Lists of structure factors, anisotropic displacement parameters and complete geometry have been deposited with the IUCr (Reference: BR1075). Copies may be obtained through The Managing Editor, International Union of Crystallography, 5 Abbey Square, Chester CH1 2HU, England.

## References

- Amorós, P., Beltrán, A. & Beltrán, D. (1992). J. Alloy. Compd, 188, 123–127.
- Beltrán, D., Beltrán, A., Amorós, P., Ibañez, R., Martinez, E., Le Bail, A., Ferey, G. & Villeneuve, G. (1991). Eur. J. Solid State Inorg. Chem. 28, 131–161.
- Brese, N. E. & O'Keeffe, M. (1991). Acta Cryst. B47, 192-197.
- Brown, I. D. (1992). Acta Cryst. B48, 553–572, and references therein. Lafontaine, M. A., Ferey, G. & Rodríguez, J. (1990). Eur. J. Solid State Inorg. Chem. 27, 805–817.
- Le Bail, A. & Lafontaine, M. A. (1990). Eur. J. Solid State Inorg. Chem. 27, 671-680.
- Leblanc, M. & Ferey, G. (1990). Acta Cryst. C46, 15-18.
- Liebau, F. (1981). *Structure and Bonding in Crystals*, Vol. 2, edited by M. A. O'Keeffe & A. Navrotsky, pp. 197–232.
- Livage, J., Henry, M. & Sanchez, C. (1989). Prog. Solid State Chem. 18, 259-341.
- Marcos, M. D., Amorós, P., Beltrán, D. & Beltrán, A. (1993a). Solid State Ionics, 63/65, 96–109.
- Marcos, M. D., Amorós, P., Beltrán, D. & Beltrán, A. (1993b). Solid State Ionics, 63/65, 87–95.
- Mocała, K. & Ziółkowski, J. (1987). J. Solid State Chem. 69, 299-311. Sheldrick, G. M. (1990). Acta Cryst. A46, 467-473.
- Sheldrick, G. M. (1991). SHELXTL-Plus. Release 4.1. Siemens Analytical X-ray Instruments Inc., Madison, Wisconsin, USA.
- Sheldrick, G. M. (1992). SHELXL92. Program for the Refinement of Crystal Structures. Univ. of Göttingen, Germany.
- Umegaki, T. (1989). Inorganic Phosphate Materials, edited by T. Kanazawa, pp. 221-246, and references therein. Tokyo: Elsevier.

Acta Cryst. (1995). C51, 555-557

# Cu-Bearing Tourmaline from Paraiba, Brazil

DANIEL J. MACDONALD AND FRANK C. HAWTHORNE

Department of Geological Sciences, University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada R3T 2N2

(Received 30 November 1993; accepted 14 July 1994)

## Abstract

Crystal structure refinement of copper-bearing tourmaline from Paraiba, Brazil, rim composition  $\{Na_{0.54}Ca_{0.05}\}\{Li_{1.21}Mn_{0.04}Cu_{0.10}Al_{1.66}\}Al_6\{Si_{5.92}-Al_{0.08}\}O_{18}\{BO_3\}_3\{(OH)_{3.56}F_{0.44}\}$ , core composition  $\{Na_{0.55}Ca_{0.01}\}\{Li_{1.16}Mn_{0.08}Cu_{0.05}Al_{1.71}\}Al_6\{Si_{5.88}-Al_{0.12}\}O_{18}\{BO_3\}_3\{(OH)_{3.70}F_{0.30}\}$ , shows the octahedrally coordinated Z site to be completely occupied by Al, and Li to occur only at the octahedrally coordinated *Y* site. The high displacement factors at the O1 and O2 positions indicate significant positional disorder that is induced by occupancy of the  $X \simeq 0.57 \text{ Na} + 0.43 \square$  (vacancy)] and  $Y \simeq 1.2 \text{ Li} + 1.8 (\text{Al} + \text{Mn}^{3+})$ ] sites by cations of very different size and charge.

