2 & 39^{1} & 107 \\ 2 & 39^{1} & 107 \\ 2 & 39^{1} & 107 \\ 2 & 12 & 128 \\ 1 & 10 & k \\ 1 & 12^{1} & 12^{1} & 128 \\ 1 & 21 & 21 \\ 1 & 10 & k \\ 1 & 12^{1} & 12^{1} & 128 \\ 1 & 12^{1} & 12^{1} & 128 \\ 1 & 12^{1} & 12^{1} & 128 \\ 1 & 12^{1} & 12^{1} & 128 \\ 1 & 12^{1} & 12^{1} & 128 \\ 1 & 12^{1} & 12^{1} & 128 \\ 1 & 10 & 12^{1} & 128 \\ 1 & 10 & 12^{1} & 128 \\ 1 & 10 & 12^{1} & 128 \\ 1 & 12^{1} & 12^{1} & 128 \\ 1 & 12^{1} & 12^{1} & 128 \\ 1 & 12^{1} & 12^{1} & 128 \\ 1 & 12^{1} & 12^{1} & 128 \\ 1 & 12^{1} & 12^{1} & 128 \\ 1 & 12^{1} & 12^{1} & 128 \\ 1 & 10^{1} & 13^{1} & 138 \\ 1 & 10 & 12^{1} & 138 \\ 1 & 10 & 12^{1} & 138 \\ 1 & 10 & 12^{1} & 138 \\ 1 & 10 & 12^{1} & 138 \\ 1 & 10 & 12^{1} & 138 \\ 1 & 10 & 12^{1} & 138 \\ 1 & 10 & 12^{1} & 138 \\ 1 & 10 & 12^{1} & 138 \\$ 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 264 153 63 9
 380
 43*

 9
 251 *

 9
 251 *

 188
 486

 128
 486

 128
 486

 1261
 578

 127
 578

 127
 578

 127
 578

 127*
 53*

 127*
 53*

 127*
 53*

 127*
 33*

 127*
 33*

 127*
 33*

 127*
 33*

 127*
 33*

 127*
 33*

 127*
 33*

 127*
 33*

 127*
 33*

 127*
 33*

 123*
 47*

 133*
 47*

 133*
 47*

 133*
 47*

 147*
 13*

 137*
 50*

 8
 k

 134*
 59*

 134*
 59*

 134*
 59*

 <trr>
 379 257 1881 289 1753 817 267 178 102 4 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 1 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 10 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 1 12 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 1 12 3 14 5 6 7 11 12 3 14 5 16 7 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 2 1 7907455265514750448278 645575135873476099457 8736432646582434406485 12309044850 5 $\begin{array}{c}
 0 & 1 & 2 \\
 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 \\
 7 & 8 & 9 & 10 \\
 11 & 12 & 3 & 14 \\
 12 & 11 & 14 \\
 \end{array}$ 8 0123456789011 11 01234567 012345678901 1 3 5 7 9 11 13 5 17 19

