THE AMERICAN MINERALOGIST, VOL. 56, JANUARY-FEBRUARY, 1971

COMPARISON OF MOURITE FROM KARNES COUNTY, TEXAS WITH MOURITE FROM THE U.S.S.R.¹

MARIE LINDBERG SMITH AND JOHN MARINENKO, U. S. Geological Survey, Washington, D. C. 20242, AND ALICE D. WEEKS, Temple University, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 19122.

Abstract

Mourite, ideally $4[(U^{6+}O_2) \cdot 2Mo^{5+}O_2(OH)_2 \cdot 3Mo^{6+}O_2(OH)_2] \text{ or } 4[(U^{4+}O_2) \cdot 5Mo^{6+}O_2(OH)_2]$, depending upon whether the reducing power of the sample is ascribed to molybdenum or to uranium, occurs at the Boso-Hackney prospect in Karnes County, Texas, the first reported locality outside the Soviet Union. Mourite forms spherulitic masses of purple bladed fibers elongated parallel to *b* and flattened on {100}; the cleavage on {100} is pronounced. The indices of refraction exceed 1.79, with many fibers being opaque; other fibers are pleochroic in shades of dark blue-violet and greenish blue-black. Unit cell measurements derived from a refinement of the powder diffraction data are a=24.443(9) A, b=7.182(1), c=9.901(2), $\beta=102^{\circ}13'(2)$. The principal reflections in the powder diffraction pattern are d(400)=5.98 A, (I=100); d(003)=3.226 (I=35), d(222)=2.888 (I=31), d(800)=2.986(I=22), $d(\overline{403})=3.132$ (I=21), and d(001)=9.66 (I=13).

A new chemical analysis for Russian mourite shows 99.3% hydrous uranium molybdenum oxides, whereas the original analysis shows 93.19% hydrous uranium molybdenum oxides and 7.35% oxides of other cations. Unit cell measurements derived from a refinement of the powder diffraction data are a=24.426(6)A, b=7.185(1), c=9.895(1), $\beta=102^{\circ}10^{\circ}(1)$. The new interplanar spacings for the Russian mourite include a different set of strong reflections from those previously reported.

INTRODUCTION

A molybdenum uranium mineral was separated from the uranium ore samples collected by Weeks in 1955 and 1956 at the Boso-Hackney prospect in Karnes County, Texas. The prospect is located at the foot of the north end of Tordillo Hill (named on the Fashing quadrangle, Texas, $7\frac{1}{2}$ minute topographic map of the U. S. Geological Survey). The location is 12 miles southwest of Falls City, Texas, and 100 yards southeast of Farm Route 791 at Tordillo Hill. This prospect was one of many small near-surface deposits which stimulated further drilling down the dip and led to the finding of much larger deposits. Reference to this uranium molybdate mineral was made by Weeks in a joint paper by Frondel and Weeks (1958).

This mineral was first designated "Unknown 8653" because its X-ray powder diffraction pattern differed from that of other molybdenum uranium minerals. Its identity with mourite (Kopchenova *et al.*, 1962) was first suspected from chemical data which indicated Mo:U=5:1.04, whereas Mo:U=5.5:1 was reported for type mourite. A sample of

¹ Publication authorized by the Director, U. S. Geological Survey.

mourite from the U.S.S.R. was obtained through the courtesy of Professor G. P. Barsanov of the Fersman Mineralogical Museum, Moscow, U.S.S.R. The chemical analysis and X-ray diffraction data obtained in the present study from this specimen established the identity of the Texas mineral with mourite. Karnes County, Texas, is the second reported occurrence for mourite.

GEOLOGIC OCCURRENCE

The general geologic setting of the Karnes County uranium deposits is described by Eargle and Weeks (1968), and Weeks and Eargle (1963). At the Boso-Hackney prospect the host rock is a sandy and tuffaceous member (known as the Stone Switch Sandstone Member) of the Whitsett Formation, Jackson Group of late Eocene age. The sandstone is highly lithic and feldspathic with many grains of slightly to highly altered volcanic fragments, zoned feldspars, and moonstone-sanidines. Some ore sand is very friable, some firmly cemented with interstitial clinoptilolite; and locally, as at the mourite occurrence, it is very tightly cemented with opal and chalcedony. Interbedded with the sand is tuffaceous clay containing plant impressions. Abundant glass shards are preserved at nearby uranium localities, although not directly at the mourite prospect.

