discussed in two papers at the end of the volume. In a proceedings volume of this type, the level of treatment is generally very uneven. This volume is no exception; the guest editors and the editor-in-chief, C.A. Kogbe, are to be congratulated for a very polished product that maintains the high standards of the publishing house. The photographs and figures are all very clear, and not reduced to postage-stamp size, as sometimes happens. The collection of papers provides an excellent account of the state of current knowledge concerning African ring-complexes and, by extension, those in other continental blocks as well.

Robert F. Martin
McGill University


The oldest among us mineralogists still remember, with gratitude, the first two editions of this book (Larsen 1921, Larsen & Berman 1934). For generations it has been the trusted companion of every petrographic microscopist, who soberly appreciated the difference between identification (checking a hunch) and determination (starting from scratch). This 3rd edition, in its new format, neatly typed, one inch thick, is quite impressive. It looks just like what it is — the work of a life time: 34 years collecting the data, 18 of which (while still collecting) putting them into the right tabular format. The deadline for new data to be included was 1983-08-01, half a century after Larsen and Berman stopped their collecting. The amount of data in the book under review is truly enormous, and yet its selling price per page comes to 4.1¢ (Can) or 2.6¢ (US) — less than the cost of a xerox copy!

In the Introduction (Ch. I) the authors with nostalgia deplore the fact that, in many colleges, "the time allotted to Optical Crystallography has been reduced". To this observation the Reviewer may add that, probably in the same colleges, all of Crystallography has been cut down to a few lectures given by the mineralogist at the beginning of his course, so that Mineralogy, for which Crystallography is most needed, is itself hurt by the new fad. It is to be hoped that the availability of Larsen's third edition, revised, updated and enlarged, will help remedy this sad situation. The authors themselves stress the need for additional data and emphasize the fact that recent advances now make it feasible to identify extremely tiny samples optically. The large number of persons that deserved acknowledgements (14) testifies to the eagerness with which the profession was awaiting the arrival of the "New Larsen": like the "New Dana' in its days, it has been considered an event of North American Continental magnitude. Now the long wait is over — it has been richly rewarded.

The Preface credits Wilcox for writing the summary of the results of the theory of Crystal Optics and their practical application to Mineralogical Microscopy (methods, equipment, procedures). It is hard to see how anyone, in 25 pages (Ch. II), could have done a better job. Every needed formula is properly stated, and the reader is told where he can find the proof in the literature (104 references cited). Good line-drawings illustrate methods or instruments described, particularly the Wilcox-modified spindle stage of Blass. The ellipsoids (uni- and biaxial) are given a prominent place, as they deserve (Fig. 3), and so is the nomograph (Fig. 8) to determine $2V$, first roughly from $(\gamma-\beta)/(\gamma-\alpha)$, to be refined by means of a companion graph. A drawing shows differently curved isogyres for four different values of $2V$, in a convergent-light figure of a central optic axis (Fig. 9). The directions for use of every procedure are carefully given, step-by-step, with an occasional warning of a lurking faux-pas, thoughtfully dispensed to the neophyte by a seasoned practitioner.

Strict optical orientation "would require coordinated optical and X-ray structural investigation of the same crystal fragment" (p.20). Obviously such meticulous work has not routinely been performed. The authors explain that "for many unknowns, much can be inferred from the behavior of interference figures . . ." The tables of biaxial crystals do indeed show large numbers of optical orientations. For example, anthophyllite shows (Table 6, p.155): $1.616\ 1.628\ 1.641\ 2V_Z = 79^\circ\ Y = b\ Z = c$ el.pos. ORTH(pris. c) (210) perf." This is a case where the complete orientation is known to the compiler, but possibly not to the reader.

In the Bragg setting the unit vectors, listed in the order of increasing principal indices of refraction $a\beta\gamma$ ($XYZ$ vibration directions) were along $abc$, which increase in order $cba$, the space group is written $Pnma$ (D2h-16) and the gliding mirror is symbolized (210). In "Crystal Data", $XYZ$ are along $b\ a\ c'$, which increase as $c'\ a'\ b'$, the space group is $Pmnb$ and the gliding mirror is 120. In the setting advocated by M.J. Buerger, $XYZ$ became $c'\ b'\ a''$, increasing as $a''\ b''\ c''$, the space group is $Pcmm$ and the gliding mirror is (012). (In the above the symbol of the cleavage plane is the same as that of the gliding mirror.) Airing these facts should show the makers of the Tables that some decision will have to be taken for the future. There comes a little brightness in this dark picture: when Larsen began compiling his first edition, there reigned a consensus among mineralogists: no one should modify the original setting,
chosen by the mineralogist who described the species. It is my impression that the followers of Larsen have never given up this rule. If so, the task ahead does not loom so large!

