

ing the humanities as were matriculated in the sciences, or by actual count 63 % against 37 %.

CHARLES BUNDY WILSON.

THE UNIVERSITY OF IOWA,  
DEPARTMENT OF GERMAN.

NOTES ON THE NOMENCLATURE OF SOME  
NORTH AMERICAN FOSSIL VERTEBRATES.

In *Palæontological Bulletin* No. 16, p. 5, published August, 1873, Professor E. D. Cope described a new genus of rodents which he called *Gymnoptychus*. Of this genus he described at the same time four species, viz. : *chrysodon*, *nasutus*, *trilophus* and *minutus*. Later in a paper published in the *Seventh Annual Report of the U. S. Geological and Geographical Survey of the Territories*, on page 477, Professor Cope shows that he had determined that his *G. chrysodon* was identical with *Ischyromys typus*, described by Dr. Leidy in 1856. Accordingly *G. chrysodon* is recorded as a synonym of *I. typus*, while *minutus* and *trilophus* are retained under *Gymnoptychus*, the form *nasutus* being regarded as a probable synonym of *trilophus*. The same disposition is made of the species in Cope's *Vertebrata of the Tertiary Formations of the West*, except that *nasutus* is there made a synonym of *minutus*. It is evident that an error in nomenclature has been committed. Professor Cope nowhere definitely states which of his species he originally regarded as the type of *Gymnoptychus*; but, considering the way in which the species *chrysodon* is associated with the new genus *Gymnoptychus* and Professor Cope's practice in other cases, we are justified in believing that he regarded *chrysodon* as the type. But if this conclusion is contested there is indubitable evidence. The characters of *Gymnoptychus* are derived from the dentition of both upper and lower jaws; and *chrysodon* was the only species of which he possessed both mandible and maxilla. It must, therefore, be regarded as the type of *Gymnoptychus*. Hence, when *chrysodon* was proved to be identical with *Ischyromys typus*, *Gymnoptychus* became a synonym of *Ischyromys*, and was no longer available as a generic name for the species which had been associated with it. These require a new generic name, and I therefore propose *Adjidaumo*, having for its type Cope's *Gymnoptychus minutus*. *Adjidaumo* is

taken from Longfellow's *Hiawatha*. The known species are *A. minutus* and *A. trilophus*.

MR. E. S. RIGGS has recently proposed in *Field Col. Mus., Geol.*, Vol. I., p. 183, a new generic name, *Protogaulus*, for the reception of *Meniscomys hippodus*, since he considers that the species is not congeneric with the others which have hitherto been associated with it. This new genus Mr. Riggs arranges in the family *Mylagaulidæ*. Even if Mr. Riggs' views regarding the generic distinctness of *hippodus* and regarding its family relationships prove to be correct, he has proceeded in an improper way to express his conclusions. The type of the genus *Meniscomys* is the species *hippodus*, and in this genus it must remain, unless it can be shown either that *Meniscomys* is preoccupied or that it is a synonym of some earlier genus. *Hippodus* is provided for; it is the other species which are deprived of generic name by the removal of *hippodus*. They, however, may find lodgment under Marsh's *Allomys*. As the matter stands, *Protogaulus* is merely a synonym of *Meniscomys*, and both possibly synonyms of *Allomys*.

In the *American Journal of Science*, 1871, Vol. II., p. 125, Professor Marsh described, from the Bridger Eocene of Wyoming, a fossil carnivore which he called *Canis montanus*. This name, however, was preoccupied, having been employed in 1836 by Pearson. In the *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, Vol. V., p. 313, he describes a fox which he called *Canis vulpes montana*. Although this animal is regarded by some as at most a subspecies of *Canis (Vulpes) alopec*, and although Professor Marsh's species probably belongs to a different genus, nevertheless, the latter species is shut out from the enjoyment of the name *montanus*. I shall apply to it the name *Canis ? marshii*.

It is necessary to call the attention of paleontologists to the fact that the genus *Hypotemnodon* can not be employed for the two species which have been arranged under it. *Hypotemnodon* was proposed in 1894, by Dr. John Eyerma, in the *American Geologist*, Vol. XIV., p. 320, the type species being Professor Cope's *Temnocyon coryphæus*. But already, in 1890, in an article entitled 'The Dogs of the American Miocene,' published in the *Princeton College Bulletin*, Vol.

