nominative case and it is always singular in number." I believe that Mast is here quoting or at least paraphrasing the rules of zoological nomenclature. The corresponding botanical code says that "Names of genera are substantives . . . in the singular number . . ." without allusion to their case. The difficulties adumbrated by the authors cited originate in a too servile adherence to these carelessly worded dicta. The botanical version has one solecism fewer than the zoological, but it is inconceivable that either represents the real thought of the framers of the codes. Obviously, the name of a genus is a nominative singular when taken by itself, or for entry in a catalogue or index; likewise the name of a family is a nominative plural. It can scarcely be the sense of any self-respecting code of nomenclature that such a name can not be treated as other names are treated when it is introduced into discourse. When a generic name is the object of a verb, it is no longer "in the nominative case"—rules or no rules.

Linnaeus wrote: "Cerealia sunt semina majora graminum . . .: *Oryza, Triticum, . . . Mays,* excepto forte solo *Lolio,* nisi arte praeparato." And again: "Semina minora *Phalaridis, Panici, Milii, . . .*" More than a hundred years later Bentham and Hooker wrote: "Genus potius *Sisyrinchio* quam *Solenomali* affine videtur." A modern writer, describing a new genus of algae, characterizes its thallus as "erectus ex fundamento radicato in cryptostomatibus *Cystoseirae* immerso." How else could you say these things? To say that a word is "always in the nominative singular" is tantamount to saying that it can not be used in a sentence except as the subject of the verb. Are we to pretend that the italicized words in these quotations are not names of genera but "common nouns"? In English we have no endings for genitives and ablatives; so we say "seeds of *Panicum*" and the like. But we do have plural forms, and we need not hesitate to use in an English sentence the plurals of Latin words, as we do those of *nucleus* and *alumnus*. *Crataegi* means members of the genus *Crataegus,* as "the Smiths" means members of the Smith family. If English had case-inflections, we should undoubtedly enjoy dative, ablative, locative and genitive Smiths, to say nothing of vocative Smiths ("O Smittee . . .").

Obviously, there is need here for clarification of the rules of nomenclature. To say that names can not be declined is not only without precedent in grammar or in science—it is without use. If our steed is to carry us surely and swiftly, it is inadvisable to hamstring him. What mirth would be provoked among the "fathers" of our science if they could see their successors laboring to render impotent the technical language which they devised!

H. W. RICKETT
THE NEW YORK BOTANICAL GARDEN

A NEW GENERAL TERM FOR MINERAL INDUSTRIES STUDIES

DURING the recent summer the undersigned received from Dean Edward Steidle, of The Pennsylvania State College School of Mineral Industries, a letter part of which follows:

> I am trying to find a word that will be all-embracive for earth sciences, mineral economics, mineral engineering and mineral technology, i.e. mineral service, mineral work or mineral utilization. If there is no word, I have in mind that a new word might be coined. . . .

The purpose of the present communication is to bring before earth scientists the term that the undersigned has suggested. It appears to embrace the techniques and studies involved, to be readily pronounced, to be easily recognized and understood, and to the writer, a Hellenist, to have the virtue of sound etymological formation. The new word is "geotechnology."

It is the considered opinion of the writer and of Dean Steidle that this is a new term, and we thus record it. Specific reference to contrary evidence will be greatly appreciated.

ROBERT E. DENGLER
THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE COLLEGE

SPECIAL CORRESPONDENCE

SUGGESTIONS FROM THE OFFICE OF SCIENTIFIC PERSONNEL OF THE NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL

As soon as the Army and Navy training programs are in full operation there will be an unprecedented demand for teachers of physics and mathematics. The situation will be particularly critical in the field of physics where the teaching ranks of colleges and universities have already been seriously depleted.

It is the business of the Office of Scientific Personnel to assist in the placing of the scientific specialist where he can best serve the war effort. Because the present supply of physicists approximates zero and the supply of mathematicians is running low, perhaps this office can assist best by suggesting two sources of supply close at hand to the institutions which are so fortunate as to secure Army and Navy contracts.

The first source of supply is the near-by institutions which will not have Army or Navy training programs. Although these institutions should con-