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Intermetallics. Electron-Deficient Multi-Center Bonding

The structural types discussed may be thought of as being composed of two-dimensional layers cleaved out of the FCC lattice. Each layer has a square sublattice capped by apical atoms above and below four-fold hollows. The electronic structure of such an Al layer is constructed – it has eight low-lying bands per four Al, and two of these bands are localized in apical Al’s, pointing away from the layer. On stacking, bonds are formed between apical Al’s, leading to the pushing up of one Al₁–Al₁, σ* band, and a gap after 7 bands are filled. This is BaAl₁, with Al₁²⁺. An alternative picture is of delocalized five-center six-electron bonding in each hollow, closely related to the electron deficient bonding in Bi₂. The bonding in CeAl₂Ga₂ and CeMg₂Si₂ can be derived similarly, by perturbing the original BaAl₁ case. A rationale for switching from BaAl₁ to the CeMg₂Si₂ structural type for electron counts exceeding ~16 for four atoms is given. Finally we relate these arguments to the high cohesive energy of Al metal.

More than 50 years have elapsed since the first synthesis of BaAl₁ [1], 1. Since then chemists, in their industrious search for new structures, trying to understand the abundance given to us in the microscopic arrangements of atoms in the solid state, have found to their amazement that over 400 compounds crystallize in this prototype [2]. And this does not count the variants on this structural type or close relatives to it [3], structures such as CaBe₂Ge₂ [4], TiCu₃S₃ [5], BaPtSn₃ [6], SrZnBi₂, SrZnSb₂ and SrCuSn₂ [7]. Physicists joined the march recently, the vast collections of compounds, especially the transition metal intermetallics, providing them with an inexhaustible base for measurements, characterization, and ultimately understanding. The “heavy fermion” material CeCu₂Si₂ [8] and the high temperature silicide superconductors Lu₁₂Fe₄Si₁₈ (Tₑ = 6.0 K). La₃Rh₃Si₁₆ (Tₑ = 4.4 K) [9] are perhaps the most intriguing, but only two examples among many.

Despite the fact that so much experimental and theoretical effort has been devoted to the investigation of the BaAl₁ derivatives, the chemical bonding in the original phase still awaits elucidation. In this contribution we are going to analyze the bonding in the BaAl₁ and the closely related REAl₂Ga₂ [10], CaAl₂Zn₂ [11] and CeMg₂Si₂ [12] structures, with the assistance of extended Hückel type band calculations (details in Appendix).

The BaAl₁ Structure

The body-centered tetragonal BaAl₁ structure is shown in 1. Motivated by our eventual analysis of the bonding in bulk Al metal, we would like to make a connection between the BaAl₁ structure and Al metal. 2 shows a “cleavage” of the Al FCC metal which allows us to see such a connection by inserting the Ba atoms [13]. A subsequent relative shift in the horizontal direction among layers makes additional interlayer Al–Al bonds, and the Al₁²⁺ part of the BaAl₁ 3-dimensional lattice is formed (3).
Let us describe the resulting structure in terms of sublattices. There are in the BaAl$_4$ structure obvious Ba layers, and two kinds of Al. One Al forms a square layer sublattice, with long 3.20 Å contacts within the square layer. We'll call these basal aluminums, Al$_b$. The square layers are capped on top and on bottom with the other kind of aluminum, which sit above and below the four-fold hollow sites of the square lattice. We will call these apical aluminums, Al$_a$. The Al$_b$–Al$_b$ distance is short, 2.69Å (compare Al metal, where Al–Al is 2.86 Å). The two-dimensional layers are tied together by vertical Al$_b$–Al$_b$ bonds, and these are again short, 2.67 Å.

The coordination around Al$_b$ is approximately tetrahedral, not counting the four Al$_b$–Al$_b$ contacts. Such an environment for a group 3 or 13 element is not unusual. But the coordination around the apical Al, Al$_a$, is different, for it is clearly five-coordinate, square-pyramidal. There are some consequences of this.

**The Zintl Electron Count for BaAl$_4$**

There are about a dozen or so compounds which adopt the BaAl$_4$ structure. Most of them are combinations of the alkali metal, alkaline earths or the rare earth elements with Group 13 elements [15], with 13 or 14 electrons per unit cell. An exception is ThZn$_4$ [16], which has 12 valence electrons if we count Th as Th$^{4+}$. These compounds are listed in 4, reproduced from ref. [17].

From 4 we see that the atomic size ratio varies quite a lot, from 1.34 for ThZn$_4$ to 1.65 for BaGa$_4$. The electron count, on the other hand, is remarkably
constant. Group 14, 15 phases, e.g. KGe₄, RbGe₄, KSn₄, KPb₄ [18], which have 17 or more electrons have not been found to crystallize in the BaAl₄ structure.

Thus, there must be some electronic driving force at work. The optimum electron count for the BaAl₄ structure should be around 14 per unit cell, judging from the known compounds. It is important that such an electron count is not obvious on the basis of the tremendously useful classical Zintl electron counting scheme, which assumes donation of electrons from the cations to the anions and bond formation among the anions to complete the octet [19]. Let us take an Al₃ square pyramid, 5 out of the BaAl₄ lattice for scrutiny. We see that there are four short bonds (2.69 Å) from the apical to the basal atoms, which comprise the 2-dimensional square lattice in the BaAl₄ structure. One would be led to think that eight electrons would be needed for these four bonds. Another short bond present between the apical atoms of two such pyramids requires two electrons, or one electron per square pyramid, adding up to nine electrons per square pyramid. The square pyramid corresponds to two Al atoms in the BaAl₄ lattice, since each basal atom in the pyramid is shared with four other pyramids. Thus 9 electrons per two Al’s or 18 per BaAl₄ formula are required by Zintl’s rule. Obviously this is not the case, for there are no such 18 electron compounds. The obvious five coordination of one Al calls for a multi-center delocalized description; the actual electron count of 14 electrons/4 atoms for electron deficient bonding. And the structure is inherently 3-dimensional, so a band structure is called for. We will see eventually how these three descriptions merge.

