



Fig. 2. Projection de la structure suivant [001].

de ces liaisons hydrogène sont représentées par des traits en pointillé; la troisième est visible sur la Fig. 1.

Nous remercions Monsieur le Professeur Lacroute, Directeur du Centre de Calcul de la Faculté des Sciences de Strasbourg, d'avoir mis à notre disposition l'ordinateur Bull  $\Gamma$  ET et Monsieur R. Strosser pour l'aide apportée dans la réalisation des programmes.

#### Références

- CRUICKSHANK, D. W. J. (1949). *Acta Cryst.* **2**, 65.  
 CRUICKSHANK, D. W. J. (1952). *Acta Cryst.* **5**, 511.  
 CRUICKSHANK, D. W. J. (1961). In *Computing Methods and the Phase Problem in X-ray Crystal Analysis*.  
 FERRARI, A. & CAVALCA, L. (1950). *Gazz. chim. Ital.* **80**, 151.  
 WEISS, R., GRANDJEAN, D. & WENDLING, J. P. (1964). *Bull. Soc. Chim. Fr.* p. 3152.

*Acta Cryst.* (1966). **20**, 566

## Crystalline Phases in the System In–In<sub>2</sub>S<sub>3</sub>

BY W. J. DUFFIN AND J. H. C. HOGG

*Department of Physics, The University, Hull, England*

(Received 22 July 1965)

Phases existing at room temperature in the In–In<sub>2</sub>S<sub>3</sub> system are established as InS and In<sub>6</sub>S<sub>7</sub> and their properties related to previous work. Crystallographic data are presented and InS is confirmed as orthorhombic with  $a=3.944$ ,  $b=4.447$ ,  $c=10.648$  Å, space group  $Pm\bar{m}n$ ,  $Z=4$ . In<sub>6</sub>S<sub>7</sub> is found to be monoclinic with  $a=9.090$ ,  $b=3.887$ ,  $c=17.705$  Å,  $\beta=108.20^\circ$ , space group  $P2_1/m$ ,  $Z=2$ . Evidence for the existence of crystalline In<sub>2</sub>S is also examined.

### Introduction

While the structures of  $\alpha$ - and  $\beta$ -In<sub>2</sub>S<sub>3</sub> have been well established by Hahn & Klingler (1949) and by Steigmann, Sutherland & Goodyear (1965), considerable confusion exists over the other crystalline phases in the

In–In<sub>2</sub>S<sub>3</sub> system which are stable at room temperature. In a detailed investigation of the phase diagram, Stubbs, Schuffle, Thompson & Duncan (1952) reported the existence of InS and, with some uncertainty in composition, In<sub>5</sub>S<sub>6</sub>: no other phases were found, apart from In<sub>3</sub>S<sub>4</sub> which is stable only above 370°C. X-ray

powder data for both the InS and the  $\text{In}_5\text{S}_6$  reported by Stubbs *et al.* have been published in the ASTM index by Schuffle, but seem to bear little relation to the structure of InS reported by Schubert, Dörre & Günzel (1954) or to the lattice parameters of a compound listed as  $\text{In}_4\text{S}_5$  also given by Schubert *et al.* Moreover, a phase with composition  $\text{In}_2\text{S}$  was reported by Klemm & von Vogel (1934) together with X-ray data and, although its existence is doubtful, the original evidence has not previously been critically examined.

In view of the importance of many group III – group VI compounds as semiconductors, an investigation to clarify the situation described above was instituted in this department. The present paper covers the whole range of compositions and is intended to identify the various phases and establish crystallographic data for them. Further work on the individual structures is in progress.

### Experimental procedure

All specimens were prepared by mixing weighed amounts of  $\text{In}_2\text{S}_3$  and metallic indium and heating the mixture above the melting point in an evacuated sealed-off quartz tube. The tube was then cooled slowly to a temperature appropriate to the phase(s) required [according to the phase diagram of Stubbs *et al.* (1952)] and held there for an hour or so. The tube was then removed from the furnace and quenched to room temperature in air before breaking the seal. The range of compositions of the original mixtures varied from about 73% by weight of In (corresponding to  $\text{In}_3\text{S}_4$ ) to 85% In (nearly  $\text{In}_2\text{S}$ ).

Apart from excess  $\text{In}_2\text{S}_3$  and In, only two intermediate crystalline phases were obtained in any specimens: red crystals, identified as InS; and almost black crystals, corresponding to Stubbs's ' $\text{In}_5\text{S}_6$ '. Single crystals of both phases large enough for X-ray work were easily obtained, but it proved impossible to make polycrystalline specimens consisting of a single phase. Nevertheless, it did prove possible to prepare specimens containing so little of one phase that the X-ray powder patterns yielded by them consisted only of lines from the other phase.

