

ERRATA

I. Jahnsite, Segelerite, and Robertsite, Three New Transition Metal Phosphate Species.
II. Redefinition of Overite, An Isotype of Segelerite.
III. Isotypy of Robertsite, Mitridatite, and Arseniosiderite

PAUL BRIAN MOORE

Department of the Geophysical Sciences,
 University of Chicago,
 Chicago, Illinois 60037

The American Mineralogist, 59, 48-59, inadvertently omitted the following table from the original publication.

TABLE 8. Robertsite, Mitridatite, and Arseniosiderite. Chemical Analyses

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
CaO	19.21	19.13	15.94	17.4	15.7	17.4	14.82	14.44	16.54	16.10
Mn ₂ O ₃	36.05	--	--	36.3	2.4	2.7	--	--	--	--
Fe ₂ O ₃	--	36.31	30.27	0.70	32.1	35.6	30.53	32.71	38.60	38.48
P ₂ O ₅	32.41	32.28	--	32.2	28.4	31.5	--	--	30.84	31.08
As ₂ O ₅	--	--	43.56	--	--	--	43.60	42.67	--	--
H ₂ O	12.33	12.28	10.23	12.0	11.5	12.8	9.83	9.34	11.60	11.79
rem.	--	--	--	1.95	10.5	--	0.39	1.41	2.57	2.78
	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.55	100.6	100.00	99.17	100.57	100.15	100.23
<u>Cations in Cell</u>										
Ca ²⁺	24			22.3*		23.0	22.6	21.9		
Mn ³⁺	32			33.1		2.5	--	--		
Fe ³⁺	--			0.6		33.0	32.5	34.8		
P ⁵⁺	32			32.7		32.9	--	--		
As ⁵⁺	--			--		--	32.4	31.6		
H ¹⁺	96			95.9		105.3	93.2	88.2		

¹Ca₃Mn³⁺(OH)₆(H₂O)₃[PO₄]₄, proposed formula for robertsite.

²Ca₃Fe³⁺(OH)₆(H₂O)₃[PO₄]₄, proposed formula for mitridatite.

³Ca₃Fe³⁺(OH)₆(H₂O)₃[AsO₄]₄, proposed formula for arseniosiderite.

⁴Robertsite. J. Ito, analyst. Rem. = K₂O 0.08, Na₂O 0.28, MgO 0.13, ZnO 0.30, Li₂O 0.03, Al₂O₃ 0.7, H₂O(-) 0.43.

⁵Mitridatite. J. Ito, analyst. Rem. = K₂O 0.08, Na₂O 0.1, MgO 0.03, ZnO 0.26, insol. 10.0 (quartz).

⁶Mitridatite (5). Recomputed.

⁷"Mazapillite" (= Arseniosiderite). Rem. = Sb₂O₅ 0.25, P₂O₅ 0.14. Mazapil, Mexico. Koenig (1889).

⁸Arseniosiderite. Rem. = PbO 0.28, FeO 0.12, MgO 0.61, insol. 0.40. Mapimi, Mexico. Foshag (1937).

⁹Chukhrov *et al.* (1958), Sample 2. Rem. = MgO 0.60, SrO 0.27, MnO 0.30, Al₂O₃ 0.32, CO₂ 0.92, insol. 0.16. H₂O⁺ 7.08, H₂O⁻ 4.52. The specific gravity is 2.950.

¹⁰Chukhrov *et al.* (1958), Sample 3. Rem. = MgO 0.27, SrO 0.30, MnO 0.36, Al₂O₃ 0.92, CO₂ 0.77, insol. 0.16. H₂O⁺ 6.43, H₂O⁻ 5.36. The specific gravity is 3.064, <n> = 1.77.

* Rem. = 0.12 K, 0.69 Na, 0.24 Mg, 0.27 Zn, 0.99 Al.

Calculation of Binary Solvi with Special Reference to the Sanidine-High Albite Solvus

WILLIAM C. LUTH, AND PHILIP M. FENN

Department of Geology, Stanford University,
 Stanford, California 94305

The American Mineralogist, 58, 1009-1015.

Through the several versions of the original manuscript, certain of the references to the figures and to the equations used in the calculation of the various solvi have inadvertently been reversed. The following changes will correct the published version:

- (1) Figures 2a and 3a have been reversed, and
- (2) on page 1011, column 1, line 7, the reference to equation (3) should refer to equation (4); in column 2, line 9, the reference to equation (4) should refer to equation (3); and in line 16, the reference to equation (3) should refer to equation (4).

Murataite, a New Complex Oxide from El Paso County, Colorado

JOHN W. ADAMS, THEODORE BOTINELLY,
 W. N. SHARP, AND KEITH ROBINSON

U. S. Geological Survey, Denver, Colorado 80225

The American Mineralogist, 59, 172-176. The indices for *d* (obs) 2.622 should read 440 instead of 400.

Photograph Identification Contest

American Mineralogist, **59**, 380 and 447–453.

Photograph No. 1:

We apologize for misidentifying the photographer and the minerals involved.

The photograph was published by D. June Sutor and Susan E. Wooley, Department of Chemistry, University College, Gower Street, London, W. C. I., in *Science* **159**, 1113–1114. It was described by them as “a gallstone of almost perfect octahedral symmetry . . . composed of a mixture of crystallites of the three polymorphous forms of calcium carbonate: calcite, aragonite, and vaterite.”

Mr. Richard I. Gibson, who submitted the photograph, writes “. . . the photo I submitted is in fact identical to that in the Sutor and Wooley article. This misrepresentation was completely unintentional, but is due entirely to failings on my part.

“The photograph was among the papers of the late Carl W. Beck, of Indiana University, and was accompanied by a label identifying the minerals as I submitted them to you. I made the obviously wrong assumption that the photo was by Dr. Beck, himself an expert on human mineralogy. In addition, my own experience with such minerals indicated that the label was, indeed, correct. A further mistake of mine was in not identifying Dr. Beck as the photographer.

“I regret this confusion very much, but it is all my fault. . . . My apologies to Sutor and Wooley, and to the members of MSA.”

Photographs 4–8:

The correct word, *micrograph* or *photomicrograph*, as supplied by photographers Buseck and Iijima, should displace “microphotograph.”