UNIVERSITY AND EDUCATIONAL NEWS.

THE regents of the University of the State of New York will hereafter strictly enforce the law prohibiting the unauthorized use of the names college and university. An institution to be ranked as a college must have at least six professors giving their entire time to college and university work and a course of four full years of college grade in liberal arts and sciences, and must require for admission four years of academic or high school preparation in addition to the preacademic or grammar school studies. The regents believe it sound educational policy to encourage the establishment and maintenance of colleges wherever these minimum conditions can be met. The small college follows naturally the high school, and the more widely it is scattered about the country the better for higher education, but to give college instruction is a very different matter from exercising university powers in conferring degrees. The council earnestly recommended, as vitally important for protecting and promoting higher educational interests, that the regents should not, except for extraordinary reasons, increase the number of institutions in this State holding degree-conferring powers. Students completing the courses in colleges newly established may obtain from the university of the State the bachelor's degree, which will be more valuable and more widely recognized than a degree conferred by a local institution.

THE will of the late Miss Abby G. Beckwith leaves $5,000 to Brown University for the founding of two Scholarships.

THE first graduate of the University of Wales by examination is a woman, Miss Maria Dawson, B. S.

PROF. HOELDER, of Tubingen, has been appointed professor of mathematics in the University at Königsberg; Prof C. von Seelenhorst, of Jena, assistant professor in the University of Göttingen, and Dr. H. Stuhr, assistant in the Anatomical Institute at Breslau, in succession to Dr. Endres; Dr. Andreas Obrzut, of Prague, to the chair of anatomy at Lemberg. Dr. Joseph Blaas, of the University at Innsbrück, has been promoted to an assistant professorship of geology and paleontology.

DISCUSSION AND CORRESPONDENCE.

A REPREHENSIBLE METHOD OF DETERMINING PRIORITY OF PUBLICATION.

QUESTIONS of nomenclature and of priority of discovery in relation to matters of fact must, of course, be decided by the date of publication of the works in which the names of the species or the facts in question were first announced; hence it is important to determine the date of publication with the greatest possible definiteness. It is, therefore, necessary to define at the outset what is meant by the term publication. On this point the 'Century Dictionary' will be admitted as good authority. In this work the word publication, in the sense in which it is used in the present article, is defined as follows: "The act of offering a book, map, piece of music, or the like, to the public by sale or by gratuitous distribution." Publication thus implies distribution, and has no necessary relation to the date of printing, except that, of course, printing must precede publication.

Unfortunately, however, it is often difficult to determine the exact date when a book, pamphlet, or any regular part of a serial publication, or the signature of any work issued in signatures, became accessible to the public, or even to those especially interested in the subject to which the treatise relates; in a word, when it was *published*, or, to use the 'Century Dictionary' expression, *when it was offered to the public.*

We have only to look through the various codes of nomenclature for biology to find that the matter of determining the 'date of publication' has received attention from those who have made this question the subject of special consideration. The rule generally adopted by scientific bodies which have legislated on the subject is to the effect that the ostensible date, as that given on the title page of a book or pamphlet, or at the bottom of the signatures, when works are issued in signatures, shall be taken as the correct date, unless known to be erroneous, and that whenever such dates are found to be erroneous the true date of publication shall be taken in all cases where it can be established. The date of printing is thus wholly ignored as having any bearing on the

date of publication. Hence the long accepted date of some well-known work is liable at any time to be overthrown and some later or earlier date established as the real and proper date of publication, leading, of course, to great inconvenience and often to the overthrow of long accepted names.*

In view of the general unanimity of action on the part of naturalists on this question, it is a matter of surprise and deep regret that the Zoological Section of the American Association for the Advancement of Science should have recently adopted a set of resolutions wholly at variance with not only the concensus of opinion concerning 'the date of publication,' but with common sense; the only redeeming feature being the fact that they will fall harmlessly in consequence of their obvious absurdity. These resolutions were adopted at the Springfield meeting, held in August, 1895, and appear in the recently issued volume of the 'Proceedings' of the Association for that meeting (p. 159).† The whole pith of the resolutions is that 'the date of publication of books is the date at which they are printed.' This is the phraseology adopted in the second '*whereas*,' while the resolution covering this point is, in full, as follows:

"Resolved: *First*—The Section of Zoology of the American Association for the Advancement of Science recommends that the date of the completion of printing of a single issue be regarded as the date of publication.

"*Second*—That the Section recommends that such date be printed on the last signature of all publications, whether books, periodicals or 'separates.'"

The reasons given in support of this resolution show a surprising lack of familiarity with the subject in hand on the part of the framers of these resolutions; and it is not a little remarkable that they should have been adopted in such a body 'with but one pertinent objection,' as the editor of the *American Naturalist* states. The gist of the argument in favor of the above quoted resolution is given under the final '*whereas*,' as follows: "The determination of the date of printing will generally depend on the records of the printing office and the testimony of several persons, while the time of mailing will be known generally to but one person;" or, as said just previously, "the actual date of mailing will be often impossible to ascertain with precision, owing to lack of record and irregularity in the period of transmission."

