

in glass has never been fully investigated. Thus, it is more than understandable that the results and conclusions of Anderson are not in any way comparable with those of Cohen and Roy.³

In an Addendum, Weir and Spinner state that "... the 40 to 80 μ particles used by Cohen and Roy would be somewhat birefringent ..." and that "... there were certainly deforming stresses at points of contact between particles. One wonders, then, just what the observed refractive index means."

Weir and Spinner must be aware of the possibility of determining the indices of refraction of small grains, whether they are isotropic or slightly birefringent (<0.003). Since birefringence of

the order of magnitude that is relevant (i.e., 0.003) can be both recognized and easily determined under the polarizing microscope, the reported refractive indices are meaningful within the stated uncertainty.

Finally, Weir and Spinner say that "From purely theoretical considerations it would be surprising if molar refraction is not changed by densification under pressure." The note by Cohen and Roy stated that the molar refraction *was* changed by 3.5%. Its specific mention (p. 524) was ignored by Weir and Spinner. The present writers would welcome detailed treatment of such "theoretical considerations."