The kinship tribes first developed by man gradually underwent a change. Tribe coalesced with tribe, and when tribes became too large by union or by natural multiplication they divided. In the consolidation of tribes the plan of union by kinship remained. Two or more tribes allied their fortunes by intermarriage, each furnishing wives to the other; so the chains of affinity were forged, and out of this affinity spring new bonds of consanguinity. In succeeding generations fathers and mothers belong to different clans, and each tribe is made up of individuals, every member of which is kin to both primal tribes. Kinship through affinity and kinship, through consanguinity, was maintained in knowledge by a device of naming, so that the name not only expressed kinship by clan, but also kinship by tribe as composed of clans, and at the same time expressed relative age by which authority was claimed and yielded and primeval equality maintained. In the coalescing of tribes in this manner a new generation became heirs to the activities of the coalescing tribes. They inherited industries, pleasures, languages, institutions and opinions of the ancestral tribes. So tribes coalesced with tribes and divided and coalesced again, until tribal society was lost in the confusion of ancestries. Then nations were born, based not on kinship bonds but on territorial boundaries. The first nation and every other nation since has in its very organization lost its ancestral identity by multiplied admixture of streams of blood. To speak of a nation as of one blood or as derived from one primeval tribe with its primitive industries, pleasures, speech, institutions and opinions is absurd. To search for the origin of a nation in one primeval tribe having some one or all of the primeval activities is a search for the impossible.

It is thus that the study of the human race has led to the discovery of its unity. It is found that we cannot classify men as biotic kinds with differing forms, functions and genealogies, as the lower animals are classified. An early tendency to such differentiation is discovered, but it is farther learned that this tendency has been partially obliterated and greatly obscured in the later history of mankind. By these discoveries many interesting facts have been recorded of variations in human forms, functions and genealogies. The study is one of interest and proves to be valuable. Thus the old science of ethnology remains as the study of biotic varieties of mankind, and is pursued with more vigor than ever and becoming of more and more importance.

In the study of ethnology as the science of biotic races the attempt was early made to supplement biotic characteristics with cultural characteristics from the domain of arts, or, as they are here called, *humanities*. This has led to the development of a new science pertaining to human activities as herein classified, and to which the term *demology* is sometimes given, while even the term ethnology is made to include both the biotic and the activital history of mankind. It may be well to keep the term ethnology to the limits of its primitive use and to adopt the term demology for the new science of human activities.

J. W. POWELL.

WASHINGTON.

ZOÖLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE.

THE EARLIEST GENERIC NAME OF THE GROUND SQUIRRELS COMMONLY PLACED IN THE GENUS SPERMOPHILUS.

THE eccentric Rafinesque, who imposed such a multitude of new names upon animals and plants, seems to have been first to name the group of ground squirrels for which the later name *Spermophilus* of Cuvier (1825) has been in common use for more than half a century. In 1817 Rafinesque published a paper entitled 'Descriptions of new genera of North American Quadrupeds,'

in which the 'Burrowing Squirrel' of Lewis & Clark was made the type of a new genus and species, *Anisonyx brachiura*.* This animal had been named *Arctomys columbianus* by Ord two years previously;† and was afterward erroneously referred to the genus *Cynomys*—likewise proposed by Rafinesque for one of Lewis & Clark's animals. Several years ago I showed that the animal in question is a true ground squirrel or spermophile,‡ but refrained from reinstating Rafinesque's genus *Anisonyx* because it was then believed that a still earlier name would be found. A somewhat exhaustive search through the literature, however, has failed to bring to light anything earlier; hence it seems necessary to publicly reintroduce *Anisonyx* as the proper generic name for the group of mammals now commonly referred to *Spermophilus*.

THE EARLIEST AVAILABLE NAME FOR THE MOUNTAIN GOAT.

IT has been customary of late to refer the Mountain Goat to the genus *Mazama* of Rafinesque.§ But *Mazama* was based primarily on the *Temamazame* of Mexico, which Rafinesque called *M. tema*, and which has been since shown to be a deer.|| The next species mentioned by Rafinesque is our Mountain Goat, which he named *M. dorsata*. But under this species he makes the following unequivocal statement which seems to have been overlooked: "This species, with the following [*M. sericea*, which is really the same animal] and the *Mazama puda* [of Chili], will form a particular subgenus (or perhaps genus) which I shall call *Oreamnos*, distinguished by the horns slightly curved backwards or outwards, often rough or annulated, and long hair, besides living in mountains." (Am. Monthly Mag., II., 1817, 44). In view of these facts there seems to be no escape from the adoption of the name *Oreamnos* as the earliest available generic name for the Mountain Goat, which is the type and only known species of the genus, the '*M. puda*' being a South American deer. The full name for the species is *Oreamnos montanus* (Ord) 1815, and the type locality is the Cascade Range, near the Columbia River, in Oregon or Washington.

C. HART MERRIAM.

WASHINGTON.

* Am. Monthly Magazine, II., 1817, 45.

† Guthrie's Geography, 2dA m. Ed., II., 1815, 292 and 303–304.

‡ Mammals of Idaho, N. Am. Fauna, No. 5, July, 1891, 39–42.

§ Am. Monthly Mag., II., 1817, p. 44.

|| Biologia Centrali-Americana, Mammalia, 1880, p. 113.

THE NEED OF A CHANGE OF BASE IN THE STUDY OF NORTH AMERICAN ORTHOPTERA.

SOME twenty years ago one of the very acutest and most industrious of modern entomologists, the late Carl Stål, of Stockholm, began the publication of a Recensio Orthopterorum. In it and in kindred papers he had within five years laid the foundation of an entirely new system in nearly every family of Orthoptera, offering novel and taxonomically important but easily overlooked points of structure for subdivisions of a high order. A great deal of work has been done since then (the number of species has perhaps doubled), and it has been mainly upon the lines laid down by him, but in greater detail.

Most American students of Orthoptera, however, have been very poorly acquainted with these modern studies, and the result is that, with a distressing wealth of undetermined species, new forms have been described and referred to genera of ancient name, a procedure which in many cases has given little or a wrong impression of the real affinities of the insects in question, and it has now become impossible to correlate American and European work. Something, indeed much, has been done by European