The Band Structure of BaAl₄

We will now build up the band structures step by step, first constructing the square lattice 6 and then the two-dimensional layer 7. After that we proceed to the three-dimensional Al₄²⁻ lattice 8 by stacking the two-dimensional ones. Finally we may insert Ba²⁺ into the lattice.
The band structure of a two-dimensional square lattice is most easily understood when the s band and p bands do not overlap, as shown in Fig. 1. At the $\Gamma$ point in the Brillouin zone each orbital has the same phase as its four nearest neighboring translational correspondents. At the X point two nearest neighbors in $x$ direction have the opposite phase, at the M point all the four nearest neighbors have the opposite phase. Thus the s band goes up in energy from $\Gamma$ to X to M, as the number of the nearest bonding partners of the s orbital decreases from 4 to 2 to 0 (and the number of antibonding ones increases from 0 to 2 to 4). The $p_z$ band, topologically the same as the s band, changes its energy in a similar fashion; only the band width is much smaller due to the less effective $\pi$ type overlap between the nearest neighbor $p_z$ orbitals. The $p_x$ and $p_y$ bands are degenerate at $\Gamma$, both having 2 antibonding $\sigma$ interactions and 2 bonding $\pi$ interactions with their nearest neighbors. Upon going away from $\Gamma$ to X where 2

Fig. 1. Schematic band structure of a planar square lattice. The s and p levels have a large enough separation so that the s and p bands do not overlap.
nearest neighbors along the $x$ direction have the opposite phase, the degeneracy is broken. The $p_z$ band goes down in energy when the antibonding neighbors along the $x$ direction become bonding ones; the $p_y$ band rises up due to the $\pi$ antibonding character along the $x$ direction. They meet again at $M$ where both bands have $2\sigma$ bonding and $2\pi$ antibonding nearest neighbors.

Fig. 2 is the calculated band structure of a two-dimensional Al square lattice with an unrealistically large lattice constant $a = 4.5$ Å. The shape of the bands is that expected from the preceding discussion. If the lattice constant is smaller, and therefore the inter-cell overlap greater, the band structure should appear somewhat different; the $s$ band being likely to cross the $p$ bands. Structure 9 indicates schematically what is likely to happen, with the $s$ band at $M$ (four out-of-phase nearest neighbors) higher than the $p$ bands. Avoided crossings occur between the $s$ band and $p_y$ ($X \to M$) or $p_x + p_y$ band ($M \to \Gamma$), since they all have the same symmetry in the group of $k$. The $p_z$ band, being anti-symmetric with respect to the plane of the square lattice, does not mix with any other bands. Fig. 3 is the calculated realization of 9, a band structure of the square lattice in BaAl$_4$ ($a = 3.2$ Å).

Since the layers in BaAl$_4$ have only a glide plane parallel to the layer instead of a real mirror plane, we need to classify the levels according to their symmetry with respect to the glide plane. Otherwise, we have to choose 4 Al atoms (instead of 2) as a unit cell and the band structure analysis becomes more complicated. The glide plane is a reflection in the plane of the paper and a translation along $x$ direction, taking an atom at position 1 to 2 in 10.

---

Fig. 2. Band structure of a square lattice of Al atoms. The lattice constant is deliberately chosen to be big enough ($a = 4.5$ Å) so that the $s$ and $p$ bands do not overlap.
In the Bloch sum \( \hat{P} \phi \) where \( \hat{P} = \sum e^{i \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{R}} \hat{T}_R \) and \( \phi \) an arbitrary function the symmetry operation \( \hat{T}_R \) can be something other than translation, as long as \( \{ \hat{T}_R \} \) is Abelian and represented by \( \{ e^{i \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{R}} \} \). In our case \( \hat{T}_R \) is the glide plane (or the two-fold screw axis) and \( \mathbf{k} \) is no longer plane wave but contains angular parts. There have been some previous applications of this idea where the asymmetric unit is chosen as the “unit cell”, so as to simplify the calculations for biological [20a–d] and solid state systems [20e].

One choice of the unit cell is \( \mathbf{11} \), where \( \mathbf{a}_2 \) is the conventional lattice translation vector but \( \mathbf{a}_1 \) the glide plane translation. The unit cell (shaded area in \( \mathbf{11} \)) contains two Al atoms, one from the planar square lattice \( (z=0) \) and the other from the apex above the hollow of the square lattice \( (z>0) \). We need to replot the bands in Fig. 3 from \( \Gamma \rightarrow X' \rightarrow M' \rightarrow \Gamma \) in the Brillouin zone (BZ) defined in \( \mathbf{11} \), in order to prepare the square lattice to interact with the apical atoms.

Fig. 4 shows such a plot. All the bands which are symmetric with respect to the plane containing the square lattice \( (s, p_x, p_y) \) remain unchanged. The \( p_z \) band, however, changes its appearance. This is due

---

Fig. 3. Band structure of the Al square lattice taken from BaAl₄. The s band crosses the p bands due to the high dispersion produced by a small lattice constant \( (a=3.20 \text{ Å}) \).

Fig. 4. Glide plane band structure of the Al square lattice taken from BaAl₄ (cf. Fig. 3). The dashed lines indicate the atomic s and p levels.
to the fact that we plot the glide plane band structures along \(a_1\) instead of a simple translation. An example is 12, the \(p\) band at \(\Gamma\). The phase relation is now determined by the glide plane along \(a_1\) and simple translation along \(a_2\). The \(p\) orbitals at sites 1 and 2 are in-phase with respect to the glide plane along \(a_1\), since the glide plane reverses the \(z\) direction. Sites 1 and 3 are in-phase by the translation \(a_2\). Thus 12, the \(\Gamma\) point of the BZ in 11, corresponds to M in the conventional BZ, illustrated in Fig. 1. Similarly, \(X'\), 13, \(M'\), 14, correspond to X and \(\Gamma\) points in Fig. 1.

