taken on the basis of fragmentary advances in diagnosing and treating phenylketonuria. As second thoughts began to come in, the Children's Bureau of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare found it wise to order a 5-year evaluation which, among other things, would ascertain whether the dietary correction of phenylketonuria is really efficacious.

JOSEPH D. COOPER
School of Government and Public Administration, American University, Washington, D.C.

Degrees and Titles

A recent letter by Berarde ("Rank discrimination," 30 July, p. 499) objects to not addressing Ph.D.'s as Dr.

It is my impression that there are two entirely different types of titles in the English language—true titles and occupational titles. Examples of the first type are Hon., Lord, Mr., Esq.; of the second type, Coach, Sen., Officer, Gov., Lt. The title Dr. can be either. That the distinction between the two types is quite sharp can be seen by considering how they are used: True titles can never be used by themselves; only press-photographers yell, "Hey Duke, how about one more picture?" and very few people would say; "Will this cut be all right, Mrs.?" Unless the form of address is ceremonial, such as "Madam" or "Your Excellency," one must always add the name: "Take a letter, Miss Green." On the other hand, it is quite proper to address somebody by occupational title without the name: "Officer, I wasn't speeding!" Indeed, this form is often used in an impersonal way to address people who are somewhat faceless and interchangeable. One way to indicate respect is to use an occupational title as if it were a true title and add the name to it. Furthermore, one never refers to oneself by true title, particularly if it carries the connotation of distinction, but it certainly is proper to use one's occupational title; "I am the Hon. Joe Gray" will never do, but there is nothing wrong with "This is Senator Gray calling."

In Latin, "doctor" means "teacher." As a true title it designates those upon whom it was bestowed for having taught the community of scholars something, that is, for having made a significant contribution to the body of knowledge in a field of science or humanities (usually in a dissertation). It was first granted in the 13th century to theologians and lawyers. Later the word acquired its occupational meaning, designating those engaged in the healing professions. This came about because the only educated person the illiterate man of the street—who didn't know better but wanted to be respectful —ever came in contact with was the healer.

Thus a veterinarian, or a chiropodist, or an M.D., or an optometrist, or a dentist, or a naturopath, or a naprapath, or a podiatrist, or a chiropractor, or an osteopath is addressed by occupational title alone: "Good morning, Doctor," and he introduces and signs himself as Dr. (The foregoing list was compiled from the Chicago classified telephone directory by looking up "Doctor" in the index.) This has nothing to do with having or not having a doctor's degree, although in this country, where academic practice imitates popular usage, just about all these practitioners have one; in Britain or the Scandinavian countries, for example, where the original sense of the degree is preserved, they don't. (Some British physicians do get an M.D., but this is comparable to obtaining a Ph.D. on top of a medical degree here.)

On the other hand, it is not good form in English for a Ph.D. or the holder of an honorary degree to refer to himself as Dr.—though in some fields it is customary to put an abbreviation of the degree after the name—because in his case it is a true title, indeed one denoting distinction. As an extension of this idea some even feel that Ph.D.'s should not address or refer to one another by title. While Benjamin Franklin was addressed as "Dr. Franklin," and while this certainly is proper—if maybe somewhat formal —usage, I think titles denoting distinction are gradually disappearing. Being addressed as Mr. puts one into rather good company: the *Congressional Record* refers to senators as Mr., and Gen. Eisenhower would have never become Mr. Eisenhower if it weren't for his promotion at the polls.

FREDERICK P. WIESINGER
Department of Materials Engineering, University of Illinois, Chicago 60680

The title "Dr." is much overused in our society and often does not in fact represent the level and type of academic or professional training that many people associate with it. As Shaw wrote in 1903 in *Man and Superman*, "Titles distinguish the mediocre, embarrass the superior, and are disgraced by the inferior." Degrees are clearly not becoming obsolete. Nevertheless, it is time for a reexamination of the effects that titles—that is, the symbols, as distinguished from the referents—are having on social behavior.

JAMES W. IRVIN
U.C.L.A. Center for the Health Sciences, Los Angeles 90024

Neologismification

Although I am willing to admit my naïveté to anyone, I nevertheless resent being outclassed in wordly wisdom by analytical procedures, diets, equipment, and studies on ciliary movement. These have been described as "sophisticated," and this pestiferous weed of a word is now rapidly smothering such words as *modern, complicated, novel, advanced,* and *exact.* Thus J. F. Crow in his review of two books (18 June, p. 1579) takes an author to task for neologisms, and two sentences below he writes of "some possibilities for more sophisticated diets that could support larger populations." The use of *sophisticated* in this context is certainly a neologism by dictionary definition. Further on, Crow writes: "I enjoyed J. B. S. Haldane's recipe for happiness in an increasingly sophisticated technological society. . . ." Does this mean increasing artificiality of the people, or a growing physical complexity of the artificial environment?

In the same issue Kaye Kilburn and John Salzano ("Respiratory cilia," p. 1618) conclude: "More sophisticated studies are needed to understand how mammalian cilia move." Are these further studies, more thorough studies, or studies by less ingenuous people? I have no quarrel with either Crow or Kilburn and Salzano; their examples, no worse than most, are handiest.

We seem to be caught up in a fashion of using pompous words, strained from their original meaning. Happily the use of the word *posture* to describe a diplomatic policy or a bias on the part of a government or a portion of it ("Congress has taken a belligerent posture toward increased funding of research and development"; "Britain has adopted a neutral posture") seems to be disappearing. *Community* to describe a profession seems to be almost as weedy as *sophistication.* Or in other