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Abstract

Multiple regression analysis has been used to determine the relationships among the formal charges and Shannon-Prewitt radii of the non-tetrahedral M1 and M2 cations in thirteen C2/c (or C2) pyroxenes and their lattice parameters, their mean M-O and Si-O bond lengths, and their O3-O3-O3 chain angles. Crystal-structure data from three groups of silicate pyroxenes (both natural and synthetic) were used in the regression analyses: Li pyroxenes with trivalent Al, Fe, and Sc in the M1 sites, Na pyroxenes with trivalent Al, Cr, Fe, Sc, and In in the M1 sites, and Ca pyroxenes with divalent Ni, Mg, Co, Fe, and Mn in the M1 sites.

Using only first-order linear regression equations in terms of the radii of the M1 and M2 cations (\(r_{M1}\) and \(r_{M2}\)) and the charge \(q\) on the M2 cation, it was found statistically that more than 98.5 percent of the variation in the \(a\) cell dimension can be attributed to the variation in \(r_{M1}\) alone, and 97.5 percent in \(b\) can be attributed to variations in both \(r_{M1}\) and \(r_{M2}\). The parameters \(c\) sin \(\beta\) and unit-cell volume require a third term, \(q\), to produce the most highly significant regression equations: \(c\) sin \(\beta\) has a standard error of estimate (SEE) of 0.011 Å and volume 2.2 Å³. The mean M1-O distance is linearly related only to \(r_{M1}\) (SEE = 0.007 Å) and the mean M2-O distance to both \(r_{M2}\) and \(r_{M1}\) (SEE = 0.013 Å) or, more significantly, to \(r_{M1}\), \(r_{M2}\), and \(q\) (SEE = 0.009 Å). Both the mean Si-O bridge bond lengths (range: 1.624–1.688 Å) and the grand mean Si-O distances (range: 1.618 to 1.644 Å) may be estimated to better than 0.004 Å, and the tetrahedral chain angle O3-O3-O3 (range: from 163.8° in the O-rotated chain of johannsenite to 189.5° in the S-rotated chain of spodumene) to better than 2.6°, using a regression equation in three terms.

Because it has been shown that the effective radius of the M2 cation (or the \(\langle M2-O\rangle\) distance) is not independent of the size of the M1 cation, it is possible to rationalize the distinctly non-linear curves of volume vs. \((r_{M1})^3\) for the isostructural series NaAl-NaCr-NaFe-NaTi-NaSc-NaIn, and LiAl-LiFe-LiSc, as well as the series CaNi-CaMg-CaCo-CaFe-CaMn, which has an opposite curvature from the pyroxenes with monovalent M2 cations.

Introduction

Crystal-chemical studies of the pyroxenes are numerous, but we, in the course of a classroom exercise, have produced yet another which pertains to the ordered clinopyroxenes of C2/c (or C2) symmetry, specifically those with Ca, Na, or Li in the M2 site and Si in the tetrahedral site(s). At present count thirteen such structures have been refined, some of them more than once. Where there was a choice, we selected data from the more recent study (see Table I). The preliminary account of our work (Ribbe and Prunier, 1976) has been subjected to considerable revision.

Relationships between cell dimensions and chemical composition have been extensively investigated for naturally occurring orthopyroxenes (Smith et al., 1969) and synthetic orthopyroxenes (Turnock et al., 1973). Turnock et al. have also calculated trend surface equations for the clinopyroxenes in the diopside–hedenbergite–ferrosilite–enstatite (CaMg–CaFe–FeFe–MgMg) quadrilateral based on 62 synthetic one-phase samples, many of which must be considered metastable because of their crystallization within the two-phase region or in the stability field of orthopyroxenes. Third-order trend surfaces gave the best fit for \(a\), \(b\), \(c\), and \(\beta\), while a fourth-order equation was required for volume. The authors (p. 57) “emphasize that the data are not directly appli-
cable to natural pyroxenes, since other elements in the latter may affect unit-cell parameters. They do not attempt to relate lattice parameters to site occupancy. Their paper is an excellent review of earlier work on pyroxenes in the quadrilateral (e.g., Rutstein and Yund, 1969). Nolan (1969) determined unit-cell dimensions and refractive indices for synthetic clinopyroxenes in the system diopside-hedenbergite.

