THE July number of the Journal of Nervous and Mental Diseases opens with the presidential address delivered at the meeting of the American Neurological Association, June 1, 1905, by Dr. William G. Spiller. • Dr. Spiller follows a custom more prevalent abroad than at home on such occasions and discusses a subject of general interest, namely, disturbances in the associated movements of the eyes as affording a sign of localizing value in lesions of the brain. He makes an exhaustive summary of the literature and adds reports of a number of cases of his own, with numerous illustrations. The paper is to be continued in the next number. The second article is by Dr. Smith Ely Jeliffe, of New York, on 'Dispensary Work in Nervous Diseases,' being a report of the clinic of Professor M. Allen Starr for the year 1904. This is followed by a paper by Dr. Robert H. Chase, of Philadelphia, on 'Delusions of the Insane.'

THE contents of the Journal of Infectious Diseases is as follows:

TILESTON, WILDER, and LOCKE, EDWIN A.: 'The Blood in Scarlet Fever.'

WHERRY, WM. B., and MCDILL, JOHN R.: 'Notes on a Base of *Hematochyluria*, Together with Some Observations on the Morphology of the Embryo Nematode—*Filaria Nocturna*.'

BUTTERFIELD, ELMORE E.: 'Case of Pulmonary Infection with an Acid-fast Actinomycosis.'

EDWARDS, RALPH T.: 'Bacillus Mycogenes (Bacterium Mucogenum) Nov. Spec., an Organism Belonging to the Bacillus Mucosus Capsulatus Group.'

WHERRY, WM. B.: 'A Search into the Nitrate and Nitrite Content of Witte's "Peptone" with Special Reference to its Influence on the Demonstration of the Indol and Cholera Red Reactions.'

WEAVER, GEORGE H., and TUNNICLIFT, RUTH: 'The Occurrence of Fusiform Bacilli and Spirilla in Connection with Morbid Processes.'

MANWARRING, W. H.: 'A Quantitative Study of Hemolytic Serum.'

MANWARRING, W. H.: 'The Absorption of Hemolytic Ambcceptor.'

ROBINSON, G. C.: 'The Rôle of the Typhoid Bacillus in the Pulmonary Complications of Typhoid Fever.'

JORDAN, E. O.: 'Thermostalbe, Hemolytic Precipitate from Nutrient Broth.' GWYN, N. B. and HARRIS, N. MACL.: 'A Comparison between the Results of Blood Cultures Taken During Life and After Death.'

GUTHRIE, C. C.: 'A Contribution to the Clinical Knowledge of Texas Fever.'

DISCUSSION AND CORRESPONDENCE.

ANCIENT GREEK FISH AND OTHER NAMES.

IN SCIENCE for July 7 (p. 23) Dr. C. R. Eastman has given some valuable references to authors treating of the ancient Greek names of fishes but has omitted notice of the most important and trustworthy of all. Besides other data, Cuvier and Valenciennes, in their 'Histoire Naturelle des Poissons' (1828-1849), have embodied quite full notices of the ancient literature concerning the species they Their greatly superior knowledge treat of. of the fauna of the Greek peninsula and archipelago enabled them to make better identifications than any of their predecessors. It is from the neglect of that great work, and not of Artedi's, that Hoffman and Jordan have failed to make their contribution as valuable as it might have been. Had they used the work they would not have fallen into the error of confusing the accounts of the $\sigma x \dot{a} \rho \sigma \sigma$ and $\sigma \pi d\rho \sigma_{S}$ as they have done—and as Apostolides also has done! In most respects Hoffman and Jordan's work is excellent.

I can by no means assent to the estimate as to 'the extremely valuable historical and bibliographical works of Artedi.' Indeed, there are few errors more deplorable than Artedi's misidentifications which have entailed on ichthyological nomenclature such monstrosities as the use of Esox (corrupted from a Gallic or Teutonic name of the sturgeon) for the pike, of *Echeneis* (a blenny) for the sea suckers, of *Exocatus* (a goby or blenny) for the flying fishes, of Trigla (a surmullet) for the gurnards, and of *Callionymus* (a stargazer) for the dragonets. The example thus set was followed by Linné and others, so that most of the Greek names now in use for fish genera have a signification neither justified by ancient usage nor by analogy.

