

be *Cucumites globulosus*, although I am free to confess that is not the name I had intended it to bear! I would write the name and its authority as *C. globulosus* (Knowlton) Cockerell, and I may add, that, in my judgment, Professor Cockerell has himself further complicated the issue by intentionally publishing a combination in a field in which he has at most only a passing interest.

F. H. KNOWLTON.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

#### THOSE MANUSCRIPT NAMES.

TO THE EDITOR OF SCIENCE: I am much averse to using the pages of scientific papers for nomenclatorial discussion, but since Professor Cockerell's and Dr. Bather's articles indicate that I introduced MS. names merely to upset them, a few words may not be amiss. Dr. Bather says 'It (*Filistata oceanea*) appears first on page 50 of Mr. Banks's paper.' Such is not the case, and in this very paper (p. 60, bottom) I refer to an unpublished name of Marx but am careful not to introduce it. Dr. Marx (as I state) published a list of spiders from the Galapagos Islands in 1889 which includes six MS. names. In order to make my paper on the spiders of these islands complete it was necessary to note previous publications. In order to show how many spiders were known from these islands I collated the previous lists (Butler's and Marx's) with my material, in so showing that three of Marx's published names were synonyms of previously described species, and two others were the same as those I would describe below. In sinking five of the six previously published names (every one of which is still a *nomen nudum*) under described species I believe I was doing a service. My case is not unique; I can mention dozens; commonly, however, the MS. name is referred to after the description. And the paper and ink wasted in so doing are as nothing to the time and type wasted in the two articles which are the mismatched parents of this one.

NATHAN BANKS.

#### EXPLORATION OF OKEFINOKEE SWAMP.

TO THE EDITOR OF SCIENCE: Some of your readers may be interested to know that the

vast wilderness, several hundred square miles in extent, known as Okefinokee Swamp, in southeastern Georgia, so long avoided by botanists and other scientists—though mentioned as long ago as 1791 in the writings of William Bartram—has at last been penetrated. In company with Mr. P. L. Ricker, of the U. S. Dept. of Agriculture, and a guide, I entered the swamp near the center of its eastern margin on August 6, and came out at the same place on the 8th, having in the meanwhile been about a dozen miles into the interior and secured a considerable number of interesting plants and photographs.

One of the first features of the swamp to attract my attention was the fact that all the thousands of cypress trees seen were undoubtedly *Taxodium imbricarium*, a species whose distinctness from the old *T. distichum* I have recently attempted to show (*Bull. Torr. Bot. Club*, 29: 383-399, June 20, 1902). According to the theory there proposed (see pp. 389, 395) this would seem to indicate that the Lafayette formation underlies the swamp, or at least that part of it visited by us; but direct evidence on this point is still wanting. This formation was actually observed however a few miles east of the swamp, and it is reasonable to suppose that it underlies the whole area.

Lumbering operations in the swamp seem to have been suspended for the last few years (owing mostly, it is said, to the death of the principal promoters of the scheme for deforesting and draining it), and fortunately the natural conditions have been very little altered thereby. The fauna seems to have suffered considerably from the ravages of sportsmen, but the flora is practically intact, and the swamp offers a number of most interesting problems in many branches of natural science.

ROLAND M. HARPER.

FOLKSTON, CHARLTON COUNTY, GEORGIA,  
August 11, 1902.

#### SOUTHERLY DEVIATION OF FALLING BODIES.

READERS desiring a somewhat fuller historical account of experiments and theories relating to the southerly deviation of falling