X-ray powder patterns were obtained both with a de Wolff focusing camera of effective diameter 22.9 cm and with a Geiger counter diffractometer.  $\text{Cu K}\alpha$  radiation was used and internal calibration with metallic indium mixed with the specimens minimized systematic errors. The agreement between photographic and diffractometer measurements of spacings was good enough in all cases to confirm that systematic errors (which arise from different causes in the two techniques) were small. The observed powder data given in the tables are those obtained by the photographic method with intensities measured with a microdensitometer. This is because some very weak reflexions were more certainly recorded photographically, particularly where they were adjacent to strong ones.

### InS

The structure of InS reported by Schubert *et al.* (1954) gives it an orthorhombic unit cell with  $a=3.94_0$ ,  $b=4.44_3$ ,  $c=10.64_2$  Å and a space group  $Pm\bar{m}n$  ( $D_{2h}^{12}$ ). There are 4 formula units per cell, 4 In atoms in  $4(g)$  with  $y=0.125$ ,  $z=0.121$  and 4 S atoms in  $4(g)$  with  $y=-0.005$ ,  $z=0.355$  (see also *Structure Reports*, Vol. 18, p. 382). They give no single-crystal data, and the only powder pattern on record is that of Schuffle in the ASTM index in which the reflexions are indexed on a cubic cell.

Rotation and Weissenberg photographs of the red InS crystals obtained in the present investigation confirmed the space group and approximate lattice parameters of Schubert *et al.* Observed and calculated structure factors were obtained for reflexions appearing on an  $a$ -axis Weissenberg photograph and the agreement was sufficiently good for us to assume that Schubert's atomic positions are substantially correct.

The powder data are given in Table 1, and the lattice parameters yielding the values of  $d_{\text{calc}}$  therein are  $a=3.944$ ,  $b=4.447$ ,  $c=10.648$  Å. The agreement between calculated and observed spacings is good enough for the error in  $a$  and  $b$  to be no more than  $\pm 0.001$  Å and in the  $c$  parameter no more than  $\pm 0.002$  Å. The observed and calculated intensities of Table 1 show good agreement, although some preferred orientation undoubtedly occurred since the specimens for the X-ray photographs were prepared by sedimentation. By comparing diffractometer powder patterns of specimens with a flat surface with some of specimens whose surface had been disturbed with the points of a brush, it was found that the peak intensity of the 004 reflexion was somewhat enhanced by preferred orientation, while those of the 122 and 204 reflexions were reduced. These account for most of the differences in the table.

Comparison of the spacings with those of Schuffle shows that his pattern had some weaker reflexions missing and some stronger ones unresolved. The fact that the reflexions remaining could be approximately indexed on a cubic cell is probably fortuitous.

InS crystals show frequent twinning of an interesting nature which will be reported elsewhere.

### $\text{In}_6\text{S}_7$

The black crystalline phase occurring in the specimens of Stubbs *et al.* (1952) corresponded, according to them, to a binary compound containing 75–76% In: this they said 'would seem to correspond to  $\text{In}_5\text{S}_6$  (74.9% In)'. Powder data for this phase were also published by Schuffle in the ASTM index.

Somewhat later, Schubert, Dörre & Günzel (1954) quoted lattice parameters but no other data for a compound  $\text{In}_4\text{S}_5$  (74.1% In) and Hansen (1958) concluded that this was now the composition of the phase previously reported by Stubbs *et al.* In private correspondence with the authors, however, Dr Schubert gave the

Table 1. Powder data for InS

$I_c$  = calculated intensity from  $p|F_c|^2 f_1(\theta)$  where  $p$  is the multiplicity and  $f_1(\theta)$  is the angular factor for the de Wolff camera as defined by Goodyear & Duffin (1957).

$I_o$  = observed integrated intensity obtained from microdensitometer recordings.

$I_c$  and  $I_o$  are scaled so that  $I_{110} = 100$ .

$hkl$	$d_c$	$d_o$	$I_c$	$I_o$
011	4.104 Å	4.104 Å	22	25
101	3.699	3.699	49	48
012	3.413	3.413	72	68
110	2.951	2.951	100	100
111	2.843	2.843	39	39
013	2.775	2.775	3	4
004	2.662	2.662	58	61
103	2.638	2.636	10	10
113	2.269	2.269	26	24
020	2.224	2.224	2	1
021	2.177	2.177	19	9
114	1.977	1.977	51	66
200	1.972	1.973	23	
015	1.921	1.920	7	9
023	1.884	1.885	14	13
105	1.874	1.873	14	15
122	1.820	1.822	50	34
211	1.777	1.778	5	5
115	1.727	1.727	7	6
212	1.707	1.707	20	17
024			1	
016	1.648	1.647	8	5
204	1.585	1.584	24	15
025	1.538	1.538	5	2
221	1.461	1.461	11	9
131	1.376	1.376	4	6
215			5	

Table 2. Powder data for In<sub>6</sub>S<sub>7</sub>

$I_o$  is scaled so that  $I_{212} = 100$ .

