

*Chlamidomonas* and others represent the usual and incorrect sound of upsilon. Y and *ph* are letters or combinations that are unfamiliar or unpronounceable to Italians. I doubt if most Italian printers of the seventeenth century even had *y* in their fonts. The omission of initial *h* in *Aplosporidium* is simply the omission of a silent letter which is not a letter but a diacritical mark in the original Greek. The Germans often used *ö* for *oe* even in Latin words where no transliteration is involved.

The rules are not really precise as to the language in use. Greek and Latin are mentioned, but it is not made clear that we are to transliterate Greek into Latin according to classical Latin custom rather than according to the varying usages of modern languages. *Strombidion* is a correct transliteration from Greek, but the word remains Greek in form, not Latin. Doubtless an educated Roman would have had no difficulty in understanding the Greek ending. The only course seems to be to enforce correct transliteration into Latin by amending such barbarous forms as *Flebotomus*.

CHARLES H. BLAKE

MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE  
OF TECHNOLOGY

#### TRANSLITERATION OF RUSSIAN WORDS

WHILE it would appear from Dr. Hoare's note in *SCIENCE* for December 15, 1944, that my previous note (June 16, 1944) contained a view contrary to his, the truth appears to be that we are "on the same side of the fence."

I agree thoroughly that a universally applicable Russian transliteration system is an admirable idea, and I hope that such a system will be adopted eventually.

The second part of the matter under discussion touches a somewhat different point. I believe that a person using a transliterated Russian word, be it on a

file card or in a research notebook, will be compelled, at one time or another, to attempt to pronounce it in talks with the fellow workers. It is at this point that a difficulty will enter if the transliteration system used contains letters or symbols which are not found in this person's native alphabet. I simply feel that this trouble is best resolved by the use of closest phonetic counterparts in any given language for the Russian letters. Thus, for an English-speaking person the use of ordinary English letters would appear to be a good solution. This is essentially what is done in the *Chemical Abstracts* system. Incidentally, I should like to point out that the change of the Russian orthography a quarter of a century ago did not invalidate the C.A. system. In effect, the change of orthography affected only the total number of letters in the alphabet by elimination of letters which already had their phonetic counterparts (much to the delight of schoolboys, I can assure you). Thus, the phonetic features of the language were unchanged and the *Chemical Abstracts* system is perfectly usable as a pretty good phonetic transliteration system for both new and old orthographies.

The spelling of Czech in my note was my own personal oversight. Incidentally, this word presents some interesting points. It seems to me that for an English person the spelling "Chekh" is closer to the currently used pronunciation than is the usual "Czech" spelling. Frankly, I am at a loss as to how an English-speaking person would pronounce the C-z combination.

In closing this discussion, permanently I hope on my part, I wish to add that, inasmuch as Russian is my native language, it is possible that I fail to see some of the difficulties encountered by a non-Russian speaking person. I avoid the transliteration difficulties, etc., by keeping notes, etc., in whichever language is necessary.

G. M. KOSOLAPOFF

DAYTON, OHIO

## SCIENTIFIC BOOKS

### SCIENCE IN THE UNIVERSITY

*Science in the University.* By members of the Faculties of the University of California. 332 pp. 10 photographic plates. 31 figures. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press. 1944. \$3.75.

THE title of this interesting volume is a misnomer. The individual reader or librarian who should order it under the impression that "Science in the University" relates broadly to either might find the book disappointing. Actually it is a compilation of occasional addresses and papers by 19 scientists<sup>1</sup> of the

<sup>1</sup> Robert Grant Aitken, J. R. Oppenheimer, Joel H.

University of California, published in commemoration of the seventy-fifth anniversary of the university's founding. About half of the chapters are concerned with state and regional topics such as "The California Current," "Evolution of a Sierran Landscape" and "Subsidence and Elevation in the Los Angeles Region," or with specific contributions made by University of California scientists to genetics, hydrography,

Hildebrand, Carl L. A. Schmidt, G. Ross Robertson, Jakob Bjerknes, H. U. Sverdrup, William C. Putnam, U. S. Grant, O. L. Sponsler, Richard B. Goldschmidt, Charles B. Lipman, Claude E. Zobell, Ralph W. Chaney, Loye Miller, D. R. Hoagland, J. M. D. Olmsted, Knight Dunlap and S. J. Holmes.