\& Carroll (1960), and $102 \cdot 8^{\circ}$ for $\mathrm{Cl}_{8} \mathrm{P}_{4} \mathrm{~N}_{4}$ by Hazekamp, Migchelsen \& Vos(1962). The exocyclic N(8)-P(6)-N(9) angle of $103.7^{\circ}$ in this structure is comparable to the corresponding value of $103 \cdot 8^{\circ}$ in $\left(\mathrm{NMe}_{2}\right)_{8} \mathrm{P}_{4} \mathrm{~N}_{4}$.

## Intramolecular contacts

Although there are no intermolecular contacts shorter than expected, there are four short intramolecular contacts between some of the H atoms of the methyl groups and the N atoms of the ring. These are $\mathrm{H}(7) \cdots \mathrm{N}(5), 2 \cdot 46 ; \mathrm{H}(1) \cdots \mathrm{N}(3), 2 \cdot 55 ; \mathrm{H}(6) \cdots \mathrm{N}(5)$, 2.60 ; and $\mathrm{H}(17) \cdots \mathrm{N}(1), 2.62(\sigma=0.05-0.06) \AA$, as identified in Fig. 1. The corresponding van der Waals contact based on the radii given by Pauling (1960) is $2 \cdot 7 \AA$, and according to the statistics only the shortest of these contacts can be considered statistically different from the expected value. The $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{H} \cdots \mathrm{N}$ angles for these short contacts are $109,106,102$, and $106^{\circ}$ respectively.

## Residual electron density

The residual electron density distribution in the mean plane of the phosphazene ring, and in the planes of the ligands is shown in Fig. 4. The positions of the P atoms have negative residual electron densities around them with troughs as low as $-0 \cdot 15,-0 \cdot 20$, and -0.28 e. $\AA^{-3}$ at $\mathrm{P}(2), \mathrm{P}(4)$, and $\mathrm{P}(6)$, respectively. The positions of the N atoms of the ring have positive residual electron densities of about $0 \cdot 1-0 \cdot 2$ e. $\AA^{-3}$ around them. The estimated standard deviations of the electron density is 0.08 e.$\AA^{-3}$.

The authors are indebted to Professor R. A. Shaw for various discussions on the phosphonitriles, to him
and Dr R. Keat for supplying the crystals, and to Mrs M. E. Pippy for assistance with the computations. The computer programs employed in the analysis are those by Ahmed, Hall, Pippy \& Huber (1966) for the IBM/360 system.
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# Barium Aluminate Hydrates. IV. The Crystal Structure of $\alpha-\mathrm{Ba}_{2}\left[\mathrm{Al}_{4}(\mathbf{O H})_{16}\right]$ 
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(Received 13 April 1971)
The barium aluminate hydrate $\alpha-\mathrm{BaO} . \mathrm{Al}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3} .4 \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ has been shown by X-ray structural analysis to contain anions of formula $\left[\mathrm{Al}_{4}(\mathrm{OH})_{16}\right]^{4-}$ consisting of a cluster of four $\mathrm{Al}(\mathrm{OH})_{6}$ octahedra sharing edges. The anions are linked by the barium ions and by hydrogen bonding. The compound is thus a complex hydroxide whose formula should be written $\mathrm{Ba}_{2}\left[\mathrm{Al}_{4}(\mathrm{OH})_{16}\right]$.

## Introduction

The existence of a compound of empirical formula $\mathrm{BaO} . \mathrm{Al}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3} .4 \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ was first reported by Sainte-Claire-

[^0]Deville (1862). Subsequent preparations have been reported and its stability relationships have been investigated (Carlson \& Wells, 1948; Carlson, Chaconas \& Wells, 1950). Thilo \& Gessner (1965) also prepared it; they added the prefix $\alpha$ to distinguish it from a different polymorph $(\beta)$ which they prepared by dehydration of a higher hydrate.

The single crystals used in the present study were
prepared by Ahmed (1969) in the course of a systematic study of compounds in the system $\mathrm{BaO}-\mathrm{Al}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}-\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$. About 1 g of pure Al wire was allowed to react with about 12 g of $\mathrm{Ba}(\mathrm{OH})_{2} .8 \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}\left(\mathrm{BaO} / \mathrm{Al}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}=1 \cdot 8\right)$ in about 65 ml of water for 55 days at $30^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, and then maintained at $55^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for a further 25 days. Table 1 gives the unit cell and other crystal data determined by Ahmed, together with the data of Carlson \& Wells (1948). Full details of the preparation and properties of this compound will be published elsewhere (Ahmed \& Dent Glasser, 1972).

