has sometimes been termed temporarily eka-manganese on account of its being considered to be a metal with properties similar to those of manganese.

Surely the best name and one most appropriate under the circumstances is Moseleyum. The actual discoverer, whoever he is, will lose little in yielding to such a suggestion which will certainly meet with general approval. Moreover, it is a name better and more international in character like true science itself than a latinized name of the discoverer's own kingdom or republic.

Whether we say that cruel war or that destiny decreed that young Moseley should be denied the great and happy privilege of pushing on to greater completion his wonderful and far-reaching experimental results, we know that his research has helped us in our search after truth. His step-like photographs have simplified our steps and we now roam on ahead.

There is little that we can do that will more fittingly show our appreciation of the best of his life's labor. Wherever the Periodic Table will be shown after this, let the outstanding name in the center of it be "Moseleyum," as an inspiration to the teacher and the earnest student and as a monument to man's own intelligence and the value of research.

To all I say: "Element 43 no longer but 'Moseleyum.' Make it unanimous."

RICHARD HAMER

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH

## MUSCLE SHOALS VS. MUSSEL SHOALS

DR. A. E. ORTMANN'S suggestion on pp. 565 and 566 of the December 19th issue of SCIENCE to change the official spelling of Muscle Shoals to read Mussel Shoals, because of the fact that the Shoals are named after the well-known bivalves that abound in that locality, brings to mind a similar agitation in the south a few years ago when the Shoals were beginning to attract the attention of the investing public. A leading newspaper then advocated making the change for the same reasons advanced by Dr. Ortmann. The writer, who at that time was engaged on a waterpower investigation of the Tennessee River for the War Department, and happened to be familiar with the early history of the geographic name, was able to set at rest the minds and as a result the old spelling has since prevailed. The story is briefly this:

The writings of early settlers and explorers in that part of the United States give the spelling uniformly as Muscle Shoals, often followed by a note that the name was derived from the *muscle shells* for which the place had always been famous with the Indian tribes. The earliest map of the Shoals made by the government was that of 1832, prepared by officers of what was then known as the Corps of Topographical Engineers, U. S. Army. This map, which also shows the spelling Muscle Shoals, was for the purpose of locating a canal with nine locks around the Shoals to enable navigators to pass the latter. This canal is still in existence, though obsolete. All indications were to the effect that the name of the bivalve in those days was *muscle shell*. This was substantiated by referring to dictionaries and encyclopedias, both old and new editions. One standard dictionary, edition of 1875, showed a wood cut of the shell and gave "muscle shell" as the only form of spelling. Later editions give both forms of spelling. About 1895 the form "mussel" is given the preference. The most recent editions of Funk & Wagnalls' Standard Dictionary and Webster's International still mention under "muscle" the name of the shell as an old form.

In the earlier writings mention is made of the fact that the "muscle shell' is so named because of the powerful muscles that close the two valves. Any one who has worn out his jack knife pearl hunting on the Tennessee and tributaries can testify as to these muscles and wonders why "mussel shell" is not spelled "muscle shell."

The writer urges adherence to the old form of spelling the name of the Shoals for two reasons: It has been established through long usage, extending over more than a century; the new form of spelling *mussel* is no improvement over the old form *muscle*.

GERARD H. MATTHES

NEW YORK CITY

## SCIENTIFIC BOOKS

*The Life, Letters and Labours of Francis Galton.* By KARL PEARSON. Vol. I. Birth 1822 to Marriage 1853. Cambridge (University Press), 1914. Pp. xxiii + 246. 56 plates and 5 pedigree charts. Vol. II. Researches of Middle Life. Cambridge (University Press) 1924. Pp. xi + 425. 54 plates.

HAVING as its subject one who will probably be written down in the history of science bracketed with Darwin as one of the most important figures in nineteenth century biology, and for its author the pioneer explorer of a new field of biological thought and methodology, Pearson's "Life of Galton" is bound to be a work in the very first rank of significance. And it is. Such a biography as this stands alone. Biographies as monumental in point of size as this will be when finished are not rare. In contradistinction to all such, however, the thing which makes this unique is that it is a thorough piece of *scientific* research on the life of a great *scientist*. It is less entertaining than Galton's autobiographical "Memories," but immeasurably more valuable. For