Acta Cryst. (1967). 22, 182

Refinement of the Alum Structures. II. X-Ray and Neutron Diffraction of NaAl(SO₄)₂.12H₂O, γ Alum*

By Don T. Cromer

Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory, University of California, Los Alamos, New Mexico, U.S.A. and Puerto Rico Nuclear Center, Mayaguez, Puerto Rico

M. I. Kay

Puerto Rico Nuclear Center, Mayaguez, Puerto Rico

AND ALLEN C. LARSON

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

(Received 21 March 1966)

The structure of NaAl(SO₄)₂.12H₂O, γ alum, has been refined by use of three-dimensional X-ray and partial three-dimensional neutron diffraction data. The maximum shift in atom positions from those given by Lipson (1935) is about 0.05 Å. The sulfate oxygen atoms have large anisotropic thermal motion which is observed in both the X-ray and the neutron diffraction analyses. An explanation of this motion is given in terms of coupled translational and rotational vibrations.

Introduction

The alums are a large class of double salts having the general formula $A^{IBIII}(RO_4)_2$. $12H_2O$ all crystallizing in space group *Pa3*. The alums were first thought to be isomorphous but Lipson (1935) showed that there are three different types, α , β and γ . In the first paper of this series (Cromer, Kay & Larson, 1966, hereafter CKL) the refinement of the structure of CsAl(SO₄)₂. $12H_2O$, a β alum, was given and the relations among the three types were discussed. In the present paper we give the results of an X-ray and neutron diffraction study of NaAl(SO₄)₂. $12H_2O$, the only known member of the γ alum type.

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

Experimental

Crystals for both X-ray and neutron diffraction studies were grown from water solution in the manner described by CKL. Frequent stirring of the solution was necessary because Na alum tends to supersaturate. For X-ray work crystals were ground into spheres and a sphere of about 0.15 mm in diameter was selected. The crystal was coated with Krylon plastic spray to inhibit the slow loss of water in the dry atmosphere of New Mexico. The lattice constant was measured with a carefully aligned single-crystal orienter on a General Electric Co. XRD-5 X-ray diffraction unit and found to be 12.213 ± 0.003 Å (Mo $K\alpha_1 = 0.70926$ Å) in good agreement with the value 12.215 Å reported by Haussühl (1961). Mo $K\alpha$ radiation and Zr–Y balanced filters were used in measuring the intensities within the range

Table 1. Least-squares parameters for NaAl(SO₄)₂. 12H₂O from X-ray diffraction data

Standard deviations (in parentheses) apply to the rightmost digit

 $\beta_{11} \times 10^5$

	x	у	Z	or B	$\beta_{22} \times 10^5$	$\beta_{33} \times 10^5$	$\beta_{12} \times 10^5$	$\beta_{13} \times 10^5$	$\beta_{23} \times 10^5$
Na	4	4	+)	412 (10)	β ₁₁	β ₁₁	- 30 (20)	β_{12}	β_{12}
Al	Ô	Õ	Õ '	284 (7)	B ₁₁	BII	50 (14)	β_{12}	β_{12}
S	0.2652(1)	x	x	397 (5)	β_{11}	β_{11}	44 (9)	β_{12}	β_{12}
$O_s(1)$	0·3343 (2)	х	x	687 (16)	β_{11}	β_{11}	-291(31)	β_{12}	β_{12}
$O_s(2)$	0.2957(2)	0.2783(2)	0.1508(2)	1417 (32)	724 (22)	535 (19)	- 987 (41)	733 (38)	-168(32)
$O_w(1)$	0.0767(2)	0.0403(2)	0.3188(2)	619 (21)	591 (21)	419 (18)	- 367 (39)	48 (33)	110 (32)
$O_w(2)$	0.1371(2)	0.9596(2)	0.0573(2)	338 (16)	438 (17)	498 (17)	77 (28)	- 97 (27)	173 (27)
$\tilde{H}(1)$	0.585 (3)	0.319(3)	0.378 (3)	3.4 (12)	. ,	. ,	•		
H(2)	0.486(3)	0.308(3)	0.383(4)	4.0 (14)					
H(3)	0.555(3)	0.202(3)	0.502(3)	3.2 (10)					
H(4)	0.588(3)	0.339 (3)	0.113(3)	2.4 (9)					

 $g = 1.65 \pm 0.01 \times 10^{-6}$

 $2\theta \le 50^{\circ}$. The fixed-crystal, fixed-counter method was used, and of 544 reflections measured 388 were observed according to the criterion $[I-Background] \geq$

Table 2. Observed and calculated X-ray structure factors for NaAl(SO₄)₂.12H₂O The column headings are k, $10|F_o|/K$ and $10|F_c^*|/K$ (see text). A minus sign preceding F_o means 'less than'.

