through the epidermis. In *Rhipsalis glaucosa* a number of accessory abortive flowers were found. *Cuscuta glomerata* was mentioned as the only other plant in which, so far as the speaker knew, subepidermal flowers occur.

One person was elected to active membership.

WILLIAM TRELEASE,
Recording Secretary.

DISCUSSION AND CORRESPONDENCE.

ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE.

EDITOR OF SCIENCE: I fear that the subject may verge on becoming tedious to your readers, but will ask the privilege of concluding my part in the discussion by a few comments on two points raised in Mr. Bather's communication of January 10th (p. 154).

It will hardly be denied that the date of printing will always be useful to the systematist in noting a period earlier than which publication of a paper *cannot* be claimed, even if we ignore the obvious fact that in nearly every case it will now-a-days closely approach the date of distribution or actual publication. Hence, the committee should consider well before minimizing its value.

Secondly, it has been held, with some plausibility, that the distribution by favor alone should not constitute publication, but that the ability of any one interested to procure a paper by purchase is essential to an effective publication. If now, by a doctrine of ethics which is certainly novel to me, the committee decides that no paper can be regarded as published until the society which prints it is ready to sell the complete volume of which it may form a part, it is obvious that the committee has it in contemplation to put a quietus on the prompt publication of separate papers, unless this is done commercially by the society in question, in the first place. To this proposition I believe it will be impossible to obtain the assent of workers in systematic natural history, and justly so.

The reasons are obvious and need not be enlarged upon. I think it is not unfair to add that most libraries in this country would rather pride themselves on procuring, even at the cost of seven shillings, at the earliest practicable moment, a paper demanded by their readers; and would consider its belated acquisition in the miscellaneous volume of a scientific society, subsequently, as no reflection upon their performance of their duties to the public.

WM. H. DALL.

THE RED-BEDS OF KANSAS.

THE correlation of the Red-Beds of Kansas has hitherto been impossible to satisfactorily settle, as has been stated by Professor Prosser in his admirable report upon them in the second volume of the University Geological Survey of Kansas. Many persons have diligently sought for fossils in them, but entirely without success until recently. About two years ago Mr. C. N. Gould discovered a horizon just south of the Kansas line and at the base of the Kansas series, containing large numbers of a small phyllopod crustacean, examples of which, when referred to Professor T. Rupert Jones, through Professor Prosser, were determined as *Estheria minuta* with some doubt, as stated in his paper in the *Geological Magazine* (1898, p. 291).

Associated with these crustacean remains, the blocks sent with the skeleton showing numerous specimens, was a large part of the skeleton of an amphibian. This specimen is now in the University of Kansas collection, but so far has been only partly freed from its matrix, a work of much tediousness. The parts already brought to light, however, enable me to determine it as *Eryops megacephalus* Cope, a form described from the 'Permian' of Texas.

This identification settles once for all the horizon whence it came as Permian, if the Texas beds be really of that age. There are several hundred feet of deposits in Kansas above this horizon that still possibly may be considered as Triassic, but there is no reason for so doing. *Estheria minuta* is a Triassic species, but, even if correctly determined, its value is slight in comparison with that of the vertebrate in the correlation of the beds. It must be remembered, however, that *Eryops* is by no means necessarily characteristic of the Permian.

S. W. WILLISTON.

MEN OF SCIENCE AND ANTI-VIVISECTION.

IF, according to my critic (SCIENCE, Dec. 16, 1898, p. 873), the efforts of the anti-vivisection-