#### THE AMERICAN MINERALOGIST, VOL. 56, JANUARY-FEBRUARY, 1971

# A NEUTRON-DIFFRACTION STUDY OF THE FERRIC TOURMALINE, BUERGERITE<sup>1</sup>

# ARMIN TIPPE<sup>2</sup> AND WALTER C. HAMILTON, Chemistry Department, Brookhaven National Laboratory, Upton, New York 11973.

#### Abstract

The structural parameters of buergerite (ideally  $NaFe_3B_3Al_6Si_6O_{30}F$ ) have been refined using three-dimensional, single-crystal neutron diffraction data. The occupancy factors in the cation sites have also been refined, and, in agreement with the X-ray results, a substitution of Fe into the 18c Al point position of space group R3m is found.

A difference synthesis resulted in the location of a hydrogen atom in the structure corresponding to the replacement of O by OH in one site of the  $FeO_6$  octahedron about 8 percent of the time.

Because of the differences in scattering amplitudes, some of the bond distances have been determined to slightly higher precision than in the X-ray determination. The final R ( $F^2$ ) factor for 391 independent reflections is 0.034. The maximum error in the final difference synthesis is 0.4 fm Å<sup>-3</sup>—about 1 percent of the maximum peak height in the observed scattering density map. The position and thermal parameters agree extraordinarily well with those of the X-ray study, and confirm the results of that work in detail; the precision of the atomic position determinations is about 0.003 Å in both studies.

A comparison of neutron powder diffraction patterns at 300°K and at 4.2°K provides no evidence for magnetic ordering or other structural change between these temperatures.

#### INTRODUCTION

Buergerite, a ferric tourmaline with the idealized formula NaFe<sub>3</sub>B<sub>3</sub>Si<sub>6</sub>Al<sub>6</sub>O<sub>30</sub>F, has been described by Mason, Donnay, and Hardie (1964) and by Donnay, Ingamells, and Mason (1966). In a recent X-ray diffraction study Barton (1969) found the crystal structure of buergerite to be very similar to the dravite structure of Buerger, Burnham, and Peacor (1962). An important result of the X-ray study is that some iron replaces aluminum in the 18c position of space group R3m, a substitution not demanded by the chemical analysis. The ratios of atomic scattering amplitudes for neutrons and X-rays differ; therefore a neutron diffraction study should provide independent evidence of cation substitution. Furthermore, neutron diffraction data are sensitive to the ordering of unpaired electrons, and a report of the antiferromagnetic behavior of buergerite (Tsang, Thorpe, Senftle, and Donnay, 1970) gave further stimulus to the study reported in this paper.

<sup>1</sup> Research performed under the auspices of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission.

<sup>2</sup> Present address: Institut Max v. Laue-Paul Langevin, rue des Martyrs, 38 Grenoble, France.

## A. TIPPE AND WALTER HAMILTON

## CRYSTAL DATA

The cell constants, density, and space group were taken as those found in the X-ray study: a=15.869 Å, c=7.188 Å,  $p_x=3.29$  g cm<sup>-3</sup>, R3m.

#### Experimental

The crystalline material used in this investigation was kindly supplied by Dr. John S. White of the U. S. National Museum (specimen R-12631), and was from the same locality as the crystals studied in the investigations referenced above. The final formula adopted by Barton on the basis of the chemical analysis and the x-ray structure determination is

 $Na_{2,49}K_{0,05}Ca_{0,39} = 0.07 (M_{6,30}Al_{2,65} = 0.05) B_{9,00}(Al_{16,32}M_{1,57} = 0.11)$ 

#### $\cdot (Si_{17,20}B_{0,80})(O_{88,53}OH_{1,39}F_{0,08})F_{3,00}.$

with  $M = Fe_{0.051} + Ti_{0.025} + Mg_{0.013} + Mn_{0.008}$ . This overall chemical composition was assumed in the present study, and the distribution of the cations was essentially confirmed.

