of which may be judged from the following editorial introduction: "Edwin F. Naulty, of this city, has recently created lively interest and discussion by his assertions concerning the 'new' comet which he and Dr. Brooks, of Hobart College, announced to the world several weeks ago. Especial interest has attached to Mr. Naulty's statements attributing to the movements of this comet certain disturbing manifestations in nature, such as cyclones, fires and floods—and more particularly the numerous shipwrecks which have puzzled marine experts."

UNIVERSITY AND EDUCATIONAL NEWS

THE five hundredth anniversary of the foundation of the University of Leipzig is being celebrated this week. In addition to banquets and receptions, there are two academic ceremonies. At the first of these addresses are to be made by the rector, Professor Binding, and by the King of Saxony, followed by addresses from delegates; at the second, an address by Professor Wundt, followed by the conferring of honorary degrees.

IT is proposed to establish in connection with the Paris University a system of exchange between French and foreign professors on similar lines to that which obtains between Germany and the United States. M. Liard, rector of the university, has made an appeal to create a fund for the purpose. M. Albert Kahn has placed at the disposal of the rector an annual grant of 30,000 francs for five years.

THE registration for the first term of the summer quarter at the University of Chicago shows a growth in every one of the schools of the institution. The total number registered on July 10 was 2,817, as compared with 2,593 at the end of July, 1908.

AT the University of Chicago associate professors have been appointed from the grade of assistant professors as follows: Carl Kinsley, physics; Chas. M. Child, zoology; Anton J. Carlson, physiology, and H. Gideon Wells, pathology.

ELLIS E. LAWTON, Ph.D. (Yale), who has been professor of physics during the past year in Colby College, has accepted the professorship of physics in Denison University.

MALCOLM E. STICKNEY, for several years assistant professor of botany in Denison University, has been promoted to the full professorship in that subject.

DR. C. E. STROMQUIST, of Princeton University, has been appointed professor of mathematics at the University of Wyoming.

W. E. WENGER, formerly assistant professor of railway engineering in the University of Illinois, has been appointed associate professor in the department of electrical engineering at McGill University.

THE council of King's College has elected Mr. C. G. Barkla, D.Sc., professor of physics, in succession to Professor Harold Wilson, F.R.S., who has accepted the chair in McGill University.

DR. E. KNECHT has been appointed professor of technological chemistry in the University of Manchester.

DR. EDUARD BUCHNER, of the Agricultural School at Berlin, has been appointed professor of chemistry in the University of Breslau, to succeed Professor Ladenburg, who has retired from active service.

DR. FRITZ COHN, astronomer in the Observatory at Königsberg, has been called to a chair of astronomy at Berlin.

DR. VOLKMAR KOHLSCHÜTTER, associate professor of chemistry at Strassburg, has been called to the chair at Bern, vacant by the retirement of Professor Friedheim.

DISCUSSION AND CORRESPONDENCE

A NOMENCLATORIAL COURT?

THE communication of my friend, Mr. Francis N. Balch, on the subject of a nomenclatorial court[1] has been perused with interest by me, not only on account of the novel proposition and the new point of view from which the subject was contemplated, but also because an analogous proposition has been for some years advocated by me in correspondence and conversation regarding zoological nomenclature.

[1] SCIENCE, June 25, pp. 998–1000.

As a lawyer, Mr. Balch does not need to be reminded that there are two sides to every question (else there were no lawyers), and in this case I venture to believe that what is needed is not a court, but more power to our legislature.

Courts have existed since before the days of Hammurabi, say some 5,000 years; yet I read last month in one of the current magazines an article by a Philadelphia lawyer (and his tribe has been proverbial for acumen these hundred years), writing from his own experience, that in the courts of that city the decision in a case of simple fraud was had only after three years delay; and that business men were submitting to robbery or arranging arbitrations, rather than to take the uncertain chances of court justice in that city. And similar complaints in other cities are so common as to excite no interest except in the parties concerned.

We will admit that the complexity of business affairs makes common-sense justice a difficult ideal to attain, yet it seems as if one would not gain much by instituting nomenclatorial courts.

Nomenclature has existed in its binomial form, which alone concerns us, for 150 years, and in its present shape is a development or evolution from more simple conditions. It is common to hear nomenclature treated as an unimportant and unscientific matter, and the discussion of its principles denounced as trivial and unworthy the attention of those capable of research.

On the contrary, I am prepared to maintain the thesis that except the strictly accurate determination of the facts of science and their interrelations, nomenclature is the most important branch of any science. It is not unworthy of the best and most thorough study that clear heads can devote to it. It is, in short, the summation of all the facts of science in systematic form; without a strictly devised nomenclature there could be no science worthy of the name. It is to science, regarded as the facts of the cosmos, what language is to mankind, without which they could not have risen above the brutes.