Table 3. (Continued) F, Fc k F F_c k Fo F k F P. k F, r. k Fo Fe k F, F k Fo P. 5 29 4 86 29* 54* 48* 0* 0* 39* 24* 0* 21* 79 518 35 105 370 38 101 14 15 86 5 66 16 46' 143 344 206 40" 149 47" 75 216 145 0" k 144 350 202 150 45 76 225 147 21 23* 75* 07** 96 2 k 920* 74* 88* 87 90* 70* 130* 149* 902 100 1558 102 1058 10 80 10 26 21 29 4 74 512 3 94 370 18 89 1 7 8 9 10 7 8 2 13 5 10 11 12 13 39* k 90 62 32* 75 40* 64 35* k 10 11 12 13 14 15 6 8 10 12 14 16 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16 17 61 11 2 28 8 8 55 12 5 k 24* 16* 37* 31* 0* 56 0* 23* k 14 60 7 70 16 74 8 26 39 50 5 134 4 7 366 4 104 8 7 26 5 $\begin{array}{c} 0 & 1 & 2 \\ \mathbf{2} & \mathbf{3} & 4 & 5 \\ \mathbf{6} & \mathbf{7} & \mathbf{8} & 9 \\ \mathbf{10} & \mathbf{11} & \mathbf{12} \\ \mathbf{11} & \mathbf{13} & \mathbf{14} \\ \mathbf{15} \end{array}$ 3 k 107 12* 117 224 133 26* 112 0* 89 178 121 38* 80 26* • 21* • 268 • 97 2 0* 5 126 • 0* 5 56* 5 247 7 90 3 42* 264 81 130 263 238 84 5 7 115 219 130 7 104 20 79 176 117 14 81 26 4 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 3 k 10 74 87 15 83 50 17 84 15 4 9 0 1 2 3 4 56 7 8 9 10 1 12 3 4 56 7 8 9 10 1 12 3 14 15 16 58* 35* 0* 12* 58* 30* 58* 40* 50* 49* 48* $\begin{array}{r} 42\\ 19\\ 10\\ 36\\ 10\\ 15\\ 36\\ 19\\ 9\\ 9\\ 9\\ 10\\ 3\\ 16\\ 7\\ 20\\ 8\end{array}$ 12* k 1 15 0 257 1 27* 2 48* 3 0* 4 57 5 16* 6 229 14 k 0 18* 1 15* 2 0* 3 0* 34 39 6 54 27 224 6 0* 14* 93 0* 0* 1 11 101 7 19 2 4 6 8 10 k 22 18 33 20 0 0* 34* 48* 39* 3 k 26* 310 38* 34* 242 0* 31* 1 2 3 4 k 0* 27* 49* 49* 49* 48* 28* 39* 56 37* 29* 0* 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 1 12 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 3 4 14 k 42 11 16 27 118 36 41 16 952 101 31 101 26 91 37 80 101 14 78 43 50 305 28 61 246 9 60 3 5 7 9 11 13 k k 45* 148 0* 168 209 9* 138 47* 83 158 161 27* 96 11* 206 23 150 31 164 204 11 130 31 100 146 165 1 98 24 48* 284 0* 281 23 k $\begin{array}{c} 17\\62\\56\\442\\0\\2\\12\\81\\41\\355\\7\\2\\235\\40\\235\\40\\\end{array}$ 5 k 71 108 108 111 5* 74 71 92 76 42* 40* 45* 35* 33* 23* 38* 20* 7 12 19 13 7 23 k 29* 47* 57* 249 40* 29* 47* 25* 208 35* 24* 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 1 1 60 40 67 260 25 7 64 90 104 35 75 67 88 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 1 12 1997 1554 1594 1574 131 58 20 15 k 0* 95 119 111 32* 5 k 17 99 105 112 11 k 28 52 6 75 29 42 55 15 54 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 11 2 11 2 32** 57** 14* 731** 59 k 10 0* 3* 59 36* 19* 12 k 677 88 17 84 136 94 11 82 19 59 5 k 79 85 147 103 54* 83 44* 5 k 119 30* 95 55* 109 40* 100 55 72 4 k 238 134 0* 129 0* 90 215 130 27* 50* 0* 0* 47* 11 17 50 1 2 3 27 30 65 33 20 0 27 98 33 109 22 105 28 70 23 8 4 17 24 57 1 2 3 4 5 1 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 121 14 132 27 95 213 122 k 0* 0* 35* 15* 12 4 14 7

The structure factors marked with an asterisk can be considered unobserved at the 10% significance level, those which were derived from a negative net intensity were given a value of zero

sulfur bond lengths in the centric space group can be explained (see later).

In changing from refinement in the centric space group to the acentric, the overall residual decreased slightly from 0.096 to 0.093. In terms of the Hamilton R (significance) test (HAMILTON, 1965), this difference is significant, as the ratio of weighted residuals for the two space groups, 1.032, is larger than the expected value, 1.007, at the $\frac{1}{2}0/_0$ significance level, for the change in the number of parameters and the number of observations used. However, criteria for the acceptance of the Hamilton test when applied to space group differences have been discussed earlier (NYBURG, OZIN and SZYMAŃSKI, 1971). It is felt that the ill-conditioned refinement, the larger standard deviations, and the

gross distortions of chemically equivalent bonds in the acentric case contradict the result of the Hamilton test. In the absence of any further evidence to support it, the result of the test should be discounted and the centric space group should be chosen as being correct for the structure. Nevertheless, for the sake of completeness, the parameters from the acentric refinement are set out in Table 1 as Data Set VI. The parameters from the centric refinement, which are considered as being the most accurate in the present work, are set out in Data Set V, Table 1.