A new English translation of Aristotle's zoological works is a great desideratum. The old translations are poor and inferior to

Barthélemy-Saint Hilaire's French translations. In my youth I had hoped and expected to translate the 'History of Animals,' and even commenced it; other matters, however, distracted me, and I endeavored to interest others, but without eventual success. Some years ago Professor D'Arcy W. Thompson, of Dundee, informed me that he had almost completed a translation, but it has not yet been put to press. A good translation would demand a union of such qualifications as Professor Thompson has, and most of his predecessors did not have-an intimate acquaintance with the Greek language as well as of the Greek animals. The union of President Jordan with Professor Hoffman realized the demand so far as the fishes were involved.

The difficulty encountered by the would-be translator of Aristotle was entertainingly illustrated in 1862. The Rev. W. Houghton, in an article in the Natural History Review (II., 136-149), "On the Desirability of an English Translation of Aristotle's 'History of Animals," gave a translation of the first chapter of the first book of the history, which was soon criticized (II., 329-332) by Dr. John Scouler and, after a couple of admissions, defended (II., 408–415) by the translator. Meanwhile, in the same year, appeared Richard Creswell's translation. A comparison of Houghton's and Creswell's translations with each other and the original will show how different such may be without either deviating excessively from the Greek text. On the whole, there is no urgent reason to regret that Houghton's translation was not completed instead of Creswell's. The absence of a sufficient knowledge of zoology is, however, sometimes glaringly manifest in Creswell's work, especially in the identifications of the Aristotelian names in footnotes and the index.

Scores of mistranslations or faulty translations occur in Creswell's work, and a couple illustrating the kinds may be cited. "Some animals unite in their nature the characteristics of man and quadrupeds, as apes, monkeys and cynocephali"! (p. 32). This does not represent what Aristotle intended; he meant that some animals combine in their persons characteristics of man and quadrupeds, and instanced as such macaques $(\pi\iota\theta\eta_{-x}\upsilon\iota)$, monkeys $(z\eta_{\beta}\upsilon\iota)$ and baboons $(z\upsilon\nu\upsilon z=\varphi a\lambda o\iota)$. The word ape nowadays is mostly limited to the tailless anthropoid apes which were entirely unknown to Aristotle and the Greeks.

Apropos of tails and hair, Aristotle promises to speak of the monkey-like animals subsequently, but notices the hippelaphus or nilgau and indicates that it has a beard under the throat. Creswell says (p. 26): 'the hipellaphus has a beard upon its larynx'! The erroneous spelling hipellaphus is repeated on the same page.

A word as to the use of Aristotle. His zoological treatises are not repertories of exact information to which a learner should be referred, though proclaimed to be such by some. In my youthful days I was advised by an eminent naturalist of the time to study and follow Aristotle. It happened that I had studied and in a special article 'On the Status of Aristotle in Systematic Zoology' (Am. Nat. for 1873) I gave reasons why I considered it inexpedient to follow him. Let me add another now. As Dr. Eastman well knows, several paleichthyologists have recently been basing new names on fossil otoliths or earbones of fishes. He and others may be amused by Aristotle's ideas respecting the otoliths of some Greek fishes. "Those which have a stone in their head, as the chromis, labrax, sciæna and phagrus, suffer most in the winter; for the refrigeration of the stone causes them to freeze and be driven on shore" (VIII., xx, 5)! THEO. GILL.

ENGINEERING PROBLEMS IN A COURSE IN PHYSICS.

To THE EDITOR OF SCIENCE: Last fall my attention was attracted to a letter published in SCIENCE from a professor of physics in a school of engineering. He asked if others agreed with him that more of 'pure science' ought to be required in engineering courses. At least some of us who are not teaching in either technical or engineering schools feel a need that is just the opposite to the one above expressed. It would be of much assist-