The early classic work on the crystal-chemical characterization of clinopyroxenes is that of Clark et al. (1969), who discussed the structures of eight of the "end-member" ordered pyroxenes (LiAl, LiFe, NaAl, NaCr, NaFe, NaIn, CaMg, and CaMn) that presently concern us. Since then the crystal structures of five other pyroxenes have been published: CaFe (Cameron et al., 1973), CaNi and CaCo (Schlenker et al., 1977; Ghose and Wan, 1975), and NaSc and LiSc (Hawthorne and Grundy, 1973 and 1977 respectively). New refinements of NaAl (Cameron et al., 1973) and NaIn (Hawthorne and Grundy, 1974) pyroxenes complete our data set. A plethora of structural studies of pyroxenes at high temperatures has recently appeared; among them are those involving ordered C2/c end-members (Cameron et al., 1973; Ohashi and Burnham, 1974; Finger and Ohashi, 1976) and others which invert to C2/c symmetry at elevated temperatures (e.g., Brown et al., 1972; Smyth and Burnham, 1972; Smyth, 1974). Our investigation, however, is restricted to the structures of ordered phases at room temperature whose symmetry is C2/c or C2.

The C2 structures are the LiM$_2$+ pyroxenes which differ from the C2/c NaM$_2$+ and CaM$_2$+ structures in two respects: (1) the Li ion (radius $r = 0.74$ Å) is six-coordinated, whereas Na ($r = 1.16$ Å) and Ca ($r = 1.12$ Å) are considered to be eight-coordinated, and (2) the smaller Li causes very slight structural distortions which produce two symmetrically non-equivalent M1 sites and two symmetrically non-equivalent M2 sites in the octahedral layer and two Si sites in the single tetrahedral chain. However, these distortions are so slight and the deviation from C2/c
symmetry so small that "even the temperature factors for the [LiAl and LiFe] spodumenes refined in C2/c are entirely comparable to those found in other ordered clinopyroxenes" (Clark et al., 1969, p. 42). We have therefore taken the average structures of the LiM³⁺ pyroxenes and examined them together with the other ordered C2/c pyroxenes.

Results of regression analyses

There is merit in knowing exactly what the relationships are between the lattice parameters, the bond lengths and angles, and the effective ionic radii of atoms occupying the coordination polyhedra in so important a group as the ordered C2/c silicate pyroxenes, and we propose to explore them. Other investigators have suggested some of these: (1) Clark et al. (1968) mentioned that "the b cell-dimension of the Na and Ca clinopyroxenes is found empirically to be a linear function of the average M1-O distance." (2) Prewitt et al. (1972) and Hawthorne and Grundy (1974) plotted lattice parameters as a function of the radius of the M1 cation, rM₁, or (rM₁)³ for the NaM³⁺ pyroxenes, and the latter authors have in press a comparison of the geometric parameters of the LiM³⁺ and NaM³⁺ pyroxenes which were discussed earlier by Brown (1971). (3) Papike et al. (1973, p. 264) have elaborated on the topologies of pyroxene structures, noting "that the ionic charge of the cations occupying M(2) and M(1) cation sites should also be taken into consideration" in the obvious relation "between the mean radius of the M(2) and M(1) cations . . . and the tetrahedral chain angle O(3)-O(3)-O(3)" in C2/c pyroxenes (cf. their Fig. 4, p. 260). (4) Ghose and Wan (1975) recognized four distinct groups of C2/c pyroxenes (LiM³⁺Si₂O₆, NaM³⁺Si₂O₆, CaM³⁺Si₂O₆ and CaM³⁺AlSiO₆) "in all of which the average M2-O distances increase linearly with an increase in the average M1-O distance. In each series, an increase in the M1-octahedron results in a simultaneous increase in the kinking of the tetrahedral chain and a slight increase in the T-O (brg.) and O3-O3' (tetrahedral edge) distances."

By contrast with previous investigators, our initial approach was to use the standard techniques of multiple linear regression analysis (Dixon, 1973) to systematize relationships between the Shannon and Prewitt (1969, 1970) effective ionic radii of the M1 and M2 cations and the unit-cell parameters, the mean M1-O, M2-O and Si-O distances, and the O3-O3-O3 chain angle. Later it was found necessary to introduce a term to account for the charge q on the M2 cation.