Comparison of refinement results

The atomic parameters from the four refinements of the present study and those obtained by earlier workers are all listed in Table 1. Refinement Set I is taken from AZAROFF and BUERGER (1955), Refinement Set II from FLEET (1970). Refinement III consists of the data from crystal 1, refined in the centric space group. Set IV consists of the data from crystal 2 using only reflections considered as observed at the $10^{0}/_{0}$ significance level. Sets V and VI are the data from crystal 2 refined in space groups Pcmn and $Pc2_1n$ respectively, but with all data being considered as observed. With the exception of Refinement Set VI, which should be considered separately, there is good agreement between the positional parameters determined in this present work (Sets III, IV, V). There are, however, significant differences between the atomic positions in Sets I and V. The differences are 0.025, 0.024, 0.029, 0.046 Å for Cu, Fe, S(1) and S(2), respectively. Surprisingly, some differences between the more recent values in Set II and Set V are even larger-0.026, 0.015, 0.117, 0.056 Å.

It is difficult to compare the thermal parameters of Sets I and II with those of the present work because of the use of an overall temperature factor in Set I, and individual, but isotropic temperature factors in Set II. It can be said, however, that the values obtained in Set II are within 2σ (FLEET'S σ) of our mean isotropic temperature factors. Despite the suspected systematic errors in Refinement Set III, the positional parameters, and most of the thermal parameters, agree well with our final values (Set V), with the exception of the U_{22} values in the two sets, which are grossly different. This is no doubt caused by the fact that the *b*-axis direction was approximately normal to the irregular hexagonal plate, and the absorption corrections are likely to be very poorly evaluated in this direction. As is often the case, it appears that the thermal parameters may have "taken up the slack" in this refinement.

The difference syntheses calculated at the end of the refinements for Sets IV and V showed positive and negative excursions above the level of significance. However, these did not fall into a systematic pattern expected from aspherical scattering of the atoms. Some positive peaks of density $1.5e/Å^3$ were found in or near the interatomic regions, but not all these regions had positive peaks, nor were the peaks found restricted to such regions. Consequently, no inference could be drawn from these peaks. It was felt that although the use of spherical form factors in the refinement was a contributing factor to the residual errors, an attempt to use aspherical form factors would not be justified. At the atomic sites themselves, no features were observed; this seems to substantiate the choice of the scattering curves, though this is not a sensitive test.

Refinement Set VI has been included for the sake of completeness, though it is felt that acceptance of the noncentric space group is not warranted. It can be seen that for Set VI, the values of the refined positional parameters, or the mean of the refined parameters (in the case where mirror-related atoms are now independent), or the mean of $y, \frac{1}{2}-y$ for Fe and S(2) are within one standard deviation of the values of Set V. The agreement in the thermal parameters is not as good. This is probably caused by the fact that U_{12} and U_{23} are now refinable parameters for Cu and S(1), and that their refinement away from zero causes the corresponding cross-product terms for the other two atoms to change significantly.

Discussion of the structure

Figure 1 illustrates the structure of cubanite projected down the a and c axes, and shows the nearly hexagonal close-packed layers of sulfur atoms found in the structure. The layers themselves, however, are not ideally planar. Within each wurtzitic slab b/2 wide, the sulfur on the mirror plane is displaced in the c direction by 0.057 Å relative to the two sulfur atoms not on the mirror plane, and there is a displacement of about 0.2 Å along the c direction between sulfur layers in adjacent wurtzitic slabs.

Figure 2a shows the geometry around the two atoms Cu and S(1) on the mirror plane and Fig. 2b shows the corresponding geometry for the Fe and S(2) atoms which are not on the mirror plane. More details of bond lengths and angles with standard deviations are found in Table 2.

232

The full list of observed and calculated structure factors is given in Table 3, where the values of F_0 are given as derived directly from the mean net count of intensity. The asterisks denote the reflections that are considered as unobserved in Data Set IV.



Fig. 1. The structure of cubanite projected down the a and c axes. The upper diagram also illustrates the relative displacement in the c direction of the closepacked sulfur layers between adjacent wurtzitic slabs b/2 wide

The structure of cubanite, as described by BUERGER (1945) and more recent workers, is basically correct. However, the present refinement has yielded a more consistent set of bond lengths and angles, than have been given in some recent work. Particularly significant is the shortening of the Cu—S(1) bond to $2.291(1_3)$, from the value reported by FLEET as 2.433(11) Å, and that the mean Cu—S distance,

 2.305 ± 0.02 Å, is significantly less than the mean given previously 2.34 ± 0.09 Å (FLEET, 1970). The values given here agree better with those given by AZAROFF and BUERGER (1955): Cu—S(1) = 2.29₂, mean Cu—S = 2.31 ± 0.04 Å. The mean Cu—S distance, 2.30_5 Å, compares very well with that recently found in chaclopyrite, 2.302(1) Å (HALL and STEWART, 1973) and the Fe—S distance in chalcopyrite, 2.257(1) Å, is in good agreement with the two shorter Fe—S distances in cubanite.



