

tures correct. I wish to make it clear that for the mislaying of the manuscript, and for the consequent delay in ultimately returning it, responsibility rests upon me. It suffices to indicate my responsibility for it, and to offer the apology hereby made for its happening.

W. J. CROZIER

In connection with the letter of Mrs. Brooks the following statement may be of interest.

The practice of printing the date of acceptance of manuscripts came about because in many cases papers had to be returned to the authors with the suggestion that certain alterations were desirable. It often happened that considerable time elapsed before they came back and were finally accepted. If in these cases the date were given when the paper was first received, it might appear that the delay in publication was entirely the fault of the *Journal* unless perhaps the true explanation were surmised in which case it is possible that it might be embarrassing to the author of the paper. The present practice avoids these difficulties and has elicited expressions of approval from many of our contributors: in fact the first criticism we have heard is contained in the letter of Mrs. Brooks. When MS has been accepted without revision, the aim has been to make the interval between the date of receipt and the date of acceptance as short as possible.

It may be added that the editors intend in all cases to acknowledge manuscripts promptly and to report as soon as possible upon their availability. It may happen that they need time to examine papers critically or it may be desirable to obtain the opinion of others. Delay is sometimes due to the absence of the editors and the necessity of forwarding MSS: this is especially the case during the summer. That delays of this sort are not serious is shown by the fact that during the last twelve months, for example, the average time elapsing between receiving a paper and sending it to press is about one month (it requires about two months to go through the press).

The editors desire to thank the contributors to the journal for their loyal cooperation in endeavoring to maintain a high standard. They will greatly appreciate suggestions by private correspondence with the object of increasing its usefulness.

THE EDITORS OF THE JOURNAL OF
GENERAL PHYSIOLOGY

THE ELDEN PUEBLO

REFERRING to Professor Colton's note in *SCIENCE* of February 4, I regret exceedingly that, through inadvertence, I neglected to state in my paper before the National Academy that Professor Colton had already

mentioned the existence of "Elden Pueblo" in a manuscript now awaiting publication by the Bureau of American Ethnology. I desire to give every credit to him for his reconnaissance of the region. In saying that the ruin was "practically unknown to any scientific man," I meant simply that no thorough excavation of the ruin had ever been attempted and naturally, therefore, its exact nature, dimensions and significance could not be known.

Regarding the use of the name "Elden Pueblo," inasmuch as this is the first ruin in the immediate neighborhood of Elden Mesa to be excavated and made available to tourists and students, and as that Mesa is a most conspicuous object in the surrounding landscape, I think that the appropriateness will not be questioned. As the other ruins which Professor Colton mentions are opened up and studied, equally appropriate names can surely be applied to them.

Although Professor Colton spoke to me of the site of Elden Pueblo in connection with numerous other sites in the Flagstaff region, I must say that it was due more to the efforts of Mr. J. C. Clarke, of Flagstaff that I undertook the excavation of this particular ruin. At no time in the course of the work was Professor Colton's measured plan used. Professor Colton aided my assistants to measure off the site of the ruin and a plan was made on which the walls were drawn in as excavated.

J. WALTER FEWKES

BUREAU OF AMERICAN ETHNOLOGY,
WASHINGTON, D. C.

SCIENTIFIC BOOKS

Astronomy. BY JOHN CHARLES DUNCAN. xiii + 384 pp. 64 plates and numerous figures in the text. Harper & Brothers, N. Y., 1926. Price, \$4.00.

SHORTLY after a copy of Duncan's "Astronomy" had been received from the publishers and while it was lying on my table awaiting examination, a student in the beginning course picked up the book and ran through the pages. His comments were, "Why don't we use this book in class? It actually seems to teach itself." A careful examination of the book has only served to convince the writer of the soundness of that student's judgment.

On the title page we find the simple statement, "A text-book"; and the book is all that and more. The liberal use of boldface type and excellent line drawings throughout the text certainly make it a manual of instruction. In addition to these features we find many splendidly executed reproductions of astronomical photographs which, together with much of the text written in a fascinating style, are sure to make the book one of interest and value to the general