facturers have been deliberately adding copper to their steel, because it has been found that small amounts of this element caused the metal to be more insoluble in dilute acids. Most investigators agree that an acid test should not be made the sole basis of specification where resistance to atmospheric corrosion is required in the product, but nevertheless the fact that a metal can be shown resistant to the attack of mineral acids has been in the past, and is still, used as an attractive salesmen's argument.

The writer can not help regretting that Professor Walker should have included a paragraph in a scientific review, written in such a manner that it could be reprinted and used in a commercial contest with the object of producing a false impression.

Professor Walker in the same review takes occasion to regret that Dr. Friend had recommended this pure open hearth iron as a possible standard on which to base a corrosion factor. The writer has used this material in this way for some time, and the U. S. Bureau of Standards has recently acquired a quantity of the same metal in which the sum of the total impurities present, including the gases, is less than two tenths of a per cent.

It would appear to the writer that there is such a thing as professional ethics in respect to the scientific treatment of scientific books reviewed in a scientific journal, and that such reviews should not be used to introduce false impressions to be afterwards touted about the country as "salesmen's arguments." It is an unfortunate fact that the development of this new step in metallurgy, namely, the manufacture for the first time of commercially pure iron in the open hearth furnace, on a large scale of operation, should have called forth active enmity from so many unexpected quarters in this country.

Allerton S. Cushman

ITONIDÆ VS. CECIDOMYIIDÆ

A note by Dr. E. P. Felt in Science for July 5 (p. 17) calls attention to a matter somewhat aside from the question of priority in nomenclature, but one which should not be disregarded by zoologists who are striving to attain stability and accuracy in the designation of taxonomic groups. There is much dissension among systematic zoologists regarding the status of Meigen's 1800 names for his genera of diptera which were rechristened by him in 1804. As is well known, the latter names were in common use for a full century and many workers are not in sympathy with those who advocate the adoption of the older, long-forgotten names. Whether the generic name *Cecidomyia* should become *Itonida* depends upon our acceptance of Meigen's earlier names, but no one should countenance the appearance in print of a family name "Itonidæ" in place of the proper form Itonididæ formed from *Itonida*. The international code is very specific on this point, stating that: "The name of a family is formed by adding the ending *idæ*, the name of a subfamily by adding *inæ*, to the root of the name of its type genus."

No one has seen fit to criticize this portion of the code, so far as the writer is aware, and students of these same Diptera have previously used in many instances the carefully formed family name Cecidomyiidæ even though this approaches dangerously near the tabooed "unpronounceable combination" which we are warned diligently to avoid. There has been much laxity in the use of carelessly formed family names by zoologists, particularly Americans, and the writer must plead guilty with the rest.

A little care on the part of systematists will serve to eliminate all such barbaric family names, and would add to the dignity of zoological nomenclature.

C. T. Brues
Bussey Institution,
Harvard University

SCIENTIFIC BOOKS

American Permian Vertebrates. By Samuel W. Williston. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Ill. 1911. Pp. 145 with frontispiece, plates I–XXXVIII, and 32 text figures.

This work from the pen of one of the most