## Comment

Bank, Henn, Bank, von Platen & Hofmeister (1990) reported the occurrence of Cu-rich tourmaline from the state of Paraiba, Brazil. Their samples were Mn-rich elbaite containing up to 2.1 wt% CuO and 0.11 wt% FeO, and are thus unusual in that Cu had only been reported previously in the p.p.m. range in tourmaline (Bassett, 1953; Power, 1968). Henn & Bank (1990) and Rossman, Fritsch & Shigley (1991) examined the colouration mechanisms in Cu-bearing tourmaline, and showed that Cu is solely responsible for the blue colour. Optical-absorption maxima in the 695–940 nm region were assigned to d-d transitions in Cu<sup>2+</sup>, and maxima at 700 and 520 nm are due to d-d transitions in Mn<sup>3+</sup>.

Two specimens were studied in the present work; a sample from the rim (T54) and a sample from the core (T55). Site occupancies were refined in the following manner. The X and Y sites contain more than two scattering species [(Na, Ca, vacancy) and (Li, Mn, Cu, Al), respectively]; hence, the chemical site occupancies cannot be refined directly. However, the total scattering at each of these sites may be derived from the refinement and then compared with the chemical species assigned to these sites from the chemical analysis and calculation of the formula unit. The scattering at the X, Y and Z sites was considered as variable and represented by a single scattering species: X = Na, Y = Mg and Z = Al. The occupancies at the Z sites refined to within one standard deviation (0.004) of unity; these values were fixed at 1.0 for the final cycles of refinement. The occupancy of the X site refined to 0.65(2) Na for both crystals. When the scattering from the minor Ca at the X site is considered, there is reasonably good agreement between the refined scattering and the chemical species assigned to the X site from the chemical analyses. The occupancy at the Y site refined to 0.822(6) and 0.831(6) Mg for T54 and T55, respectively. This gives an effective Ysite scattering of 9.86 and 9.97 equivalent electrons per site for T54 and T55, respectively, and can be compared with an effective scattering of 9.70 and 9.72 equivalent electrons calculated from the site assignments from the unit formulae. Thus there is close agreement between the results of the site-occupancy refinement and the site assignments for the unit formulae calculated from the chemical analyses.

There is significant positional disorder at the O1 and O2 positions in Cu-bearing tourmaline, as indicated by the relatively high  $U_{eq}$  values at the O1 and O2 positions. This is a common feature in many tourmaline structures, and Burns, MacDonald & Hawthorne (1994)

556

# $(Na,Ca)_x(Li,Mn,Cu,Al)_3Al_6(Si,Al)_6O_{18}(BO_3)_3(OH,F)_4$

1112 reflections

 $(\Delta/\sigma)_{\rm max} = 0.04$ 

H-atom parameters not

 $w = 1/[\sigma^2(F) + 0.00058F^2]$ 

92 parameters

refined

have proposed that it is due to local positional disorder induced by occupancy of the X and Y sites by cations of very different size and charge. The occupancies derived here (Table 3),  $X \simeq 0.57 \text{ Na} + 0.43 \square$  (vacancy) and  $Y \simeq 1.2 \text{Li} + 1.8 (\text{Al} + \text{Mn}^{3+})$ , are in accord with this mechanism.

### Experimental

**Compound T54** 

Crystal data

 ${Na_{0.54}Ca_{0.05}}{Li_{1.21}Mn_{0.04}}$  $Cu_{0,10}Al_{1.66}$  Al<sub>6</sub> Si<sub>5.92</sub>- $Al_{0.08}$   $O_{18}$   $BO_3$   $O_3$  $\{(OH)_{3.56}F_{0.44}\}$  $M_r = 940.16$ Rhombohedral R3m a = 15.818 (2) c = 7.087(1)V = 1535.8 (4) Å<sup>3</sup> Z = 3 $D_x = 3.070 \text{ Mg m}^{-3}$ 