A doubly terminated prismatic crystal was chosen for data collection. The distance between the two monohedra and between the three pairs of opposite prism faces (1010, 0110, 1120) were each equal to 1.90 mm. The crystal volume was 6.25 mm<sup>3</sup>. The crystal was mounted with the [110] axis parallel to the  $\phi$  axis of a four-circle goniometer at the Brookhaven National Laboratory High Flux Beam Reactor. A monochromatic beam of neutrons with wavelength 1.047 Å was obtained by reflection from the (111) face of a single crystal of copper; at this wave-length, the amount of second order contamination in the beam is negligible.

Integrated intensities were obtained for reflections with  $(\sin\theta)/\lambda < 0.65$  by a  $\theta - 2\theta$  step scan-method, with steps taken every 0.1 degree in  $2\theta$ . The length of the scan was a variable function of scattering angle, chosen to obtain several background points at each end of the scan. The data were reduced to squared structure amplitudes by background correction, application of the Lorentz factor  $\sin 2\theta$ , and correction for absorption ( $\mu = 4.36$  cm<sup>-1</sup>). The transmission factors varied from 0.46 to 0.52. Most reflections were observed twice; 822 separate (*hkl*) values were obtained from 1644 measurements. The agreement factors R and R<sub> $\omega$ </sub> for the 585 multiply-observed reflections were 0.023 and 0.025.<sup>1</sup> Only seventeen of these reflections deviated by more than 4 $\sigma$  from the weighted mean.

The intensities for the 822 (*hkl*) values were now averaged over sets of symmetryequivalent reflections to obtain 397 independent reflections. The values of R and  $R_{\alpha}$  for this averaging were 0.024 and 0.025; no departure from Laue symmetry  $\overline{3}m$  was suggested. For the subsequent analysis, each reflection was assigned an estimated standard deviation which was the highest of the following three values: (1) the counting statistical error, (2) the standard deviation of the mean as estimated from the agreement between equivalent reflections, (3) five percent of  $F^2$ .

#### STRUCTURE REFINEMENT

Initial least squares refinement of all position parameters, anisotropic thermal parameters, an isotropic extinction parameter (Zachariasen, 1967), a scale factor, and atomic scattering lengths for all positions ex-

$${}^{1} R = \sum_{hkl,j} \left| F_{j}^{2}(hkl) - F_{\mu}^{2}(hkl) \right| / \sum_{hkl,j} F_{\mu}^{2}(hkl)$$
$$R_{\omega} = \left[ \sum_{hkl,j} \omega_{j} \left| F_{j}^{2}(hkl) - F_{\mu}^{2}(hkl) \right|^{2} / \sum_{hkl,j} F_{\mu}^{4}(hkl) \right]^{1/2}$$

with the weights  $\omega_i = 1/\sigma_i^2$  being determined by Poisson counting statistics.

#### NEUTRON DIFFRACTION OF BUERGERITE

# Table 1. Neutron Scattering Lengths in $10^{-12}~{\rm cm}$ for the Elements in Buergerite

Those values with standard deviations in parentheses were refined in this study, and mean values are based on the chemical composition given by Barton.

Atom	Atomic Number	b	
Na	11	0.351	
K	19	0.37	
Ca	20	0.49	
$\mu$ (Na site)	_	0.361	
Fe	26	0.95	
Ti	22	-0.34	
Mg	12	0.52	
Mn	25	-0.36	
$\mu(M)$		0.898	
Al	13	0.35	
В	5	0.540 (9)	
0	8	0.577	
F	9	0.55	
H	1	-0.378	
Fe site		0.763 (11)	
Al site		0.385 (7)	

cept the 18c Al position (which was normalized to agree with Barton's results) indicated that the chemical composition given by Barton and the neutron scattering lengths given in Table 1 are indeed satisfactory. In subsequent refinements, most scattering lengths were fixed at their theoretical values. Exceptions were made for the 18c Al position and the 9b Fe position; the scattering lengths at these positions were varied to obtain an independent estimate of the (Al, Fe) replacement found by Barton.<sup>1</sup> The boron scattering length was also refined, inasmuch as it is not as well characterized by previous crystallographic studies. The O(1) site was assumed to be entirely F; the scattering lengths for F and O are nearly equal, and a moderate substitution of O for F would not affect the results.

