inations while under the influence of stimulatory and depressant drugs? Should we take urine samples or blood samples from those achieving the highest scores? Should we take urine samples from all the students and select several for evaluation? And then, how much of the drug is too much? What are the proper educational standards? How can we compare drugged and nondrugged students?

And this also—how can we turn out professionally trained doctors, lawyers, engineers, and architects whose learning periods were framed by a border of tranquilizers and whose test periods were flown through on stimulants? Can a doctor who spent his clinical years on tranquilizers maintain the standards established by those free from these drugs?

We need standards for this problem. *They are not being developed.* The student counselors steadily tranquilize nervous sophomores—without controls and without study of the effect of these drugs on the individual during the time of his schooling and later in his career.

GILBERT E. CORRIGAN
Department of Pathology, University of Texas Medical Branch, Galveston

A Pretty Kettle of Fish

With reference to the cover (13 Sept.), all I can say is Holy Mackerel!

FRANCIS V. HOWELL
Post Office Box 1965,
La Jolla, California 92037

. . . Fish may have many local names but to transplant Boston mackerel from New England to the Pacific Ocean and name them Pacific salmon is jolting. I caught enough Boston mackerel during the time I worked on a seine boat in Maine to recognize one even if mislabeled.

D. W. FRANCIS
Department of Poultry Science,
New Mexico State University,
University Park 88070

Eternity of Print

On reading Dael Wolfle's editorial, "The next Rosetta Stone" (6 Sept., p. 967), I was reminded of an inscription in the market place of Haarlem, Holland, carved on the home of Lourens Janszoon Coster (who, it is still contended by a dwindling few, was the true inventor of printing with movable type): *Memoriae sacrum typographia, ars artium omnium conservatrix . . .* which has since been modified to the more familiar and more euphonius "Printing: the art preservative of all the arts."

While Wolfle rightly emphasizes the question of information content of any "Rosetta Stone" we may leave for scholars of future civilizations, he also raises the interesting point of the medium of language communication between "lost" civilizations. Future scholars digging into the remains of our world in search of some meaningful communication symbols will undoubtedly have to do their research without the help of contemporary linguistics' sophisticated equipment for recording and analyzing oral language. They will have to rely—as today's paleographers must—on remnants of our *visible* language.

Visible language may be an unfamiliar distinction. Linguists were early to stake out oral language as being the only meaningful province for language research. Indeed, it would be improper to speak of visible language, since all but a few linguists consider any written or printed medium of communication as only a system of visual signs with which language is *symbolized.*

The study of visible language is fragmented, an academic orphan, and only in the first stages of international organization. Omnipresent as letter forms and related symbols are today, we are conducting relatively little research on them; much basic information and theory is yet to be determined. What, for example, constitutes the "g-ness" of the scores of differently shaped letter g's you see as you page through the advertisements of this number of *Science*? Could we isolate the nature of a prototype "g"? Or, what is behind the contemporary artist's fascination with letter forms? The answer may be reflected in the emphasis the program committee for the AAAS Annual Meeting this year has placed on the interaction between art and science (three general symposia are scheduled: Arts and Science—will there be a difference? Interface—art and technology, and Art and Science—the analysis of communication of form). Since its earliest beginnings, the alphabet has provided a meeting ground for such an interaction. No educated person can look at letter forms without encountering two conflicting stimuli: the *meaning*