(b) = broad.

Bracketed reflexions in the second column are unresolved by eye, in the fourth column are unresolved by the microdensitometer. Separate intensities given for the latter are based on visual estimates.

$hkl$	$d_c$	$d_o$	$I_c$	$I_o$
002	8.410 Å	8.406 Å	21	
003	5.606	5.614	10	
102	5.260	5.264	15	
201	4.537	4.539	26	
202	4.446	4.444	9	
104	4.353	4.358	50	
103	4.148	4.154	26	
203	4.094	4.096	2	
201	3.899	3.897	7	
011	3.787	3.787	36	
204	3.632	3.631	5	
110	3.545	3.543	25	123*
105	3.529	3.531	98	
012	3.529			
202	3.430	3.430	53	
112	3.427			
104	3.387	3.387	65	
111	3.382			
013	3.195	3.188	92	
113	3.186			
205	3.178	3.031	5	
302	3.028			
203	2.998	2.997	93	
301	2.997			

Table 2 (cont.)

$hkl$	$d_c$	$d_o$	$I_o$
211	2.952	2.952	27
212	2.927	2.924	8
114	2.900	2.900	10
210	2.889	2.888	5
014	2.854	2.855	10
304	2.821	2.821	63
213	2.819		
206	2.781	2.782	29
211	2.753	2.752	91
214	2.654	2.655	54
305	2.630	2.632	48
204	2.630		
212	2.572	2.570	100
107	2.528	2.526	7
106	2.451	2.449	12
207	2.450		
312	2.389	2.389	23
313	2.357	2.358	35
116	2.350	2.349	
314	2.283	2.285	70
016	2.274	2.274	
401	2.231	2.234	4
307	2.216	2.217	6
315	2.178	2.179	8
214	2.178		
208	2.177	2.161	6
400	2.159		
107	2.148	2.148	10
405	2.147	2.046	30
406	2.047		
313	1.971	1.971	31
209	1.952	1.952	44
402	1.950		
020	1.944	1.943	136*
411	1.935		
414	1.930	1.930	53
317	1.925	1.920	19
118	1.919		
108	1.910	1.909	13
218	1.899	1.898	16
410	1.887	1.886	44
117	1.880	1.880	33
415	1.879		
009	1.869	1.868	6
207	1.866		
018	1.849	1.848	21
403	1.832	1.832	23
416	1.811	1.808(b)	11
502	1.807		
221	1.787	1.786	4
124	1.775	1.774	11
2,0,10	1.765	1.763	8
417	1.731	1.731	20
315	1.716	1.715	22
125	1.703	1.703	19
208	1.694	1.695	10
124	1.686	1.685	12
319	1.673	1.672	4
507	1.671		
413	1.657	1.659	6
225	1.658		
513	1.647	1.646	12
512	1.638	1.639	16
223	1.631	1.630	31
321	1.631		

\* With non-focusing cameras, these groups of reflexions may be unresolved and could appear as very strong single reflexions.

analysis of his specimens as being  $\text{In}_{11}\text{S}_{13}$  (75.2% In) and it seems possible that the formula  $\text{In}_4\text{S}_5$  was adopted following a suggestion of Thiel & Luckmann (1928).

Our first task was to establish that the phases of Stubbs and of Schubert were the same, for it did not seem possible to index Schufle's pattern on the basis of Schubert's cell. Powder patterns of the black phase, obtained in precisely the same way as with InS, together with rotation and Weissenberg photographs enabled the unit cell and space group to be determined. The unit cell is monoclinic with lattice parameters  $a = 9.090 \pm 0.005$ ,  $b = 3.887 \pm 0.001$ ,  $c = 17.705 \pm 0.004$  Å,  $\beta = 108.20 \pm 0.05$ , which are very close to those of Schubert. The agreement between observed and calculated spacings (Table 2) is not so good as with InS because of the large number of weak and overlapping reflexions. Schubert's cell is not the conventional one because there does exist a monoclinic cell with the same  $a$  and  $b$  but with smaller  $c$  and with  $\beta$  nearer to  $90^\circ$ , but to avoid further confusion in the literature it was thought better to leave the cell as quoted above.

Careful examination of Schufle's pattern showed that it could be identified with that in Table 2 provided it was assumed that it omitted many medium and weak reflexions and that a gross systematic error occurred in his spacings.

