

injustice to the reader to give this account in any other language than that of the original. We do this without reluctance, as our object is to convey the most accurate knowledge, rather than produce a work exclusively of our own composition. All that follows in relation to the whale is selected from the different works of the accurate and philosophical Scoresby." If the critic's edition of Godman has played false with him, as our edition of Scoresby has with us, perhaps he may think it wise to 'cry quits,' and join with us in throwing out of the case the two slippery points.

It may be proper to add here, that we are familiar with Scoresby's second figure of mysticetus, which is so far improved as to have the 'small' shortened; but unfortunately the first figure, with all its imperfections, is the one that has been brought down to us through every book on natural history.

The reference to Bachstrom's figure of nordcaper is obscure.

It matters not what that figure is: it was regarded as one of nordcaper by Cuvier; and he, in comparison with the old figures of mysticetus, which we claim were nearer true than Scoresby's in general proportion, wisely admitted two species.

They were both, as we have said, about equally incorrect; yet they both had certain features that agreed with the descriptions of the two forms. The nordcaper had been described in nearly the same terms by various authors, great stress being laid on its slenderness and mobility. Scoresby now presents his figure, which, instead of being bulky, with a very short 'small,' or caudal region, and a head one-third the total, had quite nearly the proportions of the figure of Bachstrom, received by Cuvier as that of nordcaper, and with no other specific feature to distinguish them.

The mention of inaccuracies, seen near the close of the criticism, is not wholly free from error; for example: the citation touching Col. Hamilton and the Naturalists' library is exactly correct, yet it is noticed as one of the errors that render the historical *résumé* 'seriously defective and misleading.' We are now willing to rest this showing, trusting to the facts herein referred to for our vindication in the face of this grave charge.

J. B. HOLDER.

Fortunately for Dr. Holder, he did not state directly and unequivocally that the St. Lawrence whale was a Balaena; but he occupies several pages in trying to explain away the obvious discrepancies in the way of such an identification and in offsetting them with the *possibilities* in its favor, leaving the reader with the conviction that the specimen is cited as, in Dr. Holder's opinion, an instance of the occurrence of a Balaena in the St. Lawrence near Quebec. Indeed, he goes so far as to say, "and the second example [the one here in question] . . . shows that the largest of the right whales [Balaena] have really found their way as far up a fresh-water stream as Quebec and Montreal" (p. 116). Again he says, "This example is valuable for record, 1°, as a specimen of unusual size; 2°, as one of great age; 3°, as one out of its usual habitat in so far as to be quite within fresh water" (p. 115). From the context, the point in doubt seems to be, not whether the species is a Balaena, but whether it is *B. cisarctica* or *B. mysticetus*; and the whole tenor of the argument (for such it really is) is fairly open to only this construction, whatever may have been intended. In evidence that my criticism on this point is not groundless, or due to perversity on my part, I may cite Mr. F. W. True's

notice (*Scient. lit. gossip*, i. 72) of Dr. Holder's memoir, where the same criticism is made.

As to other points, I will take space to say merely that I regret to notice that Dr. Holder forgets to tell us where Scoresby got his drawings, which, he (Dr. Holder) informs us, 'were evidently ill-considered and taken at second hand,' and to ask for proof that Col. Hamilton wrote the 'Cetacea' of Jardine's 'Naturalists' library.' The copies of the work I have seen are anonymous, but the work is accredited by Gray and other cetologists to Jardine; and some time since, I took pains to satisfy myself that Jardine was the author. As to Godman, I confess to having done him injustice in overlooking his credit to Scoresby, which my friend Dr. Holder appears to have unfortunately only recently discovered; otherwise, doubtless my stricture on this point would not have been called out.

J. A. ALLEN.

### The Ainos of Japan.

On p. 307 of SCIENCE, D. P. Penhallow objects to my statement of the number of Ainos. It is rather surprising how little he heeds what I said. The numbers he gives are official; i.e., he gives the number of Ainos known to the Japanese government. Therefore he reaches the surprising result, that, with the exception of the Ainos brought over from Saghalien (now about 800), there are but 200 in all the province of Ischicari. That province is about as large as Hitaka (according to Penhallow, with 5,000 to 6,000).

Penhallow