The other orbitals \(s\), \(p\), \(p\), are in the plane of the square lattice and unaffected by reflection in that plane. It is important to note that in plotting the glide plane band structures no information is lost – we just plot the \(p\) band in a different way.

We are ready at this stage to interact the square lattice with the apical atom. The dashed lines around \(-12.3\) and \(-6.5\) eV in Fig. 4 indicate the \(s\) and \(p\) levels of an (apical) Al atom. The states of the square lattice above these levels will act as acceptors, being pushed up when the composite layer 7 is formed. We illustrate what will happen upon interaction of square (basal) and apical sublattices in Fig. 5.

On the left side in Fig. 5 we plot the approximate band structures (heavy lines) for the square lattice from \(\Gamma\) to \(M'\) (cf. Fig. 2): the \(s\) and \(p\) bands rise up, the \(p\) band drops sharply, the \(p\) band, when plotted against the glide plane we mentioned before, sinks very slowly. The \(p\) and \(p\) bands, being of different symmetry with respect to the plane \(m\) shown in 15 (in the group of \(k\) from \(\Gamma\rightarrow X'\)), cross each other.

The \(s\) and \(p\) levels of the apical atom, denoted by \(s'\), \(p'\), are between the \(s\) and \(p\) bands before the apical-basal interaction is turned on. When the interaction is turned on, the square lattice bands will mix with the basal orbitals of the correct symmetry as depicted in Fig. 5. As a consequence, these levels will shift. At \(\Gamma\) the \(s\) band has the right symmetry to interact with \(s'\) and is pushed down in energy, as indicated by the arrow. \(s'\) is lifted up, but \(p'^{'}\), being of the same symmetry, will mix with \(s'\), preventing \(s'\) from rising further. So we'd expect \(s'\) to remain approximately the same in energy, and \(p'^{'}\), goes up as indicated by the arrow. \(p'^{'}\), \(p'^{'}\), interact with \(p\), \(p\), bands at higher energy. \(p'^{'}\), \(p'^{'}\) are pulled down and \(p\), \(p\), up. The \(p\) band at \(\Gamma\) being of \(\delta\) type symmetry, does not interact with any of the apical orbitals.

At the X point the \(s\) band interacts with the \(p'^{'}\) and is pulled down, \(p'^{'}\) is lifted up consequently. \(s'\) can interact with \(p'^{'}\), thus \(s'\) goes down and \(p\), up in energy. A similar interaction governs \(p'^{'}\), \(p\), and \(p'^{'}\).

On the right side in Fig. 5 are the levels after the shifts indicated by the arrows are accomplished. Now we need to connect the bands from the lowest level up to obtain the approximate band structure. It should be pointed out that when the apical atom is in place, the group of \(k\) from \(\Gamma\) to \(X'\) contains only the identity operation. All the bands have the same symmetry and they do not cross each other. This is because the original mirror plane \(m\) in 15 no longer
Fig. 5. A schematic interaction diagram for the two-dimensional layer in BaAl₄ as formed from a square lattice and apical atoms. On the left is the band structure before the Al₅–Al₆ interaction is turned on. The bands of the square lattice are shown in heavy lines, and the apical atomic levels in light lines. Only square lattice orbitals are drawn and combined with the apical orbitals to indicate the symmetry match. The arrows indicate the directions in which those levels should shift after the Al₅–Al₆ interaction is turned on. On the right side are the bands obtained after the level shift.
exists. The phase relation between sites 1 and 2 in 16 is determined by the \( k \) value and independent of the mirror plane.

Before we connect the bands, we should notice that at both \( \Gamma \) and \( X' \) points 3 bands are pulled down and 1 remains approximately the same. The others are either pushed up high or are originally high in energy. Thus, the connection of bands is most easily accomplished. The four lowest bands are connected, then there should be a gap. This is shown at the right side of Fig. 5.

From \( X' \) to \( M' \) and from \( M' \) to \( \Gamma \) the construction is similar, and we will not present it here. Suffice it to say that simple bonding symmetry and overlap arguments allow us to derive with ease the qualitative features of the band structure throughout the Brillouin zone. In all directions there are four low-lying bands, and a gap to a 5th band. The four lower bands are all apical-basal bonding, and are bonding or non-bonding within the square lattice. Antibonding within the square lattice would come about through orbitals of \( \delta \) symmetry, and these are not stabilized by apical-basal interaction.

When the four bands are filled, we reach an electron count of 8 electrons per 2 Al, or \( Al_2^{2+} \). Note this is 16 electrons per 4 Al, i.e. we have not yet obtained an explanation of the magic 14 electron count. But then we have not yet built the three-dimensional solid, only a two-dimensional slice of it.

The calculated band structure, the corresponding density of states (DOS) and crystal orbital overlap population (COOP) curves are drawn in Fig. 6. The band structure shows the anticipated characteristics. The DOS curve also shows the contribution of basal aluminum of the total DOS. What is not on Al\(_6\), is on Al\(_4\).

As implied by the band structure of the square lattice alone, Fig. 4, many square lattice states lie higher than the apical atom levels. When the interaction between the square lattice and the apical atoms is turned on, more square lattice states will be pushed up than apical ones. Thus, below the gap there are less square lattice states. The contribution up to the gap around \(-4\) eV from the square lattice to DOS in Fig. 6 is less than 40\%, what is left over (>60\%) in the total DOS is from the apical atoms.

Hence the apical atoms are more negatively charged than the square lattice ones when the lowest 4 bands of the layer are filled. The charge imbalance also can be understood from another point of view, based on dispersion of the filled and unfilled bands [21].