Weissenberg photographs about the  $a$  axis showed that the only absences are  $0k0$  with  $k$  odd, giving a space group of either  $P2_1$  ( $C_2^2$ ) or  $P2_1/m$  ( $C_{2h}^2$ ). A full structure determination of this phase is in progress and will be published in due course: preliminary results indicate that the structure has a centre of symmetry and that the space group is thus  $P2_1/m$ . Intensities calculated from unrefined atomic positions show very close agreement with the observed values given in Table 2.

There remains the question of composition. Although Schubert and Stubbs differ in their formulae, their estimates of composition are not in conflict: Schubert, 75.2% In; Stubbs, 75–76% In. It has not proved possible for us to obtain specimens of the phase sufficiently free from contamination to carry out an analysis, either by chemical means or by X-ray fluorescent techniques, which could give a composition to an accuracy better than 1%, although crude analyses confirm that the phase does indeed contain about 75% In. However, when a full structure determination was begun, it became clear that all atoms possessed atomic  $y$  coordinates of  $\frac{1}{4}$  or  $\frac{3}{4}$  and Patterson projections on (010) showed that the unit cell probably contained 12 In atoms. Further work showed that the unit cell could accommodate no more than 14 S atoms and at this stage the possibility of a formula  $\text{In}_6\text{S}_7$  (75.4% In) with  $Z=2$  presented itself.

Calculated densities for the various possible formulae are:

$\text{In}_4\text{S}_5$ , $Z=2$	$\rho = 3.46$	(74.1% In)
	$Z=3$	$\rho = 5.19$
$\text{In}_5\text{S}_6$ , $Z=2$	$\rho = 4.28$	(74.9% In)
$\text{In}_6\text{S}_7$ , $Z=2$	$\rho = 5.11$	(75.4% In)

Measured densities are difficult to obtain accurately, but flotation methods have shown that the phase has a density certainly greater than 4.5 and displacement methods using toluene indicate a density of about 5.08. This clearly eliminates all but two possibilities and, coupled with the evidence from the structure determination, we concluded that the phase is in fact  $\text{In}_6\text{S}_7$  with  $Z=2$  formula units per cell. It will be noted that this is in better agreement with the compositions given by Stubbs and Schubert than are the formulae suggested by them.

### Other phases

No other phases have been found in any specimens, even in those quenched from points where  $\text{In}_3\text{S}_4$  might be expected to be frozen in. A high-temperature investigation of the existence of  $\text{In}_3\text{S}_4$  is projected.

It seems certain that the  $\text{In}_2\text{S}$  phase first reported by Thiel & Luckmann (1928) does not exist in crystalline form. The main evidence for its existence rests on a diagram of its X-ray powder pattern given by Klemm & von Vogel (1934). We have, as far as is possible on such a small scale illustration, examined carefully this particular diagram and find that the majority of reflexions are identical with those of InS. The remaining reflexions are almost certainly those of metallic indium and their specimen would thus appear to be a mixture of InS and In. The densities of 5.87 and 5.92 reported for this phase by Klemm & von Vogel and by Thiel & Luckmann respectively lie between those of InS (5.28) and In (7.28).

This conclusion seems to verify that of Klanberg & Spandau (1961) who report the existence of a gaseous  $\text{In}_2\text{S}$  phase, but suggest that on condensing into a solid the  $\text{In}_2\text{S}$  is unstable and breaks down to InS and In.

We wish to thank Mr B. Lunn for advice on the preparation of specimens and Dr G. A. Steigmann for a program used in computing some results used in this paper. One of us (J.H.C.H.) is indebted to the Science Research Council for the award of a research studentship.

### References

- GOODYEAR, J. & DUFFIN, W. J. (1957). *Acta Cryst.* **10**, 597.  
 HAHN, H. & KLINGLER, W. (1949). *Z. anorg. Chem.* **260**, 97.  
 HANSEN, M. (1958). *Constitution of Binary Alloys*, p. 858. New York: McGraw-Hill.  
 KLANBERG, F. & SPANDAU, H. (1961). *J. Inorg. Nuclear Chem.* **19**, 180.  
 KLEMM, W. & VON VOGEL, H. U. (1934). *Z. anorg. Chem.* **219**, 45.  
 SCHUBERT, K., DÖRRE, E. & GÜNZEL, E. (1954). *Naturwissenschaften*, **41**, 448.  
 STEIGMANN, G. A., SUTHERLAND, H. H. & GOODYEAR, J. (1965). *Acta Cryst.* **19**, 967.  
 STUBBS, M. F., SCHUFLE, J. A., THOMPSON, A. J. & DUNCAN, J. M. (1952). *J. Amer. Chem. Soc.* **14**, 41.  
 THIEL, A. & LUCKMANN, H. (1928). *Z. anorg. Chem.* **172**, 353.