The Structure of the Monoclinic Form of Sodium Tetrametaphosphate Tetrahydrate

BY HELEN M. ONDIK AND STANLEY BLOCK National Bureau of Standards, Washington 25, D.C., U.S.A.

AND CAROLINE H. MACGILLAVRY

Laboratory for Inorganic Chemistry, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

(Received 20 February 1960 and in revised form 22 August 1960)

Crystals of monoclinic sodium tetrametaphosphate tetrahydrate, $Na_4P_4O_{12}$.4 H₂O, are needlelike in habit, elongated along c. The unit cell dimensions are

 $a = 9.667 \pm 0.002$, $b = 12.358 \pm 0.002$, $c = 6.170 \pm 0.001$ Å; $\beta = 92^{\circ} 16' \pm 10'$;

space group $P2_1/a$, Z=2. Two sets of three-dimensional X-ray diffraction data were collected with Cu $K\alpha$ radiation using Weissenberg multiple-film techniques, and the intensities were measured photometrically. The structure was determined by a combination of three-dimensional Patterson and electron-density syntheses, and a complete-matrix least-squares reduction of data. The final R value for 831 non-zero reflections is 0.108. Individual isotropic temperature factors were used.

The tetrametaphosphate rings are on centers of symmetry. The sodium ions are coordinated by six oxygen atoms in roughly octahedral configuration. One sodium ion links the rings in a network parallel to the ab plane. The other alternates with the rings linking them along c.

Introduction

Two crystalline modifications of sodium tetrametaphosphate exist: a monoclinic and a triclinic form (Bell, Audrieth & Hill, 1952). Preliminary chemical evidence (Gross, Gryder & Donnay, 1955) indicates that the polymorphism may be due to the existence of stereoisomers of the tetrametaphosphate ring. To investigate this possibility the two structure determinations were undertaken, beginning with the monoclinic form. Only one other tetrametaphosphate structure had been completely determined, that of ammonium tetrametaphosphate (Romers, Ketelaar & MacGillavry, 1951). An approximate structure for aluminum tetrametaphosphate was proposed by Pauling & Sherman in 1937 but not refined.

Experimental data

The pure monoclinic salt was kindly supplied by Dr John W. Gryder of The Johns Hopkins University. Cold hydrolytic cleavage of the phosphorus oxide α -P₄O₁₀ which forms tetrametaphosphoric acid was followed by neutralization with NaOH. The product was salted out with NaCl and recrystallized several times from water and ethanol. The identity of the crystalline form was checked using indexed powder patterns. Suitable single crystals were grown by evaporation of 2–3 cm.³ of nearly-saturated aqueous solution at temperatures below 25 °C.

The crystals are needles elongated along [001] with $\{110\}$ the predominant form. $\{100\}$ and $\{010\}$ are

AC 14 - 36

usually small and occasionally cannot be seen at all. Cleavage is not pronounced in any direction, the crystals tending to fracture irregularly.

The indices of refraction measured in white light by oil immersion techniques are

$$n_{\alpha} = 1.440 \pm 0.002, n_{\beta} = 1.458 \pm 0.002, n_{\nu} = 1.476 \pm 0.002.$$

These values agree well with those reported by Bell, Audrieth & Hill (1952). In white light the crystal appears to be slightly positive with a 2V extremely close to 90°. The plane of the optic axes is parallel to (010). An extinction angle of 37° was measured from c with the crystals lying on one of the (110) faces. (The optical data were obtained by H. F. McMurdie and A. Van Valkenburg of the National Bureau of Standards.)

The cell data as reported by Barney & Gryder (1955) were used in the determination and refinement of the structure.

$$\begin{split} a = 9 \cdot 65 \pm 0 \cdot 04, \ b = 12 \cdot 32 \pm 0 \cdot 04, \ c = 6 \cdot 17 \pm 0 \cdot 04 \text{ Å}, \\ \beta = 92^{\circ} \ 30' \pm 10'; \\ \varrho_c = 2 \cdot 173 \pm 0 \cdot 006, \ \varrho_o = 2 \cdot 18 \pm 0 \cdot 01 \text{ g.cm.}^{-3}; \\ Z = 2; \text{ space group } P2_1/a . \end{split}$$

