more than three centuries, the time of occupation of the middle latitudes of the North American continent by European peoples, of the magnitude of the local play of the seismic force. It is evident that the intervals between epochs of great destructive force in the same locality are to be measured in centuries and fractions of a century. Until science shall have discovered the signs of the return of these alarming and often disastrous earthquakes, we can only bear in mind that as we recede in the steady march of time from the epoch of one of these events we draw nearer, step by step, to the next one in the series.

Also in the Harvard Seismographic Station Fourth Annual Report for the year, 1 August, 1911–31 July, 1912 Professor Woodworth states as follows:

> The importance of engineers and architects taking into account the liability of earthquake shock strong enough to damage buildings in this district is amply shown by the history of earthquakes at Plymouth, Newburyport and Boston in the 17th and 18th centuries. There can be little doubt that the recurrence of such shocks as were felt in Boston in 1755 would produce much damage. While the Atlantic coast of the continent is relatively immune from earthquakes, the case of Charleston in 1886 enforces attention upon the necessity of recognizing the risk of destructive shocks upon this coast at long intervals perhaps of a few centuries only. Sane precaution demands the avoidance of the mistake made at San Francisco of placing a public reservoir upon a fault zone of recent movement, and of the folly of cheap mortar and rubly masonry which together were factors of first importance in the loss of life and property in Charleston in 1886, and in Messina in 1908. We may not be able to avoid building our houses and public edifices upon ground liable to destructive shocks, but we have abundant information as to how these structures should be built in order to reduce the risks of demolition to a minimum.

In many long conferences with me Professor Woodworth frequently expressed the opinions quoted above and went into detail about the great disaster which might befall the less stable sections of the city in an earthquake such as Boston has experienced in the past. To my personal knowledge he held these views up to the time of his final illness.

I feel that on such an important matter his opinions should be correctly stated.

IRVING B. CROSBY

JAMAICA PLAIN, MASS.

A PLEA FOR THE RETENTION OF THE TERM "BIOS"

IN the nomenclature of the vitamins suggested by Funk[1] it is proposed to change the name "bios" to vitamin D. Several reasons why the original name for the "substance indispensable for the development of yeast" should be retained occur to one concerned primarily with the "bios problem."

First: The substance which affects the multiplication of yeast cells was reported by Wildiers in 1901, ten years before the vitamins were recognized. The designation suggested at that time was "bios," with the further suggestion that it should be used until the substance could be identified chemically.

Second: No advance towards the chemical identification of "bios" has been made by its classification with the vitamins.

Third: It is questionable whether "bios" is a vitamin in the generally accepted sense of that term.

Fourth: The literature of "bios" has grown to considerable proportions since 1901. A recent review[2] listed 144 papers by more than 80 authors. It is evident that "bios" has a well-established literature of its own which would appear under that subject heading and not under vitamin D.

In view of these facts it would seem most unfortunate and confusing to rename the "bios" of Wildiers until its identity shall have been established.

MARGARET B. MACDONALD

UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE
AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATION

A FEW SUGGESTIONS REGARDING REPRINTS

EVERY one must have been perplexed by the difficulty of storing reprints so that they may be readily available. Current specimens range from vest-pocket to large portfolio size, even excluding monographs, which must be omitted from my criticisms for self-evident reasons. This wide range in size makes it difficult to make proper provision for their storage, not only in private but also in public libraries. This can not be accomplished without much loss of space, and one often is distressed by the wear an important reprint has received, largely due to improper storage.

One could, to be sure, classify reprints according to size, but that is inconvenient for other reasons and equally objectionable from the standpoint of space. Some publishers and institutions have already adopted a uniform size, but much remains to be desired for the great variation in size confronts one not only in the storing but also in the binding, even if done in temporary holders, and in the mailing of reprints.

Not infrequently the name, date and volume of the publication from which the reprint is taken are not indicated on it by the publisher. Besides depriving the journal in question of proper credit for the article this omission makes ready reference impossible. Rarely, publishers also use an inferior

[1] SCIENCE, (62), 157, 1925.

[2] Tanner, F. W., *Chemical Review* (1), 397, 1925.