BOOK REVIEWS


The handbook consists essentially of mineral tables carrying over 2,000 entries. The author states that he has included all minerals that had been reported in the literature up to Jan. 1, 1940. The more common minerals are printed in bold-face type.

The two important physical properties—specific gravity and hardness—are made the basis of the classification. The former yielding 15 groups in which the minerals are arranged in the order of decreasing hardness. However the tables record other properties, such as solubility in HCl, fusibility, color, streak, luster, cleavage, fracture, crystal system, and mean index of refraction, although the method for determining this property is not given.

Supplementary and confirmatory chemical tests, both of the wet and blowpipe type of reactions are listed as checks on the determination by physical means. The tables were compiled for the professional mineralogist and geologist, although it is believed the chemist and many others will find this text helpful in their mineralogical determinative work.

W. F. H.


Kemp’s Handbook of rocks perpetuates the name of a famous and well loved geologist whose name is still something of a talisman in America. But books grow old even as their authors do, and it is a question whether it is ever advisable to re-publish an old-fashioned textbook after the death of its author. If the editor makes all the changes that are needed to bring the book up to date there will be little left of the original text; yet he must defer to the dead author at least to the extent of retaining the general plan of the work. This puts the editor under a heavy handicap. When Professor Kemp wrote the Handbook in 1896 he decided in the interests of simplicity to omit all reference to the microscopic characters of minerals and rocks; yet he quoted many chemical analyses and gave instructions for computing the mineralogical composition of a rock from its chemical composition. It is difficult to believe that in 1896 it was easier to make a chemical analysis of a rock than to study it under the microscope; it is certainly not true in the year 1940, for there must be a hundred men trained in the use of the petrological microscope for one who is qualified to make a good rock analysis. Nevertheless the editor of the new "Kemp" has felt himself obliged to follow the original plan of the book; he neglects the universally used microscopic method of study but retains and adds to the discussion of chemical analyses. How can a man who has never studied rocks under the microscope be expected to make intelligent use of chemical analyses? The reviewer thinks it would have been better to depart still further from the original plan by omitting the chemical data and substituting some elementary instruction in the use of the polarizing microscope. Surely nobody will maintain in these days that rocks can be adequately described or named without the use of the microscope?

The text has been largely rewritten, and a number of illustrations have been introduced which add considerably to the attractiveness of the volume. The glossary of rock names, which many petrologists found more useful than the text, has disappeared and its place is taken by an 8-page list of names which is too condensed to be really helpful to anybody.

S. J. SHAND
NEW MINERAL NAMES

Ablykite
Pseudopyrophyllite


X-ray, thermal, chemical and other analyses of the <0.2μ fraction of clay from Ablyk, Angren River Valley, Uzbek, indicates a new mineral. This is called *ablykite* and its composition is given as \( \text{R}^{*+} \cdot 2\text{R}_2\text{O}_3 \cdot 5\text{SiO}_2 \cdot 6\text{H}_2\text{O} \). A fraction isolated from pyrophyllite from Beresovsk by Loewinson-Lessing had the composition \( 3(\text{Mg, Ca, Fe})\text{O} \cdot 4\text{Al}_2\text{O}_3 \cdot 9\text{SiO}_2 \cdot 8\text{H}_2\text{O} \). This is called *pseudopyrophyllite*.

W. F. Foshag