

four parameters, more information is needed. Redington, Olson & Cross (1962) chose an OH distance of 0.95 Å and obtained an O–O distance of 1.475 (4) Å from their infrared spectra. Busing & Levy (1965) feel that a more reasonable choice would be 0.96 Å, giving  $r(\text{O–O}) = 1.467$  (4) Å. The microwave data of Oelfke & Gordy (1969) lead to  $r(\text{O–O}) = 1.470$  Å for  $r(\text{OH}) = 0.96$  Å.

The value of  $r(\text{O–O})$  in  $(\text{NH}_4)_2\text{C}_2\text{O}_4 \cdot \text{H}_2\text{O}_2$  uncorrected for librational motion [1.452 (1) Å] is significantly shorter than the gas-phase value. Based on our estimate of the librational correction, about 0.004 Å, the difference between solid- and gas-phase O–O distances will barely be significant, [1.467 (4)–1.456 (1)] Å = 0.011 (4) Å. We therefore feel that more reliable gas-phase data and a rigorous correction for thermal motion in the solid are needed to settle this question.

### References

- BELITSKUS, B. & JEFFREY, G. A. (1965). *Acta Cryst.* **18**, 458.  
 BUSING, W. R. & LEVY, H. A. (1964). *Acta Cryst.* **17**, 142.  
 BUSING, W. R. & LEVY, H. A. (1965). *J. Chem. Phys.* **42**, 3054.  
 CATICHA-ELLIS, S. & ABRAHAMS, S. C. (1968). *Acta Cryst.* **B24**, 277.  
 CRUICKSHANK, D. W. J. (1956). *Acta Cryst.* **9**, 757.  
 CRUICKSHANK, D. W. J. (1961). *Acta Cryst.* **14**, 896.  
 GOUGOUTAS, J. Z. & CLARDY, J. C. (1970). *Acta Cryst.* **B26**, 1999.  
 GROTH, P. (1967). *Acta Chem. Scand.* **21**, 2608, 2631, 2695, 2711.  
 KIM, H. S., CHU, S. & JEFFREY, G. A. (1970). *Acta Cryst.* **B26**, 896.  
 LU, C. S., HUGHES, E. W. & GIGUÈRE, P. A. (1941). *J. Amer. Chem. Soc.* **63**, 1507.  
 MATHERN, G., WEISS, R. & ROHMER, R. (1969). *Chem. Commun.* p. 70.  
 MATHERN, G., WEISS, R. & ROHMER, R. (1970). *Chem. Commun.* p. 153.  
 OELFKE, W. C. & GORDY, W. (1969). *J. Chem. Phys.* **51**, 5336.  
 OLOVSSON, I. & TEMPLETON, D. H. (1960). *Acta Chem. Scand.* **14**, 1325.  
 PEDERSEN, B. F. (1967). *Acta Chem. Scand.* **21**, 779.  
 PEDERSEN, B. F. (1969a). *Acta Chem. Scand.* **23**, 342.  
 PEDERSEN, B. F. (1969b). *Structural Aspects of Per-hydrates*, p. 12. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.  
 PEDERSEN, B. F. (1969c). *Acta Chem. Scand.* **23**, 1871.  
 PEDERSEN, B. F. & PEDERSEN, B. (1964). *Acta Chem. Scand.* **18**, 1454.  
 REDINGTON, R. L., OLSON, W. B. & CROSS, P. C. (1962). *J. Chem. Phys.* **36**, 1311.  
 SAX, M., BEURSKENS, P. & CHU, S. (1965). *Acta Cryst.* **18**, 252.  
 SAX, M. & McMULLAN, R. K. (1967). *Acta Cryst.* **22**, 281.  
 SCHOMAKER, V. & TRUEBLOOD, K. N. (1968). *Acta Cryst.* **B24**, 63.  
 SIVERTSEN, B. K. & SØRUM, H. (1969). *Z. Kristallogr.* **130**, 449.

*Acta Cryst.* (1972). **B28**, 1016

## On the Structures of $\text{Y}_2\text{Zn}_{\sim 9}$ , $\text{Gd}_2\text{Zn}_{\sim 9}$ , and Related Compounds\*

BY DON T. CROMER AND ALLEN C. LARSON

*University of California, Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory, Los Alamos, New Mexico 87544, U.S.A.*

(Received 4 June 1971)

A number of  $M_2X_{\sim 9}$  compounds exist where  $M$  is a rare-earth or Pu atom and  $X$  is Zn or Cd. They all have a hexagonal cell, or subcell, with  $a$  about 14 to 15.5 Å and  $c/a$  about 0.98. Many of the compounds have a superlattice which increases the  $a$  axis and may or may not lower the symmetry.  $\text{Gd}_2\text{Zn}_{\sim 9}$  is an ordered example of the parent structure.  $\text{Y}_2\text{Zn}_{\sim 9}$  has an occupational disorder but does not have a superlattice.  $\text{Pu}_2\text{Zn}_{\sim 9}$ ,  $\text{Y}_2\text{Cd}_{\sim 9}$  and  $\text{Ce}_2\text{Cd}_{\sim 9}$  each have different superlattices, but so far none of these superstructures has been solved.