#### Data collection

Nicolet R3m diffractometer  $\theta$ -2 $\theta$  scans Absorption correction: spherical  $T_{\min} = 0.711, T_{\max} =$ 0.727 1122 measured reflections 1122 independent reflections 1114 observed reflections  $[I > 2.5\sigma(I)]$ 

#### Refinement

### Compound T55

Crystal data

 ${Na_{0.55}Ca_{0.01}}{Li_{1.16}Mn_{0.08}}$  $\begin{array}{c} Cu_{0.05}Al_{1.71} \\ Al_6 \\ Si_{5.88} \\ Al_{0.12} \\ O_{18} \\ BO_3 \\ 3 \\ \end{array}$  $\{(OH)_{3.70}F_{0.30}\}$  $M_r = 938.15$ Rhombohedral R3m a = 15.805(2)c = 7.084(1)

Mo $K\alpha$ radiation $\lambda = 0.71073$ Å Cell parameters from 40 reflections $\theta = 3-14^{\circ}$ $\mu = 1.07 \text{ mm}^{-1}$ T = 297  K Trigonal prism 0.24 mm (radius) Bright blue Crystal source: Paraiba, Brazil
$\theta_{\text{max}} = 30^{\circ}$ $h = 0 \rightarrow 19$ $k = 0 \rightarrow 19$ $l = -11 \rightarrow 11$ 2 standard reflections monitored every 48 reflections intensity decay: 1.5%
$\begin{split} &\Delta\rho_{\text{max}} = 0.18 \text{ e } \text{\AA}^{-3} \\ &\Delta\rho_{\text{min}} = -0.20 \text{ e } \text{\AA}^{-3} \\ &\text{Extinction correction:} \\ &\text{isotropic (empirical)} \\ &\text{Extinction coefficient:} \\ &0.0015 (2) [form given \\ &\text{in SHELXTL/PC User's} \\ &\text{Manual (Sheldrick, 1990)]} \\ &\text{Atomic scattering factors} \\ &\text{from Cromer \& Mann} \\ &(1968) \end{split}$
Mo $K\alpha$ radiation $\lambda = 0.71073$ Å Cell parameters from 40 reflections $\theta = 3-15^{\circ}$ $\mu = 1.04 \text{ mm}^{-1}$ T = 297  K Trigonal prism 0.22 mm (radius)

$V = 1532.6 (5) Å^3$ Z = 3 $D_x = 3.064 \text{ Mg m}^{-3}$	Pale blue Crystal source: Paraiba, Brazil
Data collection Nicolet R3m diffractometer $\theta$ -2 $\theta$ scans Absorption correction: spherical $T_{min} = 0.716$ , $T_{max} =$ 0.767 1122 measured reflections 1122 independent reflections 1122 observed reflections $[I > 2.5\sigma(I)]$	$\theta_{max} = 30^{\circ}$ $h = 0 \rightarrow 19$ $k = 0 \rightarrow 19$ $l = -11 \rightarrow 11$ 2 standard reflections monitored every 48 reflections intensity decay: 1.5%
Refinement Refinement on $F$ R = 0.020 wR = 0.023 S = 1.4	$\Delta \rho_{max} = 0.18 \text{ e } \text{\AA}^{-3}$ $\Delta \rho_{min} = -0.18 \text{ e } \text{\AA}^{-3}$ Extinction correction: isotropic (empirical)

Extinction coefficient: 0.0006 (2) [form given in SHELXTL/PC User's Manual (Sheldrick, 1990)] Atomic scattering factors from Cromer & Mann (1968)

## Table 1. Fractional atomic coordinates and equivalent isotropic displacement parameters (Å<sup>2</sup>)

$$U_{\rm eq} = (1/3) \sum_i \sum_j U_{ij} a_i^* a_j^* \mathbf{a}_i \cdot \mathbf{a}_j.$$