н.	1 1 1	H.	6 [*]		8 L* 3	H# 9 L# /	H= 10 L= 4	H. 12 L. J
ı	454 458	1	618 608	L	73 68	1 -62 -27	1 113 -104	1 92 88
		2	285 -282	2	83 -75	2 -63 41	2 -68 -7	2 157 -166
	2 [4 0	4	71 -69	4	458 465	4 -61 -33	4 -70 40	4 120 135
0	366 - 357	5	238 240	5	203 -208	5 174 178	5 -74 -73	5 -67 -52
,	344 345	6	209 206	÷	-58 32	6 -64 11 7 -68 -37	He 11 to 1	7 -68 18
		н≖	6 L= 4	8	143 146	8 106 -102		
Ha	2 L= 1	•	121 124			MR 0 18 8	1 288 - 305	HP 12 LF 4
t	248 -250	ĭ	220 229		0 1- 1		3 68 -56	0 424 414
2	203 -207	2	966 973	0	728 725	0 -66 -47	4 97 -108	1 155 -150
к≖	2 L= 2	2	155 162	ź	96 57	2 131 122	6 -65 -23	3 228 220
		5	-51 -16	J	140 134	3 237 -243	7 92 93	4 357 348
2	1149-1172	6	588 573	2	802 804	4 132 -156	8 -68 -11	5 224 -224
н≠	3 L= 1	h≠	6 1 5	6	-61 63	6 -69 58		7 157 146
,	110 141		104 109	7	71 68	7 -67 -14	H= 11 L= 2	HE 12 18 5
ż	135 132	ż	416 -422	v	,		0 220 -230	
3	69 -69	3	206 -214	н.	8 L= 5	H= 10 L= 0	1 143 133	1 -71 71
н=	3 L= 2		-56 -40	1	98 -93	0 408 - 397	3 -62 35	3 -70 65
		6	82 -82	2	91 86	1 371 372	4 -63 -35	4 80 -111
1	587 576	ня	6 L= 6	4	-58 14	3 134 -132	6 -69 -67	6 -69 -28
2	549 556			5	183 180	4 141 144	7 -68 19	
3	193 - 193	6	-63 54	°,	258 255	5 354 355	9 -72 -45	N= 12 L= 0
H=	3 L* 3	H=	7 L= 1	8	231 -218	7 -65 -37		0 248 237
,	264 - 267	,	200 100			8 258 251	H= 11 L# 3	1 210 201
,	230 -231	2	263 -265	,	0 - 0	10 361 355	1 92 82	3 128 -126
нч	4 L× 0	3	474 487	0	149 -135		2 -62 -52	4 -73 76
0	1106 1114		138 124	ź	471 475	H- 10 C- 1	4 102 131	, .,,,
í	1745-1636	6	190 186	3	190 -177	1 153 146	5 128 126	H= 12 L= 7
2	501 -521 261 -746	1	144 -123	4	109 101	2 202 -203	o -o8 -78 7 115 117	1 -69 43
á	761 787	He	7 L= 2	6	533 504	4 264 212	8 -72 71	2 84 -91
н-	4 I.F	0	-63 -53	7 8	-63 31 81 106	5 86 -95	H= 11 1= 4	3 173 162 4 79 -78
		ĩ	-55 -33			7 199 214		
ļ	-45 34	2	250 255	н•	8 L= 7	8 -69 53	0 143 145	H= 12 L* 8
5	396 -407	4	143 -137	1	-60 -44	10 .87 -102	2 -67 -66	0 213 205
4	96 -85	5	79 81	2	110 -95		3 -66 -14	1 130 -137
н∗	4 L= 2	2	-58 8	4	350 355	HP 10 1- 2	5 135 -133	H# 13 L# 1
				5	179 -164	0 478 469	6 -67 -36	
0	68 -68	н=	7 (* 3	°,	97 96 94 88	2 -61 23	8 -68 -21	2 -69 -70
ż	796 843	1	64 57	a	-69 65	3 194 177		3 -68 -20
3	576 -580	2	124 -126		.	4 557 555	H= 11 L= 5	4 127 -118
	71 82	4	415 -401		o L- o	6 -63 -5	1 -65 -2	6 142 -150
н≖	4 L= 3	5	100 113	8	292 273	7 140 134	2 -66 55	
1	633 623	?	79 75	H≖	9 L* 1	9 -72 -47	4 108 -141	
2	138 137					10 180 173	5 -69 66	U -65 28
2	520 -499	н.	/ [* 4	2	314 316	H= 10 1= 3	5 -67 -32	2 -69 -6
		o	115 -116	3	-56 11		8 -71 -42	3 87 105
на	4 L= 4	2	208 -191	5	204 214	1 160 -163	h= 11 L= 6	5 -72 67
