

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.

The purpose of this book is a presentation of the history and bibliography of representations of human anatomy by graphic means. Due consideration has been given both to anatomic illustration and to representations belonging to the graphic and plastic arts.

WHILE engaged in the preparation of the list of the anatomists of the world¹ one of the most useful works of reference was found to be J. Ludwig Choulant's "Geschichte und Bibliographie der anatomischen Abbildung," which had been published in 1852 in Leipzig by this energetic physician. It was likewise of great value in studying the sources of anatomical literature² and in other ways has proven its value as an aid in the study of the history of anatomy. Its importance in the history of medicine is indicated by the nine references to Choulant's work in Garrison's "History of Medicine."

Unfortunately this important work has long been out of print and there are few copies available for the younger generation of students. It was thus with great interest that we welcomed the announcement from the University of Chicago Press of the forthcoming translation of this important historical document by Mortimer Frank, a Chicago physician who had already earned fame by his contributions to medical history. As an associate editor of the *Annals of Medical History* he made his influence felt in the development of this important journal. His great collection of early medical works and engravings, since his lamented death deposited in the library of the University of Chicago, gave him a grasp of his subject such as few men are given to attain.

Dr. Frank did not live to see his book off the press and his untimely death was greatly mourned by the profession at large but especially was his loss keenly felt by those whose interests were similar to his own. His friend, Fielding H. Garrison, acted as editor and saw the book through the press.

¹ Published in Eycleshymer's "Anatomical Names," New York, 1917, pp. 177-354.

² This subject was discussed by the writer in *American Naturalist*, LI., 193-208, April, 1917.

The book is a handsome volume and the press-work is well up to the standard of the other publication from this press. Garrison's memorial notice of Mortimer Frank introduces the book to the reader. This is followed by Frank's biographical sketch of Choulant, thus making available for the first time in English, the life of this important worker. The succeeding pages are occupied with the translation of the history and the reproduction of the bibliography to which important additions are made, thus revising and bringing the work up to date.

The illustrations of the original publication are well reproduced in the translation and add great value to the work in the hands of students of art. An unfortunate feature is the arrangement of the descriptions of the figures, these being placed in the back of the book with no references to them on the plates. In this arrangement Dr. Frank simply followed Choulant's plan in the German edition.

Choulant's original discussions of the various artists who forwarded the study of anatomy by their illustrative work may seem to the art student somewhat unequal and this same inequality is apparent in the translation; but in making such a criticism one must keep in mind that Choulant's idea was the discussion of the work of each man as he had aided in the development of anatomical illustration. His very brief account of Michaelangelo's work is not in any disparagement of this eminent Italian's work but is due to the fact that the great sculptor left few contributions to anatomical illustration.

The history and bibliography already has its place in the literature and Dr. Frank's translation will make the work available to all students of the subject. While we regret that our fellow worker was not given the joy of seeing the book off the press, yet we may rejoice that he was enabled to leave the work so nearly complete as to warrant the publication of this important contribution.

ROY L. MOODIE

COLLEGE OF MEDICINE,
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS