Is it small wonder that the majority of us are turning to the use of English names except in some group with which we happen to be familiar.

I am perfectly aware that the systematist who concerns himself only with questions of the number of species and genera and the names for the same, in a single branch of science in which he specializes, will regard my remarks as pure rubbish. We must all admit, however, that specialization makes us blind to the views of outsiders and to some of the broader aspects of our specialty. Things that seem to us from long association as necessary, may be found upon unbiased consideration, susceptible of very important modifications and the present problem seems to be one of these.

In presenting these ideas I do not wish to be misunderstood. I do not wish to be placed in the same category as the carping critic of all nomenclatural changes who, by the use of clever sarcasm, appeals to the multitude who know as little about the facts as he does himself. I am a staunch supporter of the International Code of Nomenclature and all of the changes which its enforcement requires. They are necessary for ultimate stability and are happily permanent. I would encourage the study of geographic variation in the species and the establishment of subspecies since no matter how many of the latter we may have, their relationship to specific groups is always clearly indicated by the accompanying specific name.

I would encourage, to the fullest, research into the relationship of species, with however as much consideration for their resemblances as for their differences, and I would endorse the establishment of as many groups as may be desired under subgeneric headings—or any other term that may be preferred—but let us not insist upon introducing our conclusions on this matter into the technical name with the result of seriously imparing the principal use of that name.

Let us be conservative in the number of generic names that we recognize, and let general utility have a voice in the matter, of equal weight with that of the splitter and the lumper, just as to-day in another field of discussion the public is becoming recognized as a third party on an equal footing with labor and capital.

WITMER STONE
ACADEMY OF NATURAL SCIENCES,
PHILADELPHIA

OSCAR A. RANDOLPH

DR. OSCAR A. RANDOLPH, associate professor of physics in the University of Colorado, lost his life in a snow storm on April 11, during a trip to the Arapohoe Peaks on the Continental Divide. He made the trip with one companion Mr. Ellett, also of the department of physics, for the purpose of photographing winter storm scenes. They ascended to an altitude of about 12,500 feet and then descended into what is known as the Hell Hole. On the trip Dr. Randolph became ill and was unable to overcome the handicap of a sudden heavy fall of snow accompanied by bitter cold. Mr. Ellett had assisted him on the return trip till they were both exhausted. Mr. Ellett then protected Dr. Randolph with all the means at his command and started for help at the cabin of two trappers who were living some five miles away. In his weakened and confused condition he wandered for several hours without making much progress in the deep snow. One of the trappers finally found him and learned of Dr. Randolph's condition. Dr. Randolph died however before the trapper could reach him. Owing to the fact that both men were experienced mountaineers and had often made trips to the peak their friends at the university did not become alarmed till noon on April 12, when a rescue party started for the scene. Mr. Ellett, though terribly exhausted and somewhat frozen, will recover.

O. C. LESTER

ALFRED J. MOSES, 1859–1920

BY the death, on February 27, of Alfred J. Moses, professor of mineralogy at Columbia University, the science of mineralogy has lost one of its most eminent and valued exponents. Professor Moses's work as a teacher, as a