The COOP curve shown in Fig. 6 is an overlap population weighted density of states, and a nice index of the bonding character of a given bond [22]. Below the gap at \(-4\) eV, nearly all the states are Al\(_6\)–Al\(_8\) bonding, but above the gap strong antibonding features develop. An electron count above Al\(_4^{4+}\) would be most unfavorable.

Before we go on to the three-dimensional lattice, we need to "fold back" the band structures [23] so that there will be 4 Al atoms per cell and 16 bands altogether. The band structures are then not plotted against the glide plane but the conventional \( k \) vectors generated by the translations. In this way we prepare the bands for interaction in the third dimension [24].

17 and 18 show the folding-back process. In a one-dimensional system a line is folded back, in two-
Fig. 6. (a) Band structure of the two-dimensional layer taken from BaAl₄. The bands are plotted against the glide plane so there are two Al atoms per unit cell. The main contributions to the bands are indicated at each special k point: s, p for the basal Al₄ and s', p' for the apical Al₄. (b) Total density of states (dashed line) and the basal Al₄ contribution (solid line) for the two-dimensional layer in BaAl₄. The dotted line is the integrated Al₄ state density. (c) Crystal Orbital Overlap Population curves for the two-dimensional layer in BaAl₄. Solid line: Al₄-Al₄ bond; dotted line: Al₄-Al₄ bond.
dimensions an area and in three-dimensions a volume. 17 is the direct lattice. We choose $a'_1$ (glide plane translational vector) and $a'_2$ to define the unit cell which contains 2 atoms (11). The corresponding reciprocal vectors are $b'_1$ and $b'_2$ in 18 which are perpendicular to $a_2$ and $a'_1$, respectively. The Brillouin zone is the big square in 18. If we choose the conventional unit cell defined by $a_1$, $a_2$ which contains 4 atoms, the corresponding reciprocal vectors will be $b_1$, $b_2$, perpendicular to $a_2$, $a_1$, respectively. The Brillouin zone $X'_1$, $X'_2$, $X'_3$, $X'_4$ in 18 is half the size of the Brillouin zone defined by $b'_1$, $b'_2$, since in the direct lattice the unit cell is doubled.

If we choose the conventional unit cell ($a_1$, $a_2$), the triangular area $X'_1$, $M'$, $X'_2$ will be outside the Brillouin zone ($b_1$, $b_2$) but can be translated back into the zone ($X'_1$, $\Gamma'X'_2$) by $b_2$. Thus the line $X'_1M'$ corresponds to $X'_2\Gamma'$ which in turn corresponds to $\Gamma'M$ by the 4-fold symmetry in the direct lattice. Similarly $M'X_1$ corresponds to $\Gamma X_1$ and in turn to $\Gamma X_1$ by time reversal. In other words when we fold $\Gamma X'$ onto $X'M'$ and fold $M'\Gamma$ back such that $\Gamma$ coincides with $M'$ in Fig. 6, what we get is the band structure from $M$ to $\Gamma$ to $X$ for the conventional cell ($a_1$, $a_2$). This process is shown in Fig. 7. It results in 8 low-lying bands for 4 Al atoms in the unit cell ($a_1$, $a_2$).

Fig. 7. Band structures of the two-dimensional layer in BaAl, before (a) and after (b) the “folding back” process is performed. The arrows in a indicate the “rotation axes” for this folding back process.
In the folded band structure Fig. 7b there are 4 bands which are mainly of apical s’ and p’ character, as we outlined earlier in our derivation. Thus when the two-dimensional layers 7 are stacked to form the three-dimensional lattice 8 these 4 bands should result in 2 bonding and 2 antibonding combinations. The actual situation is complicated a little, by mixing between s’ and p’ upon stacking. What happens is analogous to s, p hybridization in a diatomic, sketched in 19. The mutual mixing of the symmetry-adapted \( \sigma_z \) and \( \sigma_y \) combinations formed from 2 s and 2 p, respectively, transforms the \( \sigma_z \) (2 s) and \( \sigma_y \) (2 p) orbitals into strongly bonding MO’s, but makes \( \sigma_x \) (2 s) and \( \sigma_y \) (2 p) more or less non-bonding.

Something very similar happens for the s’ and p’ bands in the BaAl\(_4\) structure. As 20 shows, one obtains \( \sigma_{z} \) (bonding), \( \sigma_{y} \) (nonbonding), \( \sigma_{p_{z}} \) (nonbonding) and \( \sigma_{p_{y}} \) (antibonding). The \( p_{z} \) bands should not be disturbed too much, due to their poor inter-layer overlap.

Fig. 8 shows the band structure, DOS and COOP of the three-dimensional lattice 8. Below the gap around \(-4\) eV there are two s’ and one p’ bands, corresponding to \( \sigma_{z} \) and \( \sigma_{p_{z}} \) in 20. The other band, equivalent to \( \sigma_{p_{y}} \) is pushed up high above the gap because of its strong antibonding. Below the gap there are 7 bands now which can accommodate 14 electrons from BaAl\(_4\).

From our construction these seven bands should be mostly Al–Al bonding. The COOP curves in Fig. 8 confirm this. There is Al–Al bonding everywhere below the gap, except for an interesting small Al\(_b\)–Al\(_b\) antibonding bump just below the Fermi level. An electron count greater than 14 would
Fig. 8. (a) Band structures of the three-dimensional Al lattice in BaAl₄. The apical bands (s', p') are indicated at each special k point.
(b) Density of states of the same lattice (dashed line) and the basal Al₄ contribution (solid line). The dotted line is the integration of the Al₄ states.
(c) Crystal Orbital Overlap Population curves for the same lattice. Each curve corresponds to a specific bond as indicated in the picture.
quickly ruin all Al–Al bonding. We now understand clearly the 14 electron count characteristic of BaAl₄ structures.