After the structure had been determined, the cell dimensions were refined by a least-squares reduction of powder diffractometry data, using Cu $K\alpha_1$ radiation (1.5405 Å). The refined values, used in calculating bond distances and angles, are

$a = 9.667 \pm 0.002, b = 12.358 \pm 0.002, c = 6.170 \pm 0.001 \text{ Å}.$ $\beta = 92^{\circ} \ 16' \pm 10'.$

Two sets of Weissenberg films hk0, hk1, hk2, hk3, hk4, hk5, h0l, and 0kl were taken of different crystals with Cu $K\alpha$ radiation using multiple film techniques. The first set of intensities, obtained from unintegrated equi-inclination films, were used for the Patterson syntheses and electron density maps, after correction for Lorentz and Polarization factors and spot extension on upper layers (Phillips, 1956). The duplicate set, used for the refinement, was obtained from integrated films. The integrated intensities were measured with a densitometer-comparator and corrected for Lorentz and polarization factors on a high-speed digital computer. There was excellent agreement between the two sets. No absorption correction was made because the small crystals used necessitated a maximum correction of only 6%.

Extremely long-exposure precession films had been taken to verify the space-group assignment (Gross, 1955). Spots violating the criterion for space group $P2_1/a$ appeared. These same reflections could not be reproduced on long exposure Weissenberg films. Their intensities are extremely weak, and they are sharper and smaller than the other reflections. Such properties are characteristic of double reflections. The extra spots have been accounted for as double reflections involving strongly reflecting planes. Therefore, no change was made in the original space-group assignment by Andress, Gehring & Fischer (1949).

Determination of the structure

The general positions in $P2_1/a$ are fourfold; the only special positions, on centers of symmetry, are twofold. Because there are two tetrametaphosphate groups per unit cell, each group must have a center of symmetry. Since neither P nor O can be expected to have a centrosymmetric environment, these atoms must occupy fourfold general positions. Thus one special position is effectively blocked by the P_4O_{12} -group. Because the sodium ions and water molecules occur in multiples of four, at the most only two of the remaining three special positions could be occupied. The assumption that no special positions are occupied was confirmed by the Patterson maps.

There are approximately twice as many reflections with h+k=2n as h+k=2n+1, the former generally being far more intense than the latter. This distribution of the intensities corresponds to a pseudo-halving of a+b, that is, of [110]. This pseudo-halving combined with the space group $P2_1/a$ leads to a pseudo space group C2/m, which has these 'extra' symmetry elements: mirror planes $(010)_0$ and $(010)_1$, twofold axes [010] through x=0, z=0, and $x=\frac{1}{2}, z=0$. Probably at least the P atoms, the heaviest scatterers, must conform approximately to this pseudosymmetry.

From a three-dimensional Patterson synthesis the P atoms were located, one P lying near the pseudo mirror plane, the other near the pseudo twofold axis. Independent superpositions on the Harker peaks of the two P atoms yielded positions for the O atoms and the Na⁺ ions. Even in three dimensions there



Fig. 1. Final electron density projection of cell contents along [011]. Contours are drawn at arbitrary intervals. Indicated atomic positions are those obtained from the final leastsquares refinement.

 Table 1. Final atomic coordinates

	x	$\sigma(x)$:	y	$\sigma(y)$	z	$\sigma(z)$	B	$\sigma(B)$
PI	0.1874	0.0005	0 •0	033	0.0004	0.9032	0.0007	0.91	0.08
P11	0.0080	0.0005	6 0·1	778	0.0004	0.0457	0.0006	0.83	0.08
D_{I}	0.4972	0.0015	6 0·2	730	0.0012	0.2663	0.0019	1.75	0.24
DII	0.0192	0.0014	. 0.2	455	0.0010	0.8501	0.0018	1.12	0.21
D ^{III}	0.1361	0.0013	B 0.0	987	0.0011	0.0661	0.0017	1.22	0.22
O_{IV}	0.1188	0.0013	8 0.0	205	0.0010	0.6866	0.0017	0.98	0.21
D_v	0.1594	0.0014	0.4	927	0.0012	0.0739	0.0019	1.56	0.22
D_{VI}	0.3851	0.0013	s 0·4	017	0.0011	0.9764	0.0017	1.32	0.22
Na _I	0.4293	0.0008	0.3	710	0.0007	0.5601	0.0011	2.03	0.15
Nam	0.0265	0.0008	3 0∙4	385	0.0006	0.7636	0.0010	1.66	0.14
(H ₂ O) _I	0.3786	0.0015	i 0·0	853	0.0012	0.4461	0.0020	2.35	0.28
$(H_2O)_{II}$	0.2005	0.0019	0.3	174	0.0015	0.5552	0.0022	3.57	0.34
				Scal	le factors				
		hk0	hk1	hk2	hk3	hk4	hk5		
		0.159	0.166	0.174	0.179	0.169	0.199		

