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Mullite (3Al\textsubscript{2}O\textsubscript{3}·2SiO\textsubscript{2}) is becoming increasingly important in electronic, optical, and high-temperature structural applications. This paper reviews the current state of mullite-related research at a fundamental level, within the framework of phase equilibria, crystal structure, synthesis, processing, and properties. Phase equilibria are discussed in terms of the problems associated with the nucleation kinetics of mullite and the large variations observed in the solid-solution range. The incongruent melting behavior of mullite is now widely accepted. Large variations in the solid solubility from 58 to 76 mol% alumina are related to the ordering/disordering of oxygen vacancies and are strongly coupled with the method of synthesis used to form mullite. Similarly, reaction sequences which lead to the formation of mullite upon heating depend on the spatial scale at which the components are mixed. Mixing at the atomic level is useful for low-temperature (<1000°C) synthesis of mullite but not for low-temperature sintering. In contrast, precursors that are segregated are better suited for low-temperature (1250° to 1500°C) densification through viscous deformation. Flexural strength and creep resistance at elevated temperatures are significantly affected by the presence of glassy boundary inclusions; in the absence of glassy inclusions, polycrystalline mullite retains >90% of its room-temperature strength to 1500°C and displays very high creep resistance. Because of its low dielectric constant, mullite has now emerged as a substrate material in high-performance packaging applications. Interest in optical applications mainly centers on its applicability as a window material within the mid-infrared range. [Key words: mullite, processing, substrates, infrared, transparent materials.]

I. Introduction

Phases of the SiO\textsubscript{2}–Al\textsubscript{2}O\textsubscript{3} and the SiO\textsubscript{2}–Al\textsubscript{2}O\textsubscript{3}–H\textsubscript{2}O systems have had, and will continue to have, a significant role in the development of traditional and advanced ceramics. As hydrous aluminum silicates, clay-based minerals have been used since the shaping of the first manmade ceramic products. Among the anhydrous forms, the group of sillimanite (Al\textsubscript{2}O\textsubscript{3}·SiO\textsubscript{2}) minerals (sillimanite, kyanite, and andalusite) (the phases that form at high pressures) and mullite (3Al\textsubscript{2}O\textsubscript{3}·2SiO\textsubscript{2}) (the only stable phase under atmospheric conditions) are well-known for their importance in refractories. In addition to these traditional applications, mullite in particular has received significant attention during the last decade as a potential matrix material for high-temperature structural applications, principally because it retains a significant portion of its room-
temperature strength at elevated temperatures and displays very high creep and thermal-shock resistance. Furthermore, mullite is now used as a ceramic substrate in multilayer packaging and has been shown to be a strong candidate as a window material in the mid-infrared range.

Although it is one of the most commonly found phases in industrial ceramics, the importance of mullite as a ceramic phase was only recognized during this century in the pioneering work of Bowen and Grieg published in 1924. This late recognition can be attributed to two factors: (i) the occurrence of mullite as a mineral is very rare in nature, and (ii) although it is a very common reaction product of most aluminum silicates at high temperatures (> 1000°C), mullite was mistakenly identified as a sillimanite mineral in some earlier studies. Sillimanite and its two polymorphs have orthorhombic crystal structures very similar to that of mullite, but at atmospheric pressure the sillimanite minerals always convert to mullite at elevated temperatures. The mullite compound, 3Al₂O₃·2SiO₂, is named after the Isle of Mull in the northern highlands of Scotland, where a rare occurrence of this compound is found in nature (Fig. 1). The occurrence of this compound on the Isle of Mull is thought to be a result of post-Caledonian volcanic activities in which clay mineral deposits, heated through contact with magma, produced a high-temperature mullite phase.

Scientific and technological developments as they relate to mullite can be categorized in three time periods. In the first period, from 1924 to 1950, the bulk of research activity was on the structural characterization of mullite with respect to the sillimanite group minerals. Most of the relevant studies from this period were well documented in an extensive review monograph by Grofcsik and Tamas. In the second period, starting in 1950, publications by Bauer et al. on the growth of the first single crystals of mullite by the Vernuil process raised doubts about the incongruent melting of mullite as reported by Bowen and Greig in 1924, and thus laid the pathway for a long series of phase equilibria studies on the SiO₂-Al₂O₃ system. The significant developments of this second period were reviewed by Davis and Pask. Although the studies on phase equilibria are still of concern today, in the third period, starting in the mid-1970s, the emphasis clearly shifted to the development of mullite as an advanced ceramic for structural, optical, and electronic applications. The beginning of this third period appears to coincide with the use of mullite single crystals in a creep study at 1500°C that showed that, at stress levels up to 876 MPa, mullite did not deform plastically.

