is the third upper molar. It possesses two divergent roots. Contrary to what one expects, the smaller part of the crown forms the outside (buccal), and the larger the inside (palatal) surface. Du Bois thus describes the tooth on the assumption that the broader of the two roots represented two other confluent roots. If the broader half of the crown were outside (as it appears to be from the figure) the identification of the tubercles on the grinding surface would be easy. As it is, it is difficult, if not impossible, to name the cusps. The tooth must be classified as irregular and degenerate. I am in the habit of naming such teeth, crater-like, since all sides of the crown are uniformly higher than the centre, and the sides of the single valley are much fissured. We often meet with such teeth in man, but so far as I know they have not been seen in apes.

The tuberculation in the gorilla for the third molar is complete; the fourth cusp (hypocone), while rudimentary, is distinct. In the chimpanzee, according to Owen, the third molar is tritubercular, but in a specimen in the Academy of Natural Sciences of Philadelphia, it shows distinctly the rudiment of a hypocone. In the orang the third molar is distinctly quintitubercular, the fifth cusp being developed in the commissure between the mesocone and the hypocone.

The tooth of *Pithecanthropus* is larger than any human tooth with which I am familiar. The following table will place its measurements in harmony with ape and human teeth.

	Length.	Width.
Pithecanthropus,	11.3 mm.	15.3 mm.
Gorilla,	14.1 "	13.5 "
Orang,	12 "	13 "
Chimpanzee,	10 "	10 "
Native of Australia, (1)	10 "	13 "
" " " (2)	10 "	14 "
" " Sandwich Islands,	10 "	13.5 "

In Owen's Odontography the gibbon is seen to possess a molar of length 6 mm. and width 7.5 mm.; but even here the form of the tooth is quite unlike that of *Pithecanthropus*, being tritubercular with a rudimental hypocone. The tooth, unlike that of any anthropoid ape examined, is wider than long. The proportion of the width in comparison to the length is much the same as in the third molar of the human subject. The great size of the tooth and the possession of three roots, forming two diverging root-stems are distinguishing characters, but they are not simian. Some allowance must be made for the great variability in the shape of the third upper human molar.

Respecting the calvarium, I note in the view of the vertex a median elevation apparently over the interfrontal suture. This is often met with in the human skull, but so far as I know is never seen in the skull of the ape. The recession back of the external orbital process differs only in degree from that seen in man. The femur is indubitably human.

HARRISON ALLEN.

PHILADELPHIA, Feb. 14, 1895.

THE ELIHU THOMSON PRIZE.

THE EDITOR OF SCIENCE: Your transatlantic contemporary, *Nature*, has from its beginning enjoyed a large support among scientific men of the United States. It is so well conducted, and combines in so unusual a degree freshness and reliability, that it it is almost indispensable, and Americans continue to renew their subscriptions annually, in spite of the very general feeling and not infrequently expressed opinion that, on the whole, it is not now and never has been quite fair or just in its treatment of American science and scientific men.

An illustration of this is to be found in a recent number (January 31, 1895) which is so striking as to deserve attention. On page 324 will be found a note in reference to the recently announced award of the Elihu Thomson Prize (see this journal, page 190). It is a most ingeniously con-

structed account of the award made by the Paris Committee, the preparation of which must have cost the writer no small effort. So skilfully, however, are the words selected and the phrases arranged that, to one unfamiliar with the facts, the note appears to be a simple and straightforward statement that in declaring the award the Committee announced that it had found two memoirs of equal value and that it was decided to award a prize of 5000 francs to each, the collection of the additional money being the cause of the delay in the publication of the decision of the Committee. In the account of the affair in a recent number of SCIENCE it was pretty clearly stated that the memoir prepared by an American, Dr. Webster, of Clark University, had been adjudged by the Committee to be worthy of first place.

In order that every reader may be able to decide this matter for himself, the following quotations from the report of the Committee are submitted: Memoir 3 was that to be the work of Messrs. Oliver Lodge and R. T. Glazebrook, and No. 4 was that of Dr. Webster.

"Le n° 3 est consacré à la vérification de la formule donant la période des décharges oscillantes d'un condensateur. C'est un travail considérable, accompagné de plusieurs photographies et dans lequel l'auteur a cherché, au moyen de calculs approfondis, à évaluer toutes les corrections inhérentes à l'emploi de sa méthode.

"La vérification n'est qu'approachée; le principe de la méthode pourrait donner lieu à quelques critiques, le circuit de la décharge se fermant périodiquement par une étincelle qui introduit des perturbations impossibles à prévoir.

"Le mémoir n° 4 port sur le même sujet, étudié par une méthode nouvelle dans ses détails, qui a permis à l'auteur d'atteindre et de mesurer des périodes de quelques centmillièmes de seconde. L'influence des principales causes d'erreur paraît très atténuée, bien qu'il reste encore quelques doutes sur l'influence de la capacité inhérente à la bobine de self-induction. La formule a été vérifiée a 1 pour 100 prés. Le temps a fait défaut à l'auteur pour compléter ses recherches en variant les conditions de ses expériences."

And then the following award from the 'procès-verbal' of the Commission:

"La Commission estime que le mémoire n° 4 est digne de recevoir le prix établi par le Professeur Elihu Thomson; elle espére que ce témoignage encouragera l'auteur à continuer ses belle recherches.

"'Toutefois elle regrette de ne pas avoir à sa disposition deux prix d'égale valeur qu'elle serait heureuse d'attribuer aux mémoires n° 3 et n° 4.'"

A literal translation of the above, as a fair statement of its meaning is, perhaps, too much to look for in the columns of 'Nature,' but it is a pleasure to assure Messrs. Lodge and Glazebrook, whose names are 'household words' in every corner of this country, that their reputation is not such as to need bolstering by any oblique methods. M.

SCIENTIFIC LITERATURE.

Monographic Revision of the Pocket Gophers, Family Geomyidæ (exclusive of the Species of Thomomys). By DR. C. HART MERRIAM. North American Fauna, No. 8. Washington, Government Printing Office. 1895. 8vo, pp. 258, pll. 18, with 4 maps and 71 cuts in text.

In this memoir Dr. Merriam has produced an admirable piece of monographic work, setting a standard that may well be aimed at by other workers in the treatment of similar groups. The family Geomyidæ, or the Pocket Gophers, has hitherto been regarded as consisting of the two genera *Geomys* and *Thomomys*, only the first of which is here treated. It is a distinctively North American group, ranging from the