

THE Board of University Regents in California have decided to locate in San Francisco the trade school for boys endowed by the late J. C. Wilmerding with \$400,000.

THREE new instructors have been appointed at the University of Vermont: Dr. David Irons in Philosophy, Dr. W. G. Bullard in Mathematics and Mr. F. S. English in Civil Engineering.

LORD REAY has been proposed for election as President of University College, London, in the room of the late Sir John Erichsen.

THE Austrian government proposes to admit women after next year to all faculties of the Universities except theology.

ABERDEEN UNIVERSITY will add a wing for science at a cost of about \$50,000. The government has refused a grant for the purpose, but it appears that the city will pay the cost in return for land given by the University Court.

THE following appointments are taken from the *naturwissenschaftliche Rundschau*: Dr. Knövenagel, of the University of Heidelberg, has been made associate professor of chemistry; Dr. Wladislaw Rothert, associate professor of botany in the University of Kasan; Dr. Seitaro Goto, professor of botany in the First High School at Tokyo, Japan; Dr. Kepinsky, associate professor of mathematics at the University of Krakau; Dr. Dalwigk has been recognized as docent in mathematics in the University of Marburg, and Dr. Beer as docent in comparative physiology in the University at Vienna.

#### DISCUSSION AND CORRESPONDENCE.

##### THE DATE OF PUBLICATION.

IN SCIENCE for November 20 (N. S., Vol. IV., No. 99, pp. 760, 761) Prof. E. D. Cope has appeared in defense of the resolution adopted by the Zoological Section of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, criticised by me in the issue of SCIENCE for November 6th (N. S., Vol. IV., No. 97, pp. 691-693). I am glad to see that in this reply Prof. Cope has clearly defined the issue. It is comprised in the following statement: "The test of publication is according to Dr. Allen that it be offered to the public. I agree with this, but hold that

the only determinable test of date of offering to the public is the date of printing. The presumption is that as soon as a book is printed and bound it is offered to the public. That is the object of printing books."

It is gratifying to find that Prof. Cope agrees that the test of publication is the offering of a work to the public. As he says, in the case of books issued for sale, it does not matter whether or not any copies are sold, the book is published when it is offered for sale.

On the other hand, his contention that the "date of offering to the public is the date of printing" is an amazing misconception of what constitutes publication. Yet he concedes that, "in case of the detention of a book by the government subsequent to the printing the question of the coincidence of the date of printing and of 'offer to the public' will depend on whether copies of the book can be had on demand or not. If the book can be had it is 'offered to the public.' If it cannot be had it is not offered to the public." In this statement Prof. Cope, in trying to obscure the issue, fairly begs the question, and implies a condition of things that does not exist, as no one probably knows better than himself.

To speak in general, and in relation to other points raised by Prof. Cope, he says: "The date of printing, or alleged printing, of the last part of a book, the title page, has always been regarded as the date of publication. \* \* \* We are accustomed to refer to the title page, or last page, to ascertain this date, for further than this we cannot go." This is quite true when there is not palpable evidence of misdating, particularly of antedating. Hence the rule generally adopted by scientific bodies, as stated in my former paper, "to the effect that the ostensible date, as that given on the title page of a book or pamphlet, or at the bottom of the signatures, shall be taken as the correct date, *unless known to be erroneous*." This rule is not only approved by Prof. Cope, but he strangely claims that it is in essential accord with the resolution of the Zoological Section of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, which, as he, himself, states it, 'recommended that the date of printing be regarded as the date of publication.'

In the case of the majority of works issued in the past, or at periods too remote to bear obvious evidence of having been antedated, and especially of works issued by responsible publishers, the ostensible date must be accepted. This fortunately covers a large part of scientific literature, but strangely and most unfortunately does not always include the proceedings, memoirs and other publications of scientific societies, the ostensible dates of publication of which are not to be relied on, a fact now thoroughly well known. There are, of course, many exceptions, when the ostensible date is the correct date, and in many other cases the approximately correct date is determinable.

Prof. Cope states: "The probabilities are so great that a book is 'offered to the public' at the date affixed to it that it is not safe to assume that it is not, except in two contingencies." One of these is the fraudulent antedating of a book; the other is that "brought forward by Dr. Allen, that the government publications which are issued at a date later than that which they carry on their title pages." This latter case Prof. Cope claims 'is not well taken,' because, "although some reports issued by our government may bear dates much prior to the dates of issue, it does not follow that the date of printing bears any such relation to the date of issue!" Yet he tells us in another paragraph, as already quoted, that we must accept the date given on the title page as the date of publication! Sometimes a government scientific report is issued reasonably near the date it bears, but, at least in recent years, this is the exception rather than the rule, even with publications issued by the U. S. National Museum. This, of course, is not the fault of the authors, nor even of the Museum,\* but is due to the peculiar ways of the

Government Printing Office. Nor is the United States government the only offender; things are not managed any better under State Printers, and in some cases even worse. Columns of this JOURNAL could be filled with titles of State reports on geology and natural history bearing dates one to three years prior to the dates when the first copies were distributed, although the final proofs were read by the authors, and the pages probably printed in conformity with the date on the title page. And during the interval between the dates of printing and distribution copies of the works were *not* to be 'had on demand,' even by the authors.

Hence it would seem that no one possessing a knowledge of these facts can candidly contend "that the date of printing [should] be regarded as the date of publication." In the case of official documents issued by the different States or by the general government, the date of distribution, or *publication*, is doubtless quite as easy to determine as the date of printing.

The 'whereases' preceding the resolution here under consideration, relating to the difficulties of determining 'a rule of distribution,' were not considered in my former communication—a fact to which Prof. Cope calls attention—nor are they now, since for the most part they are obviously of little weight, and are sufficiently covered in considering the resolution itself.

J. A. ALLEN.

AMERICAN MUSEUM OF  
NATURAL HISTORY, NEW YORK.

#### VITALITY OF THE SPERMATOZOON.

AN instance that may illustrate some of the physiological properties of the mature male sex cells was observed last summer in the course of instruction in invertebrate zoology at the Marine Biological Laboratory at Woods Holl, Mass. Illustration is also given of the rate at which the more interior tissues may harden when the entire animal is subjected to the action of alcohol.

When the study of Mollusca was begun, a date of publication, the desirability of adding the date is obvious. As this is a matter apparently within the control of the officials of the Museum, there may be some practical difficulty in the way of affixing a really correct date that is not obvious to the public.

\*The articles in the Proceedings of the U. S. National Museum are distributed separately to specialists, and to some extent to libraries, as soon as printed, but of late they are sent out without date. There is nothing on the title pages to show when they were issued. When the volume to which they belong is completed and issued, six months to a year after some of the papers were distributed, the date of distribution of each article is given on a leaf following the table of contents. As the early distribution of 'separates' of articles is obviously to secure an early