Much of the progress in the third period was assessed at the international workshop on mullite held in Tokyo, Japan, in November 1987. Because of rapid progress in the field, a follow-up symposium to this workshop was organized on “Mullite Processing, Structure, and Properties” during the American Ceramic Society Pacific Coast Regional Meeting held in Seattle, Washington, in October 1990. Many of the papers presented at the Seattle symposium are now compiled as part of this special issue.

As a complement to the articles included in this issue, this feature article provides a broader perspective on the development of mullite for structural, optical, and electronic applications. Recognizing that further developments necessitate a thorough understanding of processing—structure—property relations, in the following sections we discuss the unresolved issues with respect to phase equilibria, structure, and the processing of mullite with the key ac-

Fig. 1. Geological map of Britain and Ireland showing the location of sedimentary and igneous rocks with the color code of the international scale for geological maps. Igneous rocks are coded with red and violet. The Isle of Mull in the northern highlands of Scotland is marked as a site of past volcanic activity. Because of a rare occurrence of the compound 3Al₂O₃·2SiO₂ on this island as a reaction product of clays, the compound was named “mullite.”
accomplishments of the last decade. Next, the impact of these accomplishments on property control is illustrated with brief discussions on the mechanical, electronic, and optical properties of mullite-based ceramic systems.

II. Phase Equilibria

The key problems of phase equilibria in the SiO₂-Al₂O₃ system can be discussed in two categories: (i) the melting behavior of mullite and (ii) the solid-solution range of the mullite phase field. Although uncertainties remain on the exact location of the immiscibility region, our discussion here is confined only to these two problems since they more directly relate to the control of the microstructural features of single-phase mullite systems. The first problem relates to the nucleation kinetics of mullite and/or alumina in aluminum silicate melts and is discussed in this section. The second problem, which requires an understanding of the crystal structure of mullite, is discussed in Section III. Since many of the details on these issues have been extensively covered in recent reviews, our discussion is brief and focuses on what appear to be the reasons for the dilemma that has resulted in more than 70 years of confusion in the field.

The results of two recent noteworthy phase equilibria studies on the SiO₂-Al₂O₃ system are reproduced in Figs. 2(A) and 3. Figure 2(A) summarizes the results from the work by Aksay and Pask, and Fig. 3 is from the study by Klug et al. At first glance, the main common feature of these diagrams is the incongruent melting behavior of mullite, which agrees with the original work of Bowen and Greig. The main differences between the diagrams center on (i) the peritectic temperature and composition and (ii) the extent of the solid-solution range. These differences are quite significant and puzzling especially since both studies represent a set of very carefully performed experiments. When faced with this dilemma, the usual solution has been to assume that one of the diagrams is correct and the other is wrong. A proper approach, however, is first to assume that both sets of experimental results are correct but that the differences are in the interpretation of the results. Following this approach, in Fig. 2(B) we superimpose the latest version of the Klug et al. diagram (Fig. 3) on the Aksay and Pask diagram of Fig. 2(A). Note that the composite diagram of Fig. 2(B) reveals two other important points: (i) the metastable extension of the phase field in one diagram totally encompasses the stable phase field of the other, and (ii) the metastable (congruent) melting temperature of one perfectly matches the stable (incongruent) melting point of the other. The problem then reduces to trying to understand the conditions that led us to observe these differences and to differentiate between the stable and metastable states. By virtue of the unique diffusion couple technique used to determine the diagram in Fig. 2(A), it at present stands out as the one that provides a more unifying view of stable and metastable states.