Refinement of position, thermal, scale, and extinction parameters along with the three scattering lengths reduced the value of R and  $R_{\omega}$ (both based on  $F^2$ ) to 0.036 and 0.061. The standard deviation of an observation of unit weight (S) was 1.276. Observed and difference scattering density syntheses were calculated at this stage. Peak heights in the observed map ranged from 44.96 fm  $\cdot$ Å<sup>-3</sup> for Fe to 21.25 fm  $\cdot$ Å<sup>-3</sup> for

<sup>1</sup> The restraint on the 18c Al scattering length in the previous refinement does not affect the results of the final refinement; effectively, in the final refinements, normalization was made to the scattering factor for oxygen, which is well known.

Na (one Fermi or femtometer (fm) =  $10^{-15}$  m). Figure 1 shows a section of this map in a plane near the plane of the BO<sub>3</sub> triangle. The maximum peak heights in the difference map were 0.42 fm · Å-3, and there were many peaks nearly this high scattered uniformly throughout the cell. Thus the noise level may be taken as about 0.4 fm · Å<sup>-3</sup>. Negative peaks (see Figure 2), which will correspond to hydrogen atoms, were found above this noise level at only two chemically reasonable positions (about 1 Å from oxygen sites) and not too close to other atoms. The largest peak occurred at (-0.13, +0.13, 0.39) with a density of  $-0.99 \text{ fm} \cdot \text{Å}^{-3}$ ; this is approximately 1 Å from O(3) along the O(3)-O(5) line. A second peak with a density of  $-0.59 \text{ fm} \cdot \text{Å}^{-3}$  was found at (0.00, 0.00, -0.12). This is about 1 Å from the  $O(1) \equiv F$  site. A peak with a density of -0.61fm  $\cdot$ Å<sup>-3</sup> was found about 1 Å from B and 1.8 Å from O<sub>8</sub>; a peak with density  $-0.55 \text{ fm} \cdot \text{Å}^{-3}$  was found at about 1 Å from O(5) but at 1.8 Å from Si; three other peaks with densities between 0.40 and 0.48 fm  $\cdot$  Å<sup>-3</sup> were either too close to Fe or a long distance from any atom; all these peaks were judged to be either noise or diffraction ripple from the heavy atoms. Least squares refinement of the positions and occupancy factors for the two reasonable hydrogen atom sites led to occupancies of 0.083(11) for H(03) in a 9b position and 0.006(20) for H(F) in a 3a position. Thus the refinement would seem to indicate essentially no hydrogen in the latter position. After the final cycles of least squares refinement including only the H(03) hydrogen atom, a final difference synthesis now had its largest peak at the position (0, 0, -0.14) with a density of  $-0.5 \text{ fm} \cdot \text{Å}^{-3}$ . but there was a steady gradation of noise peaks falling off from this level. Although charge-balance considerations (Donnay, 1970) suggest significant hydrogen occupancies in both positions, the ionic disorder in both the Na<sup>+</sup> and F<sup>-</sup> positions on the three-fold axis (as evidenced by the high thermal parameters) may also smear out the hydrogen atom so that it is not quite distinguishable from the noise in the difference synthesis, and the occupancy factor for this atom becomes poorly determined. The amount of H in the H(03) site corresponds to 0.75(10)H atoms per unit cell. The chemical analysis suggests a total hydrogen content of 1.4; thus at least half of the hydrogen in the cell is in the form of OH at the O(3) position, and is located such that a weak hydrogen bond occurs between O3 and O5. The geometrical parameters of this hydrogen bond are O<sub>3</sub>-H 0.94(5), H ... O<sub>5</sub> 2.46(5), ∠O<sub>3</sub>-H ... O<sub>5</sub>  $155^{\circ}(2).^{1}$ 

