

3. Secondary group (mesozoic).
Triassic system, *violet*.
Jurassic " *blue* (lias, *dark blue*).
Cretaceous " *green*.
4. Tertiary group (cenozoic), *yellow*, using light-shades as the beds become more recent.
5. Quaternary deposits. Decision referred to the committee of the map of Europe.
6. Resolutions of detail relative to shades, reserves, etchings, and letter notations.

III. Rules concerning the nomenclature of species.

1. The nomenclature adopted is that in which each animal and plant is designated by a generic name and a specific name.
2. Each one of these names is composed of a single Latin or Latinized word, written according to the rules of Latin orthography.
3. Each species may present a certain number of modifications, related to each other in time or in space, and designated respectively under the name of *mutations* or of *varieties*. The modifications whose origin is doubtful are simply called *forms*. The modifications will be indicated, when requisite, by a third term, preceded, according to the case, by the words *variety*, *mutation*, or *form*, or the corresponding abbreviations.
4. The specific name should always be precisely designated by the indication of the name of the author who established it. This author's name is to be placed in parentheses when the primitive generic name is not preserved; and in this case it is useful to add the name of the author who changed the generic name. The same disposition is applicable to varieties elevated to the rank of species.
5. The name attributed to each genus and to each species is that under which it has been primarily designated, provided the characters of the genus and the species have been published and clearly defined.
- Priority will not be carried beyond Linné's *Systema naturae*, 12th edition, 1766.
6. In future, for specific names, priority will be irrevocably acquired only when the species shall have been not only described, but figured.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR.

A powerful direct vision spectroscope.

At a journal meeting in which Professor Rowland and the students of physics take part, an article came up for discussion which needs correction. In *Comptes rendus*, April 9, 1883, Ch. V. Zenger, in a note entitled '*Spectroscope à vision direct très puissant*,' claims a dispersive power equal to that of thirteen sulphide-of-carbon prisms of 60° angle for a spectroscope composed of a parallelopiped of two prisms, — one of quartz, and the other of a mixture of ethyl cinnamate and benzine, — combined with a third prism of crown glass of angle of refraction 27° 13'. He gives as the angles the three rays make with the perpendicular to the last prism after they have passed through, —

<i>A</i>	—90° 0'
<i>D</i>	—55° 15'
<i>H</i>	+42° 55'

It will be easily seen that *H* should be negative in place of positive; which will make the dispersion between *A* and *H* 47° 5', in place of 132° 55' which the writer gives.

H. R. GOODNOW.

Johns Hopkins university.

Connecticut minerals.

The towns of Middletown, Portland, Haddam, and Chatham, in this state, have long been famed as a region remarkable for the number of minerals occurring in the veins of coarse granite. Within the last few days two minerals have been discovered in these veins, which, so far as I am aware, have not previously been reported.

Torbernite has been found at Andrus' Quarry, near the boundary between Portland and Glastenbury, associated with autunite, the occurrence of which has been previously reported.

Rhodonite has been found at the White Rocks in Middletown.

WM. NORTH RICE.

Wesleyan university, Middletown, Conn.
June 9, 1883.

Book reviews.

I wish to quarrel a little with the critic of Gage's 'Elements of physics' in your issue of June 8, p. 517, for not keeping the following promise, found in the 'Prospectus of SCIENCE for 1883:' "To promote one of its chief objects, and as a distinctive feature of the journal, SCIENCE will give its hearty support to those who are endeavoring to introduce the study of the natural and physical sciences into public and private schools, by drawing attention in every possible way to the high importance of this measure, as well as by giving illustrated articles, plainly worded, prepared by skilful hands, to guide the efforts of the teachers." He has failed to keep this promise by failing to give such information about the book he reviews as "those who are endeavoring to introduce the study of physical science into public and private schools" would like to have. Many teachers cannot afford to buy every text-book they see advertised, and therefore must needs trust to reviews to tell them enough of a book to enable them to decide whether it is worth purchasing. In regard to a work on physics, they wish some such questions as the following answered: —

1. What is the plan of the book? Does the author expect the pupils to do experimental work, or that the teacher only will perform experiments? 2. If the author wrote with the view of having experiments performed by the pupils, how well has he succeeded in executing his plan? Has he succeeded in giving such experiments as will be of real service in laying the foundation of scientific work, and as can be performed in the short time that teachers in high schools and academies have for such work? Could pupils manage the experiments without the aid of a teacher? 3. Does the author give any directions in regard to preparing apparatus? If so, are these directions sufficiently exact and minute to enable an inexperienced person to follow them without trouble?

All of these questions a teacher would like to find answered in the review of a new book on physics. All the information he would get on these points from the review of Gage's book is found in this sentence: "The book is of merit as giving many experiments with apparatus of easy make." The reviewer said more than this, of course; but this one sentence is all to answer such questions as I have asked above. He was probably right in what he did say, which makes it the more to be regretted that he did not go farther. My quarrel with him is, that he did not say enough; that he did not say as much as your readers had a right to expect, — certainly not enough for those readers who had not seen the book, and wished to know whether it was worth buying. This suggests a question. Are reviews written for the benefit of