Fig. 2a. Bond lengths and angles around Cu and S(1), the atoms on the mirror plane, which is shown as the broken line

The two Fe—S bonds to the two sulfur atoms, 2.304(1), 2.293(1) Å, which define the shared tetrahedral edge in the structure are longer than the other two Fe—S distances, 2.264(1) and 2.258(1) Å. This has been noted earlier (FLEET, 1970) but the individual bond lengths now follow a systematic pattern which, together with the distortions from tetrahedral symmetry around the metals, can be described in terms of a Fe—Fe repulsion force. This is in contrast to the Fe—Fe attraction force suggested by FLEET (1970). Such a repulsion should result in a lengthening of the adjacent Fe—S(2) bonds, a shortening of the S(2)—S(2) distances, and a decrease in the S(2)—Fe—S(2) angle. The two Fe—S bonds are longer, as noted above, the S(2)—S(2) tetrahedral-

234

edge distance is decreased to 3.642(1) Å, compared with the mean of the other five edges $3.73_7 + 0.02$ Å².

The S(2)—Fe—S(2) angle is decreased to $104.83(3)^{\circ}$, compared with the expected tetrahedral value. A Fe—Fe repulsion would also result in a lengthening of the two metal-sulfur bonds attached³ to $S(2)^{9}$, *i.e.*, $S(2)^{9}$ —Cu⁹, $S(2)^{9}$ —Fe⁹, and a shortening of iron-sulfur bonds attached to Fe, *i.e.*, Fe— $S(1)^{2}$, Fe—S(2). However, the Fe—S(2) is



Fig.2b. Bond lengths and angles around Fe and S(2) which are in general positions in the structure. The close approach of 2.804 Å between two Fe atoms across a centre of symmetry is shown. Bond lengths are in Å units, bond angles in degrees

symmetry-related to the Fe^{9} -S(2)⁹ bond, so one could reasonably expect the expansion and contraction forces to cancel out. This would

³ A superscript indicates an atom related to the equivalent atom of xyz by the symmetry operation listed at the end of Table 2.

² The value of 4.04 Å, given in the text by FLEET (1970, p. 284) for the S(2)—S(2) distance across the centre of symmetry, appears to be in error. The corresponding value in his Table 5 (3.696 Å), is correct as calculated from his atomic parameters. The use of the value 4.04 Å in his discussion detracts from his reasoning that this S(2)—S(2) distance has been lengthened, "compared to the average S—S distance of S atoms coordinated about Fe, 3.70 Å". This study shows, in fact, that this is by far the shortest of the tetrahedral edges around iron.

leave Fe—S(1)² as a short bond, Fe—S(2) as an unchanged bond, and $S(2)^9$ —Cu⁹ as a long bond. Indeed, in this study it is found that Fe—S(1)² is the shortest iron-sulfur bond, that Fe—S(2) is longer, and that $S(2)^9$ —Cu⁹ is the longest of the copper-sulfur bonds in the structure. Furthermore, the decrease of the S(2)—S(2) tetrahedral edge is reflected in an increase in the S(2)—Cu—S(1)⁹ angle to 113.03(3)° over the expected tetrahedral value. Finally, the reasons for the difference in bond lengths of the two *longer* Fe—S(2) bonds, Fe—S(2)⁹: 2.304 Å, Fe—S(2)¹¹: 2.293 Å, can be found in considering the pseudo hexagonal close-packed sulfur matrix, in which distortions within a close-packed layer should be more difficult than a distortion which causes a slight separation of the close-packed layers. This is reflected in the shorter length of the Fe—S(2)¹¹ bond, nearly in the plane of the close-packed sulfur layer, and the longer Fe—S(2)⁹ distance, the latter being normal to the sulfur layer.

