

are urging the adoption of these ultra rules. The best systematic botanists of the world are opposed to them, and there is such a widespread and determined opposition to them in the botanical fraternity generally, both in this country and in Europe, that the movement is certain to amount only to a lamentable schism. It has been claimed that nine-tenths of our American botanists are in favor of these rules, but such statements are wide of the mark. Some of these rules are in conflict with the Paris Code, and others claim to be a strict interpretation of it; but de Candolle himself, the author of this code, considered such interpretations of it as 'abuses,' and urged that the Paris Code of 1867 be so amended as to prevent the swamping of our nomenclature by ultra theorists.

One fact lost sight of by the movers of this new American system, for it has no following in Europe, is that science is an international affair, that the bulk of the botanical work of the world is done outside of the United States, and that even if we were all agreed on this side of the water, which is far from true, it would still be necessary to gain consent of botanists elsewhere before giving to these rules any more weight than mere suggestions. It will be time enough for American botanists to put them into practice when they have received the sanction of an International Botanical Congress. Another very strong objection to making radical changes in our botanical nomenclature is the extent to which botanical names are used in agriculture, forestry, horticulture, floriculture, pharmacy and medicine. There is nothing comparable to it in zoölogy. Only intolerable confusion can result from calling a plant by one name in botany and by another in horticulture or pharmacy, and it is surprising that the force of this argument was not perceived long ago. Finally, the Botanical Club rules do not have the sanction of the A. A. A. S., as

might be inferred from some statements which have been made, and the organization of the Club is so loose as to be a fatal objection to regarding its doings or recommendations as in any sense binding on American botanists, when these are opposed by counter-recommendations proceeding from the most famous botanists in the world.

F. A. LUCAS, *Secretary*.

BOSTON SOCIETY OF NATURAL HISTORY,
MAY 15.

Notes on the Dissection of a Chimpanzee, with Especial Reference to the Brain: PROF. THOMAS DWIGHT.

The Conditions of Escape of Gases from the Interior of the Earth: PROF. N. S. SHALER.
SAMUEL HENSHAW,
Secretary.

THE MINNESOTA ACADEMY OF NATURAL SCIENCES, MINNEAPOLIS, MAY 7.

I. An Observation on Ants: O. W. OESTLUND.

II. Remarks on Some Birds New to Minnesota: DR. THOS. S. ROBERTS.

III. An Amine Compound of Gold: H. B. HOVLAND.

IV. The Chemical Characters of the Minnesota Sandstones: CHAS. P. BERKEY.

V. Miscellaneous Business.

C. W. HALL, *Secretary*.

NEW BOOKS.

Zur Psychologie des Schreibens. W. PREYER. Hamburg and Leipzig, Leopold Voss. 1895. Pp. 230. M. 8.

The Female Offender. CÉSAR LOMBROSO and WILLIAM FERRERO. New York, D. Appleton & Co. 1895. Pp. xx + 313. \$1.50.

Story of the Innumerable Company. DAVID STARR JORDAN. Stanford Univ. Press. 1895. Pp. 38.

Short Studies in Nature Knowledge. WILLIAM GEE. London and New York, Macmillan & Co. 1895. Pp. xiv + 313. \$1.10