A very short section (Ch.III) explains how the data are arranged in the Tables and how to use them to identify minerals. In tabulating data the use of abbreviations is, of course, of the essence. Any way of shortening words or symbols is welcome. The dot that usually follows an abbreviation has been systematically omitted. The braces that enclose the Miller indices of a form are likewise gone. One serious omission in the list of abbreviations is "rhomb" for "rhombohedron". The two examples chosen to demonstrate the method of optical determination (here called "identification") definitely can't be beaten: they make it clear that thoroughness and patience will be prerequisites of the art.

Now comes the most voluminous part of the book, the Determinative Tables themselves. Essentially the arrangement by optical divisions and choice of criteria taken up by columns remain faithful to the Larsen tradition. A couple of examples show how conscientious the compilers have been in details.

At ice, in the Division of Uniaxial positive, "Melts at 0°C" has been added, but that is not the only change! $\omega$ is now written $\omega_e$, thus stressing the constant index as the listing number; $\omega$ is now 1.309 as in 1934, but $\epsilon$ has moved down from 1.313 to 1.312; an added column for birefringence gives $B = 0.003$. Note the right emphasis on the accuracy of birefringence, better than that of an index of refraction.

Now consider Schairerite, uniaxial (+), same page 62. Its $\omega$ goes up by 0.003, $\epsilon$ stays put at 1.445, but the B is given as 0.0012, not as 0.002. A nice feature of this compilation is that the Authors are much against illusory accuracy, but not against valid accuracy. G 2.612 has been trimmed to 2.62, whereas $F = \epsilon$ is now a quantitative $F = 1.5$.

The property of variability of indices has received special attention, and the range of variation can now be read quantitatively, between added figures in the left margin. The column heading has been changed to "Other entries".

Among the biaxial minerals, Alunogen has seen these alterations: the numerical values of the indices changed to (from) 1.475(1.474), 1.478(1.476), 1.482(1.483), B 0.010; formula $Al_2(SO_4)_3\cdot17$ $H_2O$ (from $Al_2O_3\cdot3SO_4\cdot16H_2O$); $2V = 75^\circ$ (near 90°), Opt. orient. unchanged; TCL, tab or fib c (MON. Tab. (010), Fib. c); cleavages 010 perf, 100, 013; White (white); H 1.5–2 (H 1.5); $G = 1.79$ (G 1.64–1.67); Sol. in $H_2O$, in closed tube, melts in its water of crystn. (Keramohalite. Sol. in $H_2O$).

Chapter IV collects the special tables for mineral groups, the number of which passes from 17 in 1934 to 31 in 1985. There again the formulae have been modernized, the population of each group has increased, the B has been added. Bringing together chemically similar species, disregarding the arbitrariness of the determinative tabulation, is a very worthy tradition that has been endorsed and enlarged. The future of Crystal Optics may be dim in determination, but it is brighter than ever as part of Crystal Chemistry, Solid State Physics, Materials Science, and other sciences that are interested in properties of matter and their relation to its structure. For years professionals in all these disciplines have accumulated most of Crystallography as their own. For some reason they have not been after Crystal Optics yet, but give them time — they'll see the light.

The last part of the book I wish to comment upon is the list of references cited. Out of the 104, nine are in German and three in Russian. Unfortunately one that should have appeared on the list was in French, and was missed (Girault 1980). His book covers the same ground as the book under review; the compilation of the literature stopped in 1977, against 1983 for the US work. His alphabetical list of mineral names contains, under A and B only, 23 names that are not in the US index, the latter, for the same two initial letters, has 59 mineral names not found in the Girault index. Girault's book does not include any mineral-group table; they were in the manuscript, but the publisher thought they would make the book too expensive. A new idea is to plot a characteristic index on a line on which the interval labelled 1.49 contains 10 subdivisions from 1.48 to 1.50 (for instance). These lines make vertical columns. Each mineral entry is marked by a horizontal segment showing its range. This scheme does away with the traditional subdivisions Un1(+), Un1(−), etc. This reviewer would recommend that both books be used simultaneously, for easy checking. The book is written in French, but that should not deter any one. As Professor Ray Young once said in an A.C.A. meeting: "French is English misspelled". Personally I say: "English is French misspronounced."

J.D.H. Donnay
McGill University
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