In the present study, the mean Cu—S distance is found to be longer than the mean Fe—S distance, although there is an overlap in the individual distances, because of the distorted geometry at the shared tetrahedral edge. This means that it is not possible to identify positively the metal sites in more complex copper-iron sulfides, using the criterion of the bond lengths alone, without recourse to considering the spatial interrelationship of the metal-sulfur tetrahedra. The bond lengths and angles are given in Table 2 and Figs. 1 and 2. They are based upon the figures given in Data Set V, Table 1. The set of nonbonded sulfur-sulfur distances, across the corners of the coordination tetrahedra, is also given in Table 2.

The thermal parameters, given in Table 1 and illustrated graphically in Fig. 2, do not indicate any large anisotropy, and such anisotropy as is present is difficult to correlate to the features of the structure. However, as found in chalcopyrite (HALL and STEWART, 1973), the mean isotropic temperature factors of the sulfur atoms, $\langle B \rangle = 0.96$ Å², are about 8°/₀ higher than that of iron, B = 0.89 Å², while that of copper, 1.38 Å², is about 60°/₀ higher than that of iron. The corresponding figures for the temperature factors found in chalcopyrite are 1.00, 0.92, 1.48 Å². On the basis of x-ray analysis, it is not possible to decide between possible oxidation states for Fe, bùt the refinement appears to indicate that the centrosymmetric space group *Pcmn* is correct; this implies that the two Fe atoms across the centre of symmetry are in identical oxidation states, at least on a time-average basis. GREENWOOD and WHITFIELD (1968) had earlier suggested, on the basis

 $\mathbf{236}$

of their Mössbauer spectra, that the odd electron per formula unit was being exchanged rapidly between the iron atoms, but other Mössbauer spectra at 4°K (IMBERT and WINTENBERGER, 1967; TOWNSEND *et al.*, 1973) have *not* shown any further splitting of lines compared with the room-temperature spectra. This precludes the idea of rapid electron exchange and favours the idea of identical oxidation states for iron at all times, though it does not answer the fundamental question as to the location or function of the odd electron per formula unit. The author feels that the problem of the location of this odd electron is still unresolved, though the suggestion of HULLIGER (1968) that it is in an incomplete *d* band thus accounting for the electrical conductivity of cubanite, seems reasonable. TOWNSEND *et al.* (1973) have recently reported that cubanite is an *n*-type semiconductor, thus giving further weight to HULLIGER's suggestion.

Conclusion

The final parameters for the present structure refinement, listed in Table 1, Data Set V, have yielded a set of bond lengths and angles that are considerably more accurate than those from previous work, and that are of comparable precision to those from the recent work on chalcopyrite. No attempt is made to rationalize the bonding within this structure in terms of the d orbitals of Fe and Cu, but this has already been discussed at some length by HULLIGER (1968), by KNOP *et al.* (1970) and by FLEET (1970, 1972). The distortions from tetrahedral geometry around the metal atoms are consistent with an Fe—Fe repulsion, rather than with a long Fe—Fe bond involving the dz^2 orbitals, as suggested by FLEET (1970). The space-group ambiguity has been studied, and despite the evidence of the Hamilton test, it is felt that the original assignment to the centric space group is correct.

Acknowledgements

The author is grateful to Dr. S. R. HALL of this Division, for much useful help and discussion in the work and for critical reading of the manuscript. Thanks are due to Dr. L. J. CABRI, of this Division, for supplying the original cubanite material and for doing the microprobe analysis, and to Dr. J. D. SCOTT, of Queen's University, Kingston, Ontario, for additional cubanite crystals used in this analysis. Figures 1 and 2 were prepared using the computer program ORTEP (JOHNSON, 1965).