II., p. 37, Dr. W. B. Scott established the genus *Mesocyon*, basing it on the same species *coryphæus*. Dr. Scott seems to have afterwards forgotten his genus, since he employed Eyerman's name. Indeed, all paleontologists who have had occasion to mention the genus have called it *Hypotemnodon*. It is obvious, however, that it must yield to *Mesocyon*.

IN 1865, in *Proceed. Acad. Nat. Sciences of Philadelphia*, p. 90, Dr. Leidy described, from the Eocene of South Dakota, a carnivore which he called *Amphicyon gracilis*. Unfortunately for his species, Pomel had, as early as 1847, employed the same name for a fossil carnivore found in Europe. Cope in 1884, in his *Vertebrata of the Tertiary Formations of the West*, p. 916, made Leidy's name a synonym of *Galecyneus gregarius*. Scott and Osborn in 1887, in a paper in the *Bulletin of the Museum Comp. Zoology*, Harvard, Vol. XIII., p. 152, speak of it as a distinct species under the name *Cynodictis gracilis*. Matthew recently, in *Bulletin of the American Museum*, Vol. XII., p. 54, records it as an 'invalid species' and apparently as a synonym of *Cynodictis lippincottianus*. When those disagree who have access to the type specimens and to abundant materials belonging to related forms, it is evident that the last word has not been said. Until it can be determined with some degree of unanimity where Leidy's specimens belong, it will be better to keep them to themselves under a distinct name. Furthermore, the possibility exists that the discovery of additional materials will prove Leidy's form to be a good species. Pending this settlement of the question I propose to call the *Amphicyon gracilis* of Leidy *Cynodictis hylactor*. The specific name is that of one of Actæon's dogs.

O. P. HAY.

U. S. NATIONAL MUSEUM, July 27, 1899.

#### THE PROPER NAME OF THE POLAR BEAR.

THE technical name of the Polar Bear as usually mentioned is *Thalarctos maritimus* (Linn.), the reference being *Systema Natura*, X., 1758, p. 47. In looking up this reference I find it is simply mentioned under *Ursus arctos*, as follows: '*Ursus maritimus albus major arcticus*'; with a reference to Martën's

Spitzbergen, and concluding with a note doubting the specific distinctness of this bear. A question as to the value of this reference was referred to several noted authorities on the Mammalia, whose answer did not sustain the reference, and induced me to examine the case closer. The next date when any mention of the Polar Bear was made was 1776, when Müller and Pallas each gave it a name. Müller in his *Zoologiæ Danicæ Prodromus*, etc., p. 3, refers to it as a variety of *U. arctos*, calling it *U. albus*, but giving only a reference to Martën's Spitzbergen, and a short note on its habitat. Pallas, in his *Reise*, III., bh. 2, p. 691, describes this species as *U. marinus*, with a good diagnosis, which proves he knew the animal very well. As the name of Pallas is undoubtedly the best, being accompanied by a good description, therefore the name of the Polar Bear should be *Thalarctos marinus* (Pallas). The reference is *Reise*, III., bh. 2, p. 691, 1776.

JAMES A. G. REHN.

ACADEMY OF NATURAL SCIENCES,  
PHILADELPHIA, August 7, 1899.

#### THE INTERNATIONAL CATALOGUE OF SCIENTIFIC LITERATURE.

TO THE EDITOR OF SCIENCE: A few days after contributing to your esteemed journal my remarks upon the bibliographical methods proposed for the Catalogue of Scientific Papers I received a report of a committee of Dutch scientists, whose conclusions are diametrically opposed in certain points to the opinions which I expressed. Impartiality requires that I should not pass this criticism unnoticed.

Let me translate from the French text: "The adoption of the Dewey Decimal Classification having been favored by certain persons, we wish to state our opinion in regard to this system. This opinion is very unfavorable. In our opinion the adoption of the system would lead to the failure of the enterprise.

"Our conviction in this matter is based upon the faulty manner in which the system has been worked out for various sciences in the 'Decimal Classification and Relative Index' of Mr. Dewey (1894, Library Bureau, 146 Franklin Street, Boston; 21 Bloomsbury Street, London).