Small amounts of molybdenum are present in many of the Texas Coastal Plain deposits forming yellow molybdates, such as iriginite, near the surface, or dark blue water-soluble ilsemannite in leachings from the walls of the deep open ore pits. A unique feature at the mourite locality is a tight silica cement found at the surface of the ground. The cement preserves a reducing environment in which mourite, pyrite, and marcasite can survive. The opal coating of the sand grains and the interstitial filling of opal and chalcedony enclose microscopic needles of mourite. The interlocking of the opal cement with the mourite grains made the purification of the analysis sample difficult and prevented accumulation of more than a minimal amount.

PHYSICAL PROPERTIES

Mourite occurs in spherulitic masses of purple bladed fibers, elongated parallel to the monoclinic b axis and flattened on {100}. Cleavage on {100} is pronounced. Most of the matted masses are several millimeters in diameter, but individual crystals are of micron size. Some fibers are larger, up to 0.5 mm. along [010], but these tend to be randomly oriented in the zone normal to the fiber axis. Mourite has an adamantine luster. The optical properties are incompletely known because the fibers decompose in the required index liquids, n > 1.79. Many of the grains ap-

MOURITE

pear to be opaque, but others of approximately the same size are pleochroic in shades of dark blue-violet and greenish blue-black. The extinction is parallel to the fiber axis in mourite from Texas. Kopchenova *et al.* (1962) report that mourite has inclined extinction ($\sim 10^{\circ}$) relative to the cleavage. We observed microscopic platelets of Russian mourite which were flattened on {100}, but elongated along [001]. In this orientation the reported extinction angle would be $Z \land c$, but as all the platelets examined were opaque, we were unable to confirm their extinction angle.

X-RAY CRYSTALLOGRAPHY

X-ray powder diffraction data for mourite are given in Table 1. Preliminary unit cell measurements obtained from Weissenberg and Buerger precession patterns were refined in stages by least squares analysis of X-ray diffraction powder data using the method of Evans et al., 1963. In earlier cycles, the refinement was based upon a small pseudocell with $a \sim 12.22$ A, $b \sim 3.59$, $c \sim 9.90$, $\beta \sim 102^{\circ}$, using all reflections in the powder diffraction pattern with intensities >1 on a scale of 100, and limiting conditions of possible reflections to those consistent with space groups C2, Cm, or C2/m. In later cycles, the refinement included interplanar spacings for the remaining very weak reflections; the *a* and *b* axial lengths were doubled; concomitantly, the previously determined hkl were fixed as 2h, 2k, l in the larger cell. For *hkl* with k = 2n, 2h + 2k = 4n; for k = 2n + 1, no restrictions were placed on h. In rotation patterns from thick bundles of fibers taken along [010] eighteen very weak h1l reflections were observed, including (010), (110), and (210), whereas only ten h1l reflections are resolved in the powder pattern. The suggested space group for mourite is Pa or P2/a.

There are significant differences between the new interplanar spacings and those cited by Kopchenova *et al.* (1962); some, but not all, may be attributed to their use of unfiltered copper radiation. The interplanar spacing, d=12.77 Å, reported by Kopchenova *et al.* (1962), was looked for, but not observed in patterns of mourite; the spacing d(001) = 9.67 Å found in our patterns, was not reported by them. If these interplanar spacings are basal spacings, respectively, of a more hydrated phase, and of a less hydrated phase, then the patterns of mourite should vary depending upon the water content of the sample at a given point in the hydration or dehydration process.

A variation in basal spacings with conditions of humidity in the atmosphere has been reported for the hydrous uranium molybdate, umohoite, $(UO_2)MoO_4 \cdot 2H_2O$ (Kamhi, 1959). In our study, the remarkable constancy of the unit cell parameters of mourite from two localities indicates that stable phases have formed with fixed volume requirements.

The interplanar spacings of mourite from Russia were obtained from clusters of crystals enclosed in a sealed glass capillary and X-rayed without either grinding or cementing into a spindle, whereas clusters of crystals and fibers of mourite from Texas were mounted on the open end of a glass rod for X-raying. A new chemical analysis of mourite from the U.S.S.R. shows that the sample that we have X-rayed has both the larger H₂O: Mo ratio, calculated elsewhere in this paper, and the smaller initial spacing, d(001) = 9.67 Å, thus excluding the 12.77 Å interplanar spacing as a basal spacing of a more hydrated phase. Either the reflection is from an impurity or it represents a contamination of copper radiation by molybdenum radiation. The spacing 12.77 Å, assuming $\lambda = 1.5418$ Å and $2\theta = 6.92^{\circ}$, may be recalculated as d(400) = 5.89 Å, using $\lambda = 0.7107$ Å and $2\theta = 6.92^{\circ}$.