References

- L. V. AZAROFF and M. J. BUERGER (1955), Refinement of the structure of cubanite, CuFe₂S₃. Amer. Mineral. 40, 213-225.
- W. L. BOND (1951), Making small spheres. Rev. Sci. Instr. 22, 344-345.
- M. J. BUERGER (1945), The crystal structure of cubanite, CuFe₂S₃, and the coordination of ferromagnetic iron. J. Amer. Chem. Soc. 67, 2056.
- M. J. BUERGER (1947), The crystal structure of cubanite. Amer. Mineral. 32, 415-425.
- W. R. BUSING (1970), Least squares refinement of lattice and orientation parameters for use in automatic diffractometry. *Crystallographic computing* (F. R. AHMED, Ed.), Munksgaard, Copenhagen, 319-330.
- L. J. CABRI and S. R. HALL (1972), Mooihoekite and haycockite, two new copper-iron sulphides and their relationship to chalcopyrite and talnakhite. Amer. Mineral. 57, 689-708.
- L. J. CABRI, S. R. HALL, J. T. SZYMAŃSKI and J. M. STEWART (1973), On the transformation of cubanite. Can. Mineral. 12, 33-38.
- D. T. CROMER and D. LIBERMANN (1970), Relativistic calculation of anomalous scattering factors for x-rays. J. Chem. Physics 53, 1891-1898.
- D. T. CROMER and J. B. MANN (1968), X-ray scattering factors computed from numerical Hartree-Fock wave functions. Acta Crystallogr. A24, 321-324.
- G. DONNAY, L. M. CORLISS, J. D. H. DONNAY, N. ELLIOTT and J. M. HASTINGS (1958), Symmetry of magnetic structures: Magnetic structure of chalcopyrite. Physic. Rev. 112, 1917–1923.
- M. E. FLEET (1970), Refinement of the crystal structure of cubanite and polymorphism of CuFe₂S₃. Z. Kristallogr. **132**, 276-287.
- M. E. FLEET (1972), A note on the oxidation state of iron in cubanite. Can. Mineral. 11, 901-902.
- E. J. GABE and T. O'BYRNE (1970), An absorption correction program for the PDP-8. Amer. Crystallogr. Ass. Summer Meeting, Ottawa. Abstr. Paper A4.
- N. N. GREENWOOD and H. J. WHITFIELD (1968), Mössbauer effect studies on cubanite (CuFe₂S₃) and related iron sulphides. J. Chem. Soc. [London] A, 1697-1699.
- S. R. HALL and E. J. GABE (1972), The crystal structure of talnakhite, Cu₁₈Fe₁₆S₃₂. Amer. Mineral. 57, 368-380.
- S. R. HALL and J. F. ROWLAND (1973), The crystal structure of synthetic mooihoekite, Cu₉Fe₉S₁₆. Acta Crystallogr. B29, 2365-2372.
- S. R. HALL and J. M. STEWART (1973), The crystal structure refinement of chalcopyrite, CuFeS₂. Acta Crystallogr. B 29, 579-585.
- W. C. HAMILTON (1965), Significance tests on the crystallographic R factor. Acta Crystallogr. 18, 502–510.
- F. HULLIGER (1968), Crystal chemistry of the chalcogenides and pnictides of the transition elements. Structure and bonding. 4, 83-229
- P. IMBERT and W. WINTENBERGER (1967), Etudes des propriétés magnétiques et des spectres d'absorption par l'effet Mössbauer de la cubanite et de la sternbergite. Bull. Soc. franç. Mineral. Cristallogr. 90, 299–303.
- C. K. JOHNSON (1965), U.S. Clearinghouse Fed. Sci. Tech. Inform. Rep. ORNL-3794.

- O. KNOP, C. HUANG and F. W. WOODHAMS (1970), Chalcogenides of the transition elements, VII. A Mössbauer study of pentlandite. Amer. Mineral. 55, 1115.
- A. C. LARSON (1970), The inclusion of secondary extinction in least-squares refinement of crystal structures. In: *Crystallographic computing*, Ed. F. R. AHMED, Munksgaard, Copenhagen.
- S. C. NYBURG, G. A. OZIN and J. T. SZYMAŃSKI (1971), The crystal and molecular structure of bismuth trichloride. Acta Crystallogr. B27, 2298-2304.
- M. A. PEACOCK and G. M. YATSEVITCH (1936), Cubanite from Sudbury, Ontario. Amer. Mineral. 21, 55-62.
- J. M. STEWART, G. KRUGER, H. AMMON, C. H. DICKINSON and S. R. HALL (1972), The x-ray system of crystallographic programs for any computer. U. Maryland Comp. Sc. Tech., Report TR-192.
- J. T. SZYMAŃSKI (1974), The crystal structure of high-temperature CuFe₂S₃. Z. Kristallogr. 140, 240-248.
- Y. TOMILE and C. H. STAM (1958), Calculation of atomic scattering factors using Slater wave functions: sodium to calcium. Acta Crystallogr. 11, 126-127.
- M. G. TOWNSEND, J. L. HORWOOD and J. R. GOSSELIN (1973), On the weak ferromagnetism of orthorhombic CuFe₂S₃. Canad. J. Physics **51** 2162-2165.