The diffusion couple technique leading to the diagram in Fig. 2(A) is unique since it can be utilized to determine the stable and metastable equilibrium assemblages. This point can be illustrated with an example that addresses the problem of nucleation in aluminum silicate melts and thus the consequent diffusion on the exact location of the peritectic composition. Diffusion zone microstructures of three diffusion couples, each of which was annealed at 1903°C for 15 min, but cooled at different rates, are shown in Fig. 4. These microstructures differ drastically, although the average composition profiles and the liquidus compositions at the alumina single-crystal interface— as obtained by scanning an electron beam over an area affected by localized crystallization—are identical. The precipitated crystalline phase, as determined by electron microprobe and X-ray diffraction (XRD) is mullite in the

Fig. 2. (A) Stable and metastable phase diagram of the SiO₂-Al₂O₃ system, as determined by diffusion-couple experiments and through characterization of melt-quenched samples. (B) Insert in (B) superimposes the solid-solution range of mullite (shaded region) as determined by Klug et al. on the diagram of (A).

Fig. 3. SiO₂-Al₂O₃ phase diagram, as determined through microstructural characterization of quenched samples. Note that when this diagram is superimposed on Fig. 2(A), the solid-solution range falls completely within the solid-solution range of ordered mullite (Fig. 2(B)).
couple that was quenched (Fig. 4(A)), alumina in the couple that was cooled relatively slowly (Fig. 4(C)), and a composite of alumina and mullite in the couple that was cooled at a moderate rate (Fig. 4(B)). Since the liquidus composition at the peritectic temperature is 52.3 wt% alumina, ~350 µm of the diffusion zone adjacent to the alumina portion of the diffusion couple would experience some alumina precipitation during equilibrium cooling (Fig. 2(A)). The absence of alumina in this portion of the diffusion zone of a quenched couple (Fig. 4(A)) and the presence of alumina in a slowly cooled couple (Fig. 4(C)) can be explained only on the basis of supercooling of the liquid. Therefore, note that, although the overall composition profiles obtained by averaging over an area are independent of the nature of the microstructure and always provide information on the stable equilibrium conditions, microstructural observations could yield conflicting results depending on the experimental conditions followed. Consequently, when a phase diagram is determined only by microstructural examination of quenched samples, either one of the phase diagrams may be proposed as the stable one since the microstructure of Fig. 4(A) would lead an investigator to propose the diagram of Fig. 3, whereas the microstructure of Fig. 4(C) would lead to Fig. 2(A). However, independent of the microstructural features, the composition profiles in all microstructures support Fig. 2(A) as the stable diagram although more work is needed to clearly understand the conditions that lead us to the metastable states.

III. Crystal Structure of Mullite

The crystal structure of mullite is a modified defect structure of sillimanite, Al₂O₃·SiO₂, in which the mullite stoichiometry is achieved by substituting Si⁴⁺ ions with Al³⁺ ions in the tetrahedral sites of the alternating aluminum and silicon columns, as in the scheme 2Si⁴⁺+O²⁻=2Al³⁺+□ (Fig. 5).³⁸⁻²⁹ The crystal structure is orthorhombic, and the average composition may range from 3Al₂O₃·2SiO₂ (3/2) to 3Al₂O₃·SiO₂ (3/1).³⁵⁻²⁹⁻³⁰⁻³⁴ This is achieved by the removal of oxygens from the O(3) positions (tetrahedral linking oxygens)³⁵ and by a readjustment of cations from the $T\rightarrow T^{*}$ type in partially occupied columns formed by linking $(Si, Al)O₄$ tetrahedra (Fig. 6).³³⁻³¹⁻³³⁻³⁵ The octahedral $AlO₆$ clusters (Fig. 5), which form the columnar structure by sharing edges, and the center of the orthorhombic unit cell do not change during this rearrangement. In general, the elemental composition of mullite in this well-accepted defect structure is expressed as

$$Al_{2}^{x/2}(Al^{IV}_{2-x/2}Si_{2-x/2})O_{x-1},$$

where $x$ denotes the amount of missing oxygen from the formula and VI and IV denote sixfold and fourfold coordinations of aluminum, respectively, and silicon occupies the fourfold positions. Although the ordering of aluminum on the sillimanite-type $(Al, Si)^{IV}$ sites cannot...
be detected, the new (Al)$^{IV}$ sites can be detected by XRD and electron diffraction analyses. It has been observed that $x$ continuously changes from 0.17 to 0.6 in parallel with the ordering of the vacancies on the O(3) site. For example, for $x=0.25$, the composition becomes $3\text{Al}_2\text{O}_3\cdot 2\text{SiO}_2$ (space group $P6_3/m$; unit-cell dimensions $a=7.940 \text{ Å}$, $b=7.880 \text{ Å}$, and $c=2.885 \text{ Å}$ ($1 \text{ Å}=10^{-9} \text{ nm}$), and, for $x=0.57$, the composition is $3\text{Al}_2\text{O}_3\cdot \text{SiO}_2$.