We noted earlier the negative charging of the apical sites in one layer. As the relative contributions to the DOS in Fig. 8 show, this persists in the three-dimensional solid. The calculated charges for a 14 electron Al₂⁺ structure are given in 21. It follows that when two of the four Al’s in BaAl₄ are substituted by an isoelectronic but more electronegative element, that this element should occupy the apical position [25]. Indeed, this is what is observed for REAl₄Ga [10] (as it should be on the basis of a lattice site dispersivity argument as well [21]). Ga (\(\chi = 1.81\)) is more electronegative than Al (\(\chi = 1.61\)). The same is true for Zn (\(\chi = 1.65\)) [26] in CaAl₂Zn₂ so we expect Zn to be at the apical position, as it is.

We search for a still simpler picture of the bonding in the solid, for a chemical explanation of the 14 electron count. Since the apical site is more appropriate for a more electronegative element let’s think of BaAl₄ = Ba²⁺[(Al₆)₂(Al₆)₂]²⁻ as Ba²⁺(Al₆⁺)₃(Al₆⁺)₂, i.e. transferring all the electrons to Al₆. Remember, this is just a formalism. Al₆⁺ is isoelectronic with Cl. So the short interlayer bond, a full single bond, is easily understood. What about the Al₆–Al₆ bonding? Let us form tetrahedral hybrids at each Al₆, pointing to the neighboring Al₆. But at each Al₆ let’s form instead sp hybrids, one of which is then involved in the apical Al₆–Al₆ bond. The basis functions are shown in 22.

In each hollow there will be four hybrids, one from each Al₆ around the hollow, pointing towards Al₆. The cyclobutadienoid symmetry-adapted linear combinations are easy to draw, and so is the hollow interaction diagram. 23. Three delocalized bonding
MO's are formed, of \( a_i + c \) symmetry. These are responsible for \( \text{Al}_a - \text{Al}_b \) bonding. The seventh electron of \( \text{Al}^{2-} (\text{Al}^{4+}) (\text{Al}^{3+}) \) enters the sp hybrid \( \text{hy}_{\text{out}} \), pointing away from the hollow. When the three-dimensional framework is assembled, this orbital and its electron are used to form normal two-center, two-electron bonds.

To summarize: the \( \text{Al}^{2-} \) framework of \( \text{BaAl}_4 \) is held together by 14 electrons per \( \text{(Al}_a \text{)}_4 \text{(Al}_b \text{)}_2 \). Two of these electrons are involved primarily in \( \text{Al}_a - \text{Al}_a \) bonding, the other twelve, six in each of two hollows, hold together \( \text{Al}_a \) and \( \text{Al}_b \) through electron-deficient multi-center bonding. Four \( \text{Al}_a - \text{Al}_b \) bonds (not two-center, two-electron bonds) are made with only six electrons.

The type of bonding that is discussed here is nothing new. It is precisely the kind of bonding suggested in the boranes by Lipscomb [27, 28]. More directly, we have precise analogues for \( \text{BaAl}_4 \) in \( \text{B}_3 \text{H}_9 \), 24, and \( \text{B}_{10} \text{H}_{16} \), 25. In \( \text{B}_3 \text{H}_9 \) each boron uses one electron for terminal H bonding. That leaves \( 5 \times 2 = 10 \) electrons per five borons. Then the bridging hydrogens are held by four three-center, two-electron bonds, to which each basal boron contributes one electron, each hydrogen one. That leaves \( 10 - 4 = 6 \) electrons for framework bonding. \( \text{B}_{10} \text{H}_{16} \), 25 [29], is a still more direct analogue of the \( \text{BaAl}_4 \) structure.

Let us in summary trace what happens as we progress from a local viewpoint to the fully delocalized structure. Starting with sp\(^3\) hybrids at \( \text{Al}_a \) and sp at \( \text{Al}_b \), we get the local (but delocalized, locally!) hollow MO's, 26. At the right side we have doubled the \( \text{Al}_2 \)
MO's to anticipate full unit cell. No hollow-hollow interaction is yet turned on.

Now we stack the layers. This turns on the localized two center bonding between Al's, but does little else, 27. One orbital, Al$_6$—Al$_6$ bonding, goes down, one Al$_6$—Al$_6$ antibonding orbital goes up. A gap occurs after 7 levels, 14 electrons. Al$_6^{1-}$. Now we turn on the inter-unit cell interactions. (They could have been turned on earlier — remember this is just a schematic reconstruction of a complex process in which many things, within a unit cell and between unit cells, happen, all at once.) Each of the 14 levels develops into a band. But the inter-unit cell interactions, the delocalization, is not strong enough to destroy the locally imposed gap after the seventh level. A band gap remains after 14 electrons per unit cell.

To complete our discussion of BaAl$_4$ we should insert Ba$^{2+}$ into the three-dimensional lattice. This will add to the total energy a Madelung contribution, but the occupied bands should not be perturbed too much since the Ba$^{2+}$ levels are very high in energy.

The dominance of different contributions to the total energy in different geometrical realizations of the lattice may sometimes lead to a double minimum and requires more sophisticated study.

**The CeMgSi$_2$ Structure**

The CeMgSi$_2$ structure [12], 28, differs from the BaAl$_4$ structure in that half of apical atoms are...
shifted so that above and below one hollow of the square lattice there are two such apical atoms but in an adjacent hollow there is none. cf. 29, 30. The apical positions are taken by the more electronegative Si atoms, as expected from lattice site dispersivity [21]. The Si–Si distance between the two-dimensional MgSi₂ layers is 2.57 Å, but is longer within one layer, 3.19 Å. In other words, there is no Si–Si bond within a layer. We will construct the approximate band structure through a procedure similar to that used for the two-dimensional layers in BaAl₄, then stack the layers together to the three-dimensional lattice. We will use Al atoms first for a structural comparison, and then add the perturbation to derive the CeMg₂Si₂ bands. The simplest starting point is again the hybrids. For the hollow with apical atoms we use 23 (or 26) as the bonding scheme, whereas for the hollow without the apical atom the orbital levels are trivial: they are just the original hollow hybrid levels (left side of 23 or 26) before interaction with Al₂. In addition, we have an extra apical atom, interacting poorly with the two hollows. The schematic level diagram is shown in 31. The levels for the hollow without the apical atom should
be in the gap of those for the hollow with the apical, for that gap is created by the interaction between the hybrids and the apical atoms, now absent in the empty hollow.

