

UNIVERSITY AND EDUCATIONAL NEWS.

PROFESSOR W. A. SETCHELL, of Yale University, has accepted a call to the chair of botany in the University of California, vacant through the removal of Professor E. L. Greene to the Catholic University of Washington.

A SUIT has been brought by Yale University against Storrs College to determine the disposition of the Government appropriation (about \$20,000 a year) to agricultural colleges. This money was paid to Yale University from the time the fund was appropriated, in 1862, till it was diverted to the fund of Storrs College, in 1893. Since this date the money has been tied up by reason of the suit of Yale University to restrain the Treasurer from paying the money to Storrs College.

PROFESSOR HENRY TALBOT has been appointed associate professor of chemistry in the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

THE following changes have been made in the medical faculty at Yale University: Dr. Cheney and Dr. Henry L. Swain have been appointed to professorships; Dr. Oliver T. Osborn and Dr. Louis S. DeForest have been made assistant professors, and Mr. C. J. Bartlet instructor in bacteriology.

QUEEN'S COLLEGE, Belfast, Ireland, attains its jubilee this year. It has been, however, resolved to postpone the celebrations till next year, when it is hoped that many alumni from different parts of the world will find it possible to be present.

THE number of Freshmen admitted to Harvard University by examination is 465, as compared with 418 last year. The scientific school shows a gain of 22 students; 104 were admitted this year as compared with 84 last year.

THE Freshman Class at Williams College, the largest in its history, numbers about 124 members. The Freshman Class

at Boston University, also the largest yet assembled, shows an increase of 50 over last year.

CORRESPONDENCE.

PROFESSOR HALSTED REPLIED TO.

EDITOR OF SCIENCE: Your number of September 6th appeared while I was in Europe, so that I am late in replying to an extraordinary charge made against me on page 309 by Professor Halsted, as follows:

"This letter of Beez incited Dr. McClintock to an examination of Beltrami's article and a paper on it under the title 'On the early history of the non-Euclidean geometry,' where, among other mistakes, he makes one peculiarly entertaining. He says, p. 145, Bulletin, Vol. II., of Saccheri: 'He confessed to a distracting heretical tendency on his part in favor of the hypothesis anguli acuti, a tendency against which, however, he kept up a perpetual struggle (diuturnum proelium). After yielding so far as to work out an accurate theory anticipating Lobatschewsky's doctrine of the parallel-angle, he appears to have conquered the internal enemy abruptly, since, to the surprise of his commentator, Beltrami, he proceeded to announce dogmatically that the specious hypothesis anguli acuti is positively false.' Who would suspect that all that is a pure fairy tale evolved by Dr. McClintock from his mistranslation of a passage immediately announced by the two Latin words he fortunately retained in parenthesis?"

This is all that Professor Halsted now says of my paper which he names and from which he quotes. He does not mention that half of that paper consists of a brief but careful resumé of the claims of Gauss, to which he devotes so large a part of the review to which I am replying, nor does he recollect that at the time when my paper appeared he wrote me (April 17, 1893), "I was delighted with your article on the Early History of the Non-Euclidean Geometry," giving no hint of dissatisfaction, but going on among other things to refer to an earlier paper of mine as 'your epoch-making article on the Non-Euclidean Geometry.' He sent me a second letter on April 27, 1893, again of the friendliest and most appreciative sort, but not referring to the paper in question; showing that the half on Saccheri as well as the half on Gauss met at that time with no disapproval on his part.

Professor Halsted has since added to our obligations to him as the bibliographer of this subject by obtaining the original Latin treatise of Saccheri and translating it into English. He found from the beginning that the two words quoted by Beltrami and from Beltrami by me, *diuturnum prælium*, were meant by Saccheri to indicate a mental attitude of constant war against the 'hypothesis' as heretical, without any such 'struggle' in his own mind as he appeared, from my reading of Beltrami, to have 'confessed.' 'The words of Beltrami are not inconsistent with my rendering of the two Latin words.

In May, 1894, on Professor Halsted challenging my word 'confessed,' etc., and sending me his Latin copy of Saccheri, I denied my mistranslation of what Beltrami had set before me, though acknowledging that I had, through the ambiguity of my material, credited Saccheri with a confession of what he did not confess (though he doubtless felt it, as intimated by Beltrami), the 'distracting heretical tendency.' In the last letter which I find on this subject from Professor Halsted, May 8, 1894, he says properly: "In my interpretation of the facts as they exist in the book I am inclined to go much further than Beltrami or yourself. But I wish to distinctly separate historic fact from interpretation, however probable or however much called for." There was no hint that I should publish any correction. I assumed that he would make the case clear in bringing out his translation of Saccheri.

The reader will now observe that I am charged with 'other mistakes,' of which no specification is or has ever been given, publicly or privately, and will form his own judgment. He will kindly note that I am charged with 'mistranslation,' after I had quoted to Professor Halsted the Italian and Latin context of the two Latin words in question and received no reply expressing dissatisfaction, and will form his own judgment. He will finally remark that my references to Beltrami's surprise, etc., are ridiculed as a 'pure fairy tale,' contrary to the fact, by this usually staunch upholder of historical accuracy, and will form his own judgment. And after all he will probably form a wholly incorrect judgment of Professor Hal-

sted's motives, however correct it may be of his imprudence; for I have had too many proofs of personal friendliness from him not to feel sure, in spite of this injury he has done me, that he had no idea that his hasty phrases could injure me, and no motive other than that of 'pointing a moral' for the moment.

EMORY MCCLINTOCK.

MOREISTOWN, Sept. 24, 1895.

SCIENTIFIC LITERATURE.

The Climates and Baths of Great Britain. Vol. I. London and New York, Macmillan & Co. 1895. 8vo. pp. xvi+640.

This volume contains the first part of the report of a Committee of the Royal Medical and Chirurgical Society of London, which Committee was appointed in 1889 to investigate certain questions relating to the climatology and balneology of Great Britain and Ireland, and includes the results of correspondence with medical men, of personal investigations by members of the committee and of the analysis of meteorological and medical statistics relating to the various localities. This first volume relates to the climates of the South of England and the chief medicinal springs of Great Britain.

The chairman of the Committee is Dr. W. M. Ord, of London, and his name is a sufficient guarantee of the accuracy and scientific impartiality of the statements made. In his introductory remarks he points out the contrast between England and Continental Europe from the point of view of the seeker of health, the former furnishing chiefly seacoast resorts while the main sanatory resources of the continent are inland and mountainous.

While a large part of this report is mainly of local interest, being intended especially as a guide to English physicians in prescribing certain health resorts to certain classes of patients, the general principles upon which its recommendations are based are as applicable to many American resorts as they are to the English ones. For example, much of what is said as to the class of cases which may hope for benefit or as to the other class of cases which are likely to be injured by the hot waters of Bath is equally applicable to the Hot Springs of Virginia or of Arkansas. So far as seaside resorts