Structural studies, which have concentrated primarily on the effects of kinetics, temperature, and composition, in the presence or absence of alumina, have resulted in the development of various forms of mullite structures. All of these factors can promote the development of metastable forms of mullite because of ordering/disordering of oxygen vacancies. The ordering phenomena in mullite have been studied by examining extra reflections that are produced in XRD and electron diffraction patterns. These reflections are either in the form of satellite reflections (sharp and diffuse, denoted by S-mullite and D-mullite, respectively) or in diffuse streaks in which sharpness indicates the ordering and diffuseness indicates the disordering. Generally, when mullite is synthesized from a melt of high alumina content and then quenched to room temperature, its structure is highly ordered and a pair of sharp reflections occur around the $\{h0l\}$ reflections of the matrix; the sharpness changes with respect to the alumina content in the structure. The solid-solubility limit of alumina in mullite can extend as high as 83.2 wt% (76 mol%) when mullite is formed from a melt. In these aluminous concentrations, the mullite lattice is heavily twinned, with twin spacing in the nanometer range. In this case, depending on the initial concentration of alumina and the cooling procedures, a continuous change in the composition of mullite can be obtained from an alumina/silica ratio of 1.5 to 3.17.

On the other hand, the stable form of mullite has the 3/2 composition of alumina and silica when mullite is formed from diffusion couples of silica and alumina. These images also indicate at least 50% cation displacement from the nearest neighbors to $T^*$-type columns. This displacement is presumably a result of vacancies created in oxygen sites, which are randomly distributed (and thus
these sites do not produce diffuse scattering in the electron diffraction patterns).

Structural analysis studies of various mullites formed using solid-state reactions or melt-grown samples indicate that mullite can have a solid-solubility range from about 70 to 84 wt% alumina (x = 0.17 and x = 0.59, respectively), which is consistent with the phase equilibria studies. The issue of alumina solubility is still disputed in these studies, especially with respect to the extent of the solubility range near the peritectic transformation. However, despite numerous structural studies, there has been no systematic study to determine the exact conditions under which these ordered and disordered structures form and the nature of their compositions. For example, it is very probable that several different forms of mullite are present in a given sample prepared under a set of synthesis conditions involving differential heating and cooling, which may cause changes in the heterogeneous distribution of diffusing species (e.g., oxygen) and, hence, result in nonuniform ordering. Therefore, it would be useful if future studies were directed toward the determination of the precise limits of sub-phase fields of various mullite compositions prepared under controlled kinetic and thermodynamic conditions. These studies would, then, identify whether it is possible to have several forms of mullite, both ordered and disordered, at a given temperature but with slightly different compositions and the phase transformation conditions of these structures. These studies would be essential for identifying these structures and their phase stabilities and other physical properties.

**IV. Synthesis and Processing**

Driven by the need to produce high-quality mullite for optical, dielectric, and structural applications, progress in the last decade on the synthesis and processing of mullite has been exemplary. With the use of chemically synthesized powders and colloidal consolidation methods, it is now possible to produce almost single-phase mullite in the temperature range of 1250°C to 1500°C (Fig. 7). In comparison to conventional methods that require either hot-pressing above 1500°C or pressureless sintering above 1650°C, low-temperature-processing methods allow pressureless sintering of mullite-matrix composites, co-sintering with metals in multilayer packaging, and fiber processing (Fig. 8).

Since nature has not been generous in providing us with minerals that contain a molecularly mixed state of aluminum and silicon at the stoichiometric composition of mullite, until recent years most commercial products were produced through reaction sintering of mixed minerals (e.g., clays with alumina). In such systems, the scale of chemical homogeneity is limited to the size of the particles, and, thus, global homogenization to the mullite stoichiometry is left to the high-temperature (>1650°C) heat-treatment stage.

