———, G. C. AMSTUTZ AND S. CHAN (1964) Syntheses and x-ray investigations within the system FeS_2—CoS_2. *Neues Jahrb. Mineral.* (in press).

SWANSON, H. E., N. T. GILFRICH AND G. M. URGINIC (1955) Standard X-ray diffraction powder patterns. *Natl. Bur. Stand. Circ.* **539**, V, 29–31.

WASSERSTEIN, B. (1949) Observations on two precision lattice measurements of pyrite from Leadville, Colorado. *Am. Mineral.* **34**, 731–35.

WÖHLER, F. (1836) Künstliche Bildung von krystallisiertem Schwefelkies. *Liebig's Ann. Chemie* **17–18**, 260.

THE AMERICAN MINERALOGIST, VOL. 49, JANUARY–FEBRUARY, 1964

X-RAY POWDER DATA FOR AMINOFFITE

J. A. MANDARINO, *Earth Sciences Division, Royal Ontario Museum, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario.*

When aminoffite was first described by Hurlbut (1937), single-crystal x-ray data were included, but not powder data. The writer borrowed one of the type specimens (Harvard Museum No. 106917) and removed a few small crystals for a powder pattern. The measured data were indexed

TABLE 1. X-RAY POWDER DATA FOR AMINOFFITE

(Harvard Museum No. 106917)
CuKα Radiation
Camera Diameter 57.3 mm
R.O.M. Film No. 1770

hkl	$d_{calc.}$(Å)	$d_{obs.}$(Å)	$I_{obs.}$	hkl	$d_{calc.}$(Å)	$d_{obs.}$(Å)	$I_{obs.}$
110	9.758			213	2.887		
101	7.990			402	2.820	2.840	9
200	6.900	6.97	7	332	2.710	2.730	½
211	5.222			510	2.707		
002	4.900	4.90	4 diff	303	2.663		
220	4.879			431	2.657		
112	4.379	4.40	7	501			
310	4.364			422	2.611	2.614	10
301	4.164			323	2.484		
202	3.995	4.02	8	521	2.479		
321	3.564			004	2.450	2.455	2
222	3.456	3.48	7	440	2.440		
400	3.450			114	2.376	2.380	6
312	3.258	3.30	½	512	2.369		
330	3.253			530	2.367		
103	3.179			413	2.338		
411	3.167	3.11	7	204	2.309	2.315	1
420	3.036			600	2.300		
		2.96*	½	611	2.210		

* Magnetite impurity.

TABLE 1—(*Continued*)

hkl	$d_{calc.}$(Å)	$d_{obs.}$(Å)	$I_{obs.}$	hkl	$d_{calc.}$(Å)	$d_{obs.}$(Å)	$I_{obs.}$
224	2.190			660	1.626		
442	2.184			116	1.611		
620	2.182			750	1.604		
314	2.136	2.141	8	435	1.598		
532	2.131			505			
433	2.108			831	1.594		
503				206	1.590	1.590	7
541	2.105	2.094	1	822	1.584		
602	2.082			525	1.557		
523	2.016			653	1.554		
631	2.013			226	1.549		
404	1.998	2.002	6	662	1.544		
622	1.993			840	1.543		
334	1.957					1.532	1
550	1.951					1.480	½
710						1.447	1
105	1.940					1.404	2
701	1.933	1.926	6			1.388	2
424	1.919					1.359	1
640	1.914					1.334	5
215	1.868					1.288	1
613	1.863					1.244	1
721	1.861					1.230	½
514	1.816	1.821	½			1.208	½
552	1.813					1.191	3
712						1.174	3
730	1.812					1.157	1
305	1.803					1.141	1
543	1.799	1.791	1			1.112	4
642	1.783					1.092	2
325	1.744					1.072	½
633	1.741					1.059	1
651	1.739					1.036	1 brd
444	1.729	1.734	5			1.014	1
800	1.725					1.002	½
534	1.705					.992	1
732	1.700					.981	1
415	1.691					.961	½
703	1.688					.955	½
741	1.686					.935	2
811						.912	2
604	1.677	1.681	7			.892	1 brd
820	1.674					.876	1 brd
723	1.640					.868	½
006	1.633	1.634	5			.855	1
624	1.630					.849	2
802	1.627						

using Hurlbut's single-crystal data: space group $I\ 4/mmm$, $a=13.8$ Å, and $c=9.8$ Å. The results are shown in Table 1. The weak line at d = 2.96 is probably due to a small amount of magnetite.

The writer is indebted to Professor Hurlbut for providing the aminoffite specimen.

REFERENCE

HURLBUT, C. S. (1937) Aminoffite, a new mineral from Långban. *Geol. Fören. Forh.* **59**, 290–292.

ERRATA

A corrected calculation of laumontite (Leonhardite and Laumontite in Diabase from Dillsburg, Pennsylvania, Lapham, 1963, *Am. Mineral.* **48**, 683–689) based on 60 cations for 64 oxygens should read:

1) $Ca_{3.85}Na_{.21}K_{.09})(Al_{7.68}Mg_{.08}Fe_{.05}Si_{15.25})O_{48}\cdot 16.39$

H_2O If calculated on the basis of 28 total cations, the formula is:

2) $(Ca_{3.96}Na_{0.22}K_{.09})(Al_{7.90}Fe_{.05}Mg_{.09}Si_{15.69})O_{48}\cdot 16.91$

H_2O If calculated on the basis of 48 oxygens with no charge imbalance, the formula is:

3) $(Ca_{4.00}Na_{0.22}K_{.09})(Al_{7.98}Fe_{0.05}Mg_{.09}Si_{15.86})O_{48}\cdot 17.05$

H_2O

Formula 1) treated H+ as a cation site and is probably incorrect.

Formula 2) implies a charge imbalance and tetrahedral deficiency.

Formula 3) based on charge balance is preferred. The author is grateful to Douglas Coombs for correcting the original calculation to formula 3).