CHEMISTRY

Chemical analyses of mourite are cited in Table 2. Kopchenova *et al.* (1962) calculated the reducing capacity of mourite to U^{4+} in order to avoid dividing the oxides of molybdenum into two valence states. They noted, however, that U^{4+} cannot be present together with Mo^{6+} in an acid medium; they also noted that the blue-violet color of mourite was characteristic of molybdenum in lower stages of oxidation.

Our analyses of mourite are calculated in two ways. The reducing capacity of the sample is ascribed to Mo^{5+} (Table 2, columns 4 and 6) and to U^{4+} (Table 2, columns 5 and 7). The evidence that the reducing capacity is due to Mo^{5+} is the blue-violet color of the mineral and the fact that Mo^{6+} would be reduced by U^{4+} in acid solutions, as noted above. The evidence that the reducing capacity of the sample is due to U^{4+} is that a UF₄ precipitate formed when the mineral was digested with HF solution. When we consider the additional fact that U^{4+} molybdate is insoluble in solutions of low acidity, this would change the acid potential of the $U^{4+}-U^{6+}$ couple so that the U^{4+} state is favored.

The reducing capacity was determined by decomposing the sample in 20 percent by volume hot sulfuric acid in the presence of excess potassium dichromate. Air was excluded by passing nitrogen through the solution during decomposition. Excess dichromate remaining in solution was determined by titration with standard ferrous iron.

The analysis of mourite from the U.S.S.R. (Kopchenova *et al.*, 1962) shows 93.19 percent hydrous uranium molybdénum oxides and 7.35 percent oxides of other cations (total 100.54 percent). The analysis was recalculated to its main components: "Rough approximate ratios of the oxides may be expressed in the form

 $(\mathrm{UO}_2 + \mathrm{UO}_3) \cdot 5.5 \mathrm{MoO}_3 \cdot 5.3 \mathrm{H}_2\mathrm{O}$

166

Locality			U.5	S.S.R.				Karnes Col	unty, Texas	10	
Reference	Kopchene et al., (196	оvа 62) ^а					Present study				
Radiation	Cu-unfilte	ered			Cu/Ni, λ=	=1.5418 Å		Cu/Ni, $\lambda =$	-1.5418 Å	$Cr/V, \lambda$ =	=2.2902 Å
b b c Vol_*			24.426 Å 7.185 9.895 102°10' 1698 Å ³	$\pm 0.006 \text{\AA} \pm 0.001 \pm 0.001 \pm 1'$			$\begin{array}{c} 24.443 \ \mbox{Λ\pm 0$}, 009 \ \mbox{$\Lambda$}\\ 7.182 \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \$				-
	$\prod_{I}^{\text{measure}} d$	ed (Å)	calcul hkl	$d^{\rm b}_{\rm d}({ m \AA})$	meas I	ured ^e d (Å)	calculated ^b d (Â)	measu	$d^{\circ}(\hat{A})$	mea I	sured ^e d (Å)
	90 12. 10 6.	.77	001 110	9.673 6.880	1 ²	9.67 6.87	9,677 6,878	a∆	9.66 6.87	MM	9.65
	40 40 100 5.	- 41) - 10 - 897 - 520	$\frac{210}{400}$	6.156 5.969 5.639 5.470	100 9	5.65	5.972 5.644 5.470	100 9	5,98 5,66	s mw	5.97 5.65
		000	111	5.452		5.45	5.452	$\stackrel{\scriptstyle <}{\scriptstyle \sim}$	5.49		
			311 002	4.977	777	4.98	4.977 4.839	$\nabla\nabla$	4,98 4,83	WV	4.837
			$\frac{401}{311}$	4.660 4.414	\sim 1	4.40	4.661				
			112 511 511	4.075 3.929	$\overline{\vee}\overline{\vee}$	4_06 3_931	4.076 3.931	$\tilde{\lor}$	4,07		
			312 112	3.865 3.848	$\overline{\vee}$	3.850	3.867 3.849	$\stackrel{\scriptstyle \checkmark}{\sim}$	3.863		
	10 (3.	,598)	212 020	3.617 3.592			3.591	$\stackrel{\scriptstyle \wedge}{_{\scriptstyle 1}}$	3.614		
	20 (3. 10 (3.	.528). 421)	220 402	3.440 3.421	1	3.424	3.439 3.422	4	3.426	ΜΛ	3,419
	70 3. 70 3.	.285 193 148	$\frac{2}{221}$ 003 221	3.305 3.224 3.181	25 25 25	3, 302 3, 226 3, 181	3.305 3.226 3.180	Quartz 17 35 17	3,344 3,306 3,226 3,179	ms	3 - 225