was sufficient overlap to prevent locating the water molecules. The hk0 structure factors, calculated from the phosphorus, sodium, and oxygen parameters, were used to choose suitable signs for an electron density projection along [001]. Water positions were indicated and a check of the Patterson map yielded possible z parameters.

Even a 3-D electron-density map did not unambiguously determine the atomic parameters. Difficulty in assigning signs to the low intensity h+k= 2n+1 reflections resulted in a synthesis containing too many, badly distorted peaks, enhancing the natural pseudosymmetry. The various models, all compatible with the electron density map, differed mainly in the z coordinates. The smaller differences in the x and y parameters were first refined from the hk0 data, using a complete-matrix least squares program (Busing & Levy, 1959). The final R_{hk0} value for the correct set of parameters was 0.104. The other possible sets did not refine properly. In Fig. 1, one can see that

557

Table 2. Comparison of observed and calculated structure factors

$\underline{\mathbf{n}} \mathbf{F}_{0} \mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{c}} \underline{\mathbf{n}} \mathbf{F}_{0} \mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{c}} \underline{\mathbf{h}} \mathbf{F}_{0} \mathbf{F}_{0 $	F _o F _c	<u>h</u> F _o F _c
<u>h00</u> <u>h10.0</u> <u>h31</u> <u>h91</u> <u>h22(cont'd.)</u>	<u>h</u> 82	<u>h</u> 13(cont'd.)
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	24 26 60 -49	-7 49 -45
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	24 -28 54 -50	-8 46 -42 9 20 18
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	50 -41 41 33	-9 57 63 h23
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	52 -46	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	32 - 37	-1 66 52 2 10 -20
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	<u>h92</u> 89 -91	3 14 15 -3 20 23
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	86 -89 · 79 -77	4 75 -76 5 69 -67
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	61 56 32 33	-6 47 -47 7 62 -60
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	48 -48	-8 41 29 10 45 -37
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	90 -98	0 <u>h</u> 33 0 89 -87
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	<u>h</u> 10·2	1 80 93 -1 135 -138
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	78 80 26 37	2 53 -56 -2 17 -15
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	61 64 40 -38	$ \begin{array}{rrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrr$
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	32 37 58 57	5 63 -63
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	41 37	-6 47 -45
8 41 -32 2 111 96 -3 35 28 -4 39 26 -5 40 40 h40 -2 37 -31 4 75 75 6 31 51 6 62 49 1	h11·2 70 62	-7 93 -99 8 40 -41
0 - 60 56 4 35 38 5 85 87 -7 26 27 8 32 -33 -3 1 66 -59 -4 46 41 -5 130 138 h13.1 -8 57 -60 -5	57 56 64 64	-8 46 $-329 37 -33$
2 40 -38 6 170 182 6 28 31 3 3 3 -31 -11 20 18 8 3 30 21 -6 97 87 -6 22 24 11/1	20 -29 h12·2	-11 36 -39
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	32 41 24 -28	0 20 -15
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	37 -30 14 -26	-1 61 64
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	45 37 59 58	-2 63 -62
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	46 -29 b13·2	-3 44 40 4 35 -32
1 62 55 -2 35 38 2 17 21 0 T38 147 6 50 37 -1 2 54 -54 3 107 -103 3 20 -24 2 122 -110 7 61 51 3	53 -55 14 -26	-4 37 -27
3 76 72 -3 33 -26 -3 107 -109 -2 33 -19 -7 57 -45 -5 4 47 -58 4 72 -67 -4 95 93 4 63 -63 -9 33 31 6	17 20 37 -44	-5 52 60
5 92 97 -4 72 65 -5 41 -46 -4 100 -104 10 54 53 7 37 34 5 17 -17 6 41 46 6 96 95 11 30 26 0	<u>h14.2</u>	9 17 23 -9 20 25
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	60 -63	10 40 -32
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	<u>h</u> 15·2	0 39 -38
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	17 -30	-1 71 -76 3 73 70
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	<u>h</u> 03 26 15	-3 37 24 4 61 62
7 17 23 0 61 63 5 41 46 3 50 41 5 52 -50 2 8 56 -47 1 66 -70 -5 70 80 -3 100 103 -5 45 46 -2	33 -34 69 72	5 35 -34 -5 77 79
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	140 -140 73 85	6 62 68 8 44 45
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$ \begin{array}{ccc} 39 & 31 \\ 106 & 108 \end{array} $	9 17 -16 -9 55 46
7 42 -39 4 61 -53 2 100 -99 -7 48 -54 -10 57 57 -10	26 -22 33 57	10 22 30 -11 22 22
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	<u>h13</u> 82 80	0 <u>h</u> 63 0 46 39
4 69 -70 6 30 28 8 53 -45 -22 1 51 58 -1 8 61 -57 7 76 -70 -8 36 -29 h22 -1 60 -59 2	53 47 10 -17	2 94 89 -2 42 38
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	14 -16 67 -65	-4 80 84 5 40 39
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	30 -26	6 62 63 7 40 33
$ \begin{bmatrix} -3 & 1/2 & -2/2 \\ -6 & 41 & 34 \\ 7 & 22 & -27 \end{bmatrix} $	33 - 29 46 - 47 119 121	8 32 31
-5 27 16 -9 26 28 6 81 70 10 28 -26	119 121	9 14 -14 -10 14 28

