

In the chapter on Lamé's functions it is to be regretted that symmetry has not been preserved in relation to the three ellipsoidal co-ordinates, as has been most elegantly done in Halphen's "Traité des Fonctions Elliptiques."

The book is just what it purports to be. The preface states that the first part is based on Riemann-Hattendorff, and it includes besides a great deal not there treated. It is a clear, compact treatment of its subject-matter, and will be of great value to students of mathematical physics and to all persons who have to perform calculations of the kind considered. It contains those things that the "business" mathematical physicist wants to know, so arranged that he can find them at once. It is in addition much more interesting than such books have generally been. Heine's and Thomson and Tait's have been the standard treatises on spherical harmonics, but no one could pretend that Heine's was an attractive book to read, or Thomson and Tait's easy. Byerly's book is crowded with physical problems of all sorts, mostly worked out in detail. A good opportunity is also given the student to exercise himself in real numerical calculation by which he may get a tangible idea of the processes involved. A series of valuable tables of the values of the various functions is also given. Last, and not least in value, is to be mentioned the historical summary contributed by Dr. Maxime Bôcher, giving an admirable sketch of the whole subject, with a bibliography.

The book is well and clearly printed, and attractive in appearance (to one, as was stated at the beginning, who likes that sort of thing). Misprints are rare. On page 91 Ångström appears as Ängstrom, which spoils the pronunciation.

It may be mentioned that the historical essay on trigonometric series mentioned on page 61 is to be found in the *Bulletin des Sciences mathématiques* for 1880.

ARTHUR G. WEBSTER.

CLARK UNIVERSITY, WORCESTER, MASS.

NOTE ON SMITH'S REVIEW OF CAJORI.

BY PROF. GEORGE BRUCE HALSTED.

THE review, in the May BULLETIN, of Cajori's History of Mathematics by Professor David Eugene Smith produces an unfair impression. The facts upon which he says he bases his "harsh statement" do not justify it; and what he states as his "facts" are in large part not facts, but specimens of Professor Smith's *petitio principii*.