## Table 1. Crystal data

In this and subsequent Tables, figures in brackets represent the estimated standard deviation corresponding to the least significant digit(s).
Unit cell (Ahmed, 1969).

| $\begin{aligned} & a=5 \cdot 650(3) \\ & \alpha=99^{\circ} 4^{\prime}\left(2^{\prime}\right) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & b=6.821(2) \\ & \beta=92^{\circ} 31^{\prime}\left(2^{\prime}\right) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & c=8.943(3) \AA \\ & \gamma=106^{\circ} 1^{\prime}\left(1^{\prime}\right)^{\circ} \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| P $\overline{1} \quad Z=1$ | X-ray density | $3.338 \mathrm{g.cm}{ }^{-3}$ |
|  | Observed density | $3.32 \mathrm{~g} . \mathrm{cm}{ }^{3}$ |
| Refractive indices |  |  |
| Carlson \& Wells (1948) |  | Ahmed (1969) |
| $x$ | 1.625 | $1.620 \pm 0.003$ |
| $\beta$ | 1.628 | $1.625 \pm 0.003$ |
| $\gamma$ | $1 \cdot 65$ | $1 \cdot 650 \pm 0.003$ |

## Experimental

Using a Hilger and Watts Y 190 Automatic Linear Diffractometer with Mo $K \alpha$ radiation the intensities of 1185 reflexions throughout one half of reciprocal space were measured. Of these, 277 not significantly above background were assigned an arbitrary small value and will subsequently be referred to as 'unobserved'. Intensities were converted to structure amplitudes in the usual way; no corrections were made for absorption or extinction.

The data collected were not of a high order of accuracy; it is not easy to set triclinic crystals accurately on the instrument, and difficulties similar to those previously encountered with another triclinic barium aluminate (Ahmed \& Dent Glasser, 1970a) occurred. Errors were such that it subsequently became necessary to exclude data for which $\sin ^{2} \theta \geq 0 \cdot 16$; this will be considered in the discussion of the refinement.

An ICL 4/50 computer was used for all calculations, mainly using programs kindly supplied by Dr F. R. Ahmed and collaborators, of the National Research Council of Canada, and adapted for use on this machine by Mr J. S. Knowles of the Department of Computing, University of Aberdeen.

Scattering factors for $\mathrm{Ba}^{2+}$ and $\mathrm{Al}^{3+}$ were taken from International Tables for X-ray Crystallography (1962). A curve for $\mathrm{O}^{2-}$, constructed by extrapolation from values for $\mathrm{O}^{-}$and O taken from the same source, was also used. This provides some compensation for neglecting the hydrogen atoms.

## Structure determination

The barium atoms were readily located from the Patterson function, and a minimum function based on the $\mathrm{Ba}-\mathrm{Ba}$ vector gave plausible positions for all the other atoms. The structure revealed appeared to be centrosymmetric, and the space group was assumed to be $P \overline{1}$. No evidence appeared subsequently to suggest that this was incorrect.

The initial positions were refined by the method of least-squares (block-diagonal approximation) using the entire data and isotropic temperature factors. Unobserved reflexions and those for which $\Delta F / F_{o}>0 \cdot 3$ were omitted from the least-squares calculations. The weighting scheme set

$$
\mathfrak{u}=\left\{1+\left[\begin{array}{c}
\left|F_{o}\right|-P_{2} \\
P_{1}
\end{array}\right]^{2}\right\}^{-1},
$$

with the constants $P_{1}$ and $P_{2}$ adjusted by trial and error to give a reasonable distribution of $\sum w \cdot \Delta^{2} / n$. The initial scale factor was also found by trial and error. After 15 cycles the conventional $R$ value, using 711 of the 808 observed reflexions, was 0.09 and the temperature fac-