The (M1-O) and (M2-O) distances

As expected, the mean M1-O distances, (M1-O), are very highly correlated (coefficient of determination \( R^2 = 0.993 \)) with the radii of the M1 cations, rM₁ (Fig. 1 and Table 2). But (M2-O) distances correlate less well with rM₂, and a glance at Figure 1 suggests a strong interdependence on rM₁ as well. For a given M2 cation, (M2-O) increases with size of either the trivalent cations or the divalent cations in M1 (see Ghose and Wan, 1975). Multiple regression produces a significantly improved correlation (Fig. 2) where the regression coefficient for rM₁ is more than half as great as that for rM₂ (Table 2). On the graph of calculated vs. observed (M2-O) values there are still discrete populations for the Na and Ca pyroxenes. This may be due to inadequate estimates of the effective radii of Na and/or Ca, or, as will appear later, the need to introduce a third term into the regression equation.

The relationship between (M2-O) and the radius of the M1 cation is probably due to the fact that the M2 polyhedron shares three edges with octahedra of the M1 chain. A similar effect was noted in the Ca-garnets, in which the mean Ca-O distance is observed to increase with increasing radius of the trivalent cations (Al, Cr, Fe) in octahedra which share...
edges with the CaO₆ polyhedron (Novak and Gibbs, 1971; see Fig. 2 in Higgins and Ribbe, 1977).

The a cell dimension

Statistically, the most significant correlation between the a cell dimension and cation radius is represented by the equation \( a = 1.728r_{M1} + 8.525 \), which for the 13 ordered structures has a standard error of estimate of 0.021 Å (Fig. 3). The a dimension is obviously a measure of the thickness of the octahedral layer, and although \( \text{asin} \beta \) might have been considered a better measure, regression statistics do not bear this out (Table 2). What is interesting to note is that the addition of \( r_{M2} \) to the regression analysis does not improve the estimate of a, as though the size of the M2 polyhedron does not affect the thickness of the octahedral layer. (The coefficient of determination of a linear regression between \( r_{M2} \) and a is only 0.06.) This is explained by the fact that these irregular polyhedra, containing large Na or Ca cations, are free to expand laterally into the rift zone between octahedral bands and are flattened normal to (100), as shown in Figure 3 of Clark et al. (1969, p. 38). Thus, it is to be expected that the size of the M2 cation influences b, which is a measure of the width of the octahedral band, and c, which is a measure of its unit length.

The b cell dimension

Clark et al. (1968) recognized the relation between b and \((M1-O)\), and indeed the equation \( b = 2.29r_{M1} + 7.27 \) produces a standard error of estimate of 0.060 Å for the 13 pyroxenes (Fig. 3). But this is reduced to 0.039 Å when the \( r_{M2} \) term is added (Table 2). Although the regression coefficient for this term is only one-eighth the magnitude of that for \( r_{M1} \), its partial correlation coefficient is 0.78, and it significantly improves the coefficient of determination from 0.935 to 0.975 (cf. Figs. 3 and 4).
Although the Shannon-Prewitt radii for 8-coordinated Na and Ca are very nearly equal ($r_{Na} = 1.16 \text{Å}, r_{Ca} = 1.12 \text{Å}$), the equation $\cos \beta = 0.463 r_{M1} + 0.176 r_{M2} + 4.531$ gives a standard error of estimate of $0.019 \text{Å}$ and $R^2 = 0.922$. Values of $\cos \beta$ calculated with this equation are plotted in Figure 6 at the ends of the vertical lines opposite the symbols. Careful examination of these data show that there are still distinct Li, Na, and Ca populations, and that the calculated $\cos \beta$ values for the Ca pyroxenes lie systematically above the 45° line and those for the Na pyroxenes below it. This same phenomenon was observed for $(M2-O)$ in Figure 2 and to lesser degree for $b$ in Figure 4.

