# REFINEMENT OF THE STRUCTURE OF Co<sub>9</sub>S<sub>8</sub>

V. RAJAMANI<sup>\*</sup> AND C. T. PREWITT

Department of Earth and Space Sciences, State University of New York, Stony Brook, New York 11794

### Abstract

Because of uncertainty in Geller's refinement (Geller 1962), the structure of a single crystal of synthetic  $Co_9S_8$  (of composition  $Co_{8.85}S_8$  and a =9.923(1) Å, Sp. Gr. Fm3m), grown by the vapor transport technique using iodine as the transporting agent, was refined using three-dimensional xray intensity data to an R factor of 0.029. The observed octahedral cobalt-sulphur distance, 2.359 (2)Å, is slightly larger than the corresponding distances in cobalt monosulphide (2.34Å) and in cobalt disulphide (2.32Å) and is significantly larger than the octahedral cobalt-sulphur distance, 2.22Å, in Co<sub>3</sub>S<sub>4</sub>. Previously reported physical properties, aspects of bonding and the observed bond distances suggest that the octahedral cobalt in Co<sub>9</sub>S<sub>8</sub> could be in the low-spin state although the apparent valency of cobalt in the structure is less than two (u'=1.78).

#### INTRODUCTION

Recent crystal chemical studies on pentlandites using single-crystal x-ray diffraction techniques showed that the structures of natural pentlandites including Fe-Ni pentlandite, cobalt pentlandite and argentian pentlandite are essentially similar to that of synthetic Co<sub>2</sub>S<sub>8</sub> (Rajamani & Prewitt 1973; Hall & Stewart 1973). The structure of Co<sub>9</sub>S<sub>8</sub> was refined previously by Geller (1962) using visually estimated two-dimensional x-ray intensity data. In this study, the positional parameter of the sulphur atom in equipoint (24e) (which is coordinated to octahedral metal atom in addition to tetrahedral metal atoms) could not be refined satisfactorily. The observed octahedral Co-S distance, 2.39Å, using the unrefined positional parameter of the sulphur atom is significantly larger than the corresponding distances in other cobalt sulphides (2.34Å in Co<sub>1-x</sub>S, Kuznetsov 1965; 2.32Å in CoS<sub>2</sub>, Elliot 1960; 2.22Å in Co<sub>3</sub>S<sub>4</sub>, Knop et al. 1968) where octahedral cobalt is believed to be in the lowspin state. A knowledge of the nature of cobalt (i.e., its valency and spin state) is very desirable in understanding the solid solution behavior of iron, cobalt and nickel in the pentlandite structure. Vaughan & Burns (1971) predicted that octahedral cobalt in  $Co_9S_8$  could probably be in the trivalent low spin state. Nevertheless, the reported <sup>v1</sup>Co-S distance in  $Co_9S_8$  is too large even for a divalent low spin cobalt. Because of this discrepancy which may well be due to uncertainty in Geller's refinement and to provide more information on the structure and bonding of pentlandite, the structure of  $Co_9S_8$  was refined using a single-crystal grown by vapor transport techniques and is reported here.

## EXPERIMENTAL

Single crystals of Co<sub>8</sub>S<sub>8</sub> were synthesized by a chemical transport technique using iodine vapor as the transporting agent. The details of the technique including synthesis of other sulphides will be described elsewhere. To check the stoichiometry of the crystals, two large crystals were analyzed using an ARL-electron probe microanalyzer. Homogeneous, stoichiometric FeS<sub>2</sub> and CoS<sub>2</sub> crystals, grown by similar techniques (Bouchard 1968) were used as standards for sulphur and cobalt, respectively. The crystals of Co<sub>9</sub>S<sub>8</sub> analyzed are also very homogeneous. One crystal of dimensions  $0.19 \times 0.15 \times 0.13$  mm with well-defined crystal faces was mounted on the [110] axis and precession photographs were taken to check the space group. The cell parameter was determined from  $2\theta$  values measured on the Picker four-circle diffractometer. Integrated intensities of 420 reflections were collected on the diffractometer. The details of data collection and reduction including absorption correction and refinement were similar to those described earlier (Rajamani & Prewitt 1973). Crystal data including cell parameter, composition and starting positional parameters (after Geller 1962) are listed in Table 1.