### Introduction

Several  $M_2X_{\sim 9}$  compounds are known where  $M$  is a large rare-earth or plutonium atom and  $X$  is a smaller zinc or cadmium atom. The structure of the compound  $\text{Pu}_2\text{Zn}_{\sim 9}$  has been reported by Larson & Cromer (1966, 1967). Cramer & Wood (1967) in their study of the Pu–Zn system have designated this phase as  $\eta$ , and

we use their nomenclature for  $\text{Pu}_2\text{Zn}_{\sim 9}$  and similar phases. The  $\eta$  phase has a hexagonal subcell, probable space group  $P6_3/mmc$ . The previous work on  $\eta\text{Pu–Zn}$  gave what is best described as the average structure for the subcell, for it was recognized that the true cell has a doubled  $a$  axis.

By coincidence, at about the time the work on  $\eta\text{Pu–Zn}$  was started, Elliott & Lemons (1964) were making vapor pressure measurements on the Ce–Cd system at approximately the  $\eta$  composition. To interpret their data they proposed the existence of a large

\* Work performed under the auspices of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission.

number of ordered phases having very small composition differences and coined the term 'microphase'. It was found that these Ce-Cd compounds were isostructural with the Pu-Zn  $\eta$  phase.

Roof & Elliott (1965) studied  $\eta$ Ce-Cd and observed several different crystal lattices in each of several alloy specimens. They found superlattices that multiplied the  $a$  axis by 3, 6, or 8 times but none that doubled  $a$  as in  $\eta$ Pu-Zn. Further, the symmetry of many of these superlattices was orthorhombic or monoclinic instead of hexagonal. The study provided independent evidence for the microphase concept.

The structure proposed for  $\eta$ Pu-Zn has two formula units of  $\text{Pu}_{13}\text{Zn}_{58}$  in the cell, leading to the formula  $\text{Pu}_2\text{Zn}_{8.92}$ . Wang (1967) has published a paper on  $\text{Gd}_{13}\text{Zn}_{58}$ , another compound of this type. The structure given by Wang for  $\eta$ Gd-Zn is essentially the same as that of  $\eta$ Pu-Zn, but he described it in  $P6_3mc$  rather than  $P6_3/mmc$ . If the origin is shifted by about  $\frac{1}{4}$  along the  $z$  axis, if other small shifts are made, and if certain position sets are combined, Wang's structure of  $\eta$ Gd-Zn then corresponds quite closely to our structure of  $\eta$ Pu-Zn. In the reported structure of  $\eta$ Gd-Zn there are several errors and omissions in the distance table, the most notable being the Zn(10)-Zn(13) distance which should be 2.01 Å rather than 2.32 Å. Also, using Wang's parameters we do not calculate the same structure factors for  $\eta$ Gd-Zn. We suspect that the patch which he refers to for  $x\bar{x}z$  positions was incorrectly made.

We decided to make a further study of  $\eta$  phases, in particular the compounds that have shown no evidence of a superlattice and one having a pronounced superlattice, in the hope of determining the changes which produce the long-range order.

Lott & Chiotti (1966) have reported Y-Zn and Ce-Zn compounds of this type. Mason & Chiotti (1970) have also reported the existence of  $\eta$ Pr-Zn. We have prepared and studied  $\eta$ Y-Zn and  $\eta$ Gd-Zn,

neither of which has a detectable superlattice. We have also prepared  $\eta$ Y-Cd which has a fairly pronounced superlattice. In  $\eta$ Y-Cd the hexagonal  $a$  axis (but not the  $b$  axis) is doubled. This doubling leads to an orthorhombic cell of the same size as the hexagonal  $C$ -centered orthorhombic cell, but with a large number of added reflections which violate the  $C$ -centering conditions. A number of space groups could result, depending on which of the symmetry planes of the original hexagonal cell are preserved. In this case the space group is  $Pbnn$  (or  $Pnna$  in standard setting). Note that this space group is centric and unambiguously recognized by the systematic extinctions. Extensive twinning of this crystal could result in apparent hexagonal symmetry with a doubled  $a$  axis leading to the superlattice observed in  $\eta$ Pu-Zn. Cramer (1968) has stated that photomicrographs of  $\eta$ Pu-Zn show extensive twinning. Therefore, it is possible that our work on  $\eta$ Pu-Zn was done with a multiply twinned crystal having an orthorhombic superlattice of the type shown by  $\eta$ Y-Cd.