In order to compensate for this discrepancy, a third term was added to the regression analysis and tested for all parameters reported in this study. That term is $q$, the formal charge on the $M2$ cation: when $q$ is specified for $M2$, a like term is implied for $M1$, i.e., either $q_{M2} = 2$ and $q_{M1} = 2$ or $q_{M2} = 1$ and $q_{M1} = 3$. As stated earlier, the $q$ term may in part account for inadequate estimates of the effective radii of Na and Ca in 8-fold coordination, and of course a three-parameter equation is expected to give a better fit than a two-parameter regression equation. There are statistical tests to ascertain whether the addition of an independent variable is significant. The Biomedical Computer Programs (Dixon, 1973) use $F$ ratios and the more familiar $|t|$ tests, among others. For example, when $q$ is added to the equation in $r_{M1}$ and $r_{M2}$ for $(M2-O)$ (illustrated in Fig. 2), the $F$ value in-

---

**The c cell dimension and $\beta$**

When the $c$ dimensions are plotted against $r_{M1}$, those of the Li and Na pyroxenes fall on a straight line, but the Ca pyroxenes are a distinct population with barely a semblance of order (Fig. 5). A regression equation in terms of both $r_{M1}$ and $r_{M2}$ shows no improvement in predicted values over that in terms of $r_{M1}$ for the $c$ dimension.

Li pyroxenes have a $\beta$ angle of $110.2 \pm 0.1^\circ$ ($\beta$ increasing with $r_{M1}$) and Na pyroxenes have $\beta = 107.3 \pm 0.3^\circ$ ($\beta$ decreasing with $r_{M1}$), but $\beta$ values for Ca pyroxenes are scattered around a mean value of $105.5^\circ$ (Fig. 5). A regression equation for $\beta$ in terms of $r_{M1}$ and $r_{M2}$ is of no greater value in predicting $\beta$ than knowing the atomic species in $M2$ and guessing $\beta$ to be equal to the mean value for that cation.

By contrast it is most surprising to observe in Figure 5 that three distinctly ordered populations with nearly parallel trends emerge when $\cos \beta$ is plotted vs.

---

**Fig. 3.** Plots of the $a$ and $b$ cell dimensions vs. the radii of the cations in the $M1$ sites. Symbols as in Fig. 1.

**Fig. 4.** Plot of the observed vs. calculated $b$ cell dimensions using an equation in $r_{M1}$ and $r_{M2}$ from Table 2. Symbols as in Fig. 1.
creases from 506 to 652, the standard error of estimate decreases from 0.013 Å to 0.009 Å, and with 9 degrees of freedom |t| = -3.20 for the q term, indicating an extremely high degree of significance. For the b cell-edge, the significance of the addition of the q term is less clear because F decreases, but |t| = -2.1 with 9 degrees of freedom, suggesting that it is not possible at the 95 percent confidence level to reject the hypothesis that the q term is significant (Draper and Smith, 1966, p. 20). The regression data for (M2–O) and b are given in Table 2.

From Figure 6 it is obvious that an equation in \( r_{M1}, r_{M2} \) and q (Table 2) gives better estimates of \( \cos \beta \) than one in \( r_{M1} \) and \( r_{M2} \); the standard error of estimate is improved from 0.019 to 0.011 Å with an increase in the F ratio from 59 to 128. The computed |t| value for the q term is -4.65, and with 9 degrees of freedom it is not possible at the 99.9 percent confidence level to reject the q term.

The fact that \( \cos \beta \) is linearly related to \( r_{M1} \) and c and \( \beta \) separately are not, indicates that some of the expansion in the pyroxene cell caused by increased size of cations in the octahedral layer is taken up by slight [001] displacements of the tetrahedral chains above and below the octahedral layer, producing concomitant small changes in the \( \beta \) angle (cf. Papike et al., 1973, p. 265).

**Volume**

It is interesting to note that the q term carries over into the regression equation for volume \( (a \times b \times \cos \beta) \), as indicated by the following self-explanatory data:

\[
\text{Vol} = 221.3r_{M1} + 27.1r_{M2} + 252.2
\]

(Std. error of estimate, 3.5 Å\(^3\); \( R^2 = 0.981 \); \( F = 260 \))

\[
\text{Vol} = 235.3r_{M1} + 30.8r_{M2} - 5.9q + 247.1
\]

(Std. error of estimate, 2.2 Å\(^3\); \( R^2 = 0.993 \); \( F = 420 \))

In the latter equation a |t| test indicates that at the 99.5 percent confidence level the q term cannot be rejected.

**The tetrahedral chain angle, O3–O3–O3**

The \( (\text{SiO}_4)_{\infty} \) chain in pyroxenes extends parallel to c, and adjacent tetrahedra are related by a c glide (Fig. 7). The chain is nearly straight so that the c cell dimension is slightly less than four times the radius of oxygen: \( c \approx 5.2 \) to 5.3 Å < 4 × 1.36 Å. The crenulation of the chain is expressed in terms of the O3–O3–O3 angle, which varies from 189.5° for the S-rotated chain in LiAl pyroxene to 180° for the
straight chain in LiFe pyroxene to 163.8° for the O-rotated chain in CaMn pyroxene.

