cent. for the more cellular parts (margin and oral lobes). Teissier[8] found 96.5 per cent. water in *Chrysaora hyposcella.*

The foregoing figures apply to medusae taken in water of typical salinity or nearly so. In very brackish water, the water content may increase, at least in *Aurelia.* Thus Möbius[9] reported a water content of 97.9 and 97.94 per cent. for *Aurelia aurita* from the Bay of Kiel with a salinity of 17–18 parts per thousand. This result has recently been verified by Thill,[10] who found 98 per cent. water in *Aurelias* from a port in the Danish Wiek on the Baltic with a salinity of 7.3 per thousand.

During a stay at the Mt. Desert Island Biological Laboratory, Maine, the water content of several large *Aurelias* was determined. The salinity of the water around Mt. Desert Island is given by Bigelow[11] as 31.5–32.6 parts per thousand, a little less than that of the open Atlantic. The animals used were pulsating actively but were not anatomically perfect, all showing some marginal damage. It was not thought advisable to rinse them in fresh or distilled water because of a possible loss of salts; but No. 7 was thoroughly rinsed in fresh water as a check. The others were simply drained for a few minutes. The drained medusae were immediately placed in previously weighed glass or aluminum containers and subjected to dry heat in an electric oven at temperatures varying from 60 to 110° C. The drying was completed in a desiccator over concentrated sulfuric acid.

The data on the nine specimens used are given in Table 1.

TABLE 1

No.	Wet weight grams	Dry weight grams	Per cent. water
1	175.013	7.141	95.9
2	163.892	6.639	96.0
3	82.271	2.831	96.6
4	86.140	3.434	96.0
5	123.745	4.689	96.2
6	129.444	4.915	96.2
7	149.255	5.619	96.3
8	127.802	4.872	96.2
9	264.916	10.382	96.1

From these data and those in the literature it is evident that the water content of medusae in sea-water of typical salinity is 94–96.5 per cent.; in brackish water of less than half this salinity, the water content may rise to 98 per cent.

L. H. HYMAN

LABORATORY OF EXPERIMENTAL BIOLOGY
AMERICAN MUSEUM OF NATURAL HISTORY

[8] *Bull. Soc. Zool. France,* 57: 160.
[9] *Zool. Anz.,* 5: 586.
[10] *Zeit. wiss. Zool.,* 150: 51.
[11] *Bull. U. S. Bur. Fish.,* 40, pt. II: 813.

MEDICAL CLASSICS

PROFESSOR J. M. D. OLMSTED, of the University of California Medical School, contributed to the issue of SCIENCE for December 3 a statement concerning the second number of *Medical Classics,* which was published in October, 1936. This number was devoted to four of the important papers of Sir Charles Bell, those illustrating the original work on Bell's Law, Nerve, Palsy and Phenomenon. Dr. Olmsted overlooked three of the contributions of Bell, especially the "Idea of a New Anatomy of the Brain" which is one of the most important and difficult to obtain of any of Bell's writings. Of the five leading medical libraries in the United States only the Army Medical Library owns a copy.

Dr. Olmsted confines his review to a criticism of the use of Bell's paper, "On the Nerves," and states that the paper as published was not as given before the Royal Society on July 12, 1821. Bell's paper, as we reproduced it, was preceded by a photographic reproduction of the title page of the book from which it was taken, "The Nervous System of the Human Body," published in Washington in 1833. I believe no one would be in doubt as to the actual source of the paper.

When we consider that Magendie himself gives Bell credit for priority, I do not believe it adds to our stature to stress small differences in the texts of these two great men. The battle of Magendie *versus* Bell has raged for a hundred years, and even now there appear many advocates for either side. It is the intention of *Medical Classics* to convey knowledge as we find it in these famous papers and not necessarily to attempt to show old rivalries and differences of opinion as to whom proper credit is due. The modern physician, whom we are trying to interest in the broad aspects of medical history, does not like to be confused and irritated by petty controversies. Both Magendie and Bell were great men, and there is honor enough for both of them.

EMERSON CROSBY KELLY

POLLEN AND HAY FEVER

THE letter from Dr. Douglas H. Campbell published in SCIENCE for January 7, page 16, is an interesting example of the reappearance of ideas which at one time might have been regarded as plausible. However, a few minutes' inquiry should be sufficient to relegate this one to the shelf where it has lain undisturbed for some sixty years.

If the medical man of whom Dr. Campbell inquired had been an allergist, he would have referred him either to Dr. Charles Harrison Blackley's "Hay Fever," published by Baillière, Tindall and Cox, London, second