(Continued on next page)

MOURITE

167

TABLE 1. X-RAY DIFFRACTION POWDER DATA FOR MOURITE

utimu
-(Con
E 1
LABI

ed

a di, (106)/s rtream study a calculated/s measured/s <	1	Kope	chenova	U.S	,S.R.			X	Karnes Cou	nty, Texas		
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	1	et al.,	, (1962) ^a					Fresent study				
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		I me	asured d (Å)	calcu hkl	$d^{\rm b}({\rm \AA})$	measu I	d (Å)	$\operatorname{calculated}^{\mathrm{b}}d(\mathrm{\hat{A}})$	meas I	${ m sured}^{ m c}_{d}({ m \AA})$	mea I	sured ^e d (Å)
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		50	3,095	$\frac{403}{711}$	3.126	18	3.130	3.128	21	3 132	В	3.130
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$				801	3.038	4	3.036	3.040	V V	3 038	M	3.038
80 2.871 32.2 2.887 31 2.887 31 2.887 31 2.887 31 2.887 31 2.887 31 2.887 31 2.887 31 2.887 31 2.887 31 2.887 31 2.887 31 2.887 31 2.887 31 2.887 31 2.887 31 2.887 31 2.887 31 2.603 10 2.713 2.607 9 2.725 10 2.617 2.607 10 2.617 2.607 10 2.617 2.603 10 2.617 2.603 10 2.617 2.617 10 2.617 10 2.617 10 2.617 10 2.617 10 2.617 10 2.617 10 2.617 10 2.617 10 2.617 10 2.617 10 2.617 10 2.725 2.617 2.617		20	2.955	213	2.993	15	2.983	2.995 2.986	∧1 20	3.003 7.986	Ξ	084
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		80	2.871	222	2.887	38	2.887	2.887	31	2 888	I	1
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		40	(2.710)	222	2.726	15	2.724	2.726	6	2.725		
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	_			$\frac{801}{621}$	2.669			2.697				
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$				620	2.667	1	2.666	2.667	< 1	2.663		
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		10	2.595	403	2.616	~	2.614	2.616	9	2 617	mw	2.616
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$				622	2 489		4.430 tn	2.490	15R	2 485		
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$				621	2 482	18	2.482	2.482	101	COL.7		
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		09	2.464	803 803	2.465			2.467				
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		10	107	225	124 2	c	967 6	2, 428	c	107 0		101 0
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		IU	7.401	+0+ 100	2.440 7.418	7	074.7	2.428	s /	2 421	MUI	7.470
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		10	2.311	802	2.330	4	2.330	2.330	10	2 330	шw	2.331
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$				131	2.300	1	2.300	2.302	1.3			
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$			ion of	223	2.284	7	(2.279	2.284	V	2.284		
$ \begin{bmatrix} 10 & 2.198 & \frac{623}{331} & \frac{2.214}{2.101} \\ 331 & 2.202 & \frac{612}{331} & \frac{2.207}{2.133} \\ 531 & 2.131 & \frac{2.104}{331} & \frac{2.201}{2.195} \\ 332 & 2.133 & <1 & \frac{2.193}{2.133} \\ 11.11 & 2.121 & \frac{2.196}{332} & \frac{2.213}{2.123} \\ 11.11 & 2.121 & \frac{2.109}{332} & \frac{3}{2.109} & \frac{2.109}{3} \\ 60 & 2.024 & \frac{2201}{22.035} & 12 & 2.037 \\ 122.01 & 2.037 & 2.037 & 2.037 \\ 332 & 2.025 & 12 & 2.025 \\ \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 2.044 & 2.037 & 2.037 & 2.037 \\ 12.0.1 & 2.035 & 15 & 2.037 \\ 12.0.1 & 2.025 & 15 & 2.025 \\ \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 2.026 & 2.024 & 2.038 & 15 & 2.038 \\ 12.0.1 & 2.035 & 12 & 2.037 \\ 12.0.1 & 2.025 & 12 & 2.025 \\ \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 2.036 & 2.024 & 2.038 & 15 & 2.038 \\ 12.0.1 & 2.025 & 12 & 2.025 \\ \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 2.036 & 0 & 2.024 & 0 & 0 \\ 12.0.1 & 2.035 & 0 & 0 \\ \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 2.037 & 0.037 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 12.025 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 2.036 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 12.025 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 2.036 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 12.025 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 2.036 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 12.025 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 2.036 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 12.025 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 2.036 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0$		10	(007.7)	514	2 249		[2.240	2.251	\sim	2.248		
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	_			$\overline{623}$	2.214			2.215				
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		10	2.198	622	2.207	\$	[2.204	2.207	1	2.211		
$ \begin{bmatrix} 10 & 2.100 \\ 331 & 2.133 \\ 332 & 2.123 \\ 332 & 2.123 \\ 332 & 2.123 \\ 332 & 2.109 \\ 404 & 2.003 \\ 11.11 & 2.121 \\ 12.011 & 2.037 \\ 332 & 2.035 \\ 332 & 2.025 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 2.196 \\ 2.123 \\ 2.123 \\ 2.123 \\ 2.123 \\ 2.123 \\ 2.112 \\ 12 & 2.133 \\ 12 & 2.038 \\ 12 & 2.037 \\ 2.037 \\ 2.038 \\ 12 & 2.038 \\ 12 & 2.038 \\ 12 & 2.038 \\ 2.025 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 2.193 \\ 1 \\ 2.113 \\ 1 \\ 2.113 \\ 1 \\ 2.038 \\ 1 \\ 2.038 \\ 1 \\ 2.025 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0.113 \\ 1 \\ 2.113 \\ 1 \\ 2.113 \\ 1 \\ 2.038 \\ 1 \\ 2.038 \\ 2.025 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0.13 \\ 1 \\ 2.113 \\ 1 \\ 2.113 \\ 1 \\ 2.038 \\ 1 \\ 2.038 \\ 2.038 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0.109 \\ 1 \\ 2.113 \\ 1 \\ 2.038 \\ 1 \\ 2.038 \\ 2.038 \\ 1 \\ 2.025 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0.109 \\ 1 \\ 2.113 \\ 1 \\ 2.113 \\ 1 \\ 2.038 \\ 1 \\ 2.038 \\ 1 \\ 2.038 \\ 1 \\ 2.038 \\ 1 \\ 2.025 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0.109 \\ 1 \\ 2.113 \\ 1 \\ 2.113 \\ 1 \\ 2.038 \\ 1 \\ 2.$	-			331	2.202	ļ	to	2.201				
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$				913	2.191		2.196	2.193				
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$				531 227	2 133	~ 1	2 12/	2.133				
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	_			11.1.1	2.121			2.122				
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		10	2.100	804	2.109	3	2.109	2.111	1	2,113	mw	2.109
12.0.1 2.035 2.037 2.037 2.025 2.025		09	2.024	$\frac{404}{224}$	2.095	12	2 037	2.094 2.038	5	(2, 038	ANUL	2 038
332 2.025 2.025 2.025)		12.0.1	2.035			2.037		1	WITT	000-1
	-			332	2.025			2.025		2 025		