In the regression analysis of the O3-O3-O3 angle, a remarkable improvement in predicted values is obtained with the addition of the q term to the regression equation in \( r_{M1} \) and \( r_{M2} \) (Fig. 8). Perhaps it is not immediately obvious why the O3-O3-O3 angle should be related to any of these parameters, so the interested reader is referred to the discussion of Papike et al. (1973, p. 264-267) for topologic details. But we would comment further that the O3 atom is the bridging oxygen between adjacent tetrahedral sites and also is bonded to either one 6-coordinated \( M2 \) cation (in the case of Li+ pyroxenes) or two 8-coordinated \( M2 \) cations (in the case of Na+ and Ca++ pyroxenes). Intuitively, then, the charge on the \( M2 \) cation, the \( M2-O3 \) distance(s) and the coordination number of O3 all may be expected to affect the O3 position and thus the O3-O3-O3 angle. Clark et al. (1969, p. 35-42) hint at this in their discussion of bonding in the ordered clinopyroxenes. It is impossible to miss the implications of the following tabulation, which shows positive correlations between (Si-O3) and the mean of the sums of the formal Pauling bond strengths S to O3, and negative correlations of (Si-O3) and S with the mean O3-O3-O3 angles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Li+</th>
<th>Na+</th>
<th>Ca++</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean Si-O3 (Å)</td>
<td>1.627</td>
<td>1.645</td>
<td>1.677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean S to O3</td>
<td>2.167</td>
<td>2.250</td>
<td>2.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean O3-O3-O3 (°)</td>
<td>181.7</td>
<td>173.0</td>
<td>164.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

But what of the relation of the magnitude of the tetrahedral chain angle to \( r_{M1} \)? As we saw earlier, it is the size of the \( M1 \) cation that largely controls the c dimension for the pyroxenes with monovalent or divalent cations (Fig. 5), but it is also true that \( c = 2(O3 \cdot O3) \times \sin \frac{1}{2}[O3-O3-O3] \), where [O3-O3-O3] is the length of the edge of the tetrahedron most nearly parallel to c (Fig. 7). Thus Figure 8 and the regression equation in Table 2 represent a simplistic rationalization of the variation of the O3-O3-O3 angle in terms of the charges and radii of the non-tetrahedral cations.

The O3-O3-O3 angle is correlated with the \( \beta \) angle \( (\beta = 0.23[O3-O3-O3] + 67.76; R^2 = 0.80) \) and the mean of the two Si-O3 bridge bonds (\( (Si-O)_{br} = 2.1140 - 0.0027[O3-O3-O3]; R^2 = 0.80 \)). The former arises from relative displacements of the tetrahedral chains above and below the \( M2 \) site “which are necessary to accommodate changes in coordination around \( M(2) \)” (Papike et al., 1973, p. 265). The latter is best understood in the terms detailed in the previous paragraphs, keeping in mind that the bridging oxygen atoms \( O_{br} \) in the tetrahedral chain are O3 oxygens. Obviously, the greater the Coulombic interaction of O3 with its non-tetrahedral neighbor(s), the longer will be the Si-O3 bond lengths and the greater will be the O rotation of the tetrahedra.

The Si-O bond lengths

We have seen that \( (Si-O)_{br} \) is correlated to the O3-O3-O3 angle for reasons discussed above, and
thus it comes as no surprise that \( \langle \text{Si-O} \rangle_{\text{br}} \) is highly correlated to \( r_{\text{M}1}, r_{\text{M}2}, \) and \( q \). In the ordered clinopyroxenes the range of observed mean Si-O3 bonds is 1.624–1.688 Å, and as in other regression analyses, there are three distinct populations of data for Li, Na, and Ca pyroxenes when only \( r_{\text{M}1} \) and \( r_{\text{M}2} \) are considered in the regression. But when the formal charge on \( M2 \) is included, the standard error of estimate improves threefold (from 0.013 to 0.004 Å) and \( R^2 \) increases from 0.67 to 0.98. This is well-documented in Figure 9, where the tails of the vertical lines represent calculated values of \( \langle \text{Si-O} \rangle_{\text{br}} \) using only \( r_{\text{M}1} \) and \( r_{\text{M}2} \), and the symbols represent those calculated using \( q \) in addition to \( r_{\text{M}1} \) and \( r_{\text{M}2} \).