Table 2 (cont.)

<u>h</u>	F _o	Fc	<u>h</u> F _o	Fc	<u>h</u> F	Fc	<u>h</u> F _o	Fc	<u>h</u> F _o	Fc	<u>h</u> F	F	h F	F
	<u>h</u> 73		<u>h</u> 11·3		h24(cont	'd.)	h64(cont	'd.)	h11.4	-	h25 (cont	±'d.)	h65(cont'd	<u>د</u> ،
0	57 36	-59	0 41	29	4 24	-17	3 33	-32	1 24	27	-5 81	-77	5 22	-20
-ī	85	-85	-2 40	35	7 26	-18	4 26	12	-3 59	25 58	7 58	- 56	-8 48	-28
-2	69	-103	-3 39	36	-7 20	-25 28	-4 32	24 -14	5 41	-35	-7 51	-48	<u>h75</u>	
-3	39 47	-31	7 40	43	10 28	-19	-5 46	-40	-6 22	7	9 22	-22	0 22	-17 18
4	67	-71	$1 \frac{h12 \cdot 3}{49}$	-53	-10 50 h34	-20	-7 47	-40	<u>h12.4</u>		-9 32	- 32	2 46	- 34
-4	45 77	-38	-1 37	-48	1 22	-12	8 14	14	-1 22	-21	0 58	61	3 49	47
-5	54 41	59	3 45	-45	-4 45	-97	9 14	-11	-2 40	31		-76 112	-3 48	-26
8	46	-38	-3 44	-42	5 100	-87	-9 20 b74	-21	3 41	-35	-2 50	49	5 41	-31
-9	28 35	-18 32	5 28	-23	-6 44	53	1 52	51	4 35	-28	-3 28	17	7 20 585	29
	<u>h</u> 83		-5 33	-25	7 26	18 -35	-1 53 2 41	-43 -36	-4 35 b13.4	25	4 65	60 70	0 57	-65
0	-37 59	- 32	<u>h</u> 13·3		-8 57	53	3 52	48	-1 36	-33	5 24	-21	-2 58	-18
ž	49	-42	0 32 1 32	-25 28	10 14	12	4 63	-60	-2 36	-31	-6 54	-32 41	4 35	-20
-2	45 64	-63	-1 42	-48	-10 33	35	-4 26	-20	h05		7 40	33	-6 32	-35
-4	65 41	-62	2 JU b14+3	-11	0 69	-63	6 41	- 36	0 36	-51	0 92	-94	<u>h95</u>	
6	35	25	0 32	-29	-1 64	65 44	7 32	25	-2 105	103	1 53	52 20	-3 36	38
-7	39	-33	-2 20 b04	-30	2 56	47	-9 20	-31	6 20	-26	2 37	38	5 26	-19
-8	32 17	22 -26	0 53	40	-3 48	45	<u>h</u> 84		-6 57	-58 13	4 46	35	-7 14	-27
9	33	- 38	-2 102	68 104	4 42	-35 56	0 80 2 26	-75 22	-8 53	40	5 41 -5 39	34 37	$0^{h10.5}_{40}$	-46
0	<u>h</u> 93	62	4 58 -4 33	39	5 58	54	-2 67	-55	0 <u>h15</u>	-48	6 22	-25	1 58	54
-ĭ	57	-58	-8 98	97	6 51	-41	-3 37	-28	1 57	-64	7 20	29	-2 37	38
-2	62	64	-10 52	-41 54	8 24	48 12	4 35 -4 53	-27 -37	2 40	-41	8 10 -8 41	11 37	3 42	41 28
-3 -4	66 41	-70	<u>h14</u>		-8 56	25	5 17	-15	-2 84	-81	-9 20	26	5 22	28
