TABLE 1

	Crystal sys- tem	Habit	Cleav- age	Optical charac- ter	Optical orien- tation	Index of re- frac- tion	Bire- fring- ence	Sp. gr.
Litharge	Orth.?	Tab- lets		Biaxial +	X (possibly Y) normal to plates	2.61	Very strong	
Artificial yel- low modifica- cation (lith- arge) ^b		Tab- lets (100)	(001) Perfect	Biaxial +	Y (?) normal to cleav.	2.61	Very strong	9.290
Massicot	Tet.?	Tab- lets (001)		Uni- axial		2.64	Very strong	
Artificial red modification ^b	-Tet.	Tab- lets (001)	(110)	Uni- axial				9.125

^a The value of n, 1.735, given for massicot by Scott in Min. Mag. 17, 143, 1914, is obviously in error. A lead mineral with the specific gravity of massicot and so low an index of refraction would be very remarkable.

Note on the nomenclature of the lead monoxide mineral names (except those like quartz, which have great antiquity) end uniformly in ite has for many years dominated American mineralogical nomenclature, and seems worth applying to all new or reëstablished species, unless some very cogent reason for exception exists. "Massicot" and "litharge" as such are chemists' names for artificial products; but both admit of adding the mineralogical termination without essential change. Massicotite was indeed proposed by D'Achiardi in 1883; and it is now recommended that the form of lead monoxide corresponding to artificial litharge, above shown by Mr. Larsen to deserve separate recognition as a mineral species, be known to mineralogists as lithargite.

^bSee Groth, Chem. Krystallographie. I, 76, 1906.