<sup>1</sup> Hamilton and Ibers (1968) have given the geometrical criterion for a hydrogen bond as the existence of a heavy atom-hydrogen atom contact at least 0.2 A less than the sum of the van der Walls radii. (The last sentence in section 1.7 of this reference is unfortunately garbled.) Thus this would not be a hydrogen bond by the Hamilton-Ibers criterion. This is in agreement with the charge balance considerations of Donnay (1970).





as well as two O(6) atoms nearly in the plane. The smaller peaks are O(3), O(4), and two O(7) atoms which do not lie in the plane of the section. The contour interval is 0.225 fm  $\cdot$  Å<sup>-3</sup>, and the minimum contour is at 0.45 fm  $\cdot$  Å<sup>-3</sup>.



2000

0000.0

A final cycle of least squares refinement, varying all parameters for the heavy atoms, but keeping an isotropic thermal parameter fixed at 2.4 A<sup>2</sup> for H(O3), resulted in the structural parameters of Tables 2 and 3. The observed and calculated values of  $F^2$  are presented in Table 4.

 Atom	x	у	z
Na $(3a)$	0	0	0.21186 (139)
	0	0	0.21338 (41)
B (9b)	0.11001 (9)	<i>x</i>	0.45172 (50)
- ( )	0.10992 (25)	-x	0.45182 (46)
Fe (9b)	-0.06614 (8)	— <i>x</i>	0.62217 (48)
()	-0.06660 (4)	— x	0.62072 (10)
Si (18c)	0, 19171 (17)	0.19087 (17)	0
	0.19156 (4)	0.19065 (4)	0
Al (18c)	0.29925 (19)	0.25919 (18)	0.60450 (54)
	0.29880 (4)	0.25887 (4)	0.60437 (10)
O(1) = F(3a)	0	0	0.76850 (74)
0(-) - ()	0	0	0.76698 (51)
O(2) (9b)	0.06042 (9)	-x	0.48532 (54)
	0.06056 (15)	-x	0.48607 (29)
O(3) (9b)	-0.13205 (10)	-x	0.52026 (48)
	-0.13225 (17)	-x	0.52094 (30)
O(4) (9b)	0.09463 (9)	-x	0.07612 (50)
	0.09478 (15)	-x	0.07532 (28)
O(5) (9b)	-0.09117 (11)	-x	0.08362 (52)
	-0.09129 (16)	-x	0.08388 (28)
O(6) (18c)	0.19320(13)	0.18712 (12)	0.77538 (41)
	0.19314 (11)	0.18680 (11)	0.77481 (18)
O(7) (18c)	0.28708 (12)	0.28592 (11)	0.07513 (44)
	0.28670 (10)	0.28580 (10)	0.07445 (18)
O(8) (18c)	0,20925 (13)	0.26971 (12)	0.43868 (43)
	0.20894 (10)	0.26941 (10)	0.43778 (20)
H (9b)	-0.1313 (19)	- <i>x</i>	0.3889 (72)
· ·			

TABLE 2. POSITIONAL PARAMETERS	IN	BUERGERITE	
--------------------------------	----	------------	--

Neutron parameters on first line, x-ray on second. Standard deviations in parentheses.

