Trinil remains. This is very interesting. The author gives us the names of the three groups of anatomists who consider the remains human, simian and intermediate, respectively. The first group is essentially English, the second German and the third composite. Duckworth joins the last group, though admitting that the femur may be human. It is unfortunate that, having given so much space to this interesting question, he has not discussed the evidence that the pieces belong to one individual.

There are many other points which it would be interesting, at least to your reviewer, to discuss at length; but enough has probably been said to show that in his opinion it is a very good and useful hand-book.

T. D.

## SCIENTIFIC JOURNALS AND ARTICLES.

THE September issue of the *Journal of Comparative Neurology and Psychology* contains the following articles: 'A Study of the Functions of Different Parts of the Frog's Brain,' by Wilhelm Loeser. The brain was experimentally examined by the extirpation of various regions (twenty-two operations) and study of the deficiency phenomena and other symptoms. 'The Central Gustatory Paths in the Brains of Bony Fishes,' by C. Judson Herrick. This paper (which was awarded the Cartwright prize for this year) is a continuation of the author's previous studies on nerve components, in course of which the peripheral gustatory system has been isolated and experimentally studied in fishes. Selecting the types in which this system attains its maximum development, the central gustatory paths are demonstrated by various microscopical methods, the research including a description, accompanied by forty figures, of the conduction paths for all of the important gustatory reactions which have been experimentally observed in the normal life of these fishes. The central gustatory centers are found to be more closely related to the central olfactory system than to any other part of the brain.

PROFESSOR FRANK SMITH, of the University of Illinois, has been made zoological editor of *School Science and Mathematics*. The biological section, of which Professor Caldwell was formerly editor, has been divided into two sections, a zoological section and a botanical section. Professor Caldwell remains the botanical editor.

## DISCUSSION AND CORRESPONDENCE.

### THE LETTER K IN ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE.

THERE are some influential zoologists who, in their zeal for the integrity of scientific Latin (or Neolatin), propose to change the letters k and w, wherever they occur, into c and v. Thus Sir G. F. Hampson, in his great work on the moths of the world, cites a species as *Episilia voccei*, the specific name being a new rendering of *wockei*, originally proposed by Moeschler. Unfortunately, this method results in some unexpected duplication of names. Thus Gray, in 1846, applied the generic name *Kogia* to the pygmy sperm whale. Butler, in 1870, used *Cogia* for a valid genus of butterflies, which is recognized to-day by Dr. Dyar as occurring in our own fauna. Now Dr. D. G. Elliot, in a recent work, amends the name of the whale to *Cogia*, and if this is accepted the name of the butterfly-genus must fall. It is true that Elliot's *Cogia* is later than Butler's, but it is proposed as the correct way of spelling Gray's genus, and not intended in any sense as a new name.

Theobald has lately proposed *Cellia* as the name of a genus of mosquitoes. But in 1822 Turton named a valid genus of mollusca *Kellia*. According to the Hampson-Elliot method this becomes *Cellia*, and the mosquito-genus name is a homonym.

*Kallima* was proposed by Westwood in 1850 as the name of a well-known genus of butterflies. In 1860 Clemens named a valid genus of moths *Callima*. Now Dr. Dyar, because of *Kallima*, has named the moth genus *Epicallima*.

Again, *Cnephasia*, Curtis, interferes with *Knephasia*, Tepper.

A curious case occurs in a genus of African moths, *Xanthospilopteryx*. In 1893 Carpenter named a species *X. kirbyi*, but it is a synonym of *pardalina*, Walker. In 1897 Holland

named another *X. kirbyi,* but this is a homonym, as the rules are generally understood. Hampson calls Holland's species *X. cirbyi,* and it is imaginable that this might be interpreted as the necessary new name for the insect. Since, however, it is only intended as a new way of writing the old name, it seems that Holland's insect should be renamed, say, *X. hollandi.*

Enough has been said to show that the proposed abandonment of k and w, if it is not to prevail, should be checked as soon as possible; or if it is to be the rule, should be widely known, so that proposers of new names may guide themselves accordingly. Personally, I am totally opposed to it, on the ground that names are merely symbols designating particular objects, and the most we can ask is that they have a Latinoid ending, and are not too long. Nevertheless, the matter is at present an open one, and if most zoologists prefer to follow Hampson and Elliot, the minority will probably give in to their wishes, for the sake of uniformity. On the other hand, if nearly all are against the proposal, it would seem that a few should not persist in making such changes as those cited, unless they can convince themselves that a very important matter of principle is involved.

If the editor will allow it, I will herewith ask all working zoologists who are willing to take the trouble to send me a post-card voting for or against the substitution of c and v for k and w, and I will list the names and send them for publication in SCIENCE. I think that the names should be published, for several rather obvious reasons, not the mere numbers pro and con.

T. D. A. COCKERELL.

UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO,
BOULDER, COLORADO.

## 'HAMMOCK,' 'HOMMOCK' OR 'HUMMOCK'?

SOME recent botanical papers seem to indicate that there is still some uncertainty as to which of the above is the proper designation for a certain class of geographical features of frequent occurrence in some parts of the southeastern United States. These three words may represent three totally different and independent ideas, but they are so similar in spelling that one may be easily transformed into another by a mere typographical error. But typographical errors will not account for all cases, and there are certain other circumstances which complicate the problem. Having given the matter considerable study lately, both in field and library, I can present some observations which should clear up most of the existing confusion.

The lexicographers all seem to favor 'hummock.' Webster, for instance, says: "Hummock (probably an Indian word). (1) A rounded knoll or hillock; * * * (2) A ridge or pile of ice * * *. See Hommock. (3) Timbered land. (Florida.)" Under 'hommock' is the following definition: "Hommock (written also hammock and hummock). (Probably an Indian word.) A hillock, or small eminence of a conical form, sometimes covered with trees. *Bartram.*" The definitions in the Century and Standard dictionaries are somewhat longer, but do not differ materially from that of Webster, except that they say that hummock is probably a diminutive of hump. In all three, Bartram is the only authority cited for 'hommock'; and this word occurs on pages 31, 219–221, and perhaps elsewhere in the 1794 edition of his 'Travels.' The same spelling is used throughout Dr. E. W. Hilgard's 'Report on the Geology and Agriculture of Mississippi,' published in 1860, and in that work several varieties of 'hommocks' are fully described. Dr. Hilgrade in a recent letter informs me that that spelling was in accordance with the pronunciation used by the natives, but that he now believes 'hammock' to be correct, and writes it that way.

The published references to 'hammock' and 'hummock' are so numerous that it would be impracticable to attempt to list them; but thus far I have noted the former in at least thirty different books and papers, the earliest dating back to 1839, and the latter in about half as many, beginning with 1834. Most of the occurrences of both forms are in works dealing with Florida, and a careful search through Florida literature would doubtless reveal many other cases of each. It is