5	66	-69	0 89	-104	-10 33	-33	-8 20	14	-3 102	101	_1 <u>h55</u>	- 58	-6 26	-42
7	32 44	31	-1 94	-98	<u>h54</u>		<u>h94</u>		-4 53	-49	2 36	28	<u>h11:5</u>	
-7	40 26	-40	-2 78	-79	1 76	49 73	3 36	28	5 67	-59	-4 52	75 51	2 35	38 32
-9	28	31	3 44 45	31 -57		-49	-3 26 4 17	28 16	-6 53	-54	5 42	- 37	-3 37	38
0	h10·3	30	-4 67	-64	3 52	42	5 17	-23	-8 53	-56	-7 28	33	$0 \frac{h^{12} \cdot 5}{26}$	- 33
ĭ	41	37	-5 40	-37	4 26	-19	-5 1/ 6 57	-19	9 14	-21	-8 20	12 22	-1 22	-24
-1 2	51 50	52 42	6 52 -6 17	-49 -28	5 59	-52	7 39	33	h25	-	<u>h</u> 65		-2 20	23
-3	41	39	7 44	36	7 50	35	$0 \frac{h10.4}{24}$	-22	0 56	-66	0 63	-64 -68		
5	49	49	10 17	-18	-9 30	23	1 26	26	-1 58	-60	-1 71	-73		
-5 6	39 48	28 47	h24		-10 17	16	-2 26	30	2 39 -2 59	46 60	-2 48	42		
-6	40	-41	1 58	-27	0 <u>h</u> 64 0 49	-46	-5 14	15 20	3 20	-23	3 54 -3 40	-50 -41		
-7	32	-15	-1 95	-88	1 32	27	-6 44	-48	4 57	60	-4 42	41		
-8 -8	10 32	17	-2 26	27	2 76	75	-7 42	36	-4 14	-6				
-		1	-3 58	-53	-2 30	-26							i -	

seven of the twelve atoms in the asymmetric unit lie very close to the axis and that there is considerable overlap. Refinement by the usual Fourier methods, or with a least-squares program using only a diagonal matrix, would have been extremely difficult.

The ambiguities in the 3-D electron-density map were resolved after obtaining the refined x and yparameters. The z coordinates were chosen by examination of a model and consideration of the coordination requirements of the sodium ions.

The structure was refined in three dimensions using the 831 observed reflections in the Cu sphere. Isotropic temperature factors of 1.5 were assumed for each atom. The 54 variables included the x, y, z, and B for each atom and an individual scale factor for each l level. The final R_{hkl} value is 0.108, and the final parameters are listed in Table 1. A comparison of the observed and calculated structure factors is listed in Table 2.

