small discrepancies between the best modern determinations of the constant.

E. H. KENNARD

PHYSICAL LABORATORY,
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

GRAVITATION AND ELECTRICAL ACTION

In a recent number of Science¹ Professor F. E. Nipher has pointed out that the force exerted between two isolated solid spheres depends not only upon their mutual gravitational attraction, but also upon the electrostatic charges carried upon their surfaces, and suggests that this fact has been ignored in determinations of the gravitational constant by experimenters from Cavendish to Boys. The fact that the potential of the earth relative to points infinitely remote is not necessarily zero. and the further fact that the earth's surface may at a given time and place be heavily charged owing to volume changes in the atmosphere are urged to show that the spheres employed in the experiments referred to may have carried appreciable charges.

That Professor Nipher's expression for the electrostatic force between two charged spheres is applicable only to the case in which the distance between their centers is great compared with the radius of the larger is perhaps of little importance in view of the fact that the torsional systems in all experiments on the gravitational constant have been effectively shielded from electrostatic action. The important condition is, of course, that displacements of the torsional system shall not alter the electrostatic capacity of the earth, or of the earth-atmosphere condenser, and this condition is satisfied when the system is surrounded by a conducting casing. In Boys' experiment the torsional system was enclosed in a double metal casing and the apparatus was installed in an underground vault.

It does not seem impossible that contact differences of potential between the parts of the torsional system and the casing may have affected results in some of the experiments, although in Boys' experiment the symmetry of the apparatus was such that forces arising from contact differences of potential could

¹ March 31, 1916, page 472.

have exerted only inappreciable torques on the suspended system.

There would seem to be little reason for thinking that the gravitational constant is not known to within one part in 3,000, Professor Boys' estimate.

C. Davisson

CARNEGIE INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY, PITTSBURGH, PA.

AMBYSTOMA NOT AMBLYSTOMA

In view of the recent difficulty I have experienced in trying to have the generic name of the spotted salamander spelled Ambystoma as originally written by Tschudi, it seems desirable to call attention to the correct form of the word. In reporting the exhibition of a specimen of this salamander before the Biological Society of Washington I took pains to see that the word was correctly spelled in manuscript. The report has appeared in print twice and in each instance an l has been inserted by the publisher.¹

The word was proposed by Tschudi² in 1839 and written by him Ambystoma in four different places in his work, and only in that manner. The derivation of the word is not given by him and there is nothing to indicate that he intended Amblystoma and made a lapsus calami. The first author to employ Amblystoma was Agassiz³ in 1842-1846. This spelling has had a very wide acceptance and it is the one usually employed by morphologists, embryologists, physiologists and others who are not systematists. A discussion of the appropriateness of Ambystoma and its possible derivation from ἀνὰ στόμα βύειν meaning to cram into the mouth is given by Steineger in his "Herpetology of Japan."4 The correct form of the word is employed by Hegner⁵ in his "College Zoology," but aside from this most of the nonspecialist authors that I have lately seen incorrectly spell the word with the l inserted.

- 1 Jour. Wash. Acad. Sci., Vol. 6, p. 258, May 4, 1916. SCIENCE, N. S., Vol. 43, p. 761, May 26, 1916.
- ² Mém. Soc. Sci. Nat. Neuchatel, Vol. 2, section 4, pp. 57 and 92, 1839.
 - ³ Nomencl. Zool. Rept., p. 2, 1842-46.
- ⁴ Bull. U. S. Nat. Mus., No. 85, p. 24, July 22,
 - 5 "College Zoology," p. 511, 1912.