appears, and a positron and an electron appear. $E = 2mc^2$, where E is the energy of the photon, and $2m$ is the sum of the inertias of the electron and of the positron formed. Energy in this case is converted into matter, and the inertia of the photon equals the inertia of the matter formed. In these two cases the quantity of matter is changed.

Hence, Eddy's conclusion that the law of conservation of mass (inertia) still holds is correct. But it is also correct that matter and energy are interconvertible, as evidenced in the cases where the positron and electron unite and disappear, the photon or photons appearing, and where the positron and electron appear at the disappearance of a photon. At least, these are the present interpretations of the experimental evidence.

VOLA P. BARTON

Goucher College, Baltimore, Maryland

In a recent note (*Science*, 1946, **104**, 303), C. R. Eddy discusses a supposed "misconception in the minds of some scientists" concerning the meaning of the equation, $E = mc^2$, and the question of conservation of mass. To present a different view, I will recall a few definitions.

In proceeding from kinematics to dynamics, a third primary quantity is defined, namely, *rest mass* of a particle, denoted by m_0; the standard magnitude for this quantity is the rest mass of the International Kilogram. The secondary quantity, $m_0(1 - v^2/c^2)^{-\frac{1}{2}}$, is called the *relativistic mass m* of a particle, by definition. Omitting all definitions not pertinent to the present discussion, we come next to definitions of energy. Various quantities having the dimensions $[ML^2T^{-2}]$ are defined in such a way as to satisfy a law of conservation of energy. Or, to put it another way, it has always been found possible to define physical quantities representing individual forms of energy such that the total energy of an isolated system is conserved, where, by definition, *total energy* is the sum of all the energy quantities of various types identified with the system. The following are examples of individual forms of energy encountered in one way or another: kinetic energy of a particle; potential energy of a conservative system; heat energy; internal energy of a thermodynamic system; radiant energy; energy of a photon; molecular, atomic, and nuclear binding energies; etc. Another such quantity of immediate interest is the quantity mc^2 which, for convenience, I shall call the *inertial energy* of a particle (kinetic energy plus rest energy m_0c^2). In atomic disintegrations there occurs a change in individual amounts of inertial energy, and frequently there occurs a transformation of inertial energy into radiant energy or vice versa. Energy and momentum are conserved in all instances. Now, what does $E = mc^2$ mean? A perfectly legitimate and fruitful point of view is this: In order to maintain the law of conservation of energy, the quantity mc^2 is called the inertial energy of a particle, by definition; letting E denote this particular form of energy, the definition is expressed by the equation $E = mc^2$.

The conclusion of Eddy that "the law of conservation of mass still holds" is purely a question of definition. It may readily be seen that $m = m_0 + \Delta m$, where Δm is a kinetic increment equal to the kinetic energy of a particle divided by c^2. In atomic disintegrations, rest mass Σm_0 is not conserved in any case, and relativistic mass $\Sigma(m_0 + \Delta m)$ is not conserved when radiation is emitted. In the case of radiation, the quantity $h\nu/c^2$ has the dimension $[M]$. In accord with disintegration phenomena, $h\nu/c^2$ is called the *equivalent mass* of a photon. It is desirable to maintain a distinction between mass of a particle and equivalent mass of a photon in order to preserve appropriate distinction between matter and radiation. However, if we should choose to define a quantity, Q, having the dimension $[M]$, by the equation $Q = \Sigma(m_0 + \Delta m) + \Sigma h\nu/c^2$, we might then state a law of conservation of Q (a quantity which Eddy calls the total mass). That this procedure is not accepted practice may not be attributed to a misconception on the part of those who do not follow it. Conservation of Q is not employed as a specific law simply because association of the three types of quantities, m_0, Δm, and $h\nu/c^2$, on an equal basis would be a source of confusion without contributing anything toward clarification or simplification in our thinking; such conservation is already stated in more tangible terms by the laws of conservation of energy and momentum.

AUSTIN J. O'LEARY

Department of Physics, The City College of New York

Use of Shorthand by Scientists

Have many scientists adopted the use of shorthand to save time and to enable them to make more complete notes?

Steinmetz learned a Swedish system at college and later developed a system of his own which he thought was better. Hugh Callendar, physicist, also developed a new system for his use, measuring the time required for making each symbol. Callendar's system was adopted in mid-life by his colleague, Sir Joseph Thomson.

It would be interesting to have other instances reported in this section of *Science.*

DONALD A. LAIRD

Homewood, Lebanon, Indiana

Correction on the Nomenclature of Human Plasmodium

In the nomenclatorial and zoological confusion in the names for the human malaria parasites (Sabrosky and Usinger. *Science*, 1944, **100**, 190–192; Beltran. *Gaceta Med. Mexico*, 1944, *74*, 61–74), one further point has been discovered.

It has usually been considered that there were only two different proposals involving *malariae* as a new specific name—*Oscillaria malariae* Laveran, 1881, and *Haemamoeba malariae* Feletti and Grassi, 1890. Actually it now appears that there were *three*!

Careful reading of Marchiafava and Celli (*Fortschr. Med.*, 1885, 3, 791–797) shows that they too were proposing what they regarded as a distinct new form, quite unlike any previously described: "Aus dem Gesagten geht hervor, dass die beschriebenen Körperchen nicht verwechselt werden dürfen mit irgend welchen zufälligen oder pathologischen Dingen, die man bisher in den roten Blutscheiben bemerkt hat. . . . so scheint es uns nicht fernliegend, sie als parasitäre Organismen anzusprechen und