sistently prepared. The standard deviation of six crystals was approximately $\pm 0.012$ p.p.m. One crystal of PERFX was measured by X-ray and optical interferometry (Deslattes \& Henins, 1973) to give $d_{2 \overline{2} 0}$ $\left(25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)=1.9201715 \AA \pm 0.30$ p.p.m. and this was later confirmed as $1.9201718 \AA \pm 0.25$ p.p.m. (Deslattes et al., 1974) but altered to $1.9201706 \AA \pm$ 0.15 p.p.m. (Deslattes, Henins, Schoonover \& Carroll, 1976) following the correction of a systematic error. Under vacuum the Bragg spacing is 0.34 p.p.m. larger. Since this precision is far below the reproducibility of PERFX and is comparable with the range of lattice parameters measured in Table 1 for float-zoned silicon, it would seem that any source of such silicon could be used to access the absolute value of lattice spacing. IR absorption measurements can be used to measure the carbon concentration and the necessary correction is (Baker et al., 1968) $\Delta d / d=-6.5 \times 10^{-24} n_{c}$ where $n_{\mathrm{C}}$ is the number of carbon atoms per $\mathrm{cm}^{3}$.

At a rather lower precision one can have access to the PERFX lattice parameter by using Czochralskigrown oxygen-contaminated silicon. After IR determination of the oxygen concentration the latticeparameter shift can be calculated from $\Delta d / d=+3.8 \times$ $10^{-24} n_{\mathrm{o}}$ where $n_{\mathrm{o}}$ is the number of oxygen atoms per $\mathrm{cm}^{3}$.

Within the errors of measurement all of the values in the right-hand column of Table 1 are therefore effectively on the absolute scale.

Hubbard, Swanson \& Mauer (1975) have recently announced that a large quantity of powdered floatzoned silicon has been made available for calibration purposes in powder diffractometry. Since they were only concerned with reproducibility to 10 p.p.m. and not with absolute lattice spacings, it seems that the important attribute of this proposed standard is not the manifestly well defined lattice parameter of the starting material but the ill defined quality of the resultant powder. The wording of their recommendation that one
uses 'the powder diffraction value of $5.430880 \AA$ for the lattice parameter of the Standard Reference Material silicon' is amazing. The lattice parameter of Deslattes et al. (1976) for PERFX was $5.43106446 \AA \pm$ 0.15 p.p.m. in vacuum.

One of the authors is pleased to thank the British Council for a scholarship. The automatic diffractometer system was constructed with a grant from the Paul Instrument Fund. We are especially grateful to John Burrow who oriented, cut and polished all of the samples and to those listed in Table 1 who provided samples of silicon for this survey.
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#### Abstract

Accurate values ( $\sim 0.05 \%$ ) of the absorption-weighted mean path lengths for spheres as a function of $\mu R$ and $\theta$ have been calculated by differentiation of the table of values of absorption corrections [Dwiggins (1975). Acta Cryst. A31, 395-396].


## Introduction

The absorption-weighted mean path length, $\bar{T}$, needed in extinction corrections, has been calculated for spheres from the approximate formula (Coppens \& Hamilton, 1970)

$$
\bar{T}=\frac{\ln A^{*}}{\mu}
$$

where $A^{*}$ is the absorption correction factor and $\mu$ the linear absorption coefficient. This expression, however, is inappropriate for $\mu R>0.25$ (Becker \& Coppens, 1974). The correct formula is

$$
\bar{T}=\frac{1}{A^{*}} \frac{\mathrm{~d} A^{*}}{\mathrm{~d} \mu}
$$

but there are no tabulated values of the derivative, $\mathrm{d} A^{*} / \mathrm{d} \mu$, available. With absorption corrections of high precision, such as those given by Dwiggins (1975), it is possible to calculate the derivative from the table of $A^{*}$ values.

## Method

We may write

$$
\bar{T}=\frac{1}{A^{*}} \frac{\mathrm{~d} A^{*}}{\mathrm{~d} \mu}=R\left[\frac{1}{A^{*}} \frac{\mathrm{~d} A^{*}}{\mathrm{~d}(\mu R)}\right],
$$

where $R$ is the radius of the sphere. The absorption corrections for a sphere are given in a table of $A^{*}$ values as a function of $\mu R$ and $\theta, I \mu R=0,0 \cdot 1,0 \cdot 2 \ldots, \theta=0 \cdot$, $5 \cdot 10 \cdot \ldots, 90 \cdot$, where $\theta$ is the Bragg angle of a reflection.
To calculate the value of $\mathrm{d} A^{*} / \mathrm{d}(\mu R)$ at one of the points of this grid, we fix a fourth-order polynomial through the points ( $\mu R \pm 0 \cdot 2, \mu R \pm 0 \cdot 1, \mu R ; \theta$ ) and determine the derivative at $(\mu R, \theta)$. The equations are given in the Appendix. This method is clearly not applicable for the points on the grid with $\mu R=0$ and $\mu R=0.1$ since no values exist for $A^{*}$ at $\mu R=-0.2$ and -0.1 .

