had no hesitation in assuming that the general British public was so thoroughly familiar with the ideas of Professor Chamberlin, many of which they reproduced in the chapters which they wrote, that to refer to him, even indirectly, would be an unwarranted waste of space. While the foregoing may be accepted as the true explanation of interesting, if unusual, methods, a critical friend of mine points out still another theoretically possible explanation of these "astounding tactics" of certain English writers, an explanation which Dr. Jeffreys mentioned only indirectly. The suggested explanation is that these "astounding tactics" have been followed because other English writers have shared with Dr. Jeffreys the assumption that I have been "asleep for twenty years," an assumption probably due in part to the fact that it has not been my habit to publish the same ideas over and over again on every possible occasion.

F. R. MOULTON

EULER'S TENSOR AND HAMILTON'S CUBIC

WE may begin with the usual Eulerian tensor constructed for arbitrary axes in i, j, k, but write it in dyadic form $\phi\mathrm{i} = \mathrm{i}\phi = \mathrm{i}A - \mathrm{j}F - \mathrm{k}E$; etc. To refer it to the principal axes of the momental ellipsoid, the scalar function $\lambda(A, B, C, D, E, F)$ is introduced. The outcome is the determinant

$$\begin{bmatrix} A-\lambda & -F & -E \\ -F & B-\lambda & -D \\ -E & -D & C-\lambda \end{bmatrix} = 0,$$

which implies three vector equations $(\phi\mathrm{i} - \lambda_1\mathrm{i}) \cdot \mathrm{w}_1 = 0$, etc., for the three principal axes w_1, w_2, w_3.

The determinant when expanded in powers of λ, with the coefficients expressed as volumes, is $\phi\mathrm{i} \cdot \phi\mathrm{j} \times \phi\mathrm{k} - \lambda\Sigma\mathrm{i} \cdot \phi\mathrm{j} \times \phi\mathrm{k} + \lambda^2\Sigma\mathrm{i} \cdot \mathrm{j} \times \phi\mathrm{k} - \lambda^3 = 0$ where Σ refers to the three dimensions i, j, k. If, therefore, the initial volume is $\mathrm{i} \cdot \mathrm{j} \times \mathrm{k}$, the coefficients of λ^0, λ, λ^2, λ^3 are identical, respectively, with m, m_1, m_2, 1, in Hamilton's cubic of the scalar dyadic $\phi\mathrm{r}$. Of course this is not to be wondered at; but it ought, I think, to be more frequently accentuated; for a problem in rigid dynamics thus takes the form appropriate to a homogeneous strain applied to an initial volume, and this is somewhat unexpected.

CARL BARUS

BROWN UNIVERSITY

NOTICE TO ZOOLOGISTS ON THE POSSIBLE SUSPENSION OF THE RULES IN THE CASE OF NYCTERIBIA LATREILLE

IN accordance with the provisions governing possible suspension of the rules, the undersigned has the honor to invite the attention of the zoological profession to the fact that application for suspension of the rules has been made in the case of *Nycteribia* Latreille, 1796, monotype *Pediculus vespertilionis* Linn., 1758. The commission is requested to set aside the monotype designated in 1796 and to validate *Nycteribia pedicularia* 1805 as type of *Nycteribia*. *Pediculus vespertilionis* Linn. was based on an acarine (described and figured by Frisch, 1728) which is now classified in *Spinturnix*. Latreille was dealing with an insect which he erroneously determined as *Pediculus vespertilionis*. Unless the rules are suspended *Nycteribia* should be transferred from the Diptera to the Acarina and should supplant *Spinturnix*; this would cause extreme confusion and upset generic and supergeneric nomenclature which has been accepted without challenge for about a century.

A vote on the foregoing proposition will be delayed until about January 1, 1930, in order to give zoologists interested in the case ample opportunity to express their opinions, *pro* or *con*, to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.

C. W. STILES
Secretary of Commission
U. S. PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE,
WASHINGTON, D. C.

SPECIAL CORRESPONDENCE

EINSTEIN'S APPRECIATION OF SIMON NEWCOMB

THE following letter, which has recently been deposited in the manuscript division of the Library of Congress, will be of value to American scholars, especially to those interested in the physical sciences. The letter was written by Dr. Albert Einstein in response to an inquiry from Mrs. Josepha Whitney, of New Haven, Connecticut, daughter of the late Simon Newcomb, and was forwarded by her to her sister, Dr. Anita Newcomb McGee, of Washington, D. C., for deposit with the Newcomb papers in the Library of Congress.

In view of the present interest in the new work of Dr. Einstein, Dr. McGee has asked to have the letter translated and published. As the letter has an important bearing upon the history of astronomy in America and the particular part Newcomb had in this development, it is herewith published with Dr. Einstein's permission, and I therefore take pleasure in sending it to SCIENCE for publication.

The letter states briefly the history of the problem of perturbation in a system of three bodies in