During the refinement it was observed that the intensities of strong reflections such as 440, 800, and 12.4.0 are greatly affected by secondary extinction. Therefore, an attempt was made to collect another set of intensity data after subjecting the crystal to thermal shock by dipping

<sup>\*</sup>Present address: Department of Geology, Usiversity of Toronto, Toronto.

Table 1. Crystal data for synthetic Co<sub>o</sub>S<sub>8</sub>.

Microprobe anal., A	t. %:	Co = 52.5(2), S = 47.5(2)				
Chemical composition Space group: Cell parameter <u>a</u> :	1:	Co <sub>8.85</sub> S <sub>8</sub> Fm3m 9.923(1)Å				
Starting positional Parameters as given by Geller (1962)	4b(M(O)): 32f(M(T)): 8c(S1): 24e(S2):	1/2, 1/2, 1/2 0.126, 0.126, 0.126 1/4, 1/4, 1/4 0.259, 0, 0				

it repeatedly in liquid nitrogen. However, the results were not significantly changed by the above procedure.

Since the composition of the crystals is  $Co_{8,85}S_8$  instead of  $Co_8S_8$ , the occupancy of Co in the tetrahedral sites was refined assuming cation vacancies. This did not improve the results of the refinement. The observed (after absorption correction and averaging) and calculated structure factors are listed in Table 2. The refined positional parameters and temperature factors including R factor, and interatomic distances and angles are listed in Tables 3 and 4, respectively.

## **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

The cell parameter of synthetic  $Co_9S_8$  was shown to be sensitive to the stoichiometry of the phase, being smaller when the phase is saturated with sulphur and larger when it is saturated

TABLE 2. OBSERVED AND CALCULATED STRUCTURE FACTORS FOR CogS

												_								
h	k	1	Fo	Fc	h	k	1	Fo	r <sub>c</sub>	h	k	1	Fo	Fc	h	k	1	Fo	Fa	
2	٥	0	87	89	5	1	1	293	317	12	2	2	19	20	11	7	3	131	131	
4	0	0	224	241	7	1	1	136	141	4	4	2	57	56	9	g	3	154	156	
6	0	Ģ	96	102	9	1	1	33	34	6	4	2	64	63	4	4	4	204	189	
8	0	0	670	727	11	1	1	129	130	8	4	2	44	45	6	4	4	78	75	
10	0	0	30	31	13	1	1	151	155	10	4	2	48	49	8	4	4	603	602	
12	0	0	95	97	3	3	1	203	190	12	4	2	16	15	10	4	4	23	23	
2	2	0	107	96	5	3	1	108	106	6	6	2	164	161	12	4	4	88	87	
4	2	0	90	88	7	3	1	193	191	8	6	2	40	39	6	6	4	54	53	
6	2	0	70	72	9	3	1	200	199	10	6	2	120	121	8	6	4	22	22	
8	2	0	38	39	11	3	1	122	123	12	6	2	21	21	10	6	4	50	50	
10	2	0	56	58	13	3	1	21	20	8	8	2	21	20	8	8	4	98	97	
12	2	0	25	26	5	5	1	45	45	10	8	2	37	37	10	8	4	53	53	
4	4	0	882	928	7	5	1	198	194	3	3	3	267	251	5	5	5	256	247	
6	4	0	42	42	9	5	۱	206	207	5	3	3	252	245	7	5	5	65	66	
8	4	0	143	142	11	5	1	79	81	7	3	3	177	174	9	5	5	12	10	
10	4	0	76	77	7	7	1	147	144	9	3	3	67	67	11	5	5	123	122	
12	4	0	474	447	9	7	1	56	56	11	3	3	101	101	7	7	5	133	128	
6	6	0	66	66	11	7	1	88	88	13	3	3	127	127	9	7	5	149	147	
8	6	0	58	58	9	9	۱	10	9	5	5	3	251	244	6	6	6	141	139	
10	6	0	49	49	2	2	2	307	286	7	5	3	117	114	8	6	6	41	40	
12	6	0	11	11	4	2	2	77	75	9	5	3	25	26	10	6	б	104	105	
8	8	0	498	514	6	2	2	192	192	11	5	3	110	111	8	8	6	37	37	
10	8	0	20	18	8	2	2	43	45	7	7	3	122	119	7	7	7	154	150	
1	1	1	178	153	10	2	2	141	140	9	7	3	138	136	9	7	7	73	73	
3	1	1	333	337																

