

ington Farrand, Dr. A. Hrdlicka, Dr. Putnam and Dr. R. E. Dodge. These investigations were made in the Vancouver Islands, Oregon, New Mexico, Arizona and California.

CHARLES H. JUDD,
Secretary.

DISCUSSION AND CORRESPONDENCE.

THE EARLIEST USE OF THE NAMES SAURIA AND BATRACHIA.

TO THE EDITOR OF SCIENCE: In glancing over my 'Address in Memory of Edward Drinker Cope,' published by the American Philosophical Society, I find I have inadvertently referred to 'Sauria and Serpentes' as 'Linnæan terms' instead of 'prior terms.' Serpentes only was used by Linnæus, that naturalist having confounded all his 'Amphibia' except the Serpentes under the group ('ordo') named 'Reptiles.' Brongniart first used the name 'Sauriens.' The slip would scarcely be of sufficient consequence to notice were it not that a question of nomenclature of some importance is involved on which I am enabled to throw some light.

Only the French form of the name—Sauriens—was used by Brongniart (1799) and it has been believed that Latreille (1804) or Duméril (1806) was the first to give a later equivalent. Meanwhile, however, Shaw (1802) used the name *Lacertæ*. There are many who hold that a vernacular name is insufficient and should be superseded by the first applicable Latin term. I do not share in that belief in respect to super-generic groups (orders, etc.), but for the benefit of those who do, give the following facts.

Brongniart's name Sauriens was used very speedily after its proposal by Cuvier in his *Leçons d'anatomie comparée* in the 'troisième tableau' at the end of the first volume ('an VIII' = 1800), but there was no Latin equivalent. The Latin term SAURIA was first introduced by Dr. James Macartney in a translation of the first volume of Cuvier's work published in 1802. This work must be quite rare, as the only copy I have been able to find is one I purchased at a second hand bookstore when a youth. Its full title is as follows: 'Lectures on Comparative Anatomy. | Translated from the French of | G. CUVIER, | Member of the National Institute,

Professor in the College of France, and in the | Central School of the Pantheon, &c. | By WILLIAM ROSS; | under the inspection of | JAMES MACARTNEY, | Lecturer on Comparative Anatomy and Physiology in St. Bartholomew's Hospital, &c. | = | Vol. I | [etc.] | = | London, | printed at the Oriental Press, by Wilson and Co., | for T. N. Longman and O. Rees, Paternoster row. | — | 1802.

Macartney is responsible for the nomenclature. In his 'Preface,' (p. vi,) he remarks: "The names of the muscles [etc.] have been rendered into Latin" [etc.], and "the same mode has been adopted with respect to many of the terms in Natural History." He adds: "I have taken the liberty of correcting some errors in the original" [etc.], so there can be no doubt that to him is to be accredited the nomenclature adopted. His preface is dated 'London, March 18, 1802.'

All the ordinal names for reptiles are rendered into Latin in the third folded table at the end of the volume, viz.: Les Chéloniens by CHELONIA; Les Sauriens by SAURIA; Les Ophidiens by OPHIDIA, and Les Batraciens by BATRACHIA. 1802, then, is the date for those names, and not 1804, as stated by Dr. Baur in SCIENCE (N. S., VI., 172), who attributes their first Latinization to Latreille (1804). In this work also, it will be seen, is the first Latinization of Batraciens.

Dr. O. P. Hay (in SCIENCE, N. S., VI., 772) has advocated the retention of Batrachia instead of Amphibia, apparently because he thinks that "one thing is very certain, and that is that we cannot rigidly enforce, with respect to the appellatives of higher rank, the same rules that apply to genera. Common usage must and does determine much in the case of the former terms." If I accepted these ideas, I should still be in favor of retaining the name Amphibia in place of Batrachia. 'Common usage' among the Germans generally, as well as among many other zoologists, would warrant it. To me the name Batrachia, extended to cover all the class so designated, is very objectionable from a philological as well as historical point of view, and Amphibia is an excellent one.

THEO. GILL.

WASHINGTON, October 24, 1900.