4	773 779	3	271 279	6	115 114	3 170 -159		6 -70 45
	6 I. . I	4	217 218	7	-63 -52	4 113 -108	0 213 -194	HR 13 18 3
	,	6	117 -117	ÿ	-68 -46	6 132 131	2 -68 51	
1	274 -271	7	360 364		a . .	7 129 -152	3 146 -158	1 205 206
5	182 191	ни	7 1- 5		, [. 2	9 142 155	5 -67 6	3 130 123
2	171 -165			0	-56 54	10 102 96	6 -68 47	4 100 -116
,	252 248	2	322 -320	2	168 -172	H= 10 L= 4	/ 118 -119	5 -71 52
н	5 L¤ 2	3	219 236	3	-57 -21		H= 11 L+ 7	H= 13 L= 4
0	602 597	5	204 192	5	-60 -16	1 337 327	1 -67 52	0 -70 -43
i	193 -195	6	-57 21	6	241 -237	2 640 645	2 -66 -42	1 124 124
3	842 875 3C7 - 286	,	237 -235	6	-67 35	3 350 - 340	4 80 86	3 148 -153
4	124 120	×=	7 L= 6	9	98 -103	5 -63 14	5 -68 -32	4 83 86
5	99 94	•	444 -463		1	6 372 348	6 -70 -21	5 -71 -64
н•	5 L× 3	ĩ	340 348			8 - 64 6	H= 11 L= 8	H= 13 L= 5
1	604 -609	2	-57 -40	12	-56 -4	9 158 177	0 -64 18	1 -68 46
ź	818 -827	- 4	198 -190	3	327 336	H# 10 L¥ 5	1 172 -176	2 -66 -24
2	66 -65	5	206 196		-60 28	1 371 - 368	2 -73 -73	3 -72 58
5	69 71	ž	-60 -5	6	189 205	2 337 -359	4 108 128	
	5		7 1. 7	7	212 -210	3 -61 0	5 -71 47	H= 13 L= 6
	+			9	139 137	5 -76 -36	H= 11 L= 9	0 -71 -51
ę	220 212	7	309 332		9 1 - /	6 192 -202	1 101 187	1 121 -126
ż	235 244	н-	8 L. O			8 -67 15	2 -73 14	
3	317 312	~	166 180	0	326 -335	9 -69 23	Ha 12 19 0	H= 14 L= 0
5	26 90	1	670 -653	2	263 259	H= 10 L= 6		0 121 141
		2	76 68	3	257 -246		0 274 257	1 284 271
4 E	γ L ² 3	4	950 976	3	125 129	1 196 -199	2 88 99	3 244 -238
5	183 188	5	176 189	¢.	-60 -9	2 -64 47	3 306 310	Na 14
н≖	6 L= 0	ŝ	325 306	6	-62 26	4 443 448	5 189 -205	M: 14 L• 1
		8	487 495	4	-65 15	5 143 -128	6 103 119	1 -71 -50
1	401 461 565 575	н.	8 L= 1	н.	9 L= 5	6 96 106 7 198 185	7 -70 51 8 267 266	2 -69 -6 3 -71 39
ž	800 832					8 251 243		
2	418 -402 57 #A	1	203 203 85 77	2	149 145	HX 10 LX 7	H# 12 L# 1	H= 14 L# 2
5	555 534	3	71 56	3	133 120		1 -68 58	0 140 138
6	6C1 613	:	209 211 295 304	4	-62 71	1 -64 -21 2 92 -100	2 76 93	1 183 -177 2 160 177
۲×	6 L= 1	6	382 385	6	267 -265	3 83 -67	4 108 -92	3 171 176
,	471 460	7	475 -485	?	163 162	4 127 -130	5 -69 66	HT 14 / - 3
2	386 382	8	140 -147	9	95 -105	6 -68 61	7 193 -194	
3	51 45	He	8 L× 2		a 1- ·	7 -68 -25	8 -71 -38	1 -69 -11
5	277 -287	0	142 -144	HT	7 L¥ 6	H= 10 L= 8	H# 12 L# 2	2 14 83
6	-55 41	1	479 481	0	-60 1	0 101 107	0 -11 -15	
н	6 L= 2	2	882 908 332 -323	2	321 - 323	1 189 187	1 309 309	
			344 349	3	-62 -40	2 263 266	2 369 364	
1	979 -983	6	601 613	;	109 -108	5 216 -202	4 73 83	
ş	632 629	1	241 -235	6	98 -113	5 96 87	5 -67 57	
3	333 331 976 985	8	-62 35	7 Я	-67 53	6 350 335	0 100 173 7 249 -248	
5	59 -47			9	119 -111			
	140 -115							