	$\beta_{11}$	$\beta_{22}$	$\beta_{33}$	$eta_{12}$	$\beta_{13}$	$eta_{23}$
Na	325 (29)	$\beta_{11}$	720 (163)	$\frac{1}{2}\beta_{11}$	0	0
	302 (14)	$\beta_{11}$	1172 (58)	$\frac{1}{2}\beta_{11}$	0	0
в	59 (12)	$\beta_{11}$	340 (50)	33 (11)	18 (10)	$-\beta_{13}$
	62 (16)	$eta_{11}$	263 (40)	38 (10)	5 (17)	$-eta_{13}$
Fe	103 (9)	$\beta_{11}$	585 (46)	15 (7)	87 (8)	$-\beta_{13}$
	72 (3)	$\beta_{11}$	544 (10)	3 (2)	87 (4)	$-\beta_{13}$
Si	63 (12)	62 (11)	294 (44)	29 (9)	- 5 (17)	-34(17)
	40 (2)	38 (2)	152 (8)	18 (2)	3 (4)	- 8 (4)
AI	63 (15)	58 (14)	233 (50)	14 (10)	- 7 (20)	41 (19)
	64 (2)	86 (3)	286 (9)	34 (2)	- 7 (4)	35 (4)
O(1) = F	192 (15)	$\beta_{11}$	359 (85)	$\frac{1}{2}\beta_{11}$	0	0
	378 (24)	$\beta_{11}$	328 (66)	$\frac{1}{2}\beta_{11}$	0	0
O(2)	<b>99</b> (9)	$\beta_{11}$	415 (45)	77 (10)	9 (9)	$-\beta_{13}$
	103 (14)	$eta_{11}$	516 (36)	77 (8)	9 (14)	$-eta_{13}$
O(3)	67 (9)	$\beta_{11}$	381 (49)	- 4 (10)	-11(10)	$-\beta_{13}$
	82 (12)	$eta_{11}$	367 (33)	14 (8)	8 (15)	$-eta_{13}$
O(4)	86 (9)	$\beta_{11}$	356 (47)	33 (10)	-20(10)	$-\beta_{13}$
	93 (13)	$\beta_{11}$	330 (33)	33 (8)	- 5 (15)	$-eta_{13}$
O(5)	95 (8)	$\beta_{11}$	298 (41)	15 (10)	- 3 (9)	$-\beta_{13}$
	95 (13)	$\beta_{11}$	330 (32)	24 (8)	-12 (15)	$-\beta_{13}$
O(6)	71 (8)	79 (8)	202 (28)	22 (6)	1 (13)	- 6 (12)
	88 (6)	73 (6)	274 (20)	32 (5)	5 (10)	- 2 (9)
O(7)	61 (8)	47 (9)	315 (30)	12 (6)	1 (13)	-21(13)
	81 (6)	69 (6)	237 (20)	28 (5)	-17 (9)	-23 (9)
O(8)	39 (9)	96 (8)	411 (31)	26 (7)	32 (13)	52 (13)
	62 (5)	87 (6)	381 (22)	40 (5)	- 1 (9)	23 (9)

TABLE 3. THERMAL PARAMETERS<sup>a</sup> FOR BUERGERITE Neutrons on first line, X-rays on second, standard deviations in parentheses

<sup>a</sup> Debye-Waller factor is exp  $\{-\sum_{i,j} h_i h_j \beta_{ij}\}$ 

The final values of R and  $R_{\omega}$  (based on  $F^2$ ) are 0.034 and 0.056. The value of S, the standard deviation of an observation of unit weight, is 1.164. The values of  $\sigma$  assigned as discussed above are also tabulated in Table 4.

## NEUTRON DIFFRACTION OF BUERGERITE

TABLE 4. OBSERVED AND CALCULATED VALUES OF F<sup>2</sup> FOR BUERGERITE

Also given is the value of σ(F<sup>2</sup><sub>obs</sub>) as used in all least squares refinements. Units are 10<sup>-25</sup> cm<sup>2</sup> (or 10 f<sup>2</sup>). [The following reflections which contained obvious gross errors in recording are omitted from the table (h, k, l, FO, SIG, FC): (0, 7, 8, 20, 6, 142), (2, 14, 3, 354, 24, 184), (4, 1, 3, 74, 11, 9), (4, 2, 2, 376, 19, 241), (9, 1, 5, 32, 12, 133), (17, 1, 1, 181, 22, 294).]

