a shorter oestrus cycle in the rats after operation, are not entirely without fallacy. As mentioned above, it often is difficult to determine the duration of any one cycle because of the large number of scales present daily in the vaginal smears; irregular cycles may also occur in apparently normal animals.

The rats considered in Table I were observed daily during a period of four months before operation and during a similar period after operation. It would seem unlikely, therefore, that these changes are incidental. Other experiments now under way confirm the results shown in Table I.

FREDERICK E. EMERY
UNIVERSITY OF BUFFALO

A NEW RECORD OF CASTOROIDES OHIOENSIS FROM ILLINOIS

A PERFECT skull of the giant beaver, *Castoroides ohioensis* Forster, has been sent to the Museum of Natural History of the University of Illinois for identification. It was found in a gravel pit on the farm of Mr. W. A. Paullin, near Bellflower, McLean County. While the details of the find are not very clear as regards stratigraphic relationships, it is evident from the perfect condition of the skull and also from the presence of clay in the brain cavity and in other parts of the skull, containing fresh-water mollusk shells, that the skull lay at the base of the gravel which was outwash from the Champaign moraine, covering the Shelbyville till sheet which underlies the Champaign till sheet in this region. That the specimen was originally buried in a lake or other body of water is clearly evidenced by the diverse character of the molluscan fauna found in the clay, which included the following species.

Sphaerium sulcatum	*Pomatiopsis scalaris*
Pisidium species	*Helisoma antrosa striata*
Valvata tricarinata	*Gyraulus altissimus*
Amnicola leightoni, var.	*Gyraulus urbanensis*
Cincinnatia cincinnatiensis	*Ferrissia paralella*
Pyrgulopsis species	

The stratigraphic horizon of the deposit in which the skull was found is Early Wisconsin, substage 1 of Leverett, or the earliest division of the Wisconsin stage of the Pleistocene. *Castoroides ohioensis* has been reported from all interglacial intervals of the Pleistocene, from Aftonian to post-Wisconsin, and is known to have lived in pre-Glacial time. Five records[1] are known from Illinois previous to the present specimen; these are: Shawneetown, Gallatin County, teeth fragments, Le Conte, 1852; Charlestown, Cowles County, skull, Leidy, 1869; Naperville, DuPage County, Bannister, 1870; Quincy, Adams County, Worthen, 1870; Alton, Madison County, Worthen, 1890. The animal was evidently wide-spread over Illinois, the records covering the length and breadth of the state.

The Bellflower specimen is being studied by Dr. A. R. Cahn, of the University of Illinois, who will make a detailed report of the specimen.

FRANK COLLINS BAKER
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

[1] Baker, "Life of the Pleistocene."

PROFESSIONAL ETHICS AND THE ARTIST

DR. STILES' article "Absent-mindedness as a Factor in Professional Ethics"[1] brings up a point which scientists may well consider. There is, however, a prologue to the same story which I believe is an even worse ethical abuse than that to which Dr. Stiles calls attention. This is the practice, frequent among scientists of standing, who employ an artist or illustrator to do their illustrations, of denying this artist the right to sign these drawings or illustrations, and in no way making any acknowledgment of the true authorship of these drawings.

The defense is often raised that the artist deserves no credit because he or she is paid to do this work. However, so are scientists usually paid for their work, by government, university or private agency, and yet they invariably claim full credit for all their work (sometimes some of it questionably theirs) by affixing their own signatures. Again it is sometimes advanced that illustrations are very incidental, only a minor feature of a paper—something akin to the services of the stenographer in typing the manuscript. That this theory is also false is clearly shown by the incidents described by Dr. Stiles where illustrations are repeatedly copied by other authors, often without the slightest change. Dr. Stiles objects that in this copying acknowledgment should be made to the original author, the supposed source of the illustration. Why then should not the original author also acknowledge the *real* source of the illustration where it is the work of an artist, and not his own?

It is usually emphasized that these drawings are "made under supervision," as though the artist were merely a machine for mechanically recording the inspiration of the scientist. It is true, of course, that such drawings are made under direction, but the amount of it is in some cases so trivial as to be negligible. Furthermore, many illustrators, after a short novitiate in a particular line, understand what is wanted with only the barest suggestions from the superior, and proceed to solve all the smaller difficulties (and sometimes the larger) by themselves, in the execution of the work. I have personally known of several cases in which the careful, intelligent study of a specimen by the artist revealed details that the

[1] SCIENCE, 71: 100–101.