For $\mu R=0$, we know that $A^{*}=1$ and $\bar{T}=\frac{3}{2} R$ for a sphere. Hence

$$
\left[\frac{1}{A^{*}} \frac{\mathrm{~d} A^{*}}{\mathrm{~d}(\mu R)}\right]_{\mu R=0}=\frac{3}{2} .
$$

For the points at $\mu R=0 \cdot 1$, we have chosen to fix a fourth-order polynomial passing through $(\mu R=0 \cdot, 0 \cdot 1$, $0.2,0.3 ; \theta)$ and with $\left[\mathrm{d} A^{*} / \mathrm{d}(\mu R)\right]_{\mu R=0}=\frac{3}{2}$. The equations are given in the Appendix. We prefer to keep the results in the form of $\left(1 / A^{*}\right)\left(\mathrm{d} A^{*} / \mathrm{d} \mu R\right)$ as a twodimensional function of $\theta$ and $\mu R$ rather than $\bar{T}$ as a three-dimensional function of $\theta, \mu$ and $R$. We have implemented this method in a Fortran program
Table 1. Values of $\left(1 / A^{*}\right)\left(\mathrm{d} A^{*} / \mathrm{d} \mu R\right)$ for spheres


SPHCOR. The $A^{*}$ data for $\mu R$ from 0.0 to 2.5 are taken from Dwiggins (1975) and the values of $\left(1 / A^{*}\right)\left(\mathrm{d} A^{*} / \mathrm{d} \mu R\right)$ are given in Table 1. $\bar{T}$ values are retrieved by multiplying $\left(1 / A^{*}\right)\left(\mathrm{d} A^{*} / \mathrm{d} \mu R\right)$ by $R$ at the appropriate values of $\mu R$ and $\theta$.

The accuracy of the table of $A^{*}$ values (Dwiggins, 1975) is claimed to be $0.05 \%$. We have compared the values of $A^{*}$ of Dwiggins and $\bar{T}$ calculated by the present method with values given by a Gaussian-grid integration program of unknown accuracy obtained from Cromer (1977). For example, for a value of $\mu R=$ 1.0 we find relative discrepancies in the $A^{*}$ values of $0.06 \%\left(\theta=0^{\circ}\right)$ and $0.1 \%\left(\theta=90^{\circ}\right)$, whereas those in the $\bar{T}$ values are $0.03 \%\left(\theta=0^{\circ}\right)$ and $0.05 \%\left(\theta=90^{\circ}\right)$. We conclude that the accuracy of our $\bar{T}$ table is about $0.05 \%$.

This work was supported by the Swiss National Science Foundation under project No. 2.173-0.74.

## APPENDIX

1. We desire the derivative $\mathrm{d} y / \mathrm{d} x$ at $x=0$ for a fourthorder polynomial passing through the points

$$
\left(-2 x, y_{2-}\right)\left(-x, y_{-}\right)\left(0, y_{0}\right)\left(x, y_{+}\right)\left(2 x, y_{2+}\right) .
$$

Thus we fix

$$
\begin{equation*}
y=A x^{4}+B x^{3}+C x^{2}+D x+E \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{\mathrm{d} y}{\mathrm{~d} x} & =4 A x^{3}+3 B x^{2}+2 C x+D \\
\left(\frac{\mathrm{~d} y}{\mathrm{~d} x}\right)_{x=0} & =D
\end{aligned}
$$

Substituting for the values of the points in (1), we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
& y_{2-}=16 A x^{4}-8 B x^{3}+4 C x^{2}-2 D x+E \\
& y_{-}=A x^{4}-B x^{3}+C x^{2}-D x+E \\
& y_{0}=E \\
& y_{+}=A x^{4}+B x^{3}+C x^{2}+D x+E \\
& y_{2+}=16 A x^{4}+8 B x^{3}+4 C x^{2}+2 D x+E .
\end{aligned}
$$

Solving for $D$, we find

$$
D=\left(\frac{\mathrm{d} y}{\mathrm{~d} x}\right)_{x=0}=\frac{y_{2-}-8 y_{-}+8 y_{+}-y_{2+}}{12 x}
$$

2. We desire $(\mathrm{d} y / \mathrm{d} x)_{x=0}$ for a fourth-order polynomial (1) passing through the points $\left(-x, y_{-}\right)\left(0, y_{0}\right)\left(x, y_{+}\right)$( $2 x, y_{2+}$ ) and having $(\mathrm{d} y / \mathrm{d} x)_{-x}=1 \cdot 5$. Thus we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
& y_{-}=A x^{4}-B x^{3}+C x^{2}-D x+E \\
& y_{0}=E \\
& y_{+}=A x^{4}+B x^{3}+C x^{2}+D x+E \\
& y_{2+}=16 A x^{4}+8 B x^{3}+4 C x^{2}+2 D x+E \\
& 1.5=-4 A x^{3}+3 B x^{2}-2 C x+D
\end{aligned}
$$

Solving for $D$ we find
$D=\left(\frac{\mathrm{d} y}{\mathrm{~d} x}\right)_{x=0}=\frac{1}{18 x}\left(-17 y_{-}+9 y_{0}+9 y_{+}-y_{2+}-9 x\right)$.
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# The Crystal Structure of Ganophyllite, a Complex Manganese Aluminosilicate. I. Polytypism and Structural Variation 
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The reciprocal-lattice geometry of ganophyllite has been investigated by X-ray diffraction, two distinct variants being noted. These structures, comprising a monoclinic form and a hitherto unreported triclinic variant, can both be interpreted in terms of structural columns which can be stacked in varying sequences along either of the $\{011\}$ planes. Diffracted intensities from models of this type for both variants give good agreement with the distinctive pattern of intensities actually observed. With the structural column concept, it is also possible to explain instances of two-dimensionally disordered intergrowths of these structures.