168

SMITH, MARINENKO, AND WEEKS

Locality		U.S.S.R.			Karnes County, Texas		
Reference	Kopchenova et al., (1962) ^a			Present study			
	I measured d (Å)	$\begin{array}{c} \text{calculated}^{\text{b}}\\ hkl d \ (\text{Å}) \end{array}$	$\lim_{l} \max_{d} (\mathbf{\hat{A}})$	calculated ^b d (Å)	$I \qquad d (\hat{A})$	I	asured ^e d (Å)
		10.2.1 2.019 12.0.2 1.994		2.020			
	a	803 1.991 12.00 1.990	166.1 0	1.991	166'1 6	Е	066 T
	30 1.982 30 1.958	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		1 989 1 967	5 1 969	м	1.969
		10.2.2 1.964	5 1.964	1.965			
	50 1.915	224 1.924 215	7 1.924	1 924	7 1 924 <1 1 905		
	10	10.2.1 1.884		1.884			100
	60 1 775	040 1.796	10 1.381	1 796	9 1.883	MUL	C 2 2 2 . I
	60 1.716	225 1.732	7 1.732	1.732	11 1.733		
		12.0.4 1 720	5 1 720	1.727	4 1 720	MA	1.727
		12.0.2 1.717	0 11170	1.718	071*T F	ΔM	1.716
		625 1.684 042 1.684	7 $\int 1.685$	1.683	7 1.684		
	60 1.675	624 1.677	1.677	1.677			
	1 630	406 1.646	6 1.646	1.647	7 1.646	m	1.647
	30 1.610	006 1.612	4 1.612	1 044 1 613	5 1.612	m	1.613
	Plus 22 reflections		Plus 17 reflections Film Nos. 15934, 15943		Plus 12 reflections Film No. 14120	Plus 5 Film	reflections No. 14238