By contrast with the bridging Si-O3 bonds, the non-bridging Si-O1 and Si-O2 bond lengths are on the average longest for Li pyroxenes and shortest for Ca pyroxenes. However, as previously noted for \( \langle \text{Si-O} \rangle_{\text{br}} \), there is a high correlation of \( \langle \text{Si-O} \rangle_{\text{br}} \) with the Pauling bond strengths \( S \) to O1 and O2. The following table summarizes these observations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Li⁺</th>
<th>Na⁺</th>
<th>Ca⁺⁺</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean Si-O1 (Å)</td>
<td>1.635</td>
<td>1.631</td>
<td>1.607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Si-O2 (Å)</td>
<td>1.593</td>
<td>1.592</td>
<td>1.588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean ( \langle \text{Si-O} \rangle_{\text{br}} ) (Å)</td>
<td>1.614</td>
<td>1.612</td>
<td>1.595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean ( S ) to O1 &amp; O2</td>
<td>1.834</td>
<td>1.813</td>
<td>1.754</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Si-O2 bonds are relatively constant (see comments by Clark et al., 1969, p. 36), the Si-O1 bonds are highly correlated to \( q \) (although not to \( r_{\text{M}1} \) or \( r_{\text{M}2} \)), and the means of the two Si-O3 bridge bonds are highly correlated to \( r_{\text{M}1}, r_{\text{M}2}, \) and \( q \) (Fig. 9). Thus the grand mean Si-O distances may be calculated with the equation

\[
\langle \text{Si-O} \rangle = 0.036r_{\text{M}1} + 0.016r_{\text{M}2} + 0.006q + 1.580,
\]

all of whose terms have nearly equal significance, according to \( |r| \) tests, and whose standard error of estimate is \( <0.004 \) Å \( (R^2 = 0.83) \).

**Evaluation of other data**

Figure 10 has been prepared to summarize the lattice parameters of some synthetic C2/c pyroxenes found in the literature. Data for Li pyroxenes are taken from Brown (1971), for NaTi and NaIn pyroxenes from Prewitt et al. (1972), and for CaNi and CaCo pyroxenes from Ghose and Wan (1975). Most of these fall within the range of residuals of the calculated values, although many are outside the range of standard errors of estimate as indicated by the parallel diagonal lines.

Twenty-two pyroxenes synthesized by Nolan (1969) in the system CaMg-CaFe³⁺-NaFe⁺ are represented as dots in Figure 10: end-member data, labeled Di, Hd, and Ac, respectively, are taken from Table 1. The assumption used in our calculations of \( a, b, \) and \( c \) is that all of Nolan's pyroxenes are ordered with Na and Ca in \( M2 \) and the other cations appropriately apportioned in \( M1 \). The \( q \) term is appropriately weighted to give the average charge on \( M2 \). The extreme consistency of his data with the parameters we used in our regression equations for CaMg (Di), CaFe (Hd), and NaFe (Ac) pyroxenes affirms this assumption, although for this system anything less than ~10 percent disorder would not be detectable within estimated errors.

It is difficult to evaluate the lattice parameters determined by Drysdale (1975) for six Li pyroxenes containing trivalent Al, Cr, Fe, V, Sc, and In, because his estimated standard errors on \( a, b, \) and \( c \) are exceptionally large, ranging between 0.01 and 0.03 Å. Parameters reported for the LiSc and LiIn pyroxenes are so markedly divergent from values calculated with regression equations (as well as from earlier literature data for LiSc pyroxenes), that we suspect either the stoichiometry of his material or his technique for lattice-parameter determination.

