

M. College, and by Dr. B. W. Kilgore, state chemist.

Mr. White read a paper embodying a report of studies made of the sulphur class of dyes, which are to-day the most interesting class of colors with which the cotton dyer has to work. Samples were obtained from Mr. White from all the leading dye-stuff dealers. These samples were submitted to all the different tests corresponding to the tests through which the cotton must pass in actual use, and in all these tests the new class of sulphur colors showed themselves very much superior to the direct cotton colors now in use, and they promise to ultimately replace the dye-stuffs now on the market, and entirely change the method for dyeing cotton goods with direct dye-stuffs. The paper was illustrated with dyed samples which had been tested to all the different conditions.

Dr. Kilgore filled the program for a short time with a discussion of the recent work of the soil survey in this state. Though the work has not progressed far enough to draw very many conclusions, several very interesting things were noted. In analysis made of soil waters, for plant food, as was to be supposed, it was found that the more leachy sandy soils contained the largest amount of plant food in solution in the third and second foot in depth. It is interesting, however, to note that the same holds with the red clay soils in the Piedmont section of the state.

In the study of the composition of type soils of the state, which work is being carried on by the department, it has been found that lime is present in seemingly unusually small amounts. In the red-clay soils in the Piedmont section of the state, where there were considerable amounts of phosphoric acid, nitrates and potash, analysis revealed scarcely a trace of lime. This would indicate that the soils are in actual need of an application of lime, but of course for definite conclusion this would have to be tested experimentally.

J. S. CATES,
Secretary.

RALEIGH, N. C.,
May 5, 1903.

DISCUSSION AND CORRESPONDENCE.

MOUNT PELEE.

TO THE EDITOR OF SCIENCE: Should not the Martinique volcano be called either *Mont Pelé* or *La Montagne Pelée* or in plain English *Mount Pelee* (no accent)? My impression from a visit to St. Pierre and Morne Rouge in 1895 is that the common name was *La Montagne Pelée* and I understood that *pelée* was an adjective meaning *bare* like the Spanish *pelado*, also applied to bare or woodless hills. I remember that the mountain did not then seem to have any bare surface at all. Of course, if an adjective, the form to go with the masculine *mont* is *pelé* and with the feminine *montagne* is *pelée*, and the combination *Mont Pelée* is neither French nor English. I am reminded of this now by what seems a complete confirmation in Professor Heilprin's book at page 166, although he calls his work 'Mont Pelée and the Tragedy of Martinique.' Geo. Kennan's 'Tragedy of Pelée' is non-committal and his use of the name always accurate.

In Stark's 'Guide to Barbados and the Caribbee Islands,' Boston, 1893, the form *Mt. Pelee* (no accent) occurs at p. 42. This I suppose should be read *Mount Pelee* on usual English analogies. The writing of a French accent, however, seems to involve the correct French form of the word.

MARK S. W. JEFFERSON.

THE PROPOSED BIOLOGICAL LABORATORY AT THE TORTUGAS.

TO THE EDITOR OF SCIENCE: Professor Mayer, of the Brooklyn Museum, has asked me to give my opinion on the advisability of establishing a tropical-biological station in American waters.

I think that such a station would be an invaluable aid to biological research in all departments, and no one who is acquainted with the rich fauna of the Mediterranean and even of British seas can help regretting the way in which work is hampered by the comparative paucity of life on our northeastern coasts.

West Indian waters would, however, surpass in interest and variety of species the Mediterranean.

It seems to me that a station on one of the Bahama Islands, if possible in a place where some sheltered or lagoon water could be had, would be the situation most to be desiderated.

E. W. MACBRIDE.

MCGILL UNIVERSITY.

SHORTER ARTICLES.

THE FIRST EDITION OF HOLBROOK'S NORTH AMERICAN HERPETOLOGY.

IN a 'biographical memoir of John Edwards Holbrook,' prepared for the National Academy of Sciences, and in the compilation of which I took unusual care, I assumed that only three volumes of the first edition of the 'North American Herpetology' had been published. In the 'publisher's note' to the second edition it was, indeed, explicitly stated that 'in consequence of * * * the demand for the *first three volumes* it became necessary either to reprint them or to make a new edition,' and thus by implication it was certified that no later volume of the first edition had been published. With this statement all the many bibliographies and works I had consulted agreed.

I was not a little surprised, therefore, when I received a letter from my friend, Mr. Witmer Stone, informing me that 'the last word' has not been said on the 'Herpetology,' and that there was a fourth volume of the first edition in the library of the Academy of Natural Sciences of Philadelphia. I was led thereby to review numerous bibliographies and works on reptiles and amphibians to ascertain whether any references had been made to a fourth volume which I had previously overlooked. Duméril and Bibron, Baird and Girard, Cope, Garman, Günther, Boulenger, and Stejneger alike made no reference to such a volume. The bibliographies of Agassiz and Strickland, Engelmann, Carus and Engelmann, and catalogues of numerous public libraries were also silent as to the existence of any other than 'the first three volumes.' The British Museum librarians, indeed, knew only one volume; in its great catalogue, 'Vol. I., Philadelphia, 1836. 4°' is listed, and the remark made 'No more published'!

In short, no recent author seems to have known a fourth volume of the first edition, but it occurred to me that Dekay, who was a friend of Holbrook and published his part on the reptiles in the same year (1842) as Holbrook did his second edition, might have done so. On reference to his work, I found he did.

Dekay, in his 'Zoology of New York,' Part III., listed Holbrook's work in his 'List of works referred to' by him (p. vi), as 'North American Herpetology; [etc.] 4 vols. 4to. Philadelphia, 1834 et seq.,' but inasmuch as he referred, in the synonymies of his work, to the second edition, although published in the same year (1842),* this was entirely insufficient. Occasionally, however, he did refer to a volume IV. ('vol. 4') which evidently was not that of the second edition.

Under 'the Snapping Turtle' (p. 8), reference was made to 'vol. 4, p. 21, pl. 3; and vol. 1, p. 139, pl. 23 of the 2d Ed.'

Under 'the Geographic Tortoise,' reference was made to '*Testudo id. [i. e., geographica]*' HOLBROOK, N. Am. Herp. Vol. 4, and Vol. 1, p. 99, pl. 14 of Ed. 2da.' This was quite erroneous; Holbrook described his '*Emys pseudogeographica*' in the fourth volume, but not '*Emys geographica*,' that species having been described in the first volume under the new specific name '*Emys megacephala*.' Under 'the Pseudographic Tortoise,' as well as all the other Chelonians, reference was only made to the second edition.

Under '*C[oluber] sayi*' (noticed as extralimital at p. 41) reference was made to 'Vol. 4,' which must have been of the first edition, since in the second edition the species was described in the third volume.

Under 'the Ribbon Snake' (p. 47) reference was made to 'Holbrook, N. A. Herpetology, Vol. 4, p. 21, pl. 4; and Vol. 4, p. 21, pl. 4, of 2d Ed.' Evidently the author had taken up the fourth volume of the second edition twice, for in that of the first, the '*Coluber saurita*' was described on page 87 and figured on plate 16.

The '*C. obsoletus*,' '*C. rhombomaculatus*'

* Dekay probably had proof-sheets and not complete volumes.