

not be regarded as "obviously obscene" or rather let us say, immodest. My position, in brief, is that we have in Linnæus's reference to Baster's figure very clear evidence of what he intended the term *felinus* to imply, and, this being so, the application of his term *senilis* also becomes clear. I prefer Linnæus's identifications of his own species to any speculations as to other possibilities.

I am quite prepared to assume responsibility for having advocated the revival of the Linnean specific names for the two species in question, but Professor Verrill asserts that I also advocate the adoption of *Priapus equinus* for the form that he prefers to term *Actinia mesembryanthemum* (properly *mesembrianthemum*). I do not recall ever having advocated the use of the original Linnean name for this species, and, indeed, in the paper which has become the object for Professor Verrill's fulminations, it is only once mentioned and then as *Actinia (Priapus) equina*. I gave the name that form expressly to indicate that while recognizing the priority of *Priapus* according to the International Rules, I hoped that the long-established name of *Actinia* would not be dropped from our nomenclature. Apparently my mode of expressing this idea has been somewhat too subtle. It would, indeed, be unfortunate if *Actinia*, with all its associations, should be obliterated and it would also be unfortunate if the familiar *A. equina* should disappear. For Professor Verrill's statement that "the leading European authorities, familiar with the actinians of the same region, have never been able to agree as to his (*i. e.*, Linnæus's) species" is quite erroneous so far as this species is concerned, and equally untrue is the statement that "most writers, before McMurrich, have wisely rejected the names," mainly on the ground of their immodesty. I have taken the trouble to look up the references to the species now under consideration during the twenty-five years that preceded the publication of my paper and find that in *thirty-eight* it is quoted as *A. equina* and only in *four* as *A. mesembryanthemum*, although in several the latter name is given as

a synonym for *equina*. Apparently there are quite a number of zoologists unburdened by such an exquisite sense of modesty as would compel them to reject this Linnean name, and the most convincing reason for the non-use of *senilis* and *felinus* has not been that stated by Professor Verrill, but, as a review of the literature will clearly show, the confusion in their application which early arose and to which I have referred in my paper.

J. PLAYFAIR MCMURRICH

THE FANNY EMDEN PRIZE OF THE PARIS ACADEMY

TO THE EDITOR OF SCIENCE: It may be of interest to you to record the fact that the Academy of Sciences of the French Institute has published a statement in regard to the award of the Fanny Emden prize for the year 1913. This prize is of the value of 3,000 francs and is the result of a bequest made by Mlle. Juliette de Reinach of 50,000 francs, the interest of which is available every two years. The prize is to be awarded for the best work "in the field of hypnotism, suggestion or in general, of physiological action which may be exercised at a distance upon a living organism." The fund was made available in 1911. Thirteen candidates presented researches, but no prize was awarded. In 1913 the prize was divided, 2,000 francs to M. Emile Boirac and 1,000 francs to M. J. Ochorowicz.

The peculiar wording of the award lies in the fact that the Academy makes these awards as *encouragement* for meritorious work, but sets forth that neither of the essays submitted goes very far towards proving its thesis. Indeed, the report rather decidedly indicates that they contribute rather little towards the establishment of any conclusion. The report cites one or two experiments of M. Boirac which are certainly questionable, and require extraordinary confirmation before they can be regarded as evidential in the sense presented.

Nothing is indicated in the report to show that a research proving the absence of any such action "at a distance," or its extreme improbability, would not be considered; but the very wording of the original bequest seems

to suggest a leaning in favor of a positive conclusion. It is certainly to be regretted that a problem of this nature should receive even so partial endorsement as is implied by the French Academy of Science. Since the conditions of the prize do not require specific investigations, but make it available for an argument indicating the position of psychology on such an hypothesis, I trust that for 1915 some candidate will present a statement that will more adequately express the views of a considerable proportion of modern psychologists upon this subject. Psychology receives so slight a recognition in scientific competitions that it seems unfortunate that its interests should be prejudiced by a recognition of a subject somewhat tangential to its main problems, and yet one upon which it has been forced to express itself in view of the widespread public concern.

JOSEPH JASTROW

SCIENTIFIC BOOKS

Flies in Relation to Disease: Non-bloodsucking Flies. By G. S. GRAHAM-SMITH, M.D. Cambridge, University Press, 1913.

A first reading of Dr. Graham-Smith's admirable book is apt in a way to somewhat dampen the enthusiasm of the ardent fly crusader. This is especially apt to be the case with one who, like the present writer, has recently been told by Stiles, after his experiences in the Carolinas, that the half has not yet been told of the danger of the house-fly, and who only the other day heard Levy of Richmond, in an address before the State Health Association, emphatically state that even the most exaggerated newspaper statements of the dangers have underestimated them. Perhaps if Dr. Graham-Smith lived in the Carolinas or in Virginia he might share to a certain degree the views of Stiles and Levy, but, living in England, and being a most careful, conscientious, and thoroughly scientific laboratory worker, he has in this book held himself down to absolutely demonstrated statements and has viewed the problem almost strictly from the medical side. He has thus produced a work which will be highly pleas-

ing to conservative people who have diagnosed current newspaper statements about the house-fly as yellow journalism.

A second and more careful reading of the book, however, will show that there is an abundance of demonstrated facts upon which to base those vigorous anti-fly crusades. He states that it is certain that the house-fly is a potential disease carrier and a constant frequenter and disseminator of filth, "but," he says, "much remains to be done before Howard's name, 'the typhoid fly,' or Hewitt's generalization can be completely justified." Hewitt's generalization, by the way, is "It has been proved that the house-fly plays an important part in the dissemination of certain of our most prevalent infectious diseases when the necessary conditions are present." Both Hewitt and myself (quoting from Graham-Smith) "approaching the subject from the entomological standpoint, have based their conclusions in regard to disease mainly on evidence of an epidemiological character and have apparently accepted the bacteriological evidence almost without criticism. From the bacteriological point of view, however, while the evidence relating to the carriage of pathogenic bacilli by experimentally infected flies is fairly conclusive, that relating to the presence of these microorganisms in 'wild flies' is far from complete."

The book is a very thorough and a very cautious one, and covers a consideration of the species of non-bloodsucking flies found in houses, the life history of the house fly, its internal and external anatomy in much detail, its habits, the ways in which it carries and distributes bacteria, the bacteriology of city flies, the fate of organisms eaten by larvæ, and a lengthy consideration of typhoid fever, summer diarrhea, anthrax, other bacterial diseases, the carriage of the eggs of parasitic worms, myiasis, the diseases and parasites and other enemies of flies, and questions of control. It is an admirable compendium, containing many facts not hitherto presented, and bringing together the latest information in a way in which it can be easily and intelligently consulted.