Fig. 1. The $\left[\mathrm{Al}_{4}(\mathrm{OH})_{16}\right]^{-4}$ anion. (a) General view of the four condensed $\mathrm{Al}(\mathrm{OH})_{6}$ octahedra, with $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ distances in $\AA$. (b) Al-O bond lengths in $\AA$.
tors of some of the oxygen atoms were persistently negative.
At this stage the data were citically re-examined, taking into consideration both the results of an error analysis and the original diffractometer output. In the light of this it was decided to rescale the different levels of data, to alter or delete a number of reflexions, and to restrict the portion of reciprocal space included to that with $\sin ^{2} \theta<0 \cdot 16$. A total of 825 reflexions then remained, of which 214 were 'unobserved'. Refinement was continued with these data; some temperature factors continued to run negative, and error analyses showed that agreement became distinctly worse as $\sin ^{2} \theta$ increased. No reason for this could be found. Introduction and refinement of anisotropic temperature factors for the barium atom finally produced convergence with $R=0.085$ calculated on 572 of the 611 observed reflexions. At this point none of the shifts was greater than one-third of the corresponding estimated standard deviation, and most were considerably less; all the temperature factors remained positive.

The final parameters are given in Table 2, and the observed and calculated structure factors in Table 3.

Table 2. Final atomic parameters
Positional parameters are multiplied by $10^{3}$

|  | $x / a$ | $y / b$ | $z / c$ | $B\left(\mathrm{~A}^{02}\right)$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ba | -1.3(4) | $301 \cdot 8$ (3) | $135 \cdot 0$ (2) | * |
| $\mathrm{Al}(1)$ | 320 (2) | 847 (1) | 225 (1) | $0 \cdot 8$ (1) |
| $\mathrm{Al}(2)$ | 313 (2) | 825 (1) | 557 (1) | $0 \cdot 8$ (1) |
| $\mathrm{O}(1)$ | -28(4) | 746 (3) | 558 (2) | 0.5 (3) |
| O(2) | -26 (4) | 736 (3) | 197 (2) | 0.7 (4) |
| O(3) | 362 (4) | 648 (3) | 62 (2) | 0.5 (3) |
| O(4) | 277 (4) | 43 (3) | 107 (2) | 0.6 (3) |
| $\mathrm{O}(5)$ | 333 (4) | 662 (3) | 363 (2) | $0 \cdot 1$ (3) |
| O(6) | 332 (4) | 25 (3) | 424 (2) | $0 \cdot 1$ (3) |
| O(7) | 353 (4) | 622 (3) | 677 (2) | 0.4 (3) |
| O(8) | 337 (4) | 23 (3) | 741 (2) | 0.5 (4) |

* Anisotropic temperature factors $\times 10^{4}$ for Ba computed for the expression

\[

\]

Table 3. Observed and calculated structure factors ( $\times 10$ )
Reflexions marked with asterisks were treated as unobserved. Those marked with daggers represent additional poor agreements which were omitted from the final refinements.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  <br>  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  <br>  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  <br>  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  <br>  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  <br>  <br>  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Description of the structure

The anion, already described briefly in a short communication (Dent Glasser \& Giovanoli, 1970), is shown in detail in Fig. 1, which also summarizes the interatomic distances found (see also Table 4). It is a cluster of four octahedra sharing edges. In agreement with the infrared evidence (Ahmed, 1969) all the water present appears as hydroxyl groups, and the formula of the complex hydroxy anion is $\left[\mathrm{Al}_{4}(\mathrm{OH})_{16}\right]^{4-}$. There is considerable distortion of the octahedra, presumably caused by Al-Al repulsion across the shared edges; this can be seen particularly clearly by studying the O-O distances in Fig. $1(a)$. These range from $2.41 \AA$ for the shortest shared edge up to $2.86 \AA$ for some of the unshared edges. The angles at Al are also affected (Table 4). The e.s.d.'s of the individual Al-O distances are rather large, but it is instructive to divide the Al-O bonds into groups, according to the number of aluminum atoms attached to the hydroxyl group concerned, and the 'bond order' assigned using Pauling's rules (see below). The results are summarized in Table 5; the trends shown are not unexpected.

Table 4. Coordination polyhedra in $\alpha-\mathrm{Ba}_{2}\left[\mathrm{Al}_{4}(\mathrm{OH})_{16}\right]$
(a) $\mathrm{Al}(\mathrm{OH})_{6}$ octahedra

Bond distances ( $\AA$ )

| $\mathrm{O}(n)$ | $\mathrm{Al}(1)-\mathrm{O}(n)$ | $\mathrm{O}(n)$ | $\mathrm{Al}(2)-\mathrm{O}(n)$ |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| $\mathrm{O}(2)$ | $1.88(3)$ | $\mathrm{O}(1)$ | $1.85(2)$ |
| $\mathrm{O}(3)$ | $1.90(3)$ | $\mathrm{O}(5)$ | $1.94(2)$ |
| $\mathrm{O}(4)$ | $1.88(2)$ | $\mathrm{O}(6)$ | $1.93(2)$ |
| $\mathrm{O}(5)$ | $1.91(2)$ | $\mathrm{O}\left(6^{\prime}\right)$ | $1.97(2)$ |
| $\mathrm{O}(6)$ | $1.98(2)$ | $\mathrm{O}(7)$ | $1.87(2)$ |
| $\mathrm{O}\left(8^{\prime}\right)$ | $1.89(2)$ | $\mathrm{O}(8)$ | $1.93(2)$ |

Bond angles ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ) (all e.s.d's are $1^{\circ}$ )

| $\mathrm{O}(2)-\mathrm{Al}(1)-\mathrm{O}(3)$ | 92 | $\mathrm{O}(1)-\mathrm{Al}(2)-\mathrm{O}(5)$ | 98 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathrm{O}(2)-\mathrm{Al}(1)-\mathrm{O}(4)$ | 86 | $\mathrm{O}(1)-\mathrm{Al}(2)-\mathrm{O}(6)$ | 97 |
| $\mathrm{O}(2)-\mathrm{Al}(1)-\mathrm{O}(5)$ | 89 | $\mathrm{O}(1)-\mathrm{Al}(2)-\mathrm{O}(7)$ | 94 |
| $\mathrm{O}(2)-\mathrm{Al}(1)-\mathrm{O}(6)$ | 97 | $\mathrm{O}(1)-\mathrm{Al}(2)-\mathrm{O}(8)$ | 89 |
| $\mathrm{O}(8)-\mathrm{Al}(1)-\mathrm{O}(3)$ | 92 | $\mathrm{O}\left(6^{\prime}\right)-\mathrm{Al}(2)-\mathrm{O}(5)$ | 92 |
| $\mathrm{O}(8)-\mathrm{Al}(1)-\mathrm{O}(4)$ | 91 | $\mathrm{O}\left(6^{\prime}\right)-\mathrm{Al}(2)-\mathrm{O}(6)$ | $76^{*}$ |
| $\mathrm{O}(8)-\mathrm{Al}(1)-\mathrm{O}(5)$ | 92 | $\mathrm{O}\left(6^{\prime}\right)-\mathrm{Al}(2)-\mathrm{O}(7)$ | 95 |
| $\mathrm{O}(8)-\mathrm{Al}(1)-\mathrm{O}(6)$ | $80^{*}$ | $\mathrm{O}\left(6^{\prime}\right)-\mathrm{Al}(2)-\mathrm{O}(8)$ | $79^{*}$ |
| $\mathrm{O}(3)-\mathrm{Al}(1)-\mathrm{O}(4)$ | 97 | $\mathrm{O}(5)-\mathrm{Al}(2)-\mathrm{O}(6)$ | $79^{*}$ |
| $\mathrm{O}(3)-\mathrm{Al}(1)-\mathrm{O}(5)$ | 90 | $\mathrm{O}(5)-\mathrm{Al}(2)-\mathrm{O}(7)$ | 93 |
| $\mathrm{O}(6)-\mathrm{Al}(1)-\mathrm{O}(4)$ | 96 | $\mathrm{O}(8)-\mathrm{Al}(2)-\mathrm{O}(6)$ | 94 |
| $\mathrm{O}(6)-\mathrm{Al}(1)-\mathrm{O}(5)$ | $78^{*}$ | $\mathrm{O}(8)-\mathrm{Al}(2)-\mathrm{O}(7)$ | 92 |

* indicates angles subtended by shared edges
(b) Ba-O polyhedron

Bond distances ( $\AA$ )

| $\mathrm{O}(n)$ | $\mathrm{Ba}-\mathrm{O}(n)$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| $\mathrm{O}\left(1^{\prime}\right)$ | $2 \cdot 82(2)$ |
| $\mathrm{O}(2)$ | $2.97(2)$ |
| $\mathrm{O}\left(2^{\prime}\right)$ | $2.95(2)$ |
| $\mathrm{O}(3)$ | $2 \cdot 86(2)$ |
| $\mathrm{O}\left(3^{\prime}\right)$ | $2.76(2)$ |
| $\mathrm{O}(4)$ | $2.66(2)$ |
| $\mathrm{O}\left(4^{\prime}\right)$ | $2.96(2)$ |
| $\mathrm{O}\left(7^{\prime}\right)$ | $2.82(2)$ |
| $\mathrm{O}\left(8^{\prime}\right)$ | $2.90(2)$ |
| $\mathrm{O}(5)$ | $3.05(2)$ |

Table 5. Correlation of Al-O bond lengths with the number of aluminum atoms attached to the hydroxyl groups concerned $\left(\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{AI}}\right)$ and bond order calculated as described in the text

|  | Bond lengths $(\AA)$ |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: |
|  | $\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{A} 1}$ | Bond order | Range | Mean |
| $\mathrm{Al}-\mathrm{O}(6)$ | 3 | $\frac{1}{3}$ | $1.93-1.98$ | 1.96 |
| $\mathrm{Al}-\mathrm{O}(5), \mathrm{O}(8)$ | 2 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $1.89-1.94$ | 1.92 |
| $\mathrm{Al}-\mathrm{O}(2), \mathrm{O}(3), \mathrm{O}(4)$ | 1 | $\frac{5}{3}$ | $1.88-1.90$ | 1.89 |
| $\mathrm{Al}-\mathrm{O}(1), \mathrm{O}(7)$ | 1 | $\frac{3}{3}$ | $1.85-1.87$ | 1.86 |

These anions are linked together through the barium atoms (Fig. 2) and through hydrogen bonding (Figs. 2 and 3). The coordination polyhedron of the barium is irregular; Table 4 gives ten $\mathrm{Ba}-\mathrm{O}$ contacts varying from $2 \cdot 66$ to $3 \cdot 05 \AA$; no other contacts below $3 \cdot 2 \AA$ were found. Of these, those to $O(5)$ and $O\left(8^{\prime}\right)$, which are among the longest contacts observed, probably do not represent bonds: these hydroxyl groups are already bonded to two Al atoms. It is notable that the only hydroxyl group which makes no contact with the barium atom is $\mathrm{O}(6)$ (closest approach $4 \cdot 11 \AA$ ). This hydroxyl group is, of course, already bonded to three Al atoms. On the other hand, this group forms the shortest hydrogen bond found in the structure [ $2 \cdot 62$ to $\left.\mathrm{O}\left(1^{\prime}\right)\right]$; the attachment of the oxygen atom to three aluminum atoms presumably increases the polarity of the OH bond, enabling a strong hydrogen bond to form. Oxygen-oxygen distances between the anions are indicated on Figs. 2 and 3.


Fig. 2. The structure projected along $\mathbf{b}$, showing barium atoms (open circles), $\left[\mathrm{Al}_{4}(\mathrm{OH})_{16}\right]^{4}$ anions, and selected $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ distances between anions: $y$ coordinates are given as $100 y$ y.