 $3 \cdot 0[I + \text{Background}]^{\frac{1}{2}}$. No absorption correction was necessary.

For neutron diffraction measurements an octahedron 0.5 cm on an edge was selected. The crystal was briefly immersed in liquid nitrogen to decrease its crystallite size and thus reduce the effects of extinction. Intensity measurements were made on the neutron spectrometer at the Puerto Rico Nuclear Center. In the more humid climate of Puerto Rico it was not necessary to coat the crystal. A wavelength of 1.06 Å was used and nonequivalent reflections within the range $2\theta \le 80^\circ$ were measured for the hk0 and hhl zones. General hkl data were collected out to about $40^{\circ} 2\theta$ and then an accident terminated the experiment. Out of 240 reflections measured, 144 were observed according to the criterion $[I-Background] \ge 2.0[I+Background]^{\frac{1}{2}}$. Because of the large incoherent neutron scattering of hydrogen, absorption corrections were applied. The linear absorption coefficient for Na alum is 6.77 cm⁻¹, and calculated transmission factors varied from 0.106 to 0.179.

Refinement of the structure with X-ray data

The atomic positions given by Lipson (1935) were used as starting values for a full-matrix, least-squares refinement of the non-hydrogen parameters. Anisotropic thermal parameters were used in the form

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

Scattering factors given in International Tables for X-ray Crystallography (1962) were used for all atoms. The quantity minimized was $\sum w(F_o - F_c^*)^2$ where w = $w_E/(F_o + 0.02F_o^2)$, w_E is the weight based on counting statistics (Evans, 1961), and

$$F_{c}^{*} = \frac{KF_{c}}{\left\{1 + g\left[\frac{2(1 + \cos^{4}2\theta)}{(1 + \cos^{2}2\theta)^{2}}\right]LpF_{c}^{2}\right\}^{\frac{1}{2}}}$$

where K is a scale factor, g is an extinction parameter (Zachariasen, 1963), Lp is the Lorentz and polarization factor and F_c is the ordinary calculated structure factor. For unobserved reflections w=0. At the end of the refinements $\Delta \xi_i / \sigma(\xi_i) < 10^{-2}$ for all parameters ξ . R indices quoted for both X-ray and neutron data are $\Sigma |\Delta F| / \Sigma |F_o|$ with unobserved reflections omitted.

After several cycles of least-squares, R was 0.0588. A difference Fourier synthesis was calculated and the hydrogen atoms were revealed so clearly that it was decided to include them in the least-squares refinement but with isotropic thermal parameters. The hydrogen parameters readily converged and the final R was 0.0343. The final parameters are given in Table 1. The observed structure factors and those calculated with the parameters of Table 1 are given in Table 2. The anisotropic thermal parameters were transformed to obtain the thermal ellipsoid parameters which are given in Table 3.

Refinement of the structure with neutron diffraction data

The heavy atoms were held in fixed positions, as given in Table 1, and a least-squares refinement with anisotropic thermal parameters was computed as before except that no extinction parameter was used. The final R was 0.0691. Observed and calculated structure factors are given in Table 4. The resulting hydrogen parameters are given in Table 5. The anisotropic parameters are not listed as such; instead, for brevity, we give in Table 6 only the resulting thermal ellipsoids. The standard deviations are relatively large because of the rather small number of observations. (There were 144 observations and 63 parameters in this calculation.) The thermal ellipsoids of Table 3 and Table 5 agree within the rather large standard deviations. At first glance some of the standard deviations of the orientations of the ellipsoids in Table 5 are so large as to border on the ridiculous. These large standard deviations arise partly from the relatively large standard deviations of the thermal parameters but are due mostly to the fact that two of the axes are nearly the same and hence the directions become indeterminate. It is of particular interest that the extreme anisotropy of $O_s(2)$ is found from both the X-ray and neutron data.

Discussion

The atom positions found do not differ by more than about 0.05 Å from those reported by Lipson (1935).

	r.m.s. amplitude	B_i	Direction ar α	ngles relative to β	crystal axes γ
Na	0·170 (5) Å 0·180 (6) 0·180 (3)	2·28 (13) Ų 2·55 (8) 2·55 (8)	54·7°	54·7°	54·7°
Al	0·159 (4) 0·140 (3) 0·140 (3)	1·99 (10) 1·54 (6) 1·54 (6)	54.7	54.7	54.7
S	0·183 (2) 0·168 (2) 0·168 (2)	2·63 (7) 2·24 (4) 2·24 (4)	54.7	54.7	54.7
Os(1)	0·173 (7) 0·251 (4) 0·251 (4)	2·36 (19) 4·97 (15) 4·97 (15)	54·7	54.7	54.7
Os(2)	0·367 (4) 0·202 (4) 0·164 (4)	10·62 (21) 3·22 (12) 2·12 (11)	31 (1) 79 (2) 118 (1)	115 (1) 39 (3) 118 (4)	74 (1) 53 (4) 42 (4)
Ow(1)	0·245 (4) 0·182 (4) 0·172 (4)	4·76 (16) 2·63 (12) 2·34 (12)	44 (3) 53 (8) 111 (11)	133 (2) 60 (11) 122 (10)	98 (3) 51 (16) 40 (16)
O _w (2)	0·149 (4) 0·178 (4) 0·206 (3)	1·75 (10) 2·50 (11) 3·35 (10)	36 (6) 54 (6) 95 (4)	117 (5) 46 (6) 56 (5)	67 (4) 114 (6) 34 (4)

Table 3. Thermal ellipsoids in NaAl(SO₄)₂.12H₂O from X-ray data Standard deviations (in parentheses) apply to rightmost digit



Fig. 1. Stereo view of a portion of the Na alum structure. See text for details.

The interatomic distances and bond angles are given in Table 7. The standard deviations were calculated by use of the entire variance–covariance matrix and include the lattice parameter error. However, the values involving hydrogen atom positional parameters from the neutron data refinement assume no error in heavy atom positions.

