

first coined by Sir David Wilson in his "Pre-historic Annals of Scotland" to express the "whole period" (age or epoch) "disclosed to us by archeological evidence as distinguished from that known by written records," down to the present it has retained in scientific literature its original meaning. It distinctly refers to a portion of the human period (epoch or age). I fail to find Dr. Schuchert anywhere using it in any different sense. He certainly nowhere "begins the Psychozoic era" with the "historic period" as claimed by Professor Field. In spite of the latter's protest, therefore, I fail to see wherein I have misstated his position. For in between his "mastodon" (mammoth?) "preserved in the arctic ice," which is admitted to be a fossil and his "leaf buried in the gutter," which is not, there is a vast deal of time, from younger to older—*historic, prehistoric* and *geologic*—from only the last of which—the glacial or interglacial portion—would traces of organisms be considered fossil. Neolithic man is not fossil; some of the remains of Paleolithic man are fossil. Both are prehistoric.

Recurring to the propriety or the practise of using the term "fossil" in other than its strict scientific sense, the question presents itself: how about the use of other geological terms in analogous senses? In an article in the last *Geographical Review* entitled "Race Culture and Language," the author, Griffith Taylor, is found applying the terms "inlier" and "outlier" (giving credit to geology for the idea) to certain races in Europe. The former is applied to the Basques, because they constitute an island of ancient people surrounded by younger races, and the latter is applied to the Finns because they are a body separated from the main ethnic group to which they belong, and with which they were once continuous. Most of us, I think, will be disposed to congratulate Professor Taylor on the felicity of these expressions, regardless of how much Professor Field may shake his head over the liberty taken with geological terminology.

ARTHUR M. MILLER

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

THRICE TOLD TALES

TO THE EDITOR OF SCIENCE: Referring to the letters of Professor Wood¹ and Professor T. C. Mendenhall² (*semper juvenis*), I too have a story about the Lick Observatory; and following their lead, hasten to make it public; and then will patiently wait for the various transmutations. Perhaps some one will prove a similar occurrence in the days of Archimedes!

Going up to the observatory in the stage with its load of Saturday night tourists, suddenly one of them asked aloud—"Who was this Mr. Lick, any how? Did he invent the telescope?"

Shades of Galileo! It is time to come forth and be filmed as Professor Mendenhall suggests. In the cast we could have a tourist, same species as Professor Mendenhall's "damned fraud" person. He will be shown asking—"Who is this Mr. Galileo anyhow? Did he build this leaning tower?"

ALEXANDER McADIE

BLUE HILL OBSERVATORY,
February 16

AMERICAN PUBLICATIONS AND INTERNATIONAL EXCHANGE

IN a note just received from Professor Charles Julin, of Liège, he mentions the present unequal international exchange and how difficult it is, in consequence, for the Belgian universities to obtain foreign publications. He says that separata from our American workers will be most welcome, and asks that this suggestion be brought to our students. I think the fact is quite generally appreciated, but it can do only good to bring it again to our attention.

MAYNARD M. METCALF

SCIENTIFIC BOOKS

History and Bibliography of Anatomic Illustration. By LUDWIG CHOULANT. Translated and Edited by MORTIMER FRANK. The University of Chicago Press, 1920.

¹ SCIENCE, January 14, 1921.

² SCIENCE, February 11, 1921.