The atomic scattering factors for Na⁺ and P⁰ calculated by Tomiie & Stam (1958) and for O⁰ calculated by McWeeny (1951) were used. The f_{O^0} were also used for water, rather than $f_{O^{-2}}$, since only approximately 2% of the non-zero reflections have a sin θ value low enough to be affected by the difference in the two f curves.

Since there had been only one preliminary 3-D electron density synthesis, a 3-D difference synthesis was calculated to check the general features of the structure. The maximum background in this synthesis was approximately 0.7 e.Å⁻³; therefore, all statements concerning electron distributions are subject to this error. Indicated shifts in parameters are extremely small. The largest shift was found to be 0.0003 of b for Na₁, well within the estimated standard deviation of 0.0007.

Description and discussion of the structure

The tetrametaphosphate anion consists of rings of four phosphate tetrahedra sharing corners. These rings, besides having point group symmetry $\overline{1}$, show strong pseudosymmetry 2/m. See Figs. 2 and 3. These pseudosymmetry elements are slightly inclined from (010) and [010], with the plane of the ring atoms being almost parallel to (001). In the ammonium tetrametaphosphate the ring does indeed possess 2/msymmetry.



Fig. 2. The structure projected along c. In order to show complete rings, the limits of the cell are taken from $-\frac{1}{2}c$ to $+\frac{1}{2}c$. The unit cell is indicated by the solid black line, the asymmetric unit by the dashed line. The approximate z parameters have been indicated by the variation in line thickness.



Fig. 3. The structure projected along a, from $-\frac{1}{2}a$ to $+\frac{1}{2}a$.

Interatomic distances and angles are given in Table 3 with the atom numbers as indicated in Fig. 4. These values are consistent with those found in other condensed phosphates. As pointed out by Davies & Corbridge (1958) a P-O single bond with the Schomaker-Stevenson covalency correction is 1.63 Å. Within the ring the P–O bonds are 1.635 and 1.584 Å, much larger than the terminal P–O bonds (1.487 Å). Examination of the possible resonance forms as given in the paper on the ammonium salt (Romers et al., 1951) indicates that the P-O terminal bonds are primarily double whereas the P-O ring bonds are primarily single, agreeing with the observed lengths. In orthophosphates, the difference in lengths should disappear and each P-O bond be equal. The value found, 1.526 Å, (Posner, Perloff & Diorio, 1958) is, as expected, intermediate between 1.487 and 1.635 Å.

It is interesting that the bonds within the ring are not uniform; the bonds to P_I and those to P_{II} differ by 3.4σ . (σ is standard deviation.) The same magni-



Fig. 4. Illustration of the anion tetrahedra and the sodium coordination polyhedra.

tude of difference was found also in the ammonium salt.

The average O–O distances for the two independent tetrahedra of the ring are 2.54 and 2.50 Å. The smallest distance, 2.383 Å between O_{II} and O_{VI}, is the only edge shared with a sodium coordination polyhedron.

The tetrametaphosphate rings are connected by two types of sodium coordination polyhedra. Two sodium

Table 3.	Interatomic	distances	and	angl	es		
in tetrametaphosphate ring							

	-	- •	
$P_I - O_{IV}$	1·484 Å	$P_{II} - O_I$	1.498 Å
$P_I - O_V$	1.488	$P_{II} - O_{II}$	1.476
Р1ОШ	1.639	$P_{II} - O_{III}$	1.579
$P_I - O_{VI}$	1.631	$P_{II} - O_{VI}$	1.587
	$\sigma = \pm 0$	·016	
0117-01v	2·533 Å	$0_{111} - P_1 - O_1$	v 108·3°
Om-Ov	2.551	$O_{III} - P_I - O_I$	v 109·3°
OIII-OVI	2.456	0111-P1 -0	ντ 97·4°
$O_{IV} - O_{VI}$	2.547	$O_{IV} - P_I = O_V$	vi 109.6°
$0_{1V} - 0_{V}$	2.578	$O_{IV} - P_{I} - O_{V}$	v 120.4°
$O_V - O_{VI}$	2.548	$O_V - P_I - O_V$	vi 109•5°
01 -011	2·595 Å	01 -P11 -0	121·5°
$0_{1} - 0_{111}$	2.444	$O_{I} - P_{II} - O_{I}$	 105·2°
$O_{I} - O_{VI}$	2.598	$O_{I} - P_{II} - O_{I}$	vī 114·7°
011-0111	2.495	$O_{II} - P_{II} - O_{II}$	109·5°
$O_{II} - O_{VI}$	2.383	$0_{11} - P_{11} - 0_{11}$	vī 102·1°
O _{III} –O _{VI}	2.467	$O_{III} - P_{II} - O_{III}$	vi 102·4°
$\sigma = \pm 0$	0.021		
_		$P_I - O_{VI} - P_I$	u 133·2°
		P _I -O _{III} -P _I	133·2°
		$\sigma = \pm$	- 0·9°

ions of the first type (Na_I), related by a center of symmetry, alternate with the rings in the z direction. These ions are coordinated by O_I and O_{IV} of one ring and O_{II} , O'_{IV} , and O_{VI} of a second ring. See Figs. 3 and 4(e) and (f). A water molecule (H₂O)_{II} completes the irregular six-fold coordination. The two adjacent polyhedra share an edge across the center.



Fig. 5. Coordination polyhedra of the sodium ions showing the chains formed along z by the Na_{II} octahedra, and also how these chains are linked into the network parallel to x and y. Two unit cells are outlined.

The second type of sodium ion (Na_{II}) cross-links the rings in a network parallel to (001). Three oxygens of the Na_{II} coordination polyhedra, O_{II}, O_V, and O'_V are contributed by three different anion rings. Water molecules (H₂O)_I, (H₂O)'_I, and (H₂O)_{II} complete the coordination as shown in Figs. 2 and 4(c) and (d). These Na–O octahedra share edges (H₂O)_I–(H₂O)'_I and O_V–O'_V to form chains along [001]. See Fig. 5. The Na_I and Na_{II} polyhedra are linked by the corner O_{II} and by the corner (H₂O)_{II} to form a network of polyhedra alternately sharing edges and corners in the *ab* plane. See Fig. 6. The linkage of the polyhedra in three directions would account for the lack of cleavage.

The distances in the sodium polyhedra are given in



Fig. 6. Coordination polyhedra of the sodium ions showing the network formed in the x, y plane by the alternate sharing of edges and corners. The unit cell is outlined.

Table 4. The Na to non-ring oxygen distances vary from 2.258 to 2.446 Å. However, the distance Na_I-O_{VI} (a ring oxygen) is much larger (2.648 Å) as is also the distance $Na_{II}-(H_2O)_{II}$ (2.626 Å). The oxygen, O_{VI} , while contributing to the coordination of Na_I , does not serve to link adjacent Na polyhedra. This is not unexpected, since, from the point of view of Pauling's rules and the resonance forms, there are unsatisfied negative charges only on the non-ring oxygens.

Table 4.	Interatomic	distant	ces ir	ı the
sodium-ox	ygen coordi:	nation	polyľ	hedra



The shortest polyhedral edge around Na₁ is that edge shared with the P_{II} tetrahedron, a sharing found also in sodium triphosphate II (Davies & Corbridge, 1958). The shortest edge about Na_{II} is most likely due to hydrogen bonding between $(H_2O)_{II}$ and O_{II} (2.725 Å). Other short distances between H₂O and O possibly attributable to hydrogen bonds which would link polyhedra are $(H_2O)_{II}-O_I$ (2.970), $(H_2O)_{I}-O_I$ (2.845), and $(H_2O)_{I-O_{IV}}$ (3.073). The oxygen, O_{I} , which does not link the Na polyhedra, is the only oxygen acting as acceptor to two hydrogen bonds, with $(H_2O)_I$ and $(H_2O)_{II}$. The difference synthesis shows positive areas consistent with the short H_2O-O distances although accurate hydrogen positions could not be determined because of the high background of that map.