Today, high-quality commercial powders of mullite are produced by nanometer-scale mixing of aluminum, silicon, and oxygen. A recent extensive review by Sacks et al. provides detailed information on the various

---

**Fig. 7.** Densification behavior of mullite is compared among samples prepared by a diphasic sol–gel route, colloidal mixing of α-alumina and kaolinite (conventional), colloidal consolidation of composite powders, and CVD-processed powders. Low-temperature sintering of sol–gel and composite-processed powder systems is due to viscous deformation of amorphous silica-rich matrix.

**Fig. 8.** Mullite fibers are used in thermal and electrical insulation, reinforcement, and high-temperature filtration. Another application is in fire-resistant fabrics to protect boom that are used to collect oil spilled on water. As shown in this figure, using a composite fabric containing NEXTEL 440 ceramic fibers of 3M Co. (3M Fire Boom), the oil may be burned in situ under controlled conditions when retrieval is not possible or practical. High-temperature properties of the fabric allow the boom to maintain an effective oil barrier after exposure to a long, intense oil fire.
methods used in the preparation of mullite-based powders. Many of the articles included in this issue also address the methods used to synthesize and process mullite through molecular and colloidial routes. The key concepts that have emerged from these recent studies are summarized below.

(1) **Low-Temperature (<1250°C) Reaction Pathways to Mullite**

The reaction sequences of molecularly and/or colloidially prepared mullite-forming precursors show strong resemblances to those observed in clay-based systems. When the scale of chemical homogeneity is at the atomic level (i.e., monophasic precursors), mullite formation is typically observed at ~980°C through an exothermic reaction. For instance, amorphous powders produced by chemical vapor deposition (CVD) or spray pyrolysis directly transform to mullite. Similarly, slow hydrolysis of mixed alkoxide or salt-solution constituents can retain a finer scale of mixing between the two components and thus promote mullite formation directly.

In contrast, when the scale of homogeneity is in the nanometer range (~1 to 100 nm) (i.e., diphasic precursors), mullite formation is generally preceded by the formation of transient alumina phases and can be delayed to temperatures as high as 1300°C, as evidenced by a second exothermic reaction at ~1200°C. For instance, powders or gels that are prepared through rapid hydrolysis of salt or alkoxide solutions yield diphasic-type precursors. Diphasic precursors, however, a completely different mechanism than what is observed at high temperatures appears to control the nucleation and growth of mullite. In diphasic systems, although alumina is present prior to the formation of mullite, the nucleation of mullite is not at the alumina-matrix interface but instead is within the siliceous amorphous matrix. The apparent mechanism is the nucleation of mullite within the matrix as the matrix reaches the saturation concentration necessary to support mullite nucleation. This nucleation is then the cause of the second exothermic reaction discussed above. Subsequent growth of mullite is controlled by the dissolution of alumina in the matrix but not by inter-

(2) **Microstructure Evolution During (<1300°C) Heat Treatment**

In the conventional approach, when mullite is produced through reaction sintering of alumina and silica at temperatures above 1650°C, the nucleation and growth of mullite occurs as an interfacial reaction product between alumina and silica. In this case, the growth rate is controlled by the diffusion of aluminum and silicon through the mullite layer. Since this is a parabolic rate process, mullitization slows down with time, and, consequently, the elimination of the siliceous liquid phase becomes difficult with grain growth.

In the case of low-temperature (<1300°C) processing of mullite with diphasic precursors, however, a completely different mechanism than what is observed at high temperatures appears to control the nucleation and growth of mullite. In diphasic systems, although alumina is present prior to the formation of mullite, the nucleation of mullite is not at the alumina-matrix interface but instead is within the siliceous amorphous matrix. The apparent mechanism is the nucleation of mullite within the matrix as the matrix reaches the saturation concentration necessary to support mullite nucleation. This nucleation is then the cause of the second exothermic reaction discussed above. Subsequent growth of mullite is controlled by the dissolution of alumina in the matrix but not by inter-

![Corning's luminescent window made of Cr³⁺-doped mullite glass-ceramic. Low dielectric constant and optical transparency of fine-grained polycrystalline mullite has led to interest in potential applications as a host material for solid-state laser activator. In highly crystalline glass-ceramic, quantum efficiencies of 30% to 40% have been reported, in glass, quantum efficiencies are less than 1%; in single crystal, efficiencies are close to 100%.