* Camera diameter 114 mm.; in parentheses, from original table, indicate an alternate calculation from 20 is possible using CuK_B. Original intensities changed by present authors to scale of 100.

^b Includes all possible *likl* reflections, $d \ge 1.96$ A, for which 2k+2k=4n. Reflections for which k=2n+1 are very weak; calculated values reported only if consistent with a measured spacing. Unit cell constants from a refinement of the X-ray powder diffraction data, method of Evans et al., 1963.

 $^{\circ}$ Camera diameter 114.59 mm.; lower limit of observed $2\theta = 8.5^{\circ}$, Cu/Ni and Cr/V. The 12.77 Å spacing reported by Kopchenova *et al.* ($2\theta = 6.92^{\circ}$) is within the shadow of the beam catcher in the cut-off portion of our patterns using Ni-filtered-Cu radiation. The reflection was ooked for but not observed in powder and fiber patterns, Cr/V. Corrected for film shrinkage. Measured in triplicate and 20 averaged. Film no. 14238 is a fiber pattern showing h0t reflections, h = 4n; all other patterns are powder patterns. Abbreviations: s = strong, ms = medium strong, m=medium, mw=medium weak, w=weak, vw=very weak, b=broadened reflection.

MOURITE

TABLE 1.—(Continued)

2.43
- FT
्यत्तः
100
- 14
in the second
iner.
1000
1.00
dame.
100
-
See.
0
· •
1.00
64
1000
-
-
Test.
- E.
- 19 -0
180
0
5
- 196
1
1
0
6.2
1000
<u></u>
and a second
Z
-
-
P.
S A
A Si
ES A
SES A
SES A
YSES A
XSES A
LYSES A
ALYSES A
ALYSES A
VALYSES A
NALYSES A
ANALYSES A
ANALYSES A
ANALYSES A
ANALYSES A
L ANALYSES A
AL ANALYSES A
AL ANALYSES A
CAL ANALYSES A
CAL ANALYSES A
ICAL ANALYSES A
MICAL ANALYSES A
MICAL ANALYSES A
EMICAL ANALYSES A
EMICAL ANALYSES A
IEMICAL ANALYSES A
HEMICAL ANALYSES A
CHEMICAL ANALYSES A
CHEMICAL ANALYSES A
CHEMICAL ANALYSES A
. CHEMICAL ANALYSES A
2. CHEMICAL ANALYSES A
2. CHEMICAL ANALYSES A
2. CHEMICAL ANALYSES A
2 2. CHEMICAL ANALYSES A
E 2. CHEMICAL ANALYSES A
LE 2. CHEMICAL ANALYSES A
ILE 2. CHEMICAL ANALYSES A
BLE 2. CHEMICAL ANALYSES A
(BLE 2. CHEMICAL ANALYSES A
ABLE 2. CHEMICAL ANALYSES A
ABLE 2. CHEMICAL ANALYSES A
TABLE 2. CHEMICAL ANALYSES A

			ALLA	IVSCS						INALIOS		
	Calc. com- position	Previo	us data					Present stu	ıdy			
	(1)	(2) U.S.S.R.	(3) U.S.S.R.	(4) U.S.S.R.	U.S.S.R.	(6) Texas	(7) Texas		U S.S.R	(9) U.S.S.R.	(10) Texas	(11) Texas
NO3	00 2¢	2.40	2.27	26.6	2.2	24,1	0	14+11 0+0	0.98	76.0	1,04	(Excluded
MoO3	66,66	63.67	64.47	40.7	65.3	33 .4	57.6	Mo ⁺⁶	5.00	5.00	5.00	
M0205		1 • •	1	23.2		23.5	0.6	Mo ⁺⁵	0 58	04.0		
H20(+)		6.07	7.73	0.0	0.0			H (+)	1.38	0.98		
H2O(-)	8.34	1.07	1.12	0.0	0.0	9.6	9.6	H(+)	a).		10,00	3.4
Na ₂ O		0.54	0.13	0.2	0.2	1.0	1.0	Na				0.4
K_2O		0.58	0.46	0.1	0.1	1.9	1.9	K				0.40
CaO		2.09		<0.1	< 0.1			AI				2 0 0
MgO		0.49		<0.1	< 0.1			Si	1 00	00 10	00 00	0.0
Al ₂ O ₃		1.36	0 21		<0,1	3,3	3.3	0	cc 77	76*17	QN*77	4.93
5i02		1 72	0 82	<0.1	< 0.1	3.9	3.9					
LiO2			0.06									
PbO			0.09									
	100.00	100.54	99.29	7.66	7. 66	100.9	100.9					
		1.+~		4,	71	0	. 18					