The water molecules about the aluminum atom form a perfect octahedron although this is not required by the crystal symmetry. Whereas the principal orthogonal axes of this octahedron coincide almost exactly with

Table 4. Observed and calculated neutron structure factors for NaAl(SO₄)₂.12H₂O The column headings are l, 100F₀/K and 100F_c/K. A minus sign preceding F_0 means 'less than'.

Hŧ	1 · K= 1	P= 2 K= 14	H# 4 K# 7	H= 6 K= 6	H= 8 K= 4	HA 10 K. 7
ı	218 178	0 -300 -145	0 560 -570	0 466 458	0 712 744	0 -248 -79
3	-149 105		H+ 4 K+ 8	1 663 682 2 -218 -168	1 932 901	H= 10 K= 8
÷	257 -280		0 470 461	3 -214 76		
6	534 524	1 - 1/8 - 3	0 0/4 0/1	5 -223 268	N# 8 K3 5	0 384 401
7	352 334	≻* 3 K* 3	H= 4 K= 9	6 -232 -86 7 607 635	0 1349 1349	H× 10 K× 9
ž	-242 7	1 277 235	0 403 -446	5 550 552		0 695 722
10	615 611 736 -824	2 209 184	H= 4 ×= 10	10 -256 395	H# 8 K# 6	H= 10 K= 10
12	-261 -77	4 836 -818	0 347 342	11 -255 -15	0 612 548	0 604 604
14	-268 -135	6 -224 -12			H= 8 K= 7	1 -231 -28
F *	2 K= 0	8 917 -924	H* 4 K* []	H# 6 K# /	U -254 236	3 -240 229
с	401 + 382	9 477 426	C 446 451	0 480 -450	H+ 8 K+ 8	4 -240 67
		11 -254 -237	H= 4 K= 12	H= 6 K= 8		н» 12 к» О
	2 80 1	13 437 472	0 666 652	0 571 - 546	1 -236 -346	0 -263 118
c	221 189	14 275 298	H= 4 Xx 13	H. 6 K. 9	2 -226 132	H= 12 K= 1
۴.	2 K= 2	⊦• 3 X= 4	0 207 - 101	0 343 - 380	4 -225 95	0 - 251 99
0	1454 1864	1 329 338	0 241 -241	0 202 -200	6 -227 135	
2	-162 -143 307 -283	2 401 444	H= 4 K# [4	H= 6 X= 10	7 -233 -280 8 -239 162	H# 12 K# 2
3	206 74	H= 3 K= 5	0 360 271	0 391 460	9 299 -242	0 272 236
5	1414 1437	1 666 -618	H# 5 K= 2 '	H= 6 K= 11	h≈ 8 K≠ 9	H= 12 K# 3
ĩ	807 756	2 1285-1351	1 803 774	0 -278 -258	0 -262 95	0 -250 36
8	592 950 358 -354	⊦• 3 K• 6	H= 5 K= 3	H= 6 K= 12	H= 8 K= 10	H= 12 K= 4
10	-259 -245	1 1213 1264	1 710 -481	0 433 368	0 642 661	0 5#3 5#8
12	278 279	2 564 - 555	2 665 -579	0 025 750	0 942 991	
13	-265 51	F= 3 K= 7	H= 5 K= 4	H* 6 K* 13	H# 8 K# 11	H# 12 K# 5
на	2 88 1	1 -244 68	1 495 -504	0 385 - 322	0 - 279 - 37	0 -255 -12
		H4 4 K4 0	2 396 370	H= 7 K= 2	H# 8 K# 12	H# 12 K# 6
ĩ	-177 112	0 968 978	3 202 -247	1 -226 133	0 - 284 5	0 -261 373
H=	2 K= 4	P= 4 K= 1	H= 5 K= 5	H= 7 K= 3	H= 9 K= 2	H= 12 K= 7
c	258 -215	0 677 -708	1 291 -224	1 917 909	1 -248 160	0 -255 -5
ĩ	283 226		3 -206 -5	2 -234 -82		
H٩	2 K= 5		5 -222 50	H= 7 K= 4		
٥	403 410	0 -179 -135 1 515 -481	6 -242 329 7 -247 81	1 461 -504	2 338 273	0 2/8 320
1	237 -207	PR 4 KR 3	8 -235 52	2 541 -508	H= 9 K= 9	H= 14 K= 0
H=	2 K× 6	0 164 - 167	10 -270 152	H= 7 K= 5	1 -233 -178	0 -271 419
ç	453 410	1 249 -267	12 -266 -233	1 759 702	3 -238 43	H# 14 K# 1
1	969 -932	2 220 -181	H= 6 K= 0	H= 7 K= 7	4 -227 44 5 -234 -232	0 315 168
Ha	2 K= 7	F= 4 K= 4	0 314 238	1 359 - 302	6 -235 -6 7 281 245	H= 14 K= 2
ç	713 697	0 821 -753		2 406 419	No. 10 No. 0	0 - 242 - 21
•	-237 -46	2 -144 83		4 571 569	N= 10 K= 0	0 -201 -21
H.	2 K× 8	3 1056-1C95 4 416 439	0 -207 137	5 534 -556 6 248 262	0 1548-1599	H= 14 K= 3
٥	819 830	5 -223 -17	H# 6 K# 2	7 367 371	H= 10 K= 1	0 -260 -185
H=	2 K= 9	7 -251 190	0 385 -355	9 -244 -53	0 -253 217	H= 14 K= 4
٥	-259 -227	8 684 665 9 530 -540	1 832 866	10 -247 75	H= 10 K= 2	0 265 166
	2 K= 10	10 -247 -1	H# 6 K# 3	H= 8 K= 0	0 -252 102	
	-174 202	12 333 290	0 279 -261	0 675 -667		
			2 -228 -166	H= 8 K= 1		
HE	Z K= 11	H= 4 X= 5	H= 6 K= 4	0 1040-1020	0 512 462	
¢	767 -845	0 214 -216	0 451 419	H# A K# 3	H= 10 K= 4	
H¥	2 K# 12	2 -215 -93	1 -237 -311		0 -252 197	
0	334 -138	3 347 371	3 405 -366	1 -240 310	H= 10 K= 5	
	2 K~ 13	HR 4 K# 6	H- 6 K- 5	H- 8 K- 3	0 -247 02	
c	-294 -75	0 -212 56	0 1120 1114	0 1033 1043	H= 10 K= A	
1		2 469 395		1 263 -232		
		3 0/0 -084		2	0 767 - 493	