### Experimental

Alloys of  $\eta$ Gd-Zn and  $\eta$ Y-Zn were made by arc melting and slowly cooling  $M_2X_9$  stoichiometric mixtures of the elements. Rapid cooling was required to quench the  $\eta$ Y-Cd phase, which is probably not stable at room temperature. Further evidence of the instability of this phase is that whiskers of cadmium metal grow out from the surface after a few weeks. Such whiskers were also observed to form on  $\eta$ Ce-Cd. The alloys were crushed and single-crystal fragments were readily found.

Lattice constants were obtained from a least-squares analysis of the settings of 12 reflections measured with  $\text{Mo } K\alpha_1$  radiation ( $\lambda=0.70926$  Å) on an automated Picker diffractometer (Busing & Levy, 1967). The lattice constants for several  $\eta$  phase compounds are given in Table 1. The orientation, least-squares, and data

Table 1. Lattice constants for  $\eta$  phase  $M_2X_{\sim 9}$  compounds

	$a$	$c$	$c/a$	Reference
Pu-Zn	14.43 Å	14.14 Å	0.980	Larson & Cromer (1967)
Ce-Zn	14.60	14.11	0.966	Lott & Chiotti (1966)
Y-Zn	14.24	14.00	0.959	This work
Gd-Zn	14.31	14.05	0.982	This work
Gd-Zn	14.35	14.21	0.990	Wang (1967)
Ce-Cd	15.75	15.55	0.987	Roof & Elliott (1965)
Y-Cd (hexagonal subcell)	15.34	15.22	0.992	This work
Y-Cd (orthorhombic)	$a=15.34,$	$b=26.59,$	$c=15.22$ Å	

Table 2. Refinements of  $\eta$ Gd-Zn

Model	$R$	$R_w$	Number of parameters	Number of observations
$P6_3mc$ , isotropic*	0.125	0.078	68	780
$P6_3mc$ , anisotropic*	0.132	0.076	135	780
$P6_3/mmc$ , isotropic	0.153	0.095	37	780
$P6_3/mmc$ , anisotropic*	0.135	0.083	76	780

\* Thermal parameters not all real

collection programs used by the automated diffractometer were local versions of the Oak Ridge system (Busing, Ellison, Levy, King & Roseberry, 1968). Step scans were made with 2-sec counts at each step and increments of 0.05° 2θ over a range of 2° plus the α<sub>1</sub>-α<sub>2</sub> dispersion. Zr-filtered Mo Kα radiation was used. For ηGd-Zn the crystal shape was approximated by several plane faces, and absorption corrections were made by using the method of Busing & Levy (1957) and a modification of Burnham's (1962) program. The volume of the crystal was 1.6 × 10<sup>-3</sup> mm<sup>3</sup>, and transmission factors varied from 0.011 to 0.072. For ηY-Zn, the intensity at 10° intervals around the diffraction vector was measured for several reflections having χ near 90°. These measurements which produced factors varying from 0.54 to 1.70, combined with a spherical absorption correction obtained from an average value of μR of 1.4 for the fragment, were used to make an empirical absorption correction. The absorption correction for both crystals was crude, but hopefully better than none.

For ηGd-Zn, 8350 reflections were measured within a maximum 2θ of 70°. Most reflections were measured

Table 3. Final parameters for ηGd-Zn

	x	y	z	B
Gd(1)	0	0	0	3.7 (5) Å <sup>2</sup>
Gd(2)	0.2065 (2)	-x	0.0515 (4)	0.3 (1)
Gd(3)	0.5414 (3)	-x	$\frac{1}{4}$	0.3 (1)
Gd(4)	0.8715 (5)	-x	$\frac{1}{4}$	2.2 (2)
Zn(1)	0	0	$\frac{1}{4}$	3.1 (9)
Zn(2)	$\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{1}{4}$	1.9 (8)
Zn(3)	$\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	0.0949 (18)	0.1 (3)
Zn(4)	0.3633 (7)	0.0362 (7)	0.1012 (7)	1.5 (1)
Zn(5)	0.0973 (6)	-x	0.1599 (10)	1.7 (2)
Zn(6)	0.0833 (10)	0.3666 (10)	0	1.1 (2)
Zn(7)	0.4372 (5)	-x	0.1395 (8)	0.5 (2)
Zn(8)	0.6011 (6)	-x	0.0527 (10)	0.8 (2)
Zn(9)	0.7626 (5)	-x	0.1606 (9)	0.9 (2)
Zn(10)	0.2692 (9)	-x	$\frac{1}{4}$	1.5 (4)
Zn(11)	0.8098 (12)	x	0	3.0 (3)
Zn(12)	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	0	3.0 (5)

$$g = 4.2 (4) \times 10^{-6}.$$

Table 4. Interatomic distances in ηGd-Zn

Standard deviations are about 0.01 Å for Gd-Zn and 0.02 Å for Zn-Zn distances.

