

DR. F. R. MILLER has been appointed lecturer in physiology in McGill University.

MR. R. E. STONE has been appointed lecturer in the botanical department of the Ontario Agricultural College.

MR. W. H. MILLS, M.A., of Jesus College, has been appointed demonstrator to the Jacksonian professor of natural experimental philosophy at Cambridge University in place of the late Mr. H. O. Jones.

DISCUSSION AND CORRESPONDENCE

"THEORETICAL ASTRONOMY"

TO THE EDITOR OF SCIENCE: Referring to Professor MacMillan's review of Buchholz's Klinkerfues's "Theoretische Astronomie," in SCIENCE for September 6:

Professor MacMillan objects to Klinkerfues's limitation of the title "Theoretical Astronomy" to the theory and practise of orbit determinations, and the great majority of astronomers will certainly agree that this is illogical and unfortunate; but is not Professor MacMillan's application of the term "Computational Astronomy" to the same field even more illogical and unfortunate? The computational side in many other branches of astronomical endeavor is as extensive, both relatively and absolutely, as in that of orbit determinations. To illustrate: Studies of the solar corona, of atmospheric refraction, of the motion of the solar system, of Algol variable stars, of the evolution of double stars, of cosmogony in general, and so on almost indefinitely, have both theoretical and computational sides; and who is wise enough to say which side in any of the subjects mentioned will be the predominant one in the future?

Can we do better at present than to continue the already extensive use of Gauss's title, "Theorie der Bewegung der Himmelskörper," and of Oppolzer's title, "Lehrbuch zur Bahnbestimmung"?

Again, does not Professor MacMillan's characterization of this subject as the "book-keeping" of astronomical science convey an unfortunate impression? The subject received the best efforts of Kepler, Gauss, Olbers, Op-

polzer, and many others; and advances made during the present generation give promise that this field is worthy of the highest abilities of astronomers to come. Could we not, with equal justification, include in the "bookkeeping" of astronomy essentially all studies of double stars, of variable stars, of spectroscopic binary stars, of stellar positions and proper motions, of stellar radial velocities, of sunspot spectra, and so on through a long list?

W. W. CAMPBELL

MT. HAMILTON,
September 18, 1912

THE UNANIMOUS VOTE RULE IN THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

THE central branch of the American Society of Zoologists unanimously adopted the report of its committee on nomenclature¹ containing the following:

All propositions for amendments to rules on nomenclature which are approved by a majority of the International Commission on Nomenclature shall be submitted to the International Congress for decision by vote in open meeting.

It is not the purpose of the present communication to influence any person's mind for or against the foregoing resolution, which is practically identical with a proposition that has recently arisen in Austria. A brief statement of the origin of the present method of procedure may, however, be interesting to some zoologists who desire a change in the methods.

The International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature was appointed in 1895. For three years it studied the subjects submitted to it, its members coming together at their own expense from five different countries in a meeting of nearly a week's duration some months prior to the meeting of the Congress. The Commission was unanimous upon a number of propositions, but was divided upon several others. Upon the latter propositions majority and minority reports were submitted.

At the next meeting of the Zoological Congress the Commission was prepared to submit its formal report, but learned that no place on

¹ See SCIENCE, 1912, June 14, pp. 933-934.