with cobalt (Knop & Ibrahim 1961). The observed cell parameter, 9.923(1)Å, is smaller than the previously reported value, 9.929Å, for the stoichiometric  $Co_9S_8$ . This suggests that the crystals of Co<sub>9</sub>S<sub>8</sub> grown by vapor transport technique are slightly cation deficient. This is not entirely unexpected because the crystals were grown from a vapor phase which was always saturated with sulphur, as indicated by the presence of sulphur at the end of each run. Microprobe analysis of the crystals also revealed that the crystals are cobalt deficient Cos.85Ss in agreement with the prediction based on the lattice parameter. The above observation tends to support the idea that the nonstoichiometry in pentlandite is due to metal addition and omission solid solution (Donnay & Shewman 1971; Rajamani & Prewitt 1973).

Table 3. Final atomic parameters in CooSg.

4b B 0.45(4) 8c B 0.51(4) x 0.12623(3) x 0.2623(1) 32f $\beta_{11} 0.0017(7)$ 24e $\beta_{11} 0.00074(2$ $\beta_{12} 0.00006(2)$ $\beta_{22} 0.00117(9$ B 0.46(3) B 0.42(4) $R = [\Sigmawi( F_0  -  F_c )^2/\Sigmawr_0^2]^{1/2} = 0.029.$ Secondary extinction correction factor $c = 1.79 \times 100$ The numbers in parentheses represent calculated standard errors (10) and refer to the last decimal place. *** $\beta_{11} = \beta_{22} = \beta_{3} s \beta_{12} = \beta_{13} = \beta_{23}.$ *** $\beta_{22} = \beta_{3} s \beta_{12} = \beta_{13} = \beta_{23} = 0.$					•	/ 0
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	4b	В	0.45(4)	8c	В.,	0.51(4)
32f ** $\beta_{11}$ 0.00117(7) 24e $\beta_{11}$ 0.00074(2 $\beta_{12}$ 0.00006(2) $\beta_{22}$ 0.00117(9 B 0.46(3) B 0.42(4) R = $[\Sigma_w][F_o] - [F_o]]^2 / \Sigma_w T_o^2 J^{1/2} = 0.029$ . Secondary extinction correction factor $c = 1.79 \times 10$ *The numbers in parentheses represent calculated standard errors (10) and refer to the last decimal place. *** $\beta_{11} = \beta_{22} = \beta_{3} \approx \beta_{12} = \beta_{13} = \beta_{23}$ .		x	0.12623(3)		x	0.2623(1)
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	32f	** β <sub>11</sub>	0.00117(7)	24e	β <sub>11</sub>	0.00074(2)
$\begin{array}{c} B & 0.46(3) \\ \hline B & 0.42(4) \\ \hline R = [\Sigma_W^2] F_0   -  F_c  )^2 / \Sigma_W^2 \sigma^2 J^{1/2} = 0.029. \\ \hline Secondary extinction correction factor c = 1.79 \times 10 \\ \hline^{*} The numbers in parentheses represent calculated standard errors (10) and refer to the last decimal place. \\ \hline^{**} \beta_{11} = \beta_{22} = \beta_3 \ s & \beta_{12} = \beta_{13} = \beta_{23}. \\ \hline^{***} \beta_{22} = \beta_3 \ s & \beta_{12} = \beta_{13} = \beta_{23} = 0. \end{array}$		B12	0.00006(2)		*** β <sub>22</sub>	0.00117(9)
$\begin{split} R &= \left[\Sigma_W \tilde{\zeta}\right] F_0 \left[ - \left F_C\right \right]^2 / \Sigma_W \tilde{\zeta}_0^2 I^{1/2} = 0.029. \\ & \text{Secondary extinction correction factor } c = 1.79 \times 10 \\ & \text{The numbers in parentheses represent calculated} \\ & \text{standard errors } (1^2) \text{ and refer to the last decimal} \\ & \text{place.} \\ & \text{##} \\ & \beta_{11} = \beta_{22} = \beta_3 \text{ si}  \beta_{12} = \beta_{13} = \beta_{23}. \\ & \text{##} \\ & \beta_{22} = \beta_3 \text{ si}  \beta_{12} = \beta_{13} = \beta_{23} = 0. \end{split}$		B	0.46(3)		В	0.42(4)
<pre>standard errors (l<sup>2</sup>) and refer to the last decimal     place. **     f11 = \$22 = \$33; \$12 = \$13 = \$23. ****     \$22 = \$33; \$12 = \$13 = \$23 = 0.</pre>		R = [Σ Secondi *The nut	$ F_o  -  F_c )^2$ ary extinction combors in parenth	$\left[\sum_{v} \frac{2}{v}\right]^{1/2} =$ correction factors for the set of the	0.029. ctor c = nt calcu	= 1.79 x 10 <sup>-5</sup> zlated
$ \begin{array}{c} ***\\ ***\\ ***\\ **\\ **\\ *\\ *\\ *\\ *\\ *\\ *$		standa; place.	rd errors (lĉ) a	nd refer to	the last	: decimal
$\beta_{22} = \beta_{33} \beta_{12} = \beta_{13} = \beta_{23} = 0.$		β11 = 1	<sup>β</sup> 22 <sup>= β</sup> 33 <sup>i</sup> <sup>β</sup> 12	<sup> β</sup> 13 <sup></sup> β23	•	
	*	<sup>**</sup> β <sub>22</sub> <sup>-</sup> Ι	β <b>3 3</b> β12 <sup>=</sup> β13	= β <sub>23</sub> = Ο.		