In the three-dimensional solid one level should be pushed up by the interlayer interaction and all the levels develop into bands. 32. There should be no band gap in this case.

These bands are labeled "A" and drawn in a heavy line in Fig. 9. We will derive the approximate band structures again by interacting the square lattice bands with those of the apical atoms, as we did from Fig. 4 to Fig. 5.

In the Mg$_2$Si$_2$ type layer there is no such symmetry as the glide plane in the BaAl$_4$ layer that we can use to reduce the unit cell size. We have to use the bands corresponding to two Al atoms in the square lattice to interact with the apical atoms.

Fig. 10 is such a band structure, as derived by folding back the bands in Fig. 2 for the same square lattice but half the unit cell size (one Al atom per unit cell). The Brillouin zones for the two different choices of unit cells are the same as those shown in 17 and 18: the big unit cell corresponds to the small Brillouin zone (BZ) and vice versa. In the folding back process the M point of the big BZ (i.e. small unit cell, Fig. 2) is folded back to the $\Gamma$ point of the small BZ (large unit cell, Fig. 10). Similarly, the X$_1$ ($k_z = 0.5, k_\parallel = 0$), and the X$_2$ ($k_z = 0, k_\parallel = 0.5$) points of the big BZ are folded back to the M point of the small BZ. An example is provided by the $p_\parallel$ bands in Fig. 10 which are antisymmetric to the plane of the square lattice (labelled "A"). The two at the $\Gamma$ point in Fig. 10 correspond to one at $\Gamma$ and another at M in Fig. 2. The degenerate pair at M comes from the X$_1$
and $X_2$ points of the small unit cell lattice. This is illustrated in 34, where we identify the symmetry types ($\sigma$, $\pi$, $\delta$) with respect to the apical position.

The bands in 34 can interact with the out-of-phase combination of the orbitals of the apical atoms sitting above and below the square hollow, shown in 35. The basal orbitals corresponding to $\Gamma$, $M$ interact with the apical ones, resulting in orbitals at the same $k$ points, $\Gamma$, $M$. Note that by simply moving the apical Al atom in a BaAl$_3$ layer to an adjacent hollow, without changing the apical to basal atom distance, one attains a short apical to apical distance of
2.90 Å. This is the geometry we used to calculate the band structure of Fig. 9. At this Al′—Al′ separation the out-of-phase apical p level combinations are between the basal π and δ type levels. This is where the orbitals were set in 35. The other out-of-phase combination, \( \sigma^*_{\delta} \), is high up in energy, well out of range for reasonable interaction.
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**Fig. 10.** Band structure of the two-dimensional square lattice in BaAl₄, as obtained by “folding back” Fig. 3. There are two atoms in the unit cell now.

The resulting levels in 35 correspond to different points in the BZ. When we translate the results into a band structure scheme, what we obtain is 38 and 39. 38 is the approximate band structure before the apical-basal interaction is turned on. The p₃ bands of the basal atoms have the shape that we are familiar with, as in 34; the apical bands are flat and essentially the out-of-phase combinations of the MO's of the apical Al′—Al′ pair. 39 is what we have after the interaction is turned on. The \( \sigma \) and π type orbitals from the basal atoms are pushed down and correspondingly \( \sigma^* \) and \( p^*_{\delta}, p_{\delta} \) up in energy. The \( \sigma^*_{\delta} \) orbital, with the hybrid pointing away from the basal atoms, is not
pushed as high as the \( p_x', p_y' \) orbitals. The \( \delta \) type orbital from the basal atoms does not interact with the apical orbitals, neither do the \( \sigma^* \) at \( X \) nor the \( p_x', p_y' \) at \( \Gamma \). They stay where they were. The arrows in 38 indicate the directions in which the orbitals will move after the interaction is turned on; 39 is the product of the level shift indicated in that way in 38. When we connect the levels from the lowest one up, we will have the approximate band structure (the subset antisymmetric to the plane of the square lattice). 40. This is that the antisymmetric bands look like from \( M \) to \( \Gamma \) in Fig. 9, except that the \( \sigma^* \) band connects and crosses the \( \pi \rightarrow p_x, p_y \) band. This is due to another symmetry plane we have ignored so far, which is perpendicular to the plane of the square lattice and distinguishes \( p_x' + p_y' \) and \( \sigma^* \) (symmetric) from \( p_x' - p_y' \) (antisymmetric). We would rather not go into details, instead we point out that in this scheme of interaction there should be no band gap even within the antisymmetric bands, let alone for the symmetric bands in the complete band structure.

We now consider the perturbations that might be anticipated to the band structure in Fig. 9. The picture in 38, 39 can change if the apical atomic levels are well below the basal (square lattice) ones. This can happen when the apical atom is much more electronegative and the apical-apical distance shown in 36 is long so that the out-of-phase, antibonding apical combinations are close to the atomic ones in energy. Such a situation occurs in CeMgSi, where Si \((\chi = 1.9)\) is much more electronegative than Mg \((\chi = 1.3)\) \[26\] and the Si–Si distance within one layer is 3.19 Å (see 28). In this case the interaction picture should have the form of 41. All square lattice levels but the \( \delta \) type one are destabilized by the low-lying apical atoms. A big gap should be present between
the apical and the basal levels, and a small gap between the apical $p_z$, $p_y$, and the $\sigma_{p_z}$ bands.