Table 5. Hydrogen parameters in $NaAl(SO_4)_2$. $12H_2O$ from least-squares refinement of neutron diffraction data

	x	у	Z
H(1)	0.5958 (21)	0.3172 (20)	0.3663 (21)
H(2)	0.4709 (22)	0.3123(21)	0.3808 (20)
H(3)	0.5504 (18)	0.2031(15)	0.4958 (17)
H(4)	0.5926 (17)	0.3422(16)	0.1104 (18)

the cell axes in β alum, and within a few degrees in α alum, the octahedron at the origin in γ alum is rotated by 39.4° about the threefold axis of the body diagonal of the unit cell. The Al–O distance is the same in both Cs alum and Na alum. The octahedron of water about the sodium atom is somewhat distorted by being stretched out along the threefold axis of the cell.

The angles in the sulfate group depart from those of a regular tetrahedron by a small but apparently significant amount. The differences, for equivalent angles, are in the same direction as those in Cs alum although the departures from tetrahedral symmetry of the sulfate group in Cs alum were not of statistical significance. The rigid body motion, discussed below, might well account for the apparent deviation from tetrahedral symmetry.

The anisotropic thermal parameters of the sulfate group do not seem to be consistent with the rigid body analysis given by Cruickshank (1956). The τ and ω matrices are given in Table 8. The r.m.s. $\Delta U_{ij} =$ 0.0154 Å², as compared with 0.0026 Å² in Cs alum and 0.0015 Å^2 for the sulfate group in Li₂SO₄. H₂O (Larson, 1965). We might expect a torsional oscillation of the group about the threefold axis. However, the major axis of the $O_s(2)$ thermal ellipsoid, instead of being normal to the threefold axis, is at an angle of 65.5° . We believe that this is a case in which the translational and the rotational motions are coupled. Thus the Cruickshank analysis does not apply. The $O_s(2) - O_w(2)$ hydrogen bond is fairly short, 2.62 Å, and the $O_{s}(2)$ -H(4) distance is 1.64 Å. The principal axis of the $O_s(2)$ thermal ellipsoid makes an angle of 84.5° with the S-O bond and an angle of 79.9° with the O---H(4) bond. Thus a motion of 0.367 Å (the r.m.s. amplitude along this axis) changes the O---H(4) distance from 1.64 to 1.61 Å, a small amount. However, if this 0.367 Å motion were to be directed along a line normal to both the S-O bond and the threefold axis, the O---H(4)distance would be reduced to 1.51 Å. This sulfate group lies on a threefold axis so that a simple rotation about this axis will reduce three O---H distances and we reason that the whole group therefore is forced to translate along the threefold axis whenever it rotates about this axis. Thus the total motion cannot be described by independent τ and ω matrices. It should be emphasized that in the above discussion we are not making a correction to the observed bond distances in the manner of Busing & Levy (1964).

Fig. 1 is a stereo view of a portion of the structure. A sulfate group is at the center of the figure and the direction of view is normal to the threefold axis and in a plane containing the $S-O_s(1)$ and $S-O_s(2)$ bonds. The ellipsoids have been derived from the neutron diffraction data and are scaled so that their axes are three times the r.m.s. amplitude. The aluminum atoms are plotted by the letter A and the sodium atoms by the letter N. The aluminum and its water neighbors is at the left and the sodium atom with its water neighbors is at the top center. A threefold axis passes through

this sodium atom and the sulfate group in the center. The motion of $O_{s}(2)$, so as to avoid the hydrogen neighbors, can be clearly seen. This figure was produced by the SC-4020 microfilm plotter using a code recently developed by Larson (1966).