After $\mathrm{O}(6)$, the next shortest contact is that between $\mathrm{O}(8)$ and $\mathrm{O}\left(2^{\prime}\right)$; here $\mathrm{O}(8)$ is already bonded to two Al atoms, and this again would favour the formation of a strong hydrogen bond. All the other contacts, including rather surprisingly, those from $O(5)$ (also bonded to two Al atoms), are long $-2.95 \AA$ or longer - representing weak to extremely weak hydrogen bonds.
Pauling's electrostatic valency rule may be applied by counting each $\mathrm{Al}-\mathrm{O}(6)$ bond as $\frac{1}{3}$ and each $\mathrm{Al}-\mathrm{O}(5)$ and $\mathrm{Al}-\mathrm{O}(8)$ as $\frac{1}{2}$. Bonds from Al to $\mathrm{O}(2), \mathrm{O}(3)$ and $\mathrm{O}(4)$ then become $\frac{5}{9}$ and to $\mathrm{O}(1)$ and $\mathrm{O}(7), \frac{2}{3}$. The trends in bond lengths shown in Table 5 suggest that this is a reasonable assignment. It then follows that bonds from Ba to $\mathrm{O}(2), \mathrm{O}(3)$ and $\mathrm{O}(4)$ are $\frac{2}{9}$ and to $\mathrm{O}(1)$ and $O(7)$ are $\frac{1}{3}$; the contacts with $O(5)$ and $O(8)$ do not represent bonds. This all adds up satisfactorily, but does not take account of the hydrogen bonding. (While it is possible in principle to modify the scheme to do this, in practice it is very difficult to decide on the proper set of ground rules to adopt). This may, in part, account for the marked lack of correlation between bond distances and bond order for the $\mathrm{Ba}-\mathrm{O}$ contacts, but it is also likely that these distances, unlike the relatively short Al-O distances, are governed far more by the geometry of packing than by electrostatic considerations.

## Relationship to other barium aluminates

The structures of two other barium aluminates containing octahedral aluminate ions have already been described; $\mathrm{Ba}_{3}\left[\mathrm{Al}(\mathrm{OH})_{6}\right]_{2}$ (Ahmed \& Dent Glasser, 1969) is the barium analogue of hydrogarnet and contains isolated $\mathrm{Al}(\mathrm{OH})_{6}^{3-}$ octahedra and $\mathrm{Ba}\left[\mathrm{Al}_{2}(\mathrm{OH})_{10}\right]$


Fig. 3. The structure projected on (001), showing $\left[\mathrm{Al}_{4}(\mathrm{OH})_{16}\right]^{-4}$ anions and $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ distances between anions; $z$ coordinates are given as $100 \mathrm{z} / \mathrm{c}$. The dashed line at the upper left corner of the cell indicates $\mathbf{c}$.
(Louis \& Moras, 1969; Ahmed \& Dent Glasser, 1970a) contains pairs of octahedra sharing an edge. $\alpha-\mathrm{Ba}_{2}\left[\mathrm{Al}_{2}(\mathrm{OH})_{16}\right]$ apparently represents a further step in the condensation of octahedra.

Perhaps the most interesting point is that this type of condensation should occur at all when the requirements of stoichiometry could be satisfied by other arrangements which would produce less $\mathrm{Al}-\mathrm{Al}$ repulsion. The ratio observed in $\mathrm{Ba}_{2}\left[\mathrm{Al}_{2}(\mathrm{OH})_{10}\right]$ could equally well be produced from strings of octahedra sharing corners, and that in $\alpha-\mathrm{Ba}_{2}\left[\mathrm{Al}_{4}(\mathrm{OH})_{16}\right]$ from layers of octahedra sharing corners; these would give anions analogous to those found in $\mathrm{Tl}_{2} \mathrm{AlF}_{5}$ and $\mathrm{TlAlF}_{4}$ (Brosset, 1937). It could be argued that these do not occur because of the peculiar bonding requirements of the $\mathrm{OH}^{-}$group, which is not of course strictly analogous to the $\mathrm{F}^{-}$jon. However, yet another arrangement is possible for $\alpha-\mathrm{Ba}_{2}\left[\mathrm{Al}_{4}(\mathrm{OH})_{16}\right]$, namely infinite strings of octahedra sharing edges, similar to a half of one of the ribbons found in diaspore; it is very difficult to see any theoretical reason why this arrangement should not be favoured over that observed if the structure were dictated solely by the energy requirements of the solid state.

The three compounds being compared all crystallize from solution, $\mathrm{Ba}_{3}\left[\mathrm{Al}(\mathrm{OH})_{6}\right]_{2}$ from the most basic solutions and $\alpha-\mathrm{Ba}_{2}\left[\mathrm{Al}_{4}(\mathrm{OH})_{16}\right]$ from the least basic ones. It is possible that the structures of the crystals reflect the anions present in the solutions, suggesting that with decreasing $p \mathrm{H}$ condensation occurs:

$$
\left[\mathrm{Al}(\mathrm{OH})_{6}\right]^{3-} \rightarrow\left[\mathrm{Al}_{2}(\mathrm{OH})_{10}\right]^{4-} \rightarrow\left[\mathrm{Al}_{4}(\mathrm{OH})_{16}\right)^{4-} .
$$

