Here we have three authors, writing about one specimen and using three generic names for the chimpanzee. The subject is further complicated by the action of a group of European mammalogists who have petitioned the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to fix the name of the chimpanzee by fiat, not as *Pan, Simia,* or *Troglodytes,* but as *Anthropopithecus.*[5] One of these zoologists, after making his recommendation to the Commission, does not wait for action by that body, but immediately proceeds to use *Anthropopithecus* when he has occasion to mention the chimpanzee in print.[6] Four generic names are thus current for this one ape. One of these names, *Simia,* is applied by Boule to the orang-utan, and the fiat petitioners ask that it be fixed on the same animal; but by some authors, it is correctly applied to still another primate, the Barbary ape.[7] Another name, *Troglodytes,* would mean to most people familiar with generic terms in zoology, past and present, either the gorilla, or a wren.

All this confusion might be avoided if authors would observe the rules of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature and use the correct names for these anthropoids, *Pan* for the chimpanzee, *Pongo* for the orang-utan, and *Gorilla* for the gorilla. These names are now well known, and are entirely free from ambiguity.

N. HOLLISTER

ent pas familiarisés avec la nomenclature américaine, je dois dire que nos confrères des Etats-Unis ont récemment débaptisé, sans raisons bien sérieuses, les Chimpanzés et les Orangs. A leurs vieux noms latins, universellement connus et employés, de *Troglodytes* et de *Simia,* ils ont substitué les termes de *Pan* pour les Chimpanzés et de *Pongo* pour les Orangs, sous le prétexte que ce sont là les noms les plus anciennement donnés.''

[5] *Zoolog. Anzeiger,* Vol. 44, pp. 284–286, May, 1914.

[6] *Kungl. Svenska Vet. Akad. Handl.,* Vol. 58, No. 2, pp. 18–27, 1917.

[7] Thomas, *Proc. Zool. Soc. London,* 1911, p. 125; Miller, ''Mamm. Western Europe Brit. Mus.,'' p. vii, 1912; Elliot, ''Review Primates,'' Vol. 2, p. 172, 1913.

HELPING TO STABILIZE NOMENCLATURE

TO THE EDITOR OF SCIENCE: In these days when there are so many workers in the science of entomology, and when many of the workers have had but little experience in the taxonomic side of the science and, therefore, do not realize its requirements and value, it is especially important that the periodicals should have certain definite, recognized policies, which will make it necessary for all authors to so make up their communications that they will contain at least the most of the important, although seemingly minor, details which are of great assistance to contemporaneous and future workers and tends to stabilize our nomenclature. With this in mind the Entomological Society of Washington has recently adopted the following rules and suggestions governing publication in their *Proceedings:*

Rule 1.—No description of a new genus, or subgenus, will be published unless there is cited as a genotype a species which is established in accordance with current practise of zoological nomenclature.

Rule 2.—In all cases a new genus, or subgenus, must be characterized and if it is based on an undescribed species the two must be characterized separately.

Rule 3.—No description of a species, subspecies, variety or form will be published unless it is accompanied by a statement which includes the following information, where known: (1) the type-locality; (2) of what the type material consists—with statement of sex, full data on localities, dates, collectors, etc.; and (3) present location of type material.

Rule 4.—No unsigned articles, or articles signed by pseudonyms or initials will be published.

Rule 5.—The ordinal position of the group treated in any paper must be clearly given in the title or in parentheses following the title.

Suggestion 1.—All illustrations, accompanying articles, should be mentioned in the text and preferably in places where the object illustrated is discussed.

Suggestion 2.—It is desirable in describing new genera and species that their taxonomic relationship be discussed, and that distinguishing characters be pointed out.

Suggestion 3.—In discussion of type material modern terms indicating its precise nature will be found useful. Examples of these terms are: type (or holotype), allotype, paratype, cotype, lectotype, neotype, etc.

Suggestion 4.—In all cases in the serial treatment of genera or species and where first used in general articles the authority for the species, or genus, should be given; and the name of the authority should not be abbreviated.

Suggestion 5.—Where the title of any publication referred to is not written in full, standard abbreviations should be used.

Suggestion 6.—When a species discussed has been determined by some one other than the author it is important that reference be made to the worker making the identification.

It is believed that nearly all workers will realize the importance of these or similar rules and it is hoped that other periodicals will carefully consider the matter and determine on definite policies. Such a step would be of great help to all workers and would assure a firmer foundation.

Rule 4 covers a subect which is often abused. When we consider that much of the cataloguing and indexing is now done by people with but little experience and knowledge, it is especially important that all communications should be properly signed.

S. A. Rohwer,
Corresponding Secretary-Treasurer

A NEW MARINE TERTIARY HORIZON IN SOUTH AMERICA

In preparing a monograph on marine Tertiary mollusca from the Lower Amazon region for the Serviço Geologico e Mineralogico do Brazil, we have been astonished to note that we are dealing with a horizon approximately equivalent to the blue marls of the Yaqui valley, Santo Domingo; the Bowden beds of Jamaica; the Gatun formation of the Isthmus of Panama, and the Chipola beds of Florida.

Carlotta J. Maury
Department of Paleontology,
Cornell University

THE PANAMA CANAL SLIDES THAT WERE

The big slides that blocked the Panama Canal after its opening were removed sufficiently about April 15, 1916, to permit ships to again use the waterway. The dredges continued at work, however, until they had not only brought the channel to its former size but, by April 1, 1917, had also made the part where maximum sliding occurred more than 200 feet wider than it was before the temporary stoppage of traffic. After January 1, 1917, only a little dredging was done, and by February 1, 1918, it was practically discontinued.

On August 30, 1916, a large bowlder slid into the channel and, because of its menacing position, caused navigation to be suspended until it could be blasted out. Because of its great hardness the rock was not completely removed until September 7, 1916. Since this 7-day interruption to navigation in 1916 the canal has given absolutely satisfactory and uninterrupted service.

Now that even dredging in the vicinity of the former slides, except a very little for general maintenance, has been discontinued for several months, it is interesting to recall an article published in the *New York Times* during the latter part of 1915, part of which follows:

> That uninterrupted service through the Panama Canal could not be expected for several years was the statement made last night by Professor Benjamin Le Roy Miller, Ph.D., who occupies the chair of geology at Lehigh University.

The article continues, quoting the professor directly:

> Before the canal can be said to be completed and permanently opened to traffic, the amount of material that must be taken out will not fall far short of the amount already taken from the Culebra cut.
>
> Transportation companies planning to use the canal should realize that they must not expect uninterrupted service for several years. During the dry season the canal may be opened, but it is certain to be closed during the rainy season when the earth is soaked with water and its movement toward the canal facilitated.

General Goethals, then governor of the Panama Canal, in his annual report for 1916