

with sole reference to the author in question and his sources of knowledge, and that the operations of subsequent writers are not to be considered. In choosing types for Linnæan genera, we must settle the matter with Linnæus himself, considering only his purpose, the knowledge he possessed and the sources whence he drew his information.

We have rarely any difficulty in indicating the species Linnæus would have chosen had he adopted the idea of type. To a certain extent he did recognize this idea, and he tells us that in each genus his type 'is the best known European or officinal species.' When he took his genera from Tournefort or Artdi, he presumably took the idea of type also, and to find this we may well look back to these earlier and greater naturalists.

In Linnæus's arrangement, the type was usually placed in the middle of the genus, for he was developing a system of catalogue and record. But nearly all subsequent authors have, under each genus, spoken first of the species they knew best, that which we should call the 'type.' Cuvier and his followers place as the 'chef de file' the type species or best-known form, describing it fully, letting the other species follow with shorter or comparative descriptions. Various authors have chosen Linnæan specific names for their genera, the species thus honored being clearly recognizable as the 'type.'

We may adopt as fair some such rule as this: The species first named under the description of a genus shall be regarded as its type unless, as with Linnæus, the context shows that some other species was or would have been chosen by the author, or unless the name of the genus is drawn from a Linnæan or other early specific name.

To take the first species in all cases, not even excepting the case of Linnæus, would have distinct advantages over the present lack of system or over the confusion arising from the method of elimination or from any other device which throws the responsibility on subsequent usage.

DAVID STARR JORDAN.

RIDGWAY'S CLASSIFICATION OF THE FALCONIFORMES.

NOTHING could be more gratifying to the advanced ornithologist than the vindication of Mr. Robert Ridgway's excellent classification of the diurnal birds of prey through the recent independent researches of foreign investigators.

However, when Mr. Ridgway seems to think that his arrangement, published 1873-76, 'so radically different from any other, found little favor among ornithologists and has generally become forgotten' (see SCIENCE, N. S., XVII., March 27, 1903, p. 510), he has evidently overlooked the fact that its essential points have been adopted by practically *all* his American colleagues.

The American Ornithologists' Union committee on classification and nomenclature in the spring of 1885, when preparing the now celebrated A. O. U. check-list of North American birds, had to decide what classification to follow. The present writer had then recently promulgated a new system of the entire class of birds, and several of the members were in favor of its adoption without modification. The majority, however, believed this to be a too radical departure from the then accepted standards to be palatable to the large number of amateur ornithologists forming the bulk of the A. O. U. membership. On the other hand, it was admitted that the Sundevall-Lilljeborg system then in vogue had become too antiquated to serve without serious changes. The writer, who was present by invitation as a consulting member without vote, was then requested to frame a compromise scheme which would eliminate some of the worst features of the old system without deviating too violently from it. The result was the classification still adhered to in the A. O. U. check-list.

The arrangement of the birds of prey in that list is briefly as follows:

- Order RAPTORES. Birds of Prey.
- Suborder SARCORAMPHI. American Vultures.
- Family CATHARTIDÆ. American Vultures.
- Suborder FALCONES. [Old World] Vultures, Falcons, Hawks, Buzzards, Eagles, Kites, Harriers, etc.

Family FALCONIDÆ. Vultures, Falcons, Hawks, Eagles, etc.

Subfamily Accipitrinæ. Kites, Buzzards, Hawks, Goshawks, Eagles, etc.

Subfamily Falconinæ. Falcons [including the Caracaras].

Subfamily Pandioninæ. Ospreys.

It will be seen that this scheme of 1885 is essentially that of Ridgway (1873-76), the only difference being that *Pandion* was given a somewhat more independent position, easily explained by the fact that the whole, as shown above, was to some extent a measure of compromise. The Accipitrinæ are otherwise identical with Ridgway's Buteoninæ containing, as they do, the Old World vultures, the eagles, kites, buzzards, etc.

I must, therefore, claim for the American ornithologists the honor of having appreciated and followed Ridgway's classification of the Falconiformes for eighteen years.

The Old World ornithologists, as a whole, it is true, have been lagging behind. Yet, there are noteworthy exceptions. Thus, I would call attention to a very important paper by Mr. P. Suschkin in the *Zoologischer Anzeiger* for 1899 ('Beitraege zur Classification der Tagraubvoegel mit Zugrundelegung der osteologischen Merkmale,' *Zool. Anz.*, 1899, pp. 500-518), in which he, three years before Pycraft's work, commends and adopts all the essential features of Ridgway's scheme which his own investigations on forty-four genera corroborate, elaborate and partly correct.

LEONHARD STEJNEGER.

U. S. NATIONAL MUSEUM,
March 28, 1903.

HOTEL HEADQUARTERS OF THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION.

TO THE EDITOR OF SCIENCE: While traveling homeward after the recent meeting of the scientific association I spent some time, which would otherwise have been hanging heavily on my hands, in studying out a few of the relations indicated by the registered list of attendance. This list included 972 names, a number somewhat less than the total registration, but the difference is not great enough to have any important effect on results.

The question for solution was this: "What is the meaning of 'hotel headquarters'?"

It has been the custom for a dozen years past to designate some hotel as headquarters. This hotel has been conveniently near to the places of meeting of the sections, and in it the council of the association held their meetings. A majority of the council usually secured their rooms at headquarters, and it was generally understood that the social advantage implied in taking up one's temporary abode with a majority of the most prominent members present was more than an offset for the expense of accommodation at a fashionable hotel. This item of expense is one that is unfortunately more important to most followers of pure science than to the captains of industry who reap the benefits of applied science and 'legislative favors.' The hotels have, until recently, been disposed to make such reduction in rates as to constitute an inducement to make hotel headquarters the real headquarters of the association.

To the rule just named there have been a few conspicuous exceptions, as at the Buffalo meeting in 1896 and the Pittsburgh meeting in 1902. Every hotel proprietor has a perfect right to offer or refuse reduction of rates; but it is at least desirable that such hotel be chosen as to make it reasonably probable that a large percentage of members will find it advantageous to select the same gathering-place.

Of the 972 persons whose names were included in the Washington list under examination 352 were residents of Washington, and hence a trifle over 36 per cent. of those registered are naturally excluded from the body of temporary residents at hotels. The attendance at the largest five hotels is given in the following table, where the 'hotel headquarters' leads the list.

Arlington	55, or	5.7	per cent.
Ebbitt	134, "	13.8	" "
New Willard	27, "	2.8	" "
Raleigh	24, "	2.5	" "
Oxford	21, "	2.2	" "
	261	27.0	