	Site	x	у	z	$U_{eq}$
T54					
X†	3(a)	0	0	0.8408	0.0274 (9)
Υt	9(b)	0.06155 (4)	0.93845 (4)	0.4396 (4)	0.0060 (3)
ZŚ	18( <i>c</i> )	0.26003 (4)	0.29690 (3)	0.4643 (4)	0.0052 (2)
Si	18(c)	0.18989 (3)	0.19191 (3)	0.0736 (4)	0.0056 (2)
В	9(b)	0.89061 (9)	0.10939 (9)	0.6187 (5)	0.0068 (7)
01	3(a)	0	0	0.2946 (7)	0.0288 (1)
02	9(b)	0.93945 (7)	0.06055 (7)	0.5838 (5)	0.0136 (5)
03	9(b)	0.13203 (8)	0.86797 (8)	0.5666 (5)	0.0135 (5)
04	9(b)	0.90603 (7)	0.09397 (7)	0.0009 (5)	0.0097 (5)
05	9(b)	0.09363 (7)	0.90637 (7)	-0.0231 (5)	0.0103 (5)
06	18(c)	0.1846 (1)	0.1954 (1)	0.2993 (5)	0.0088 (4)
07	18(c)	0.28637 (8)	0.2865(1)	-0.0045 (4)	0.0072 (4)
<b>O</b> 8	18(c)	0.2699 (1)	0.2094 (1)	0.6348 (4)	0.0082 (4)
T55					
Xt	3(a)	0	0	0.8408	0.0272 (10)
Yt	9(b)	0.06106 (4)	0.93894 (4)	0.4393 (5)	0.0058 (3)
Z§	18(c)	0.25994 (4)	0.29674 (3)	0.4650 (4)	0.0056 (2)
Si	18(c)	0.18977 (3)	0.19175 (3)	0.0737 (5)	0.0055 (2)
В	9(b)	0.89073 (9)	0.10927 (9)	0.6197 (6)	0.0069 (7)
01	3(a)	0	0	0.2965 (7)	0.0255 (9)
02	9(b)	0.93938 (7)	0.06062 (7)	0.5833 (5)	0.0139 (6)
03	9(b)	0.13148 (8)	0.86852 (8)	0.5670 (6)	0.0131 (5)
04	9(b)	0.90567 (7)	0.09433 (7)	0.0008 (5)	0.0089 (5)
O5	9(b)	0.09369 (7)	0.90631 (7)	-0.0228 (5)	0.0097 (5)
06	18(c)	0.1847(1)	0.1950(1)	0.2996 (5)	0.0088 (4)
07	18(c)	0.28641 (8)	0.2865(1)	-0.0040 (5)	0.0078 (4)
08	18(c)	0.2703 (1)	0.2095 (1)	0.6355 (5)	0.0082 (4)
		† Site occupar	ncy = 0.57 Na		

 $\ddagger$  Site occupancy = 0.4 Li + 0.6 (Al + Mn).

§ Site occupancy = 1.0 Al.

Table 2. Selected geometric parameters (Å, °)				
		T54	T55	
<i>X</i> —O2	× 3	2.464 (3)	2.466 (3)	
<i>X</i> —04	× 3	2.814 (2)	2.820(1)	
X—05	× 3	2.741 (1)	2.741 (1)	
< <i>X</i> —0>		2.673	2.675	
Y—O3		2.131 (2)	2.130 (2)	
Y—O1		1.975 (3)	1.954 (3)	
Y—O2	× 2	1.960 (3)	1.953 (3)	
Y—06	× 2	1.964 (3)	1.965 (3)	
<y—0></y—0>		1.992	1.987	
Z06		1.858 (3)	1.861 (3)	
Z—08		1.902 (3)	1.901 (3)	
Z—03		1.960 (2)	1.961 (2)	
Z—07		1.943 (2)	1.942 (3)	
Z—07		1.877 (3)	1.876 (4)	
Z—08		1.884 (3)	1.880 (3)	
<z—0></z—0>		1.904	1.903	
Si—06		1.604 (4)	1.605 (5)	
Si—07		1.609 (2)	1.610 (2)	
Si—04		1.618 (2)	1.616 (2)	
Si—O5		1.638 (2)	1.635 (3)	
<si—0></si—0>		1.617	1.616	
B		1.361 (1)	1.357 (1)	
B	× 2	1.374 (2)	1.377 (2)	
<b0></b0>		1.370	1.370	

