

ments for the wind theory, as generally stated, are first, the general accordance of prevailing winds and associated currents; each ocean having its wind eddy only less marked than its current eddy. Second, the periodic variation of the currents in regions of monsoon winds; the type example of this kind being in the Indian Ocean, where, as even Dampier noted two hundred years ago, the currents shift about a month after the winds. Third, the irregular movements of the surface waters under storm winds, which suffice in a day or two to deflect or even to reverse the surface layers of so strong a current as the Gulf Stream off Hatteras. To these facts may be added the hardly less significant behavior of the equatorial counter currents, which increase in area and strength on that side of the equator to which the trade wind from the other hemisphere crosses over as a deflected, monsoon-like wind; the monsoon currents of the Indian Ocean being only special cases of this general rule. The greater velocity of the North Atlantic drift ('North connecting current' in the objectional terminology of the school atlases) in winter than in summer may also be mentioned as a fact best explained by the wind theory. There is nothing about the Gulf Stream so peculiar as to exempt it from the general control exercised by the winds over the waters.

W. M. DAVIS.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

CORRECTIONS.

EDITOR OF SCIENCE: The fate of my review of Beddard's Zoogeography furnishes another illustration of the dangers which an author is subject to in his path to publication. In the proof (of which I have a duplicate at hand), Nearctic and *Osteolæmus* occur all right, but in the published article (altered after it passed through my hands) *Osteolæmus* is substituted for *Ostolæmus* and *Osteolæmus* for *Osteolæmus* and consequently there is no apparent point to the criticism made and no reason for the analogue euded. 'Upiform' on p. 273 (left column) should have been *pupiform*, and 'even' on p. 273 (right column) just before 'the same Hyracodon' should, of course, have been *event*. The *p* of *pupiform* and *t* of *event* were dropped after

transmission of the proof; 'molacologist' should have been corrected to *malacologist*.

I may add that Mr. Beddard spells the title of his volume Zoogeography (without ö) as I had written and corrected.

The reviewer of Beddard's work in 'Nature' (July 25, p. 289) is "at a loss to understand" "by what confusion of ideas the name *Hyracodon*, (which belongs to an extinct genus of rhinoceros-like animals) is made to do duty for *Didelphys*." *Hyracodon* of Tomes, as noted in the review in SCIENCE (p. 273) was published in 1863 and in the Proc. Zoöl. Soc. London (p. 50) and has remained unexplained to the present day. I have long been inclined to believe that it was based on a young *Didelphys*, although the meagre description does not apply to any stage I have seen (and I have seen many). I was surprised that it was not noticed in Mr. Thomas' excellent work on Marsupials. It seems, indeed, to have fallen quite flat, but was noticed by Murray in his geographical distribution of Mammals, and I presume that it is from Murray that Mr. Beddard has received the generic name. The homonymy of the names of Leidy and Tomes was, of course, a mere coincidence. The type of Tomes' genus (*Hyracodon fuliginosus*) was from 'Ecuador; collected by Mr. Fraser.' If it has not been lost, perhaps Mr. Thomas may find it and tell us what it is.

We may, perhaps, derive some comfort from the fact that the printers of your famous contemporary 'Nature' are by no means exempt from errors like those I now correct. Four lines before the reference to *Hyracodon* just cited, we find a reference to the 'Siberian hippopotamus;' the original copy of the review undoubtedly had *Liberian*. THEO. GILL.

WASHINGTON, Aug. 31, 1895.

[In the issue of SCIENCE for August 30, smaller type was for the first time used in part of the number. As is apt to happen in such cases there was a delay in the arrival of the type and the proof was late. Dr. Gill's corrections were sent to the printer, but the corrected proof was not seen by the editor. The errors are however such (presumably due to resetting part of the article) that it is better to offer apologies rather than excuses. J. McK. C.]