$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	K H PO SIC FC   4 T 154   5 2 453 13   5 2 453 23 468   5 2 53 24 34   5 2 453 23 468   6 3 312 2 24   6 6 3237 162 3237   7 1 266 6 3237 162 32277   7 1 267 13 2727 7 2766 313 2727   7 1 266 313 2727 48 200 10 2484   6 3 13 748 2277 48 200 10 2484   16 2 4506 210 2484 3190 43 200   11 2 4506 210 2248 310 200 210 227 227
13 4 357 14 342 13 7 602 40 777	15 1 2606 130 2673 15 4 1132 57 1052	0 6 1140 57 1131 0 9 1496 74 1435	2 9 258 18 249 2 12 398 20 416	6 11 2062 103 1934 7 0 135 12 143	3 10 770 38 766
15 0 6061 303 6260 15 3 1621 81 1561	1. 2	0 12 1192 60 1116 0 15 851 44 801	2 15 944 47 976 3 1 336 17 362	7 3 162 23 172 7 6 2175 109 2195	4 5 522 26 539 5 C 188 14 180
16 1 995 50 941	K H FO SIG FC	1 1 98 10 104 1 7 321 16 325	3 4 4257 213 4323 3 7 303 18 337	7 9 593 30 643 6 L 73 34 65	5 6 2648 132 2614 6 1 99 11 119
L= 1	0 2 202 10 217	1 10 6723 336 6628	4 2 755 38 723	8 4 729 36 749	6 4 1114 56 1127 6 7 622 42 620
K H F0 S1G FC	0 8 366 18 349	1 16 234 17 280	6 8 440 25 459 4 11 897 45 858	9 2 1134 57 1092	7 2 133^ 67 1371 7 5 493 25 510
. 7 538 27 484	0 14 369 18 343	2 5 11 7 13	5 0 5485 274 5490	9 8 172 18 214	B D 258 17 253
- 13 344 17 352	1 3 196 10 176	2 8 418 21 402 2 11 316 16 314	5 6 2205 114 2313	10 3 2127 106 2126	9 4 473 27 483
C 16 1538 96 1425	1 6 261 26 228	2 14 164 19 199	5 9 924 46 901	10 6 1997 100 1902	10 2 64 15 99
1 5 1164 58 1204	1 12 1021 51 1000	3 3 547 42 870	5 12 ABS 50 423 6 1 29 5 17	11 4 262 19 231	11 0 104 33 034
1 8 466 23 460	1 15 226 21 251	3 6 1243 62 1243	6 4 226 11 240	12 2 823 109 646	1.* 8
1 14 749 37 720	2 7 377 20 403	3 12 102# 54 1053	6 10 2675 134 2762	14 1 398 20 382	K H FO SIG FC
2 0 314 16 356	2 10 603 30 631	4 1 1320 66 1335	7 2 1494 75 1570	1. 1	0 2 1568 78 1554
2 6 1192 60 1198	3 2 510 26 540	4 7 63 6 62	7 8 2358 118 2375		0 8 489 29 505
2 9 192 16 156	3 5 324 16 321	4 10 75 7 77	7 11 511 26 574	IL H FO SIG FC	1 6 181 24 269
2 15 452 41 513	3 11 231 12 237	5 2 73 5 67	8 6 2638 137 2781	0 3 86 9 97	3 2 326 16 312
5 1 81 T 89	14 1394 70 1406	5 5 654 33 659	8 9 679 34 664	0 6 578 29 586	3 5 852 65 857
3 7 704 35 711	4 1 5178 259 5350	6 3 722 36 716	9 4 565 57 574	0 12 1370 69 1287	4 6 1468 73 1424
3 10 1269 61 1287	4 4 1478 74 1480	6 6 1338 67 1437	5 7 320 16 309	L 386 L9 394	5 4 2410 120 2341
4 2 66 5 62	4 12 750 37 720	6 12 1746 87 1759	10 5 1696 85 1744	1 7 187 17 183	6 2 673 34 634
4 5 422 21 439 4 8 415 41 792	5 1 5519 276 5515	T 1 772 39 795 T 1 2761 138 2827	10 # 290 21 275	1 10 1452 73 1456	L* 9
4 11 355 18 373	5 7 690 35 740	7 10 815 41 843	11 6 1162 58 1077	2 5 274 14 270	
5 0 4711 236 4652	5 10 271 14 275	0 2 373 25 377 0 5 609 30 617	12 1 219 17 208	3 0 1591 80 1661	0 C 4599 230 4415
5 3 44 4 53	6 2 576 29 571	8 8 331 17 340	13 2 1546 77 1481	3 6 228 29 207	0 3 1939 97 1931
5 0 4197 210 4102	6 5 114 6 101 6 8 3238 162 3468	# 11 451 23 455 9 0 521 151 352	13 5 972 49 932	3 9 1329 66 1313 1 1122 56 1051	3 6 525 27 539
5 12 322 24 329	4 11 227 19 213	9 3 2284 114 2186	14 3 709 35 704	4 4 1320 66 1308	4 1 3037 152 3094
5 - 5 - 100 - Mairean	Str. 10 111				