The fact that the thermal motion of $O_s(2)$ was found to be essentially the same from both the X-ray and neutron diffraction measurements is strong evidence that the apparent motion is not an artifact resulting from systematic error in the data. If the motion is so large that the ellipsoid approximation is inadequate, there is then a systematic error in the model which might account for the failure of the independent τ and ω description of the motion. However, there is a logical structural explanation for the peculiar motion which makes it unnecessary to rationalize the results on the basis of a systematic error in the ellipsoid model.

Corrections to the S-O bond lengths were computed according to the in phase or 'riding motion' assumption of Busing & Levy (1964). The S-O bond lengths appear to be about 0.015 Å shorter than those found in Cs alum (CKL) but because of the uncertainty in the thermal motion correction the difference is probably not significant.

The O-H distances, except for $O_w(2)$ -H(4), show the usual feature that X-ray determined bonds are shorter than those determined by neutron diffraction. The O-H bonds in this structure are all nearly the same and do not show any particular correlation of long O-H bonds and short O–O hydrogen bonds. As in β alum, water (1), which is associated with the monovalent cation, forms hydrogen bonds that link $O_s(1)$ of one sulfate group with $O_s(2)$ of another. Again, as in β alum, water (2) forms hydrogen bonds with $O_s(2)$ and water (1). In the present case there is a strong indication that shorter hydrogen bonds tend to be more nearly linear.

The α alums which will be discussed in a forthcoming paper show disorder of the sulfate groups. In view of the extreme anisotropy of the sulfate group found in γ alum a difference Fourier map of the X-ray data was carefully inspected. However no significant features were observed and there is no evidence for disorder in ν alum.

All calculations were done with an IBM 7094 computer. The calculation of the τ and ω matrices used a modification of a code by Trueblood (1962). All other calculation used codes by Larson, Roof & Cromer (1963, 1964, 1965).

Table 6.	Thermal ellipsoids in NaA	l(SO ₄) ₂ .12H ₂ O fro	om neutron	diffraction	data
	Standard deviations (in par	entheses) apply to the	he rightmost o	digit.	

	r.m.s.		Direction an	gles relative to	crystal axes
Na	amplitude	<i>Bi</i>	α	β	γ
	0·06 (27) Å	0·3 (25) Å ²	54·7°	54·7°	54·7°
	0·20 (6) 0·20 (6)	3·3 (20) 3·3 (20)		0	517
Al	0·17 (10) 0·08 (10) 0·08 (10)	2·3 (28) 0·5 (13) 0·5 (13)	54.7	54•7	54•7
S	0·14 (9) 0·20 (4) 0·20 (4)	1.5 (19) 3.3 (12) 3.3 (12)	54.7	54.7	54.7
O _s (1)	0·20 (5) 0·24 (3) 0·24 (3)	3·2 (16) 4·5 (11) 4·5 (11)	54•7	54.7	54.7
O _s (2)	0·38 (2)	11.6 (13)	27 (4)	113 (4)	76 (3)
	0·19 (3)	2.8 (9)	64 (5)	30 (10)	104 (14)
	0·10 (4)	0.8 (6)	97 (7)	71 (13)	20 (10)
Ow(1)	0·20 (2)	3·0 (8)	24 (167)	114 (174)	86 (39)
	0·20 (2)	3·3 (8)	67 (174)	25 (167)	80 (21)
	0·14 (3)	1·6 (6)	97 (23)	98 (17)	11 (19)
O _w (2)	0·12 (3)	1·2 (6)	36 (14)	121 (14)	106 (24)
	0·21 (2)	3·4 (7)	56 (15)	34 (18)	85 (35)
	0·18 (2)	2·4 (6)	79 (25)	103 (36)	17 (27)
H(1)	0·32 (4)	8·3 (20)	23 (20)	91 (16)	67 (20)
	0·22 (4)	3·8 (13)	90 (134)	2 (310)	88 (315)
	0·23 (4)	4·0 (15)	113 (20)	92 (342)	23 (36)
H(2)	0·35 (4)	9·4 (22)	44 (15)	110 (13)	127 (11)
	0·24 (4)	4·5 (15)	53 (16)	43 (17)	72 (18)
	0·14 (5)	1·6 (12)	71 (14)	126 (17)	42 (11)
H(3)	0·21 (3)	3·3 (11)	28 (22)	112 (20)	107 (19)
	0·10 (6)	0·7 (9)	83 (18)	38 (11)	127 (10)
	0·27 (3)	5·8 (14)	63 (21)	60 (13)	42 (12)
H(4)	0·21 (3)	3·5 (11)	37 (88)	53 (85)	89 (87)
	0·22 (3)	3·9 (10)	115 (109)	57 (85)	44 (18)
	0·12 (4)	1·1 (9)	65 (19)	19 (17)	46 (17)

Table 7. Interatomic distances and angles in NaAl(SO₄)₂.12H₂O

Standard deviations (in parentheses) apply to the rightmost digit. Distances corrected for thermal motion are in parentheses. Distances and angles from neutron data are in italics.