Gd(1)-2Zn(1)	3.51 Å	Zn(4)- Gd(2)	3.13 Å	Zn(8)-2Gd(2)	3.09 Å
-6Zn(5)	3.30	- Gd(2)	3.05	- Gd(3)	3.14
-6Zn(11)	2.72	- Gd(3)	3.10	- Zn(2)	3.21
		- Gd(4)	3.23	- Zn(3)	2.63
Gd(2)- Zn(3)	3.20			-2Zn(4)	3.10
-2Zn(4)	3.05	- Zn(4)	2.98	- Zn(7)	2.86
-2Zn(4)	3.13	- Zn(5)	3.40	- Zn(8)	2.81
- Zn(5)	3.10	- Zn(6)	2.58	-2Zn(9)	2.59
-2Zn(6)	3.19	- Zn(7)	3.04	- Zn(12)	2.61
-2Zn(7)	3.15	- Zn(8)	3.10		
-2Zn(8)	3.09	- Zn(9)	2.63	Zn(9)- Gd(2)	3.08
- Zn(9)	3.08	- Zn(11)	2.67	-2Gd(3)	3.08
- Zn(10)	3.19	- Zn(12)	2.67	- Gd(4)	2.98
-2Zn(11)	3.16			- Zn(2)	2.69
-2Zn(12)	3.81	Zn(5)- Gd(1)	3.30	-2Zn(4)	2.63
		- Gd(2)	3.10	-2Zn(8)	2.59
Gd(3)- Zn(2)	3.10	-2Gd(4)	3.14	- Zn(9)	2.51
-4Zn(4)	3.10	- Zn(1)	2.72		
-2Zn(6)	3.24	-2Zn(4)	3.40	Zn(10)-2Gd(2)	3.19
-2Zn(7)	3.01	- Zn(5)	2.53	-2Zn(3)	2.70
-2Zn(8)	3.14	-2Zn(6)	2.86	-2Zn(6)	2.57
-4Zn(9)	3.08	-2Zn(11)	2.63	-4Zn(7)	2.73
-2Zn(12)	3.66			-2Zn(10)	2.75
Gd(4)- Zn(1)	3.18	Zn(6)-2Gd(2)	3.19	Zn(11)- Gd(1)	2.72
-4Zn(4)	3.23	- Gd(3)	3.24	-2Gd(2)	3.16
-4Zn(5)	3.14	- Gd(4)	3.24	-2Gd(4)	3.86
-2Zn(6)	3.24	-2Zn(4)	2.58	-2Zn(4)	2.67
-2Zn(9)	2.98	-2Zn(5)	2.86	-2Zn(5)	2.63
-4Zn(11)	3.86	- Zn(6)	2.86	-2Zn(11)	2.73
		-2Zn(7)	2.99		
Zn(1)-2Gd(1)	3.51	- Zn(10)	2.57	Zn(12)-4Gd(2)	3.81
-3Gd(4)	3.18			-2Gd(3)	3.66
-6Zn(5)	2.72	Zn(7)-2Gd(2)	3.15	-4Zn(4)	2.67
		- Gd(3)	3.01	-2Zn(7)	2.50
Zn(2)-3Gd(3)	3.10	- Zn(3)	2.65	-2Zn(8)	2.61
-6Zn(8)	3.21	-2Zn(4)	3.04		
-6Zn(9)	2.69	-2Zn(6)	2.99		
		- Zn(7)	3.10		
Zn(3)-3Gd(2)	3.20	- Zn(8)	2.86		
-3Zn(7)	2.65	-2Zn(10)	2.73		
-3Zn(8)	2.63	- Zn(12)	2.50		
-3Zn(10)	2.70				

at four equivalent positions. Out of 2091 unique reflections, 780 were considered to be observed according to the criterion  $(I-B) > 3(I+B)^{1/2}$ . The fact that very few reflections over  $50^\circ$  were observed is responsible for the large ratio of unobserved-to-observed reflections. A comparison of equivalent reflections gave:

$$R_F = \sum_n \sum_i |F_{i,n} - \bar{F}_i| \sum_n \sum_i F_{i,n} = 0.070,$$

where the summations are over the  $n$  equivalent measurements of the  $i$ th unique reflection. For  $\eta Y-Zn$ , 7949 reflections were measured within a maximum  $2\theta$  of  $50^\circ$ . Most reflections were measured at 12 equivalent positions, and, out of 863 unique reflections, 507 were considered observed, as given above. For these compared and averaged data,  $R_F = 0.121$ . Weights were derived from counting statistics (Evans, 1961).