Our refinement results confirm that the structure of Co<sub>9</sub>S<sub>8</sub> as proposed by Lindqvist, Lundqvist & Westgren (1936) is essentially correct. The details of the structure had been adequately described in earlier studies, referred to earlier. Only the positional parameter of the S2 sulphur atom in (24e) has changed significantly from 0.259 to 0.2623. The change is particularly important because of its influence on the interatomic distances. The octahedral Co-S distance, 2.359Å, though smaller than the value 2.392Å reported by Geller, is still slightly larger than the corresponding distances, 2.32Å and 2.34Å in CoS<sub>2</sub> and Co<sub>1-x</sub>S, respectively. Similarly, the mean <sup>1V</sup>Co-S distance, 2.202Å, is also larger than the <sup>1v</sup>Co-S distance, 2.184Å, in the thiospinel  $Co_3S_4$  which is a normal spinel (Knop et al. 1968). It should be noted here that the observed vICo-S distance in Co<sub>9</sub>S<sub>8</sub> is even larger for a divalent low spin cobalt; therefore, the octahedral cobalt could not be in the trivalent low-spin state. The isotropic temperature factors are slightly

smaller than those that were observed in natural pentlandites. This could be due to the presence of only one kind of atom in the present case and also because of the greater covalency of the Co-S bond as compared to Fe-S and Ni-S bonds in sulphides (Rajamani & Prewitt 1972).

Aspects of bonding in Co<sub>9</sub>S<sub>8</sub> appear to be similar to that in the thiospinel Co<sub>3</sub>S<sub>4</sub> because both these phases were observed to be metallic and Pauli paramagnetic (Vaughan 1971; Vaughan et al. 1971). Also, both these structures are based on the cubic close packing (f.c.c.) of sulphur atoms and the metal atoms are located in the octahedral and tetrahedral interstices. However, in the case of Co<sub>3</sub>S<sub>4</sub>, <sup>1</sup>/<sub>8</sub> of the available tetrahedral sites and  $\frac{1}{2}$  of the octahedral sites are occupied by metal atoms; whereas in  $Co_8S_8$  metal atoms occupy  $\frac{1}{8}$  of the available octahedral and <sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub> of the tetrahedral sites. This structural similarity suggests that in  $Co_9S_8$  three metal-metal interactions are possible which include: (1) M(T)-M(T) direct interaction as indicated by the M(T)-M(T) distance, 2.50Å. This distance is well below the critical separation  $R_c$ which is 3.27Å for cobalt in sulphides (Goodenough 1967). This direct interaction (or bonding) leads to the formation of the metallic cube cluster of tetrahedral metal atoms, (2) M(T)-S1-M(T) interaction which involves 109.47° cationanion-cation coupling and links the metallic cube cluster in the [110] direction. This interaction could also be strong because the M(T)-S1 distance, 2.127Å, indicates that the bonding between <sup>IV</sup>Co-<sup>IV</sup>S is highly covalent and the strength of cation-cation interactions are directly related to the degree of covalent bonding (Goodenough 1969). (3) M(T)-S2-M(O) interaction which is between the tetrahedral and octahedral cobalt through the S2 sulphur atom. These three metalmetal interactions would lead to the formation of d bands of the antibonding d orbitals and the antibonding d electrons would be completely

Table 4. Interatomic distances and angles in Co.S.

DISTANCE (R)	ATOM	ANGLE (DEG.)
2.359(2)	S2 - M(0) - S2	90
2.127(1)	SI - M(T) - S2	107.42(6)
2.227(1)	S2 - M(T) - S2	111.44(5)
2.202		
	M(T) - M(T) - M(T)	90
2.505(1)		
3.543(1)	M(T) = S1 = M(T)	109.47
3.474(1)		
	M(T) = S2 = M(T)	68,44(6)
3.336(3)	M(T) = S2 = M(0)	127.32(6)
	DISTANCE (Å) 2.359(2) 2.127(1) 2.227(1) 2.202 2.505(1) 3.543(1) 3.474(1) 3.346(2)	DISTANCE $(\hat{R})$ ATOM 2.359(2) S2 - M(0) - S2 2.127(1) S1 - M(T) - S2 2.227(1) S2 - M(T) - S2 2.202 M(T) - M(T) - N(T) 2.505(1) 3.543(1) M(T) - S1 - M(T) 3.474(1) M(T) - S2 - M(T) 3.35(3) M(T) - S2 - M(T)

errors (1c) and refer to the last decimal place.

The numbers in brackets refer to the multiplicity of the bond.



FIG. 1. Schematic energy level diagram for the 3d orbitals in  $\text{Co}_{s}S_{s}$ .

delocalized in these bands. This is illustrated in the schematic energy level diagram shown in Fig. 1. All these three *d* bands,  $\sigma^{*}_{M(C)}$  and  $2\sigma^{*}_{M(T)}$  (with respect to direct metal-metal bonding in the cube cluster) may coalesce to form a single, broad, partially filled band giving rise to the metallic conductivity and Pauli paramagnetism. The absence of Jahn-Teller distortion for the octahedral low spin Co(II)  $(f_{2g}^{6}e_{g}^{1})$  could be due to the delocalization of the unpaired  $e_{g}$ electron in the broad *d* band.

Although the observed <sup>v</sup>Co-S is slightly larger than the corresponding distances in  $CoS_2$  and  $Co_{1-x}S$  where  $v_ICo(II)$  is believed to be in the low spin state, it is not surprising when we consider the stoichiometry of  $Co_9S_8$ . Assuming S is divalent  $(S^{2-})$ , it can be argued that Co in  $Co_9S_8$  could not be entirely divalent. It must be emphasized here that in compounds such as  $Co_9S_8$  possessing metallic properties, assignment of formal valencies is not a valid procedure (Goodenough 1969, p. 272). The apparent valency of cobalt,  $\mu$ ', can be calculated using the expression  $m\mu' = x\chi'$  for a compound of the type  $M_m^{\mu} X_x^{\chi_1}$  (Hulliger 1968) and is found to be 1.78. The observed larger vICo-S distance (2.359Å as against 2.34Å in  $Co_{1-x}S$ ) and  $^{IV}Co-S$  distance (2.202Å as against 2.184Å in  $Co_3S_4$ ) in  $Co_9S_8$  could be due to the reduced valency of cobalt in the pentlandite structure. The presence of metallic properties in Co<sub>8</sub>S<sub>8</sub> indicates that "cation" s and p electrons are also involved in the metal-metal interaction, in addition to d electrons. This is because "a cation concentration yielding more s and p electrons than are needed to saturate the anion valencies must produce