Tetrahedral coordination of water and oxygen in inorganic structures has been discussed by Bernal & Fowler (1933) and Bernal & Megaw (1935) and more recently by Gillespie & Nyholm (1957). In this salt approximately tetrahedral figures are formed about the two waters and three of the terminal oxygens. $(H_2O)_1$ is coordinated to two Na₁₁ ions, O₁ and O_{1V}; $(H_2O)_{II}$ to Na_I, Na_{II}, O_I, and O_{II} forming very skewed tetrahedral figures. The three tetrahedral oxygens are: O_I surrounded by P_{II}, Na_I, $(H_2O)_{I}$ and $(H_2O)_{II}$; O_{II} by P_{II}, Na_I, Na_{II}, and $(H_2O)_{II}$; and O_{IV} by two Na_I ions, P_I and $(H_2O)_{I}$. In all these cases, the oxygens act as acceptors in hydrogen bonding. The tetrahedra about the oxygens are reasonably undistorted considering the presence of the P–O bonds, which are, of course, much shorter than the Na–O or O–H–O distances.

Examination of the P peaks in the difference synthesis indicates that the P–O bonds are predominantly covalent, as in the ammonium salt. The P positions of the least-squares refinement are in positive areas of the difference synthesis indicating that the $f_{\rm P^0}$ was a good choice. The water positions are in positive areas indicating that, as could be expected, $f_{\rm O^-}$ is a better choice than the $f_{\rm P^0}$ actually used.

There is still no crystallographic evidence for the existence of stereoisomers of the tetrametaphosphate ring. The distortion of the anion from the 2/m symmetry in the ammonium salt to the $\overline{1}$ symmetry in this salt is small. In solution, there should be no distinction between the two. In order to determine whether the polymorphism of the sodium compound is due to stereoisomerism of the ring or merely to differences in packing, work has been begun on the triclinic sodium salt.

We are happy to acknowledge the assistance of Mr Abraham Kreuger of the Netherlands Organization for Pure Scientific Research (Z. W. O.) in handling the crystals and taking films. In addition, we are grateful to the Z. W. O. for providing X-ray apparatus with which a portion of this work was performed. Thanks are due to Mr Adriaan Kaandorp of the University of Amsterdam for helping in data collecting and calculating. We are grateful, too, for the aid of Miss Ida Thole of the University of Amsterdam and Mr Peter J. O'Hara of the Computer Laboratory of the National Bureau of Standards in carrying out various calculations. We would also like to thank Miss Marlene I. Cook and Mr Howard E. Swanson of the National Bureau of Standards for refining the cell dimensions for us. Dr Daniel E. Appleman of the U.S. Geological Survey kindly calculated the interatomic distances and angles using the program written by Dr Edgar L. Eichhorn.

References

- ANDRESS, K. R., GEHRING, W. & FISCHER, K. (1949). Z. Anorg. Chem. 260, 331.
- BARNEY, D. L. & GRYDER, J. W. (1955). J. Amer. Chem. Soc. 77, 3195.
- Bell, R. N., AUDRIETH, W. F. & HILL, O. F. (1952). Industr. Engng. Chem. 44, 570.
- BERNAL, J. D. & FOWLER, R. H. (1933). J. Chem. Phys. 1, 515.
- BERNAL, J. D. & MEGAW, H. D. (1935). Proc. Royal Soc. 151, 384.
- BUSING, W. R. & LEVY, H. A. (1959). A Crystallographic Least Squares Refinement Program for the IBM 704, ORNL 59-4-37.
- DAVIES, D. R. & CORBRIDGE, D. E. C. (1958). Acta Cryst. 11, 315.
- GILLESPIE, R. J. & NYHOLM, R. S. (1957). Quart. Rev. Chem. Soc. London, 11, 339.
- GROSS, R. J., GRYDER, J. W. & DONNAY, G. (1955). Abstracts of Papers. 128th Meeting. Amer. Chem. Soc.
- GROSS, R. J. (1955). Unpublished Dissertation, The Johns Hopkins University.
- McWEENY, R. (1951). Acta Cryst. 4, 513.
- PAULING, L. & SHERMAN, J. (1937). Z. Kristallogr. 96, 481.
- PHILLIPS, D. C. (1956). Acta Cryst. 9, 819.
- POSNER, A. S., PERLOFF, A. & DIORIO, A. F. (1958). Acta Cryst. 11, 308.
- ROMERS, C., KETELAAR, J. A. A. & MACGILLAVRY, C. H. (1951). Acta Cryst. 4, 114.
- TOMIIE, Y. & STAM, C. H. (1958). Acta Cryst. 11, 126.