Least-squares calculations minimized  $\sum_w (F_o - F_c^*)^2$ , where  $F_c^* = KF_c \cdot G(\theta, g, F_c, \bar{T})$ ,  $K$  is a scale factor,  $F_c$  is the ordinary calculated structure factor, and  $G$  is an extinction function (Zachariasen, 1963; Larson, 1970, equation 22) involving an extinction parameter  $g$  and the mean path length  $\bar{T}$ . An extinction parameter was not used for  $\eta Y-Zn$ , so  $F_c^* = KF_c$  in this case. Discrepancy indices cited are  $R = \sum |\Delta F| / \sum |F_o|$  and  $R_w = (\sum w \Delta F^2 / \sum w F_o^2)^{1/2}$  with unobserved reflections omitted. Scattering factors were from Cromer & Waber (1965) and dispersion corrections  $\Delta f'$  and  $\Delta f''$  were from

Cromer (1965). Anisotropic thermal parameters were of the form:

$$\exp [-(h^2\beta_{11} + k^2\beta_{22} + l^2\beta_{33} + hk\beta_{12} + hl\beta_{13} + kl\beta_{23})].$$

## Results

### $\eta Gd-Zn$

Isotropic and anisotropic least-squares refinements of  $\eta Gd-Zn$  were made starting with both the acentric structure proposed by Wang (1967) and the centric structure given for  $\eta Pu-Zn$ . The results are summarized in Table 2. Hamilton's (1965)  $R$  ratio test strongly favors the acentric structure. However, for several reasons we believe the centric structure to be correct. First, because of uncertainties in defining the shape of the crystal that we used, there are probably large systematic errors in the absorption corrections. In the acentric refinement, two of the Zn atoms had negative isotropic thermal parameters, and in the corresponding anisotropic refinement, 18 of the 23 atoms had unreal thermal parameters. In the centric anisotropic refinement, six of the 16 atoms had unreal thermal parameters, but all atoms had positive thermal parameters for the isotropic refinement. The unreal thermal parameters probably reflect the systematic errors in the absorption corrections. The second reason for favoring the centric structure is that, as shown later,  $\eta Y-Zn$  is probably centric. The strongest evidence that this phase

Table 5. Refinements of  $\eta Y-Zn$

Model	$R$	$R_w$	Number of parameters	Number of observations
$P6_3mc$ , isotropic*	0.119	0.086	68	507
$P6_3mc$ , anisotropic*	0.100	0.064	135	507
$P6_3/mmc$ , isotropic	0.136	0.096	37	507
$P6_3/mmc$ , anisotropic*	0.108	0.073	76	507
$P6_3/mmc$ , anisotropic (disordered)	0.090	0.066	81	507

\*Thermal parameters not all real.