While these allegations may be true, they have really no bearing on the question at issue, namely, the *date of publication*, as commonly understood.

The absurdity and mischievousness of this ruling may be easily illustrated. The U. S. National Museum has within the last few months distributed two 'Special Bulletins' bearing date 1895. These important quarto publications were *printed* in 1895; in one case the printing was completed six or eight months, and in the other nearly or quite a year, before any copies were distributed, or before these works were 'published.' In one of these a new genus of fishes was described, under a name which before the work was published was also given to a genus of birds. The paper in which the bird genus was described and named is dated and was distributed June, 1896, while no copies of the work in which the fish genus was described were distributed before August, 1896, as I am informed by one of the authors of the latter work. According to current usage, the generic name in question must stand for the bird genus, and the fish genus must be renamed. According to the 'resolutions' of the Zoological Section of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, the name must stand for the fish genus and the bird genus be renamed. This is only one out of many parallel instances that might be cited.

When, as often happens, a work appears from the Government Printing Office months or even years after it was printed and dated, it is obviously absurd to claim, when the facts in the case are known, that the work was published at the date borne on the title page, if it

*A case in point is the 'Proceedings' of the London Zoological Society, some parts of the earlier volumes being dated from three months to two years and a-half in advance of their delivery by the printer to the Society. *Cf.* Sclater (P. L.), Proc. Zool. Soc. London, 1895, pp. 435–440.

†They appear to have been first printed in this Journal for October 11, 1895 (N. S. Vol. II., pp. 477–8), and have been recently reprinted with editorial commendation in the *American Naturalist* (August, 1896, pp. 651, 652).

was not distributed and rendered accessible to the public till a long time after it was printed. Indeed, it has often happened that books have been printed, even under other than Government auspices, and held in storage for years before any copies were distributed. In the usual course of trade books are often printed and held in stock, for trade reasons, for issue on a certain date, which is recognized as the date of publication. On a certain fixed day, generally previously announced, the book is placed on the market, and the advance orders for it from booksellers and others are filled on that day, which, in the records of the trade, is the date of its publication. For this purpose books are often dated several months ahead of the time when they are printed, in order that the date on the title page may agree with the date of their issue.

These simple facts show clearly how little claim the date of *printing* has to be taken as the date of *publication*, as advocated in the resolutions here under notice. If the same effort were made to find out the real date of distribution that is contemplated in these resolutions as necessary to establish the date of printing, the result would probably be worth the labor expended, for we should then be placed in possession of the real date of publication. How and by whom this needed work is to be done might form a subject worthy of consideration by even the Zoological Section of the American Association for the Advancement of Science.

J. A. ALLEN.

AMERICAN MUSEUM OF
NATURAL HISTORY, NEW YORK.

SCIENTIFIC LITERATURE.

Geological Survey of New Jersey. Annual Report of the State Geologist (John C. Smock) *for the Year 1894:* Trenton, 1895. Pp. 303, Plates I–XI, fig, 1. One map in pocket.

In the first paper of the volume before us, entitled 'Part I., Surface Geology,' Prof. Salisbury continues the record of his observations on the surface deposits of the northern part of the State, that is, of that portion which lies within or near the terminal moraine. For about one hundred pages the reader will find a valuable record of phenomena, which furnish a basis for subsequent deductions and which are of local importance, both to residents of the district and to visiting geologists. These pages deal with the drift deposits north of the moraine, taking them up under three different areas, viz., (*a*) drift deposits west of Green Pond Mountain, (*b*) drift on the Bearfort, Kanouse, Green Pond and Copperas Mountains, (*c*) drift east of the Green Pond Mountain range. Under each the unstratified drift, till or ground moraine is first described, and then the stratified. The former is chiefly on the mountains, the latter in the valleys. The glacial striæ next receive attention and from about 380 recorded observations it is shown that, as a rule, on the Palisade ridge the ice moved east of south, while west of it the direction is west of south. There are some cases of intersecting striæ and some minor local variations, but the above is the rule. The topics of changes in drainage and lakes are next discussed. The former are insignificant and of the latter the important cases are mostly due to obstructions of drift across streams. The post-glacial changes within the glacial area occupy Section IV. The post-glacial erosion is shown to be small, and the remaining topics—the alluvial deposits, peat and marl, and the changes of level—present little of great moment, except that under the latter the changes of level in the shore lines of Lake Passaic indicate post-glacial deformation in this region.

The remainder of Prof. Salisbury's paper is occupied with the surface formations south of the terminal moraine. The one earlier called the Beacon Hill is first discussed and is correlated with considerable certainty with Dr. W. B. Clark's Miocene beds farther south. The overlying Pensauken formation is considered as an equivalent of the Lafayette, and the still later Jamesburg is made the representative of the Columbia. Surface formations of even later date are briefly cited. A few pages are devoted to road materials and then in the concluding section the author describes the large map that accompanies the report. This exhibits the surface formations over the northeastern portion of the State in as great detail as has ever been attempted for an American area. Thirty different signs appear on the map, a number that