This would satisfactorily explain the non-occurrence of infinite strings or sheets of ions, because these would not be stable in solution.
It is known that polynuclear clusters of octahedra form in aluminum solutions as neutrality is approached from the acid side. Studies on alkaline solutions have been largely concentrated on sodium aluminate solutions, and the results tend to favour a tetrahedral $\mathrm{Al}(\mathrm{OH})_{4}^{-}$ion. Even if this is correct for sodium aluminate solutions, it is not necessarily inconsistent with the above suggestions for barium aluminate solutions. In the solid state, higher coordination of the central atom of a complex anion is favoured by increase in the electronegativity of the associated cation; there seems no good reason to suppose that a similar effect could not also operate in solution, particularly in such concentrated ones as those considered here. That is, in sodium aluminate solutions the aluminum might occur predominantly in tetrahedral coordination while in barium aluminate solutions octahedral coordination was favoured. Barium aluminate hydrates are known in which the aluminum is in tetrahedral coordination (Ahmed \& Dent Glasser, 1970b; Giovanoli \& Dent Glasser, 1971) but these are the results of hydrothermal preparations. A more comprehensive review of the factors governing the structures of aluminates has been given elsewhere (Dent Glasser, 1971).

We are grateful to the Royal Society for providing a grant for one of us (RG).
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#### Abstract

A four-layer orthorhombic polytype of $\mathrm{K}_{3} \mathrm{Co}(\mathrm{CN})_{6}$ has been identified and the crystal structure determined by three-dimensional X-ray methods using 854 intensities obtained by counter methods with Mo $K \alpha$ radiation at room temperature. The crystal is orthorhombic with space group Pnc2 and cell constants of $a=26.69, b=10.353$ and $c=8.34 \AA$. There are eight formula units per unit cell. The interdependence of parameters associated with the Co and $K$ atoms occupying similar positions in the various layers gave rise to such large correlation coefficients that it was impossible to refine the parameters of all the atoms in the asymmetric unit simultaneously. Two groups of non-interfering parameters were therefore refined separately by full-matrix least squares to a conventional $R$ of 0.09 . Bond lengths and bond angles of the different octahedra are given and a possible distortion is discussed in terms thereof.


## Introduction

A crystal of Cr -doped $\mathrm{K}_{3} \mathrm{Co}(\mathrm{CN})_{6}$ has been used in a number of nuclear magnetic resonance (n.m.r.) experiments in which, among other things, the second moment (Lourens \& Reynhardt, 1971a) and the quadrupole interaction (Lourens \& Reynhardt, 1971b) of the ${ }^{59} \mathrm{Co}$ nuclei were measured. With a view to the interpretation of these results in terms of the atomic environments of the ${ }^{59} \mathrm{Co}$ nuclei, the determination of this structure was undertaken, since a review of the available crystallographic literature on $\mathrm{K}_{3} \mathrm{Co}(\mathrm{CN})_{6}$ shows complete confusion.

This confusion was partially resolved by Kohn \& Townes (1961) who first demonstrated the existence of the $1 M, 20 r, 3 M$ and $7 M$ polytypes. The $40 r$ polytype should now be added to these. The early investigators obviously dealt with several of these and at-
tempted to assign a single space group to explain all their observations.

In this way Barkhatov \& Zhdanov (1942) gave cell dimensions very similar to those for the $40 r$ polytype, but by analogy with the results of Gottfried \& Nagelschmidt (1930) for $\mathrm{K}_{3} \mathrm{Fe}(\mathrm{CN})_{6}$ they assigned the space group $P 2_{1} / c$ and called it pseudo-orthorhombic. Our impression is that these workers actually encountered the $40 r$ type and not only the $1 M$ type as suggested by Kohn \& Townes (1961). Okaya \& Pepinsky (1956), who first described the $20 r$ polytype correctly, also attempted to explain the earlier results (obtained for other polytypes) in terms of their observations.

Barkhatov (1942) proposed the first structure based on the unit cell of the $1 M$ polytype. In their neutrondiffraction study Curry \& Runciman (1959) accepted the special positions of the cobalt and potassium atoms suggested by Barkhatov (1942) and determined the struc-
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