I have refrained from doing so, because I knew of the matter only at second hand, and as I made no notes at the time, I can not quote exactly, but only in substance. I had recently a conversation with Professor A. H. Tuttle, for many years at the University of Virginia, and our discussion led to mention of the position of Louis Agassiz upon evolution. Professor Tuttle in his early years went to Harvard to study with the late Jeffries Wyman, and, one day, as he was talking with the doctor, Tuttle mentioned Agassiz' opposition to the theory. He has kindly written out his recollections of what Wyman said and which he has permitted me to quote.

The following is a statement, as accurately as I can, after repeated and careful effort, recall it, of the incident of which I told you. The words of Agassiz surprised me so much that they were especially impressed on my memory, and I am sure that they are here given substantially as I received them. Of the accuracy with which they were quoted by Wyman no one who ever knew him could have any question.

It was my good fortune to be (1870–72) a student in the laboratory of Jeffries Wyman. He was not only a colleague of Agassiz, but also his neighbor and one of his most intimate friends. In those days "Darwinism" was a very live subject. I had read every thing that Agassiz had published which bore upon it. One day I asked a question about his violent opposition to it of Professor Wyman.

In reply he told me that at first they had discussed the subject quite freely; at the last time it was mentioned, after his statement of some considerations based upon his own personal work then in hand, Professor Agassiz exclaimed:

"Wyman, if I were a comparative anatomist, as you are, I should probably think as you do. But I can not accept this new doctrine consistently with the views that I have already put forth [referring, of course to his "Essay on classification"] and I do not intend to!"

"After that," added Professor Wyman, "of course neither of us said anything more about it to the other."

In one of my many talks with the late Professor A. S. Packard, who studied for several years with Agassiz and who always remained intimate with him, he told me that Professor Agassiz, in the last year of his life, said (I quote only the substance, not the exact words): "The greatest mistake of my scientific life has been in fighting the theory of evolution. I saw that it was coming for years and my 'Essay on classification' was written largely to forestall it. I believed it all wrong, but now I see that it will prevail."

This, of course, is merely my recollection of a conversation some forty years ago, but it made such an impression on me that I am confident that I have the substance correctly.

J. S. KINGSLEY

BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA

NEW ORLEANS AND YELLOW FEVER

I NOTICE on page 14 of the November 14 issue of SCIENCE, the last statement began, "About a month ago a case of yellow fever was reported in New Orleans without causing a ripple of interest in the medical profession."

While I fully endorse the sentiment expressed in the entire article, which I know is written in accord with the modern conception of preventive medicine, nevertheless, I thought it advisable to call your attention to the fact that this case of yellow fever was not reported in New Orleans. The patient, a Mexican, passed through New Orleans from Mexico and stopped for about two days. We were advised of the diagnosis of yellow fever eight days after he had left the city and had died in Houston, Texas. Without going into details, I am reliably informed that the U. S. Public Health Service has since considered the diagnosis of yellow fever erroneous.

New Orleans has not had a local case of yellow fever since 1905; a few isolated cases since that time have all been cases coming up through quarantine.

E. L. LECKERT

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH,
NEW ORLEANS, LOUISIANA

SCIENTIFIC BOOKS

Helmholtz's Treatise on Physiological Optics, translated from the third German edition. Edited by JAMES P. C. SOUTHALL, professor of physics in Columbia University. Published by the Optical Society of America. 1924. Volume I. The Anatomy and Dioptrics of the Eye. (pp. xxiv + 482).

THIS is the first volume of the English translation of Helmholtz's great and original work on physiological optics. It is not merely a reproduction of Helmholtz's own epoch-making treatise on this subject, but it is a translation of the famous third edition published in Germany between 1909 and 1911 long after Helmholtz's death, under the auspices of the late Professor W. Nagel, in collaboration with Professor A. Gullstrand and Professor J. v. Kries. This edition, brought up to date at that time and enriched by the contributions of these new editors, was expanded into a work published in three large volumes, which comprised perhaps more than double the contents of the original. The English edition also contains some additional new material written by Professor Gullstrand and Professor v. Kries, an article by Dr. Christine Ladd-Franklin and various notes and compilations made by the editor and his collaborators. Thus, for example, the first volume on "The Anatomy and Dioptrics of the Eye," which is the special vol-