Fig. 11 is the calculated band structure for the two-dimensional layer in CeMgSi$_2$. The antisymmetric bands (heavy lines) appear approximately they way we sketched them in 41, with a small direct gap present between the apical $p_x$, $p_y$ and the $\sigma_{p_z}$.
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**Fig. 11.** Band structure of the two-dimensional Mg$_2$Si$_2$ layer in CeMgSi$_2$. The heavy lines from M to $\Gamma$ are the bands which are antisymmetric to the square lattice plane in the layer. The main contributions to those bands are indicated at M and $\Gamma$.

When these layers are stacked into the three-dimensional CeMgSi$_2$ lattice, the $\sigma_{p_z}$ band will be pushed out of the low-energy region by interaction with the same band in another layer, shown in 42. There, the $\sigma_{p_z}$ orbitals related by the translation $a_1$ have the same phase (for $k_z = 0$), thus, the interlayer interaction is antibonding, as indicated by the arrow in 42. In another region of the BZ, where $k_z = 0.5$, the symmetric combination will be destabilized. 43, and for intermediate $k_z$ the destabilized level is a mixture. The crystal knows itself which bands should be sent up in energy.

Fig. 12 is the calculated band structures for the three-dimensional Mg$_2$Si$_2$ lattice. Now there are only 3 antisymmetric bands below $-6$ eV. There is a very
small direct gap between the seventh and the eighth bands (around $-6.6$ eV at $M$), but there is no gap in the density of states.

We will summarize the results obtained so far. In the BaAl$_4$ structure the apical to basal atom interaction separates the 16 bands for the four Al atoms into two parts. The bonding and antibonding parts each consist of 8 bands in the two-dimensional layer, but the interlayer interaction destabilizes one of the low-lying bands. Thus for the final three-dimensional lattice there are seven low-lying bands of Al–Al bonding character and the good electron count is 14. For the CeMg$_2$Si$_2$ type structure there is no such clear separation of bands into regions, although increasing the electronegativity difference between the apical and basal atoms enhances such a possibility, so does the elongation of the intralayer apical-apical atomic bond. 44 is such a pictorial summary of what we have said.

Fig. 12. Band structure of the three-dimensional Mg$_2$Si$_2$ lattice in CeMg$_2$Si$_2$. The heavy lines from $M$ to $\Gamma$ are the bands which are antisymmetric to the square lattice plane in CeMg$_2$Si$_2$. 44
A consequence of the fact that the low-lying levels in BaAl$_4$ are more strongly apical to basal bonding and the high-lying bands more antibonding than the levels in a corresponding energy region in CeMg$_2$Si$_2$ is the following: For low electron filling the BaAl$_4$ structure is preferred. When the antibonding levels start to be filled, the preference will shift to the CeMg$_2$Si$_2$ structure, which has nonbonding levels in between the gap of 44a. This is shown schematically in 45, where we plot the difference in total energy for these two structures against electron filling. The critical electron count, $N_c$, should be slightly greater than 14. Our extended Hückel calculation gives $N_c = 18$ for Al atoms, but when the electronegativity difference and the intralayer apical-apical distance are increased, as in CeMg$_2$Si$_2$, $N_c$ changes to 17. CeMg$_2$Si$_2$ itself has 15 or 16 electrons per unit cell, depending on the choice of oxidation state of Ce. There are quite a few BaAl$_4$ type compounds with 15 (REAL$_2$:Ga$_3$) [10] or even 16 electrons per unit cell (SrAl$_2$:Pb$_3$) [30]. CeMg$_2$Si$_2$, on the other hand, is the only main group compound of its type to our knowledge. There are some transition metal compounds (BaPd$_2$:P$_3$, BaPd$_2$:As$_3$) of this type [31], in which the apical atoms (P or As) form bonds within the layer.

46. The oxidation state for the metal is then Ba$^{2+}$(Pd$^{4+}$)$_2$(P$_3$$^{6+}$)$_2$. Had the pnictogens not formed the bond between them, the electron count would have been Ba$^{2+}$(Pd$^{4+}$)$_2$(P$^{5+}$)$_2$, a good d$^8$ configuration for the Pd$^{4+}$ in the square planar coordination. The pnictogen-pnictogen bond in 46, however, is slightly longer than a single bond distance (single bond distance: P–P = 2.21 Å, As–As = 2.43 Å), and there is a short Pd–Pd contact (3.01 Å). The packing requirement, on the other hand, may also play a role in determining the structure.

Formation of an apical-apical bond also occurs for BaNi$_2$:Si$_2$, which is intermediate between BaAl$_4$ and CeMg$_2$:Si$_2$ structures [32]. 47. The big cation Ba$^{2+}$ interspersed in between the layers prevents the formation of the interlayer Si–Si bond. Thus Si atoms.
whose p orbital level is very close to the d band, form pairs within the layer. The proximity of the Si p orbital to the Ni d bands means that the antibonding σ* orbital of the Si pair is above the Fermi level and empty, and the Si–Si bond is thus formed. One type of Ni–Ni bond is broken, giving way to the Si pair. The gain in stability upon Si–Si bond formation overrides the cost of breaking of the Ni–Ni bond, as confirmed by our calculations [34].

**Al Metal**

In the hypothetical “cleavage” process 2, we had broken the FCC Al metal down to the two-dimensional layer 7 = 48 in order to understand the band structures, departing from the simplest two-dimen-
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sional square lattice. This was accomplished. We also came to a simple alternative view of the band structure of the two-dimensional layer by thinking of the bonding pattern for the square pyramid at each hollow as a five-center, six-electron scheme. One a, and two e combinations of the basal hybrids interact with the hyb hybrid and the p, p, orbitals from the apical Al atom, resulting in three low-lying orbitals. The LUMO is the b combination of the basal lone pairs, being of antibonding character and high up in energy. The other hybrid of the basal atom pointing away from the hollow, hyout, 49, is left free to interact, bond with the same type of orbital in another layer, which will result in another low-lying orbital for every two hollows.