Table 6. Final parameters for  $\eta Y-Zn$

	$x$	$y$	$z$	$\beta_{11} \times 10^5$	$\beta_{22} \times 10^5$	$\beta_{33} \times 10^5$	$\beta_{12} \times 10^5$	$\beta_{13} \times 10^5$	$\beta_{33} \times 10^5$
Y(1)	0	0	0	56 (147)	$\beta_{11}$	223 (273)	$\beta_{11}$	0	0
Y(2)	0.2062 (3)	-x	0.0517 (4)	243 (41)	$\beta_{11}$	172 (35)	273 (102)	30 (39)	$-\beta_{13}$
Y(3)	0.5425 (4)	-x	$\frac{1}{2}$	308 (60)	$\beta_{11}$	213 (55)	338 (151)	0	0
Y(4)	0.8723 (6)	-x	$\frac{1}{2}$	314 (71)	$\beta_{11}$	1323 (128)	309 (180)	0	0
Zn(1)	0	0	$\frac{1}{2}$	239 (113)	$\beta_{11}$	981 (203)	$\beta_{11}$	0	0
Zn(2)	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	378 (119)	$\beta_{11}$	410 (149)	$\beta_{11}$	0	0
Zn(3)	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	0.0952 (12)	295 (70)	$\beta_{11}$	221 (79)	$\beta_{11}$	0	0
Zn(4)	0.3661 (5)	0.0341 (5)	0.1005 (4)	499 (56)	322 (50)	286 (28)	146 (80)	-230 (78)	29 (70)
Zn(5)	0.0984 (4)	-x	0.1581 (7)	584 (64)	$\beta_{11}$	369 (55)	815 (153)	79 (55)	$-\beta_{13}$
Zn(6)	0.0860 (6)	0.3673 (6)	$\frac{1}{2}$	236 (63)	196 (60)	250 (43)	139 (107)	0	0
Zn(7)	0.4371 (3)	-x	0.1426 (6)	419 (56)	$\beta_{11}$	227 (47)	628 (130)	-31 (42)	$-\beta_{13}$
Zn(8)	0.6009 (4)	-x	0.0521 (6)	291 (51)	$\beta_{11}$	236 (52)	77 (122)	-10 (50)	$-\beta_{13}$
Zn(9)	0.7631 (4)	-x	0.1585 (6)	211 (44)	$\beta_{11}$	250 (51)	128 (113)	5 (43)	$-\beta_{13}$
Zn(10)	0.2701 (5)	-x	$\frac{1}{2}$	296 (71)	$\beta_{11}$	177 (69)	277 (169)	0	0
Zn(11)	0.8042	x	0	650 (68)	$\beta_{11}$	1072 (86)	450 (180)	628 (79)	$-\beta_{13}$
Zn(12)	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	0	841 (115)	$\beta_{11}$	551 (93)	1469 (182)	182 (79)	$-\beta_{13}$
Zn(13)	0	0	0.0938 (35)	229 (256)	$\beta_{11}$	320 (422)	$\beta_{11}$	0	0

Occupancy parameters:

Y(1)	0.62 (7)
Zn(13)	0.34 (6)

is centric, however, is that  $\eta$ Y-Cd, as mentioned earlier, has an unambiguously centric orthorhombic cell. It seems quite unlikely that long-range ordering to form a superlattice would cause a noncentric structure to become centric.

Table 3 gives the final parameters from the isotropic refinement of  $\eta$ Gd-Zn in the centric space group. The interatomic distances are shown in Table 4. Note that our shortest Zn-Zn distance is 2.50 Å. The shortest distance we found in the acentric model is 2.28 Å as opposed to 2.01 Å in Wang's (1967) model.

#### $\eta$ Y-Zn

Isotropic and anisotropic refinements were again made in both space groups and the results are given in Table 5. The acentric model has 10 atoms with unreal

anisotropic thermal parameters and two atoms with negative isotropic thermal parameters. In the centric anisotropic model, Y(1), at the origin, had a slightly negative  $\beta_{11}$  [ $\sim -0.2\sigma(\beta_{11})$ ] and a very large  $\beta_{33}$  ( $B=57 \text{ \AA}^2$ ). Y(4) also had a large  $\beta_{33}$  ( $B=12 \text{ \AA}^2$ ).

A difference Fourier map was calculated after the anisotropic centric refinement, and a large peak was found at 0,0,0.1. This peak was also quite evident in an observed electron density map. A final model was calculated with a fractional Y(1) atom at the origin and a fractional Zn(13) atom at 0,0,0.1. The value of  $R$  for this model is also given in Table 5. Final parameters are listed in Table 6 and interatomic distances are given in Table 7. A final difference Fourier map showed residual features varying from  $-5$  to  $+5 \text{ e.\AA}^{-3}$  at positions near atomic sites. Observed and calculated

