MINERALS DISCOVERED IN OTHER COUNTRIES, FOR WHICH THE LOCALITIES ON THE TERRITORY OF THE FORMER SOVIET UNION WERE MENTIONED (WITHOUT SIGNIFICANT ANALYTICAL DATA GIVEN) IN ORIGINAL DESCRIPTIONS

MANGANOKUKISVUMITE, $Na_6MnTi_4Si_8O_{28}\cdot 4H_2O$, described as a new mineral from Poudrette Quarry, Mont Saint-Hilaire, Quebec, Canada, was also found as zones in crystals of kukisvumite, $Na_6ZnTi_4Si_8O_{28}\cdot 4H_2O$, from its type locality: the Kukisvumitovoye pegmatite, level +252 m, Kirovskii underground mine, Kukisvumchorr Mt., Khibiny massif, Kola Peninsula, Russia (Gault *e.a.*, 2004).

TARKIANITE, $(Cu,Fe)(Re,Mo)_4S_8$, described as a new mineral from Hitura Mine, Nivala, Finland, was also found in several other localities including Monchegorsk Cu-Ni deposit, Monche-Tundra, Kola Peninsula, Russia (Kojonen *e.a.*, 2004). The same mineral was also described earlier without a name from the Lukkulaisvaara complex, Northern Karelia, Russia (Barkov, Lednev, 1993).

DISCREDITED MINERAL NAMES

CLINOHOLMQUISTITE - see FLUORO-SODIC-PEDRIZITE (pages 22, 56).

MAGNIOTRIPLITE = polytype of WAGNERITE

SURKHOBITE

Surkhobite was described as a new species, Ca-dominant mineral related to jinshajiangite and perraultite, with the idealized formula $(Ca,Na)(Ba,K)(Fe^{2+},Mn)_4Ti_2(Si_4O_{14})O_2(F,OH,O)$ obtained from wet chemical data (IMA No.: 2002-037, approved). It was found in the moraine of the Darai-Pioz Glacier, southern slope of the Alai Range, Tadjikistan. Its brownish-red lamellar crystals up to 1 mm and grains up to 0.4 x 1 x 2 cm occur in an alkaline pegmatoid rock, with aegirine, microcline, albite, quartz, amphibole, annite, bafertisite, astrophyllite, zircon, fluorite, polylithionite, stillwellite-(Ce), sogdianite and tadzhikite. Surkhobite was named after the Surkhob River in the region of the locality (Es'kova e.a., 2003). However the idealized formula $(Ba,K)_2CaNa(Fe,Mn)_8Ti_4(Si_2O_7)_4(O,F,OH)_6$, written taking into account result of its crystal structure study (Rozenberg e.a., 2003), reflects the crystal chemical features of the mineral more correct.

Later, E. Sokolova with co-authors have re-studied the holotype specimen of surkhobite (FMM 91055) using electron microprobe and found that Na prevails over Ca and F content is lower than it was reported in the paper by Es'kova e.a. (2003) and, therefore, the formula $(Ca,Na)(Ba,K)(Fe^{2+},Mn)_4Ti_2(Si_4O_{14})O_2(F,OH,O)$ is incorrect. Basing on this data, E. Sokolova with co-authors considered that surkhobite is identical to jinshajiangite, $(Na,Ca)(Ba,K)(Fe^{2+},Mn)_4Ti_2(Si_4O_{14})(O,OH,F)_3$, and submitted a proposal to discredit surkhobite to the IMA CNMMN (No. 06-E). In October 2006, surkhobite was discredited as a mineral identical to earlier described jinshajiangite (see http://www.geo.vu.nl/users/ima-cnmmn/minerals06-11).

Note that Møssbauer data recently obtained for "surkhobite" specimen (N.V. Chukanov personal communication) show presence of significant amount of Fe^{3+} that causes prevailing of Mn over Fe^{2+}: (Mn,Fe^{2+},Fe^{3+})..]. Thus, jinshajiangite/perraultite-like minerals from the Darai-Pioz alkaline massif need further investigation.