 Table 3. Electron-microprobe analysis (wt%) and unit formulae of Cu-bearing tourmalines

Li<sub>2</sub>O, B<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>, H<sub>2</sub>O were estimated by stoichiometry; Ti, V, Cr, Fe, Zn, Mg and K were not detected.

	T54	T55
SiO <sub>2</sub>	37.15	37.20
Al <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub>	41.20	41.97
$B_2O_3$	10.91	10.99
Mn <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub>	0.30	0.69
CaO	0.28	0.08
CuO	0.81	0.38
Li <sub>2</sub> O	1.88	1.83
Na <sub>2</sub> O	1.75	1.78
F	0.88	0.60
H <sub>2</sub> O	3.35	3.51
0=F	-0.37	-0.25
Total	98.14	98.77
Na	0.541	0.546
Ca	0.048	0.014
ΣΧ	0.589	0.560
Li	1.211	1.164
Mn	0.036	0.083
Cu	0.097	0.045
Al	1.656	1.708
ΣΥ	3.000	3.000

6.000	6.000
6.000	6.000
5.919	5.884
0.081	0.116
6.000	6.000
3.557	3.700
0.443	0.300
4.000	4.000
	6.000 6.000 5.919 0.081 6.000 3.557 0.443 4.000

The crystals used for the collection of the X-ray intensity data were analyzed on a CAMECA SX-50 electron microprobe in wavelength-dispersion mode according to the method of Burns *et al.* (1994). Analytical data are given in Table 3; structural formulae were calculated on the basis of 31 anions, assuming stoichiometric amounts of H<sub>2</sub>O (as OH), B<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> (as BO<sub>3</sub>) and Li<sub>2</sub>O (as Li). The amount of Li assigned to the Y site was equal to the ideal sum of the Y site minus the amount of other cations occupying the site (Li =  $3 - \Sigma Y$ ) and the calculation was iterated to self-consistency. All Mn was assumed to be trivalent, and all Cu was assumed to be divalent on the basis of spectroscopic data (Henn & Bank, 1990; Rossman *et al.*, 1991). Observed bond lengths are consistent with these assumptions.

This work was supported by the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada.

Lists of structure factors, anisotropic displacement parameters and complete geometry have been deposited with the IUCr (Reference: BR1070). Copies may be obtained through The Managing Editor, International Union of Crystallography, 5 Abbey Square, Chester CH1 2HU, England.

## References

- Bank, H., Henn, U., Bank, F., von Platen, H. & Hofmeister, W. (1990). Z. Dtsch. Gemmol. Ges. **39**, 3-11.
- Bassett, H. (1953). Rec. Geol. Surv. Tanganyika, 3, 93-96.
- Burns, P. C., MacDonald, D. J. & Hawthorne, F. C. (1994). Can. Mineral. 32, 31–41.
- Cromer, D. T. & Mann, J. B. (1968). Acta Cryst. A24, 321-324.
- Henn, U. & Bank, H. (1990). Neues Jahrb. Mineral. Monatsh. 1990, 280–288.

Power, G. M. (1968). Mineral. Mag. 39, 1078-1089.

Rossman, G. R., Fritsch, E. & Shigley, J. E. (1991). Am. Mineral. 76, 1479-1484.

Sheldrick, G. M. (1990). SHELXTL/PC User's Manual. Siemens Analytical X-ray Instruments Inc., Madison, Wisconsin, USA.