MINERALOGICAL NOTES

MINERALOGICAL MAGAZINE, MARCH 1989, VOL. 53, PP. 131–2

Protocols for scientists on the deposition of investigated mineral specimens

THE mineral specimens which form the basis of scientific investigations should be retained in permanent repositories for future investigators. Just as it is important, as part of the scientific methodology, for a responsible investigator to provide information on the conditions of experiments so that the results may be repeated and corroborated or challenged, it is equally important that the very specimens used in such investigations be retained in major museums. These specimens are the only mineralogical evidence for the investigations. Although many mineralogists retain studied samples for some time, the duration of this retention period is affected by temporary degrees of interest, and many other factors, mortality among them.

Large, research-oriented museums maintain systematic, well-curated collections in which such material is preserved. It is thus available for both contemporary and future investigators. Mineralogists are encouraged, in all instances, to deposit all studied samples in these repositories.

Unfortunately, this has been done only infrequently, and the vast preponderance of investigated mineral specimens has either been lost, or the necessary links between these specimens and the published studies of them has been lost because the studied material was not deposited. Careful institutional curation can preclude the loss of information and specimens, and should be utilized by the responsible investigator as a normal adjunct to the completion of such studies, much in the way publication functions as a final repository for the data. The preservation of investigated specimen material is, therefore, a critical responsibility of professional mineralogic practice. Even unpublished data can best be preserved in museums so that it too, with the specimens, may be eventually shared with others.

The original investigator is the person best qualified to document which specimens were actually used; this is of *critical* significance in the case of type specimens (Dunn and Mandarino, 1987). The use of specimen numbers, carefully cited in the published research, remains the best method of correlating specimens and data. Deposits should be made in a direct manner, not third-hand, so that the integrity of the material is not compromised. Supporting correspondence is useful in the archival aspects of curation, and is therefore encouraged. The cooperation of all mineralogists is necessary in this long-term effort to serve the science; those who have used such research collections know well their potential and value. Please help to enhance and sustain them by depositing investigated specimens in large, well-established institutional mineral collections.

The preceding statement was approved by both the Commission on Museums, and the Commission on New Minerals and Mineral Names, of the International Mineralogical Association.

Reference

Dunn, P. J. and Mandarino, J. A. (1988) *Mineral. Mag.* **52**, 129–31.

P. J. DUNN*

Department of Mineral Sciences, Smithsonian Institution, Washington DC 20560, USA

* USA member, Commission on New Minerals and Mineral Names, IMA.

[*Manuscript received 24 May 1988*]

Chemical and mineralogical compositions of black shales (Middle Palaeozoic of the Central Pyrenees, Haute-Garonne, France)—erratum

IN the paper by Saupé and Vegas (1987) an oversight occurred in the preparation of the figures. Samples 101, 104, and 106 were collected at a later stage of the study, and for this reason were analysed by XRF at a different laboratory. These results were used in constructing the diagrams. In order to improve the internal consistency and to include minor elements, these three analyses were later duplicated at the CRPG by automated emission spectrography using a micro-wave plasma source. The latter data are reported in Table 1, but the corresponding points were not modified in the figures. Table 1A below gives the parameters of the two sets of determinations and can be used for correcting the figures. Those shown in bold are the final correct figures; the plain figures correspond to the points to be removed. The data for all other samples are correct.

As a result of these corrections, the representative points of samples 101 and 106 are displaced by small

Table 1. Correct (bold type) and superseded (plain type) values of the parameters of the representative points of the samples 101, 104, and 106 in Figs. 4–7 of Saupé and Vegas (1987)

	Samples					
Parameter	**101**		**104**		**106**	
Al / 3 - Na	**86**	83	**54**	17	**51**	42
Al / 3 - K	**33**	31	**24**	- 41	**34**	27
Al - (Na + K)	**210**	214	**172**	44	**196**	181
Si / 3 - (Na + K)	**267**	227	**247**	181	**192**	166
K / Al	**0.21**	0.23	**0.25**	0.54	**0.23**	0.25
Na / Al	**0.02**	0.05	**0.14**	0.25	**0.18**	0.21
(Fe + Mg) / (Al - Na)	**0.76**	1.01	**0.53**	1.40	**0.64**	0.75
K / (Al - Na)	**0.22**	0.24	**0.29**	0.72	**0.28**	0.32

amounts which do not substantially change their positions—they are sometimes moved nearer the positions of related samples. The representative points of sample 104 (stars in a square) undergo important shifts and are brought nearer to the positions of related samples (stars and underlined stars). Inasmuch as sample 104 is a pelite from thin pelite–limestone alternations, it is interesting to note the limited exchange between these two different rock types during metamorphism.

The authors thank G. R. Parslow (University of Regina, Saskatchewan, Canada) for pointing out these inconsistencies.

Reference

Saupé, F. and Vegas, G. (1987) *Mineral. Mag.* **51,** 357–69.

KEYWORDS: shales, Middle Palaeozoic, Pyrenees, France.

F. SAUPÉ
G. VEGAS

Centre de Recherches Petrographiques et Geochimiques (C.R.P.G.), Boîte Postale 20, 54501 Vandoeuvre-les-Nancy, France

[*Manuscript received 21 April 1988*]