big Picard theorem and Schottky's theorem have function-theoretic extensions, as does Hadamard's three circles theorem. Analytic continuations and automorphic solutions are developed at the conclusion.

To summarize, the book is well organized and accurate. Its style is computational. The tables of contents, glossary of terms and references are detailed and timely. And, open questions are pointed out. The result is an informative reference that can be followed with interest.

REFERENCES

1. S. Bergman, *Integral operators in the theory of linear partial differential equations*, Ergebnisse Math. Grenzgeb., Heft 23, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1961.

2. D. Colton, *Solution of boundary value problems by the method of integral operators*, Research Notes in Math., Vol. 6, Pitman, San Francisco, 1976.

3. R. P. Gilbert, *Function theoretic methods in partial differential equations*, Math. in Science and Engr., Vol. 54, Academic Press, New York, 1969.

4. R. P. Gilbert and J. Buchanan, *First order elliptic systems: A function theoretic approach*, Math. in Science and Engr., Vol. 163, Academic Press, New York, 1983.

5. I. Vekua, *New methods for solving elliptic equations*, Leningrad, 1948; English transl., Wiley, New York, 1967.

6. W. Wendland, *Elliptic systems in the plane*, Monographs and Studies in Math., Vol. 3, Pitman, San Francisco, 1980.

PETER A. MCCOY

BULLETIN (New Series) OF THE
AMERICAN MATHEMATICAL SOCIETY
Volume 9, Number 3, November 1983

0273-0979/83 $1.00 + $.25 per page

Finite groups and finite geometries, by T. Tsuzuku (translated from the 1976 Japanese version by A. Sevenster and T. Okuyama), Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics, Vol. 78, Cambridge University Press, 1982, x + 328 pp., $42.50. ISBN 0-5212-2242-7

All finite simple groups are now known.[1] This monumental classification project involved the efforts of numerous mathematicians and occupies many thousands of pages. Several of these group theorists are presently working hard to decrease the size of the proof. Nevertheless, it seems unlikely that the proof of this classification will become accessible to many mathematicians.

How should this classification be viewed by those not in group theory? It is clearly a remarkable result. But is it unapproachable? Is there any point in understanding parts of it? Can it be used outside of group theory, or is it just a marvelous technical feat designed only for internal consumption? It may even be tempting to ask: "What has this done for me lately?"

[1]Except that, as of this writing (April, 1983), the uniqueness of the Monster has not yet been established.