Lattice parameters determined by Abs-Wurmbach and Neuhaus (1976) for 12 compounds in the solid-solution series jadeite (NaAlSi₅O₈)-cosmochlore (NaCrSi₅O₈) present some difficulty of interpretation,
which is not made any simpler by the fact that they omitted $\beta$ angles from their complications and mislabeled the right ordinate of their volume–composition plot. In the synthesis of the NaCr end-member (and perhaps NaAl$_{0.1}$Cr$_{0.9}$ and NaAl$_{0.2}$Cr$_{0.8}$), they may have produced a non-stoichiometric or otherwise off-composition product. Their reported volume for NaCr is 417.8 Å$^3$, whereas that observed by Cameron et al. (1973) on a synthetic material whose structure was determined is 420.0 Å$^3$ (Table 1). If the 420.0 Å$^3$ value is plotted instead of 417.8 Å$^3$, the volume–composition relationship shown by Abs-Wurmbach and Neuhaus (their Fig. 4) becomes linear and no longer requires a third-order equation to fit the data. Furthermore, the 417.8 Å$^3$ volume for NaCr falls substantially below the expected value on the NaM$^{2+}$ curve in Figure 11.

Figure 11 is a graph of the relationship between unit-cell volume and the cube of the radius of the M1 cation, $(r_{M1})^3$ for the Na, Ca, and Li pyroxenes. Note that the curves for LiM$^{2+}$ and NaM$^{2+}$ are somewhat similar, whereas that for CaM$^{2+}$ has an opposite curvature. There are so few data points that calculation of a higher than first-order curve for Li is impossible, but second-order curves for Na and Ca pyroxenes have coefficients of determination $R^2 > 0.997$. Additional points for NaTi and NaIn pyroxenes are shown as large open circles. They were taken from Prewitt et al. (1972), who expressed concern that the NaIn point in particular did not fit what at that time they assumed should be a straight-line plot of volume vs. $(r_{M1})^3$. Our evidence indicates that there is no such simple relationship: volume is a function of three parameters, $r_{M1}$, $r_{M2}$, and $q$. Even the “size” of the M2 cation is not independent of the effective ionic radius of the cation occupying the edge-sharing M1 octahedra. Furthermore, when in our regression analyses we used $(r_{M1})^3$ and $(r_{M2})^3$—with and without $q$—to calculate equations for unit-cell volume, we discovered that these parameters did not account for variations in volume nearly as well as did $r_{M1}$ and $r_{M2}$.

All this simply reemphasizes a fact which has been restated frequently: effective ionic radii, like those

---

Fig. 10. Plots of observed vs. calculated $a$, $b$, and $c\sin\beta$ cell parameters for data selected from the literature. Values for Ac (NaFeSi$_2$O$_6$), Hd (CaFeSi$_2$O$_6$), and Di (CaAlSi$_2$O$_6$) are from Table 1 (open symbols); values for the 22 pyroxenes in the system Ac–Hd–Di (black dots) are from Nolan (1969); values for NaTi and NaIn pyroxenes from Prewitt et al. (1972), for Li–pyroxenes from Brown (1971) and for CaCo and CaNi pyroxenes from Ghose and Wan (1975) (crosses). Values for $a$, $b$ and $c\sin\beta$ were calculated from equations in Table 2.
determined by Shannon and Prewitt (1969, 1970), are not "hard" values, even relative to an assumed primary coordination number and oxygen radius. Secondary coordination is important, and these C2/c ordered pyroxenes demonstrate this especially well for silicon in tetrahedral coordination, because even the mean Si-O bond lengths in these isostructural compounds are strongly correlated to the formal charges and effective sizes of the non-tetrahedral M1 and M2 cations.

**Summary**

The lattice parameters of ordered C2/c (and C2) pyroxenes with Li, Na, or Ca in the M2 site may be expressed in terms of the formal valences and effective ionic radii of the non-tetrahedral cations. The a cell dimension is a function of $r_{M1}$, $b$ of $r_{M1}$ and $r_{M2}$, and $c\sin\beta$ and volume are functions of $r_{M1}$, $r_{M2}$, and $q$, the charge on the M2 cation. Multiple regression analyses indicate that the mean M1-O distance is best expressed in terms of $r_{M1}$ only, whereas the mean M2-O distance, the mean Si-O bridge and grand mean Si-O bond lengths, and the O3-O3-O3 angle require three-parameter equations in $r_{M1}$, $r_{M2}$ and $q$. The bond lengths and cell parameters are all predicted to approximately 0.5 percent of their values, whereas the chain angles are estimated to within ~5 percent of their values using the regression equations of Table 2.

**Acknowledgments**

We are indebted to the Earth Science Section of the National Science Foundation for financial support of this work under grant number DES75-14912. A.R.P., Jr. is supported by an NSF Graduate Fellowship.

**References**