## COMPARISON OF X-RAY AND NEUTRON RESULTS

The agreement between the X-ray and neutron parameters is quite good. The precision of both determinations is about 0.002–0.004 Å for most interatomic distances. The most significant position parameter difference between the two studies is in the x parameter of the Fe position  $P_n - P_x = 0.00046(9)$ , but this difference is less than 0.01 Å. The agreement between the thermal parameters is also satisfactory, although as is usual with neutron/X-ray comparisons the discrepancy is greater for the thermal parameters (Hamilton, 1969). The largest deviation is for

## A. TIPPE AND WALTER HAMILTON

		Neutrons	X-rays
Si <sub>6</sub> O <sub>18</sub>			
	Si-O(4)	1.623 (2)Å	1.620 (2)Å
	Si-O(5)	1.628 (3)	1.626 (3)
	Si-O(6)	1.616(3)	1.620(2)
	Si-O(7)	1.605 (3)	1.602 (2)
$BO_3$			
	B-O(2)	1.384 (2)	1.379 (4)
	B-O(8)	1.367 (2)	1.364 (4)
	O(8) - O(2)	2.386(2)	2.379 (3)
	O(8)-O(8)	2.361 (4)	2.356 (3)
$FeO_6$			
	Fe-O(1)	2.100(3)	2.111(4)
	Fe-O(2)	2.003(2)	2.003 (2)
	Fe-O(3)	1.954(2)	1.942 (3)
	Fe-O(6)	1.994(2)	1.989(2)

TABLE 5. SOME	BOND-LENGTH	COMPARISONS	BETWEEN	THE NEUTRON
	AND X-RAY ST	TUDIES OF BUE	RGERITE	

 $\beta_{11}(F)$ ,  $P_n - P_x = 0.19(3)$ . The value of  $|P_x - P_n|/\sigma$  exceeded  $2\sigma$  for 4 of the 28 position parameters and for 10 of the 59 thermal parameters. The values of  $\Sigma(\Delta/\sigma)^2$  were 81.88 and 145.95 which may be tested as  $\chi^2$  with 28 and 59 degrees of freedom. Both values are significant—even if the large contributions of the two parameters cited above are omitted. Thus, there are small systematic differences between the two determinations; these are not however *chemically* significant.

Comparison of some bond lengths, as further examples of the good agreement between the two studies, are presented in Table 5a. We conclude that there are no essential differences in geometry between the two studies.

#### THE M-AL DISTRIBUTION

The values of the scattering lengths refined for the 18c Al and the 9b Fe point positions provide values for the occupancy factors of the ions in these sites. Some uncertainty in the chemical analysis reported by Barton (possibly due to occluded SiO<sub>2</sub>) should not affect the Fe/Al ratio, although it does affect the total amount of either. We therefore adopt as parameters to be determined: (Al), the total number of atoms of Al in the unit cell; (M), the total number of M atoms in the unit cell; x, the number of Al atoms in 18c; and y, the number of M atoms in 18c. We may write the following equations:

X-rays
.9125 (23)
.0875 (23)
. 2961 (23)
.251 (26)

TABLE 6. DISTRIBUTION OF M AND AL BETWEEN THE 9b AND 18c POINT POSITIONS

$$0.35x + 0.898y = 18 \cdot 0.835 = 6.930 \pm 0.13$$

$$0.35|(Al) - x| + 0.898(0.414(Al) - y) = 9 \cdot 0.763 = 6.867 \pm 0.10.$$

(The M/Al ratio from the chemical analysis is 0.414.) Solution of these equations gives the following results:

$$(Al) = 19.11(22)$$
  
 $(M) = 0.414(Al) = 7.91(8)$ 

for a total of 27.0 atoms and no vacancies in either point position.

$$x = 16.85(23)$$
  
 $y = 1.15(24)$ 

The population in 9b is accordingly

$$Al_{2,26}M_{6,74}$$
.

These values agree, within two standard deviations, with the values determined by Barton. The percentage occupancies are given in Table 6. The agreement is again reasonable. It should be noted that Barton's quoted standard deviations do not take into account the considerable uncertainties in these values due to the uncertainties of the chemical analysis; his 9b M occupancy changed from 0.78 to 0.70 on revision of the chemical analysis.

## MAGNETIC STRUCTURE

Magnetic susceptibility measurements (Tsang, Thorpe, Senftle, and Donnay, 1970) indicate that buergerite has an exchange constant  $J/k = 7.5^{\circ}$ K. Donnay *et al.* (1967) have suggested that antiferromagnetic ordering in tourmalines could consist of a trigonal arrangement of spins on iron atoms lying in the mirror plane. X-ray data indicate no structural transition down to 8° K.

We have measured neutron-diffraction powder pattens of buergerite at 295°K and 4.2°K. The patterns are essentially identical (Figure 3). No





## NEUTRON DIFFRACTION OF BUERGERITE

new peaks appear, and there are no significant changes in the intensity of any peaks. We conclude that there is no significant long range magnetic order in buergerite down to 4.2°K. Such order should give rise to appreciable changes in scattered neutron intensity in the Bragg peaks. The observation that there is no change in this intensity does not preclude *local* spin ordering of the type proposed by Donnay *et al.* 

#### Acknowledgements

We thank Dr. Gabrielle Donnay for stimulating our interest in this problem and Dr. John S. White of the Smithsonian Institution for supplying samples of buergerite for these studies.

#### References

- BARTON, R. (1969) Refinement of the crystal structure of buergerite and the absolute configuration of tourmalines. Acta Crystallogr. B25, 1524–1533.
- BUERGER, M., C. W. BURNHAM, AND D. R. PEACOR (1962) Assessment of the several structures proposed for tourmaline. Acta Crystallogr. 15, 583–590.
- DONNAY, G., C. O. INGAMELLS, AND B. MASON (1966) Buergerite, a new species of tourmaline. *Amer. Mineral.* 51, 198–199.

DONNAY, G., F. E. SENTFLE, A. THORPE, AND S. WHITE (1967) Magnetic properties of tourmalines. *Carnegie Inst. Year Book* 65, 295–299.

HAMILTON, W. C. (1969) Comparison of X-ray and neutron diffraction structural results: A study of methods in error analysis. Acta Crystallogr. A25, 194–206.

AND J. A. IBERS (1968) Hydrogen Bonding in Solids. W. A. Benjamin, New York, p. 15-16.

MASON, B., G. DONNAY, AND L. A. HARDIE (1964) Ferric tourmaline from Mexico. Science 144, 71-72.

TSANG, T., A. THORPE, F. E. SENTFLE, AND G. DONNAY (1970) Magentic properties of the tourmaline group (abstr.) Amer. Crystallogr. Ass. Meet.

ZACHARIASEN, W. H. (1967) A general theory of X-ray diffraction in crystals. Acta Crystallogr. 23, 558-564.

Manuscript received, July 6, 1970; accepted for publication, July 30, 1970.