Corning's luminescent window made of Cr³⁺-doped mullite glass-ceramic. Low dielectric constant and optical transparency of fine-grained polycrystalline mullite has led to interest in potential applications as a host material for solid-state laser activator. In highly crystalline glass-ceramic, quantum efficiencies of 30% to 40% have been reported, in glass, quantum efficiencies are less than 1%; in single crystal, efficiencies are close to 100%.
diffusion through mullite. The transmission electron microscopy (TEM) study described below illustrates this point.

Figures 9(A) and (B) show characteristic regions of a sample prepared by colloidal mixing of α-alumina and high-purity kaolinite to attain an overall composition of 3Al₂O₃·2SiO₂ and then heat-treated to 1300°C for 1 h to achieve partial densification and mullitization. Note that mullite crystallites, 5 to 100 nm in size, are all found within the amorphous matrix, but none are observed in association with alumina particles. Many of the crystallites are already in contact with each other (Fig. 9(B)). A higher magnification image (Fig. 9(C)) of the interface region of the bicrystal shown in Fig. 9(B) reveals the lattice structures of both crystallites (the dark one in the [001] orientation and the other in the [123] orientation) and no amorphous region at the interface. The significance of this image is that glass-free interfaces between mullite grains start developing even at these early stages of mullite formation. This observation parallels the findings discussed in Sections II and III on high-alumina-content mullites that crystallize in melts quenched from high temperatures. However, when heated to temperatures higher than 1200°C, the alumina content decreases toward the stoichiometric (60 mol%) composition. As in the case of high-temperature mullites, the cause of these structural and compositional variations is not clearly understood.

(3) Low-Temperature (<1350°C) Sintering through Viscous Densification

Although various elegant methods have been developed to produce submicrometer-sized and phase-pure mullite powders, the pressureless sintering of these powders to a fully dense state at temperatures below 1500°C has not been possible (Fig. 7) mainly because of the low interdiffusion rates of silicon and aluminum ions in crystalline mullite. To circumvent this problem, the approach that is now preferred for low-temperature (<1350°C) densification is sintering through viscous deformation of amorphous mullite-forming systems prior to total mullitization. Thus, delaying the mullitization step to higher temperatures is an essential requirement for the success of this approach. A study of phase formation during densification shows that, in addition to mullite, the crystallization of cristobalite in the temperature range of 1275°C to 1350°C also contributes to retarding densification rates (Fig. 10). Various methods have been developed to implement densification via viscous phase deformation (Fig. 7). For instance, with diphasic sol-gel-based systems, nearly fully dense (>98.5%) states have been achieved at temperatures as low as 1250°C. In recent studies, composite particles of alumina coated with amorphous silica have been used to achieve the same result without the deleterious effects of excessive shrinkage experienced in the sol-gel-based systems during densification.

V. Mechanical Properties

Mullite has never been considered suitable for high-strength applications at low temperatures. Depending on the microstructural features, the low fracture toughness of mullite (about 2.2 MPa·m¹/₂) limits its strength to the range of 200 to 500 MPa. For high-temperature applications, however, mullite has long been recognized for its excellent resistance to creep and thermal shock in refractories. Furthermore, recent studies have shown that phase-pure mullite can also retain its strength to temperatures as high as 1500°C. Combined with its intrinsic thermal stability under oxidizing condi-
tions, mullite then stands out as a unique material for high-temperature applications not only as a single-phase material but also as a matrix material in the development of high-temperature composites. Consequently, over the last decade, research work has concentrated on two key areas: (i) understanding the role of microstructural features that affect high-temperature strength and creep resistance, and (ii) increasing the fracture toughness of mullite through composite engineering.

(1) High-Temperature Strength

In the polycrystalline form, the most essential requirement for retaining the strength of mullite at elevated temperatures appears to be the elimination of glassy boundaries. As illustrated in Fig. 11, when a polycrystalline mullite is not phase pure, although a noticeable increase in strength occurs above the softening temperature of the glassy inclusions, the effect of the glassy pockets is also to reduce the strength at higher temperatures. This initial increase in strength corresponds to a similar increase in fracture toughness caused by the blunting of the cracks with the viscous phase. Since the softening temperature of siliceous inclusions is expected to increase with the purity level, the maximum in the high-temperature strength shifts to temperatures as high as 1300°C in highly pure systems and can drop below 1000°C as the impurity level increases. When the glassy phase is crystallized to form cristobalite, the maximum in strength disappears, but the resulting mullite–cristobalite composite now retains a higher level of its strength up to 1400°C (Fig. 11). In the absence of glassy inclusions, however, polycrystalline mullite retains a significant portion of its room-temperature strength up to 1500°C.