With a muddled nomenclature nothing can be clear, and, far from being ignored by men of science, this was recognized as early as Adanson in 1757, a year before the tenth edition of Linnæus.

Owing chiefly to the difficulty of prompt intercommunication between scientific men, it was only after posts, railways, etc., began to alter ancient conditions that scientific men began to get together on general questions of nomenclature. In 1842 the result of some years of discussion was the appointment of a legislature, in the form of a British Association Committee, to prepare laws and formulate the rules of practise which had grown up by a sort of common consent. There was then, as now, a certain number of dissidents, but they did not count for much. This legislature was British, but its code was adopted at once by the American Association and very shortly by the scientists of all civilized countries.

A truly international status was given to the code, when the committee of the International Zoological Congress to consider nomenclature was appointed. This committee has met the growing complexity of the subject in the most satisfactory manner, though by necessity always a little behind the growth of the science. A person can not be considered competent to discuss nomenclature unless he knows and understands the rules of the international code. Many do not, yet "rush in," hence much unnecessary controversy.

The object of this legislature has been to make a series of rules (= laws) which any intelligent person by careful study can utilize to settle nomenclatorial questions. The cases which can not be settled by a rigid application of the code are rare. There are some such and they arise chiefly out of the existence of certain scientific works or systems which appeared in the formative period of nomenclature and about which the question arises, "Are they to be accepted as binomial?" or, "Should they, being binomial, but long obsolete or practically unknown, be admitted to disturb names which, though not entitled by the code to stand, have yet become useful through familiarity?"

Now there are a few works in this category which might be brought before our legislature (International Committee) to which I should be willing to give the power to say arbitrarily, "This book or the names in it shall not (or shall) be considered in nomenclature," on petition as to books of this category. I am not sure that much good would result, for the application of the code has been made in so many instances that the dubitable names are already more familiar to the younger men than those they replace. Still the main point is to gain stability and have the question settled definitely one way or the other; so I have for some time favored giving to the international committee the despotic power I have indicated in addition to those they already possess.

In regard to the particular instance referred to by Mr. Balch, it is sufficient to say that the question is already settled definitely by the code, where Mr. Jukes-Brown will find the answer when he becomes familiar with that body of laws. His uncertainty reminds one of the lady lawyer who, finding herself puzzled in the course of an argument, appealed to the late Chief Justice Wylie, who was hearing the case, as to what course she should pursue, and was dryly advised to consult a good lawyer.

One other question has recently been raised in SCIENCE about which a word may be proper here. That is about the use of personal specific names. The objection to them comes chiefly from those who have not yet fully appreciated the axiom that "a name is a name and not a definition." They have become commoner because the Latin adjectives in genera of many species are largely already in use, and a personal name is much less likely to prove a synonym. Further than that it is a mere question of personal taste.

WM. H. DALL

June 28, 1909

THE COMPARATIVE ENROLMENT OF STUDENTS OF ENGINEERING

TO THE EDITOR OF SCIENCE: The communication by Mr. Tombo in the issue of SCIENCE for June 4 is interesting as showing the increase or decrease in registration at the particular institutions mentioned, but it is hardly fair to draw conclusions for the entire country unless the engineering students at all institutions are included.

For instance, the total increase of 1.15 per cent. is changed by one third of its value if the University of Pennsylvania be included in the count. The enrolment at that institution for 1907–8 was 748; for 1908–9 it was 811; the increase is 63 or 8.4 per cent. As the school in question has the finest engineering building in the country and the most modern equipment and as its increase was only exceeded by two schools in the published list, it is not clear why it was omitted in the count.

It is to be noted also that only one school south of the Ohio River is considered. The total might be substantially changed by including that half of the country.

It is hardly fair, too, to infer a general trend from figures for a year following a period of financial and industrial depression.

M. G. LLOYD

THE omission of the University of Pennsylvania in the table was entirely due to inadvertence. This institution was on the list originally prepared by me, and either my letter to them or their report to me must have gone astray in the mails, and in preparing the final table I failed to note the omission. The enrolment of the engineering schools of the University of Pennsylvania for 1907–8 was 748, for 1908–9 it was 811, thus showing an increase of 64 students or of 8.4 per cent. In size, therefore, the school of this institution would rank eighth among the schools contained in the table. There was no intention to draw conclusions for the entire country, but I see no objection to inferring a general trend from figures giving the enrolment of two dozen representative institutions. So far as the southern schools are concerned they are, speaking broadly, not as important as those included in the table, and furthermore, although efforts were made to secure the figures of the most important of these schools, it