metallic properties" (Hulliger 1968, p. 68), thereby supporting the reduced valency of cobalt in the pentlandite structure.

#### References

- BOUCHARD, R. J. (1968): The preparation of single crystals of  $\text{FeS}_2$ ,  $\text{CoS}_2$  and  $\text{NiS}_2$  pyrites by chlorine transport. *Jour. Crystal Growth*, 2, 40-44.
- DONNAY, G. & SHEWMAN, R. W. (1971): The structural formula of pentlandite. Abstracts for GAC-MAC Sudbury Conference, Laurentian Univ., Sudbury, Ontario, 23-24. Can. Mineral. 11, 572 (1972).
- GELLER, S. (1962): Refinement of the crystal structure of Co<sub>9</sub>S<sub>8</sub>. Acta Cryst. 15, 1195-1198.
- GOODENOUGH, J. B. (1967): Description of transition-metal compounds: Application to several sulfides. Proprieties thermodynamiques physiques et structurales des dérivés semi-métalliques. Colloques Internationaux du Centre Nationale de la Recherche Scientifique. 157, 263-292.
- (1969): Descriptions of outer d electrons in thiospinels. J. Phys. Chem. Solids, 30, 261-280.
- HALL, S. R., & STEWART, J. M. (1973): The crystal structure of argentian pentlandite (Fe,Ni)<sub>8</sub>AgS<sub>8</sub> compared with the refined structure of pentlandite (Fe,Ni)<sub>9</sub>S<sub>8</sub>. Can. Mineral. 12, 169-177.
- HULLIGER, F. (1968): Crystal chemistry of chalco-

genides and pnictides of the transition elements. Structure and bonding. 4, 83-229.

- KNOP, O., & IBRAHIM, M. A. (1961): Chalcogenides of the transition elements. II. Existence of the  $\pi$ phase in the M<sub>9</sub>S<sub>8</sub> section of the system Fe-Co-Ni-S. *Can. J. Chem.* 39, 297-317.
- , REID, K. I. G., SUTARNO, & NAKAGAWA, Y. (1968): Chalcogenides of the transition elements. VI X-ray, neutron and magnetic investigation of the spinels Co<sub>3</sub>O<sub>4</sub>, NiCo<sub>2</sub>O<sub>4</sub>, Co<sub>3</sub>S<sub>4</sub> and NiCo<sub>2</sub>S<sub>4</sub>. Can. J. Chem. 46, 3463-3476.
- LINDQVIST, M., LUNDQVIST, D. & WESTGREN, A. (1936): The crystal structure of Co<sub>9</sub>S<sub>8</sub> and of pentlandite (Ni,Fe)<sub>9</sub>S<sub>8</sub>. Kemist Tidskrift. 48, 156-160.
- RAJAMANI, V. & PREWITT, C. T. (1972): Geochemistry of Co in sulfides. EOS, Trans. A.G.U. 53, 4, 550.
- , & \_\_\_\_\_ (1973): Crystal chemistry of natural pentlandites. Can. Mineral. 12, 178-187.
- VAUGHAN, D. J. (1971): Aspects of structure and bonding in the iron sulphides and related minerals. Univ. Oxford Ph.D. thesis.
- & BURNS, R. G. (1971): Mineral chemistry and bonding of pentlandite and mackinawite. G. S. A. Ann. Mtg., Washington 3, 737 (Abstracts).
- , BURNS, R. G., & BURNS, V. M. (1971): Geochemistry and bonding of thiospinel minerals. *Geochim. Cosmochim Acta* 35, 365-381.

...

Manuscript received August 1974.