$Al-6O_w(2)$	1·881 (2)Å	$< O_{w}(2) - Al - O_{w}(2)$	90·0 (1)°
$Na-6O_w(1)$	2.453 (2)	$< O_w(2) - AI - O_w(2)$ $< O_w(1) - Na - O_w(1)$ $< O_w(1) - Na - O_w(1)$	85·0 (1)
The sulfate grou	in	$\langle O_W(1) - I \langle a - O_W(1) \rangle$	<i>)))(</i> 1)
$S = O_s(1)$	1.461 (4)	$< O_{s}(1) - S - O_{s}(2)$	110.1 (1)
~ - 0(-)	(1.476)	$< O_{\delta}(2) - S - O_{\delta}(2)$	108.9 (1)
S-3O _s (2)	1.454 (2)	$< O_{\delta}(2) - O_{\delta}(2) - O_{\delta}(2)$	60.0
	(1.478)	$< O_{s}(2) - O_{s}(2) - O_{s}(1)$	60.3 (1)
$O_{s}(1) - 3O_{s}(2)$	2.389 (4)	$< O_s(2) - O_s(1) - O_s(2)$	59.4 (1)
$O_s(2)-2O_s(2)$	2.366 (4)		
Water molecule	S		
$O_w(1) - H(1)$	0.78 (4)	< H(1)-O _w (1)-H(2)	103 (2)
., .,	0.973(24)		
	(1.017)		
$O_w(1) - H(2)$	0.83 (4)		
	0.997 (24)		
	(1.054)		
$O_w(2) - H(3)$	0.92 (4)	< H(3)–O _w (2)–H(4)	108 (2)
	0.976 (17)		
	(1.009)		
$O_w(2) - H(4)$	1.01 (3)		
	0.991 (20)		
	1.006		
Hydrogen bond	s		
$O_s(1) - 3O_w(1)$	2.747(4)	$< O_s(1) - H(2) - O_w(1)$	162 (3)
$O_{s}(1) - 3H(2)$	1.783 (25)		(-)
$O_{s}(2) - O_{w}(1)$	2.822(3)	$< O_s(2) - H(1) - O_w(1)$	156 (3)
$O_s(2)-H(1)$	1.907 (23)		
$O_s(2) - O_w(2)$	2.623 (3)	$< O_s(2) - H(4) - O_w(2)$	174 (2)
O _s (2)H(4)	1.635 (20)		
$O_w(1)-O_w(2)$	2.649 (3)	$< O_w(1) - H(3) - O_w(2)$	178 (2)
$O_w(1) - H(3)$	1.673 (17)		

Table 8. Translation and torsional vibration matrices for the sulfate group relative to the unit-cell axes

τ=	(0.0324	0·0004 0·0324	0·0004 0·0004 0·0324)	Å2	$\omega = \left(\right)$		71.3	31·6 71·3	31·6 31·6 71·3)	deg ²
$\sigma t =$	(0.0112	0·0098 0·0112	0.0098 0.0098 0.0112)	Å2	$\sigma \omega = \left(\right)$	(26.6	24·1 26·6	24·1 24·1 26·6)	deg ²
r.m.s. $\Delta U_{44} = 0.0154 \text{ Å}^2$.													

Added note: - The sulfate group motion in Cs alum (CKL) was re-examined in the light of the present results. The amplitude of the major axis of the general position oxygen thermal ellipsoid is 0.214 Å in Cs alum. This axis makes angles of 85.5° with the S-O bond and 81.5° with the O---H hydrogen bond. The O---H distance is 1.69 Å and a motion of 0.214 Å of the oxygen atom in the observed direction of the major axis reduces this distance to 1.67 Å. On the other hand a motion of 0.214 Å in a direction normal to both the S-O bond and the threefold axis would reduce the O---H distance to 1.54 Å. There is probably coupled rotational and translational motion in Cs alum also, but because of the smaller amplitude the Cruickshank analysis appeared to be satisfactory in terms of the r.m.s. ΔU_{ij} .

References

- BUSING, W. R. & LEVY, H. A. (1964). Acta Cryst. 17, 142.
- CROMER, D. T., KAY, M. I. & LARSON, A. C. (1966). Acta Cryst. 21, 383.
- CRUICKSHANK, D. W. J. (1956). Acta Cryst. 9, 754.
- EVANS, H. T. (1961). Acta Cryst. 14, 689.
- HAUSSÜHL, S. (1961). Z. Kristallogr. 116, 371.
- International Tables for X-Ray Crystallography (1962). Vol. III. Birmingham: Kynoch Press.
- LARSON, A. C. (1965). Acta Cryst. 18, 717.
- LARSON, A. C. (1966). Unpublished work.
- LARSON, A. C., ROOF, R. B. JR. & CROMER, D. T. (1963, 1964, 1965). Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory Reports LA-2794, 3043, 3233, 3198, 3259, 3309, 3310.
- LIPSON, H. (1935). Proc. Roy. Soc. A, 151, 347.
- TRUEBLOOD, K. N. (1962). I. U. Cr. World List of Computer Programs. 1st ed. Groningen.
- ZACHARIASEN, W. H. (1963). Acta Cryst. 16, 1139.