(2) Creep Resistance

Significant differences are observed in the creep behavior of phase-pure polycrystalline mullite in comparison to mullite-matrix composites. The first definitive study attesting to the unusually high creep resistance of mullite at 1500°C indicates that mullite in single-crystalline form shows no plastic deformation at stress levels up to 900 MPa (the limit of the instrumental system used). Similarly impressive results have been obtained with polycrystalline mullite without an amorphous boundary phase (Fig. 12). In the case of mullite matrix composites and/or mullites that contain an amorphous boundary phase, creep resistance decreases (Fig. 12). However, when an amorphous boundary phase is present, the steady-state creep resistance is decreased by 2 orders of magnitude when tested under constant stress in the temperature range of 1177°C to 1427°C and stress levels of 5 to 220 MPa. A 20 vol% silicon carbide-whisker-reinforced mullite composite also containing an amorphous phase shows similar behavior, but only 1 order of magnitude decrease in the creep resistance. The three different activation energy regimes also appear to be related to the change in the viscosity of the amorphous phase with temperature. In the middle-temperature regime, cavitation primarily at the grain boundaries appears to be responsible for the high-activation-energy creep, whereas in the low- and high-temperature regimes, cavitation is not observed.
VI. Electronic Properties

High-performance packaging requirements for new-generation computer systems place a premium on the development of ceramic substrates with a low dielectric constant, high wiring density, and low sintering temperatures to achieve cosintering with metals such as copper and thermal-expansion match to silicon. As a substrate, mullite, with a dielectric constant, $\varepsilon = 6.7$, results in about 17% lower signal transmission delay time than alumina ($\varepsilon = 9.8$). Furthermore, mullite has a low-thermal-expansion coefficient ($4 \times 10^{-6}$/°C in the 20° to 200°C range), which is almost that of silicon. Consequently, mullite and mullite-based glass-ceramics have now emerged as candidates in high-performance packaging applications. As illustrated in Fig. 13, Hitachi's multilayer ceramic system is now totally based on a mullite substrate.

Recent research has shown that further reductions in the dielectric constant to values as low as 4.5 can be achieved with a mullite-glass composite. As illustrated in Section IV, with sol-gel or composite powder methods, pure mullite can now be sintered at temperatures as low as 1250°C. Thus, it is quite likely that further reductions in sintering temperatures can be achieved with a mullite-glass composite, thus making mullite an ideal candidate for cosintering with copper.

VII. Optical Properties

Recent interest in the optical properties of mullite has focused on its applicability as a window material within the mid-infrared portion of the spectrum, from 3- to 5-µm wavelength. Although various attempts have been made to produce optical-grade mullite and the infrared characteristics of mullite have been studied extensively since the 1950s, the first successful demonstration of mullite as an infrared transparent window by Prochazka and Klug is quite recent. In Fig. 14, we compare the transmissivity of their mullite with various other ceramic materials in this mid-infrared range. Figure 14 shows that the optical properties of mullite compare favorably to other advanced materials as a potential window material. Two features are of significance: (i) the presence of the 4.3-µm absorption band in the transmittance spectrum of mullite is quite deleterious to the overall properties of the mullite, and (ii) the 5-µm cutoff of mullite windows is below the cutoff of other window materials. As discussed below, the 4.3-µm absorption appears to be associated with processing-related defects and thus may be eliminated, but the 5-µm cutoff is intrinsic to the structure of mullite.

The very large absorption band centered at 4.3 µm was first attributed by Prochazka and Klug to tetrahedral silicon within the mullite matrix. A close examination of the sol-gel-processed mullite showed nanometer-sized amorphous inclusions within the mullite matrix.
grains, which may be responsible for the 4.3-μm absorption (Fig. 16).