Table 7. *Interatomic distances in  $\eta$ Y-Zn*

Standard deviations are about 0.01 Å except as noted for Zn(13)					
Y(1)-2Zn(1)	3.50 Å	Zn(4)- Y(4)	3.28 Å	Zn(8)- Zn(12)	2.59 Å
-6Zn(5)	3.28	- Zn(4)	2.94		
-6Zn(11)	2.79	- Zn(5)	3.40	Zn(9)- Y(2)	3.04
		- Zn(6)	2.59	-2Y(3)	3.07
Y(2)- Zn(3)	3.19	- Zn(7)	2.98	- Y(4)	2.98
-2Zn(4)	3.06	- Zn(8)	3.06	- Zn(2)	2.70
-2Zn(4)	3.09	- Zn(9)	2.63	-2Zn(4)	2.63
- Zn(5)	3.05	- Zn(11)	2.63	-2Zn(8)	2.58
-2Zn(6)	3.15	- Zn(12)	2.60	- Zn(9)	2.56
-2Zn(7)	3.16			Zn(10)-2Y(2)	3.19
-2Zn(8)	3.08	Zn(5)- Y(1)	3.28	-2Zn(3)	2.67
- Zn(9)	3.04	- Y(2)	3.05	-2Zn(6)	2.55
- Zn(10)	3.19	-2Y(4)	3.13	-4Zn(7)	2.69
-2Zn(11)	3.10	- Zn(1)	2.75	-2Zn(10)	2.70
-2Zn(12)	3.79	-2Zn(4)	3.40		
		- Zn(5)	2.57	Zn(11)- Y(1)	2.79
Y(3)- Zn(2)	3.06	-2Zn(6)	2.83	-2Y(2)	3.10
-4Zn(4)	3.06	-2Zn(11)	2.62	-2Y(4)	3.84
-2Zn(6)	3.27			-2Zn(4)	2.63
-2Zn(7)	3.00	Zn(6)-2Y(2)	3.15	-2Zn(5)	2.62
-2Zn(8)	3.12	- Y(3)	3.27	-2Zn(11)	2.79
-4Zn(9)	3.07	- Y(4)	3.24		
-2Zn(12)	3.65	-2Zn(4)	2.59	Zn(12)-4Y(2)	3.79
		-2Zn(5)	2.83	-2 Y(3)	3.65
Y(4)- Zn(1)	3.15	- Zn(6)	2.78	-4 Zn(4)	2.60
-4Zn(4)	3.28	-2Zn(7)	2.96	-2 Zn(7)	2.53
-4Zn(5)	3.13	- Zn(10)	2.55	-2 Zn(8)	2.59
-2Zn(6)	3.24				
-2Zn(9)	2.98	Zn(7)-2Y(2)	3.16	Additional distances when	
-4Zn(11)	3.84	- Y(3)	3.00	Zn(13) is present.	
		- Zn(3)	2.64	Zn(13)- Y(1)*	1.31 (5)
Zn(1)-2Y(1)	3.50	-2Zn(4)	2.98	-3Y(4)	3.83 (3)
-3Y(4)	3.15	-2Zn(6)	2.96	- Zn(1)	2.19 (5)
-6Zn(5)	2.75	- Zn(7)	3.01	-3Zn(5)	2.59 (2)
		- Zn(8)	2.88	-6Zn(11)	3.08 (2)
Zn(2)-3Y(3)	3.06	-2Zn(10)	2.69	- Zn(13)	2.63 (10)
-6Zn(8)	3.21	- Zn(12)	2.53		
-6Zn(9)	2.70			Y(4)-2Zn(13)	3.83 (3)
Zn(3)-3Y(2)	3.19	Zn(8)-2 Y(2)	3.08	Zn(1)-2Zn(13)	2.19 (5)
-3Zn(7)	2.64	- Y(3)	3.12	Zn(5)- Zn(13)	2.59 (2)
-3Zn(8)	2.62	- Zn(2)	3.21	Zn(11)-2Zn(13)	3.08 (2)
-3Zn(10)	2.67	- Zn(3)	2.62		
		-2Zn(4)	3.06		
Zn(4)- Y(2)	3.09	- Zn(7)	2.88		
- Y(2)	3.06	- Zn(8)	2.81		
- Y(3)	3.06	-2Zn(9)	2.58		

\* Zn(13) and Y(1) not simultaneously present.

structure factors with the standard deviations in the observed values appear in Table 8 and 9.

Discussion

Both M(1) and M(4) are in rather roomy surroundings. The ηPu-Zn paper (Larson & Cromer, 1967) includes

Table 8. Observed and calculated structure factors for ηGd-Zn

Unobserved structure factors are omitted; column headings are l, F<sub>0</sub>/K, F<sub>c</sub>\*/K and σ(F<sub>0</sub>).

Table 8: Observed and calculated structure factors for ηGd-Zn. The table contains multiple columns for l, F0/K, Fc\*/K, and sigma(F0), with rows of numerical data.

Table 9. Observed and calculated structure factors for ηY-Zn

Column headings are l, F<sub>0</sub>/K, F<sub>c</sub>, 10 σ(F<sub>0</sub>). A minus sign preceding F<sub>0</sub> means 'less than' and the value given is that derived from 3σ(l).

