

ary, 1918, page 253) when I write " F_1 increases from $\pi/2$ to logarithmic infinity."

I am glad, however, that the "logarithmic" injection left him so dazed that he did not notice the glaring error found a few pages farther on in the monograph on Elliptic Integrals. I take this opportunity of correcting it. On page 33, line 12 below, is found "in the formulas $\operatorname{sn} iu = i \operatorname{tn}(u, k')$, etc., write $u + iK$ for u ." This obviously should be "write $u + K'$ for u " with the resulting fundamental formula

$$\operatorname{cn}(iu + iK', k) = -\frac{1}{k} \frac{\operatorname{dn}(u, k')}{\operatorname{sn}(u, k')}.$$

This is found correctly given in my larger book, page 464, and follows at once from formulas (XIX) and (XVII) of pages 248 and 247 of that work. The formula is also correctly derived in two different ways in my lecture notes, from which I thought the monograph was taken. This leads me to suggest that an author be allowed one bad mistake for every 100 pages, the same to be classified under the heading "inexplicables, lapses, aberrations, etc."

May I also add that in my lectures the pronoun "we" without intentionally implying anything personal is perhaps too frequently used? At any rate one of the editors of the monograph in question thought this to be the case. To oblige him the other editor and I suppressed some of the "we's" and it appears that we did not make other corresponding changes in at least two places. Thus two infelicitous "grammatical connections" remain. I am obliged to Professor Carmichael for not characterizing them more harshly.

HARRIS HANCOCK.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CINCINNATI.

SHORTER NOTICES.

Differential Calculus. By H. B. PHILLIPS. New York, Wiley, 1916. 162 pp.

Integral Calculus. By H. B. PHILLIPS. New York, Wiley, 1917. 194 pp.

To expound a few central methods and apply them to a large variety of examples to the end that the student may learn