![Diagram](image)

The reader may wonder what happens to the bands when assembling these two-dimensional layers together to form not BaAl₄, but the three-dimensional FCC Al lattice. This is exactly what we are going to do. But before we proceed, let us focus on some important geometric differences between the layer in BaAl₄ and that of Al metal.

The bond lengths in both layers are shown in 50. In FCC Al metal, the equivalents of Alₐ–Alₐ and Alₐ–Alₐ are equal (see 51). To put it another way, Al reconstructs, adjusts some of its bond distances and angles, when broken down to the two-dimensional layer by inserting Ba atoms. But why is the basal-basal bond elongated and the basal-apical shortened, and for instance, not the other way around?
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This can be easily understood based on our five-center, six-electron bonding pattern. 52. On the left side there are four hybrids per hollow, symmetry adapted, ready to interact with the four orbitals from the apical atom. This total of eight orbitals corresponds to two Al atoms, and is occupied by 7 electrons in BaAl₄. The three lowest orbitals of the square pyramid are all apical-basal bonding. But what about their basal-basal bonding character?
Only $a_1$ is $\text{Al}_b-\text{Al}_b$ bonding, while $e$ and $\text{hy}_{\text{out}}$ are basal-basal nonbonding.

We expect the basal-basal bond to be weak. If we calculate the $\text{Al}-\text{Al}$ overlap populations in an "unbiased" two-dimensional layer, with equal $\text{Al}_b-\text{Al}_b$ and $\text{Al}_b-\text{Al}_b$ distances, we obtain the result of 53. The expectations on the bonding differential are confirmed.

The orbital diagram for the two-dimensional layer cleaved from Al metal should be topologically the same as 52, except that without the Ba donating electrons, the $\text{hy}_{\text{out}}$ level should be unfilled. Fig. 13 shows the calculated bands for that layer. The band structure for the two-dimensional Al layer in Fig. 13 resembles that of the BaAl$_4$ layer in Fig. 7. The only significant differences is the degree of dispersion of the bands above the gap. This is partly due to our different parameters for the isolated Al atom and the Al bulk metal (see the Appendix). But the empty upper
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**Fig. 13.** Band structure of the two-dimensional layer from the FCC Al metal.
bands have no relevance to our present discussion. What is important is the fact that below the gap there are eight bands per two hollows, all of Al–Al bonding or non-bonding character.

We now stack the layers together to form the FCC lattice. The $h_{y_{out}}$ orbital, which points away from the hollow of the square lattice in the two-dimensional sheet, will now point toward the hollow of another layer. The orbital of the appropriate symmetry to interact in that layer is the $a_1$ of lower energy. Thus, we expect the $h_{y_{out}}$ orbital will be pushed up and there will be three bands per hollow which are of Al–Al bonding character. In other words, the bonding is maximized when there are six electrons per hollow, or three electrons per Al atom since each hollow contains one apical and one basal atom.

Fig. 14 is the band structure for the three-dimensional Al FCC lattice stacked from two-dimensional layers. We do not see a “six bands below the gap” pattern. This is because every Al now has the same environment, being both “apical” and “basal”, depending on where the $k$ vector is in the Brillouin zone. We could say that the five-center six-electron bonding pattern for a square pyramid could be thought of as “resonating” around the six possible square pyramids surrounding the apical atom in FCC Al metal.

In the delocalized band picture, the choice of the unit cell that we are led to by our layer construction (4 Al atoms) is not a good starting point. The simplest unit cell contains only one Al atom, and the band structures will be those in Fig. 14 but “unfolded”, the reverse process to that in Fig. 7. However, the bonding character of the orbitals is the same, the physics does not change, no matter how we approach the construction of the electronic structure of the solid.

Fig. 15 is the COOP curve for Al metal. The Fermi level is almost exactly at the turning point at the COOP, the energy below which the states are Al–Al bonding and above which they are Al–Al strongly antibonding. In other words, three electrons per atom is the optimal count for main group FCC metals. Not surprisingly, Al has the highest cohesive
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**Fig. 14.** Band structure of the three-dimensional FCC Al metal. The unit cell contains four atoms.

**Fig. 15.** Crystal Orbital Overlap Population curve for the shortest Al–Al bond in FCC Al metal.
energy (77 kcal/mol) among the main group FCC metals [35].

In fact, Al, together with Be (hcp), is the element which has the highest cohesive energy among all the main group elements on the metal side of the Zintl line in the Periodic Table. Our calculations reproduce the trend (Fig. 16), although the numerical value of the cohesive energy differs from the experimental one for Al. The values for other electron counts are calculated assuming a rigid band model, i.e., using the Al geometry and parameters, and should not be taken too seriously when comparing to real experimental values for other metals. Only the trend has meaning in this rigid band approximation.

Appendix

The extended Hückel method [36] was used in all calculations. Table I lists the parameters. For the bulk Al metal, the exponents were contracted ($\xi_s = 1.55$, $\xi_p = 1.60$) to fit the experimental band structures [37], in particular the dispersion along $\Gamma \rightarrow X$ and the gap at the X point. A set of 28 or more k points was chosen according to ref. [38] to calculate DOS and COOP.
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Table I. Extended Hückel parameters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orbitals</th>
<th>$H_o$ (eV)</th>
<th>$\xi$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Al 3 s</td>
<td>-12.3</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 p</td>
<td>-6.5</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Si 3 s</td>
<td>-17.3</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 p</td>
<td>-9.2</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mg 3 s</td>
<td>-9.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 p</td>
<td>-4.5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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