Table 9: Observed and calculated structure factors for ηY-Zn. The table contains multiple columns for l, F0/K, Fc, and 10\*sigma(F0), with rows of numerical data.

stereo drawings of the polyhedra about these atoms, and Table 10 contains the anisotropic B's for these atoms when refined as ordered structures in P6<sub>3</sub>/mmc. It is probable that ηGd-Zn is a reasonably well-ordered example of the parent structure of this class. There are no anomalously large thermal parameters in this compound or other evidence for a disordered Gd(1) atom. In ηY-Zn there is a random substitution of pairs of

Zn(13) atoms for approximately one-third of the Y(1) atoms at the origin. There is no evidence for substitution at Y(4), so the large thermal parameter is either real or a reflection of a positional disorder of the Y atom in the large cage. When Zn(13) atoms are present they are only 2.19 Å from Zn(1) at 0,0, $\frac{1}{4}$ . Zn(1) is then probably pushed away to about  $z=0.28$  and the large  $\beta_{33}$  for Zn(1) is more a result of positional disorder than of thermal motion. Zn(13) atoms cannot simultaneously be at 0,0, $z$  and 0,0, $\frac{1}{2}-z$  positions. Attempts to refine fractional Zn(1) atoms at  $z=\frac{1}{4}$  and  $z=\frac{1}{4}+\Delta$  were unsuccessful.

Table 10. Anisotropic  $B_i$  for  $M(1)$  and  $M(4)$  thermal ellipsoids for several compounds refined in  $P6_3/mmc$

The large  $B$  is parallel to the  $c$  axis in all cases.

	$M(1)$	$M(4)$
$\eta$ Pu-Zn	2.4 Å <sup>2</sup>	1.2 Å <sup>2</sup>
	2.4	1.9
	4.2	13.8
$\eta$ Gd-Zn	4.1	1.5
	4.1	0.7
	6.7	4.4
$\eta$ Y-Cd	0.8	0.9
	0.8	2.3
	2.9	20.7
$\eta$ Y-Zn	0.0	2.0
	0.0	1.7
	57.5	11.9
$\eta$ Y-Zn (disordered)	0.3	1.9
	0.3	1.9
	1.8	10.4
	Zn(13)	
	1.4	
	1.4	
	2.5	

An example of random occupational disorder in the parent structure is thus given by  $\eta$ Y-Zn. The compounds  $\eta$ Pu-Zn, Y-Cd and Ce-Cd are examples of small, ordered changes in the parent structure. Unfortunately, we have so far been unable to solve the complete structure of  $\eta$ Y-Cd. We have carried out

refinements starting with the parent  $\eta$ Gd-Zn structure and ignoring the reflections which cannot be indexed with the hexagonal lattice. The resulting  $B_i$  for Y(1) and Y(4) are also given in Table 10. There is no suggestion of substitution at the Y(1) site, but there is strong evidence for an anomaly at the Y(4) site. Additional anomalies are at the Cd(11) and Cd(12) sites, for Cd(11) is extremely anisotropic and Cd(12) has such large apparent thermal motion that it is probably absent entirely. The ordered changes that produce the superlattice in this compound are thus most likely associated with the Y(4), Cd(11) and Cd(12) sites.

### References

- BURNHAM, C. W. (1962). *I.U.Cr. World List of Crystallographic Programs*, Program 338.
- BUSING, W. R., ELLISON, R. D., LEVY, H. A., KING, S. P. & ROSEBERRY, R. T. (1968). ORNL Report 4143. Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Tennessee.
- BUSING, W. R. & LEVY, H. A. (1957). *Acta Cryst.* **10**, 180.
- BUSING, W. R. & LEVY, H. A. (1967). *Acta Cryst.* **22**, 457.
- CRAMER, E. M. (1968). Private communication.
- CRAMER, E. M. & WOOD, D. H. (1967). *J. Less-Common Metals*, **13**, 112.
- CROMER, D. T. (1965). *Acta Cryst.* **18**, 17.
- CROMER, D. T. & WABER, J. T. (1965). *Acta Cryst.* **18**, 104.
- ELLIOTT, G. R. B. & LEMONS, J. F. (1964). *Advances in Chemistry Series*, No. 39, pp. 144-152, 153-169. Edited by R. F. GOULD. Washington, D.C.: Amer. Chem. Soc.
- EVANS, H. T. (1961). *Acta Cryst.* **14**, 989.
- HAMILTON, W. C. (1965). *Acta Cryst.* **18**, 502.
- LARSON, A. C. (1970). In *Crystallographic Computing*. Copenhagen: Munksgaard.
- LARSON, A. C. & CROMER, D. T. (1966). *Acta Cryst.* **21**, A84.
- LARSON, A. C. & CROMER, D. T. (1967). *Acta Cryst.* **23**, 70.
- LOTT, B. G. & CHIOTTI, P. (1966). *Acta Cryst.* **20**, 733.
- MASON, J. T. & CHIOTTI, P. (1970). *Metallurg. Trans.* **1**, 2119.
- ROOF, R. B. JR & ELLIOTT, G. B. R. (1965). *Inorg. Chem.* **4**, 691.
- WANG, F. E. (1967). *Acta Cryst.* **22**, 579.
- ZACHARIASEN, W. H. (1963). *Acta Cryst.* **16**, 1139.