Detailed analysis of mullite grains from densified samples revealed that each grain included isolated, roughly spherical pockets with sizes ranging from 3 to 20 nm. The HREM image presented in Fig. 16 shows such a region in a single grain of mullite in the [010] projection of the lattice. The structure of the amorphous phase in the pockets is discernible from the phase contrast which arises because of the differences in diffraction (crystallinity) and absorption (mass) between the pockets and the mullite matrix. Analysis of the amorphous phase within the pockets was made by electron energy loss spectroscopy, which determined that the phase is composed of about 88 mol% silica and 12 mol% alumina. The presence of pockets with amorphous silica is attributed to the silica, which remains between the AlOOH particles during the gelation step and are then entrapped within the mullite grains during the mullitization process above 1000°C.

The 5-μm cutoff within the infrared range for mullite is due to the Si-O bond within the matrix and is therefore intrinsic to the material. The cutoff region can be shifted for glasses if cations of larger size and lower crystal field strength are used. Thus, germanium oxide has a cutoff at 6 μm, compared to 5 μm for silica. Similarly, in aluminum germanate (3Al₂O₃·2GeO₂), the germanium analog to mullite, the infrared cutoff shifts to about 6 μm.

The potential applications of infrared-transparent mullite are principally as windows in chemically harsh, hot, or mechanically stressful environments. More recently, mullite glass-ceramics have been studied as a potential matrix material for Cr³⁺, a luminescent transition metal used as an optical activator in solid-state lasers (see photograph on p. 2349). Normally, activators of this type are stabilized and protected by using crystalline "hosts" (e.g., alexandrite) because the electronic structure of the ion is sensitive to the crystal field strength of the crystal. The expense of using crystalline hosts led to an interest in amorphous matrices, but quantum efficiencies for Cr³⁺ were found to fall below 1%. Mullite glass-ceramic was seen as a material of interest because of its stability as a phase, its defect structure, and the low dielectric constant for mullite glass-ceramics. In mullite, Cr³⁺ quantum efficiencies increased by 30% to 40%, and optical gain was found to be almost one-third that of Cr³⁺ in alexan-
Increasing crystallinity in the mullite glass-ceramic reduced scattering losses, indicating that the Cr$^{3+}$ ion preferentially resides in the crystalline phase and that it is possible to synthesize polycrystalline materials approaching the quality of laser crystals.

**VIII. Conclusions**

The current intense interest in mullite as an important candidate material for demanding structural, electronic, and optical applications is well justified. Its attractive properties include excellent high-temperature strength and resistance to creep and thermal shock, low dielectric and thermal-expansion constants, and good transmission at high temperatures in the mid-infrared band. However, despite the advances in fundamental research on mullite in recent years, much more laboratory research and development is required before the full potential of mullite, as an advanced ceramic material, can be realized.

After decades of controversy, uncertainties about the phase equilibria of the silica–alumina system still continue. Conflicting views mainly arise when only one method of analysis is used to determine the phase diagram. More properly, in addition to microstructural characterization, the overall composition must also be profiled to determine the stable and metastable equilibrium conditions. On this basis, the phase diagram shown in Fig. 2(A) is the most unifying one since it combines the results of various methods to provide an overall view for all stable and metastable states.

Large variations in the composition of mullite, ranging from 3Al$_2$O$_3$·2SiO$_2$ to 3Al$_2$O$_3$·3SiO$_2$, appear to relate to the defect structure as manifested by the ordering/disordering of oxygen vacancies. Additional studies are needed to determine the limits of sub-phase fields for mullites of different compositions. Controversy still attends the nature of the ordered and disordered structures which appear in mullites prepared under different conditions. Although it is probable that several different forms of mullite exist in a given sample, much more work is needed to clarify these structures and their effect upon phase stabilities and physical properties.

Almost single-phase mullite can now be produced at temperatures between 1250° and 1500°C using molecular and/or colloidal mullite precursors. Precursors with atomic-scale homogeneity convert directly to mullite at temperatures near 980°C, but these precursors are not ideal for the low-temperature sintering of mullite. In contrast, with diphasic precursors (with a scale of 1 to 100 nm) and silica-coated particles, mullite formation is delayed to the 1300° to 1550°C range, and, thus, these systems provide the means for low-temperature sintering via viscous deformation. However, although viscous sintering is beneficial, especially in the processing of composites, it is essential that glassy inclusions must later be converted to crystalline phases since glass-free grain boundaries are prerequisite to maintaining the high-temperature strength of mullite and to maintaining high creep resistance.
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