Calculated composition for UO₂-5 MoO₈-5H₂O.

2. Kopchenova et al. (1962); total originally given as 100.52. N. N. Kuznetsova, analyst. Ratios given as UO2+UO3+5.5MoO3+5.3H2O, where "all the molybdenum is provisionally calculated as hexavalent." The oxides of light metals are considered admixtures of the enclosing rocks. 3. Skvortsova et al. (1969). T. A. Ukhina, analyst.

4. This study. J. Marinenko, analyst. Reducing power of sample ascribed to molybdenum.

5. Analysis of column 4, reducing power of the sample ascribed to uranium.

6. Impure sample, J. Marinenko, analyst. Reducing power of sample ascribed to molybdenum.

 Analysis of column 6, with the reducing power of the sample ascribed to uranium.
 Ratios calculated to total Mo = 5 for analysis of column 3; principal constituents only.
 Ratios calculated to total Mo = 5 for analysis of column 7; principal constituents only.
 10, 11. Ratios calculated to total Mo = 5 for analysis of column 7; suggested distribution of components between mourite, column 10, and excluded impurities, 11.

170

SMITH, MARINENKO, AND WEEKS

MOURITE

where all the molybdenum is provisionally calculated as hexavalent. Not excluded is the possibility that part of the CaO enters into the composition of the mineral. The other oxides shown in the analysis are evidently associated with the presence of admixtures of the enclosing rocks, which are very difficult to separate completely from the fine platy mineral." (Translation by M. Fleischer, U. S. Geological Survey, June 16, 1962.) A new analysis by Ukhina (in Skvortsova *et al.*, 1969) yielded 97.24 percent hydrous uranium molybdenum oxides and 2.05 percent oxides of other cations (total 99.29 percent). The analysis given in column 3, Table 2, establishes that calcium is not essential in mourite from Russia.

An analysis sample of Russian mourite was hand-picked by Smith. The sample contained 99.3 weight percent hydrous uranium molybdenum oxides (Table 2, columns 4 and 5). Certain oxides reported in the earlier analysis were present in greatly reduced quantities in the new analysis, thus supporting the exclusion of these oxides from the composition of mourite. We have calculated the new oxide ratios from Russian mourite on the basis of $5Mo^{6+}$:

$$0.97(UO_2 + UO_3) \cdot 5MoO_3 \cdot 4.9H_2O(+) \cdot 0.5H_2O(-)$$

The oxide ratios for Russian mourite calculated to $5Mo^{6+}$ from the analysis of Ukhina in Skvortsova *et al.* (1969) are:

$$0.98(UO_2 + UO_3) \cdot 5MoO_3 \cdot 4.8H_2O(+) \cdot 0.7H_2O(-).$$

The $H_2O(+)$ in our analysis and in Ukhina's analysis is considered essential and is designated as (OH) in the ideal unit cell contents. It approximates the combined $H_2O(+)$ and $H_2O(-)$ in Kuznetsova's analysis in Kopchenova *et al.* (1962). The oxide ratios of Kopchenova *et al.* recalculated herein to $5Mo^{6+}$ are:

$$0.91(UO_2 + UO_3) \cdot 5M_0O_3 \cdot 3.81H_2O(+) \cdot 1.05H_2O(-).$$

The sample of mourite from Texas consisted of dark blue-violet bundles of fibers penetrated by a white siliceous crust. This crust could not be removed without splintering the fibers into sizes too finely divided for recovery. The analysis of this material is given in columns 6 and 7 of Table 2. The interpretation of the distribution of components between mourite and impurities is given in columns 10 and 11 of Table 2, respectively. Oxides, including excess H₂O, present in greater proportions in the Texas sample than in the Russian sample, are allotted to the impurities. The mourite fraction, $1.04UO_2 \cdot 5MoO_3 \cdot 5H_2O$, calculates to 88.3 weight percent of the original sample; the impurities calculate to 2.5 weight percent excess H₂O and 10.1 weight percent other oxides (total 100.9). We propose that the ideal unit cell contents of mourite may be expressed as:

$$4 [(U^{4+}O_2) \cdot 5Mo^{6+}O_2(OH)_2] \text{ or } 4 [(U^{6+}O_2) \cdot 2Mo^{5+}O_2(OH)_2 \cdot 3Mo^{6+}O_2(OH)_2]$$

depending upon whether the reducing power is ascribed to uranium or to molybdenum. The calculated density for the suggested unit cell contents, for a cell volume of 1699 Å³ is 4.22 gcm⁻³. The measured specific gravity of the bulk sample of mourite from Texas is 3.78; the weighted measured specific gravity of the mourite fraction is 4.17 after SiO₂, Al₂O₃, and excess H₂O are subtracted from the sample as halloysite. Approximate volume ratios,

$$\frac{1699}{4}$$
Å³: $\frac{468}{5}$ Å³

are derived from the volumes occupied by one formula unit of mourite and 0.2 [Si₄Al₄O₁₀(OH)₈·4H₂O] calculated to halloysite with a $\rho \sim 2$. We have not identified an alkali-bearing alumino-silicate with a 1:1:1 ratio; therefore, the 0.85 Na+K is not deducted as a specific mineral in weighting the measured specific gravity for probable impurities.

It is hoped that the new data herein reported will lead to identification of mourite at other localities.

Acknowledgements

The authors especially wish to thank Professor G. P. Barsanov of the Fersman Mineralogical Museum in Moscow, U.S.S.R. for his courtesy in making available to us a sample of mourite from the type locality in Russia. Thanks are extended to S. R. Steinhauser of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission who supplied us with samples of mourite from Texas, and with whom Weeks first visited the locality. We also wish to thank four of our colleagues in the U.S. Geological Survey; D. H. Eargle and A. H. Truesdell who have cooperated in the Texas Coastal Plain uranium studies, Daniel Applemen who refined the unit cell parameters from the powder diffraction data, and Michael Fleischer who translated for us the Russian article about mourite into English.

References

- EARGLE, D. H. AND A. D. WEEKS (1968) Factors in the formation of uranium deposits Coastal Plain of Texas, S. Texas Geol. Soc. Bull. 9, 3-13. (Paper presented Aug. 20, 1968 at 23rd International Geological Congress, Prague, Czech.).
- EVANS, H. T., JR., D. E. APPLEMAN, AND D. S. HANDWENKER (1963) The least squares refinement of crystal unit cells with powder diffraction data by an automatic computer indexing method [abstr.]. Amer. Crystallogr. Assoc. Meet., Cambridge, Mass., 1963, Program abstr., p. 42-43.
- FRONDEL, C., AND A. D. WEEKS (1959) Recent progress in the descriptive mineralogy of uranium, Paper 2019, in Vol. 2, Proc. Second U. N. Int. Conf. Peaceful Uses Atomic Energy, Geneva, p. 277-285.

MOURITE

KAMHI, S. R. (1959) X-ray study of umohoite. Amer. Mineral. 44, 920-925.

KOPCHENOVA, E. V., K. V. SKVORTSOVA, N. I. SILANTIEVA, G. A. SIDORENKO, AND L. V. MIKHAILOVA (1962) Mourite, a new supergene uranium-molybdenum mineral. Zap. Vses. Mineral. Obshch., 91, No. 1, 67-71. (In Russian.) [Translation by Michael Fleischer.]

SKVORTSOVA, K. V., E. V. KOPCHENOVA, I. G. ZHIL'TSOVA, AND G. A. SIDORENKO (1969) Conditions of formation of uranium-molybdenum minerals in the zone of incomplete oxidation. Zap. Vses. Mineral. Obshch., 98, 29–40. (In Russian.)

WEEKS, A. D., AND D. H. EARGLE (1963) Relation of diagenetic alteration and soil-forming processes to the uranium deposits of the southeast Texas Coastal Plain. Clay Miner. —Proc. Nat. Conf., 10, 1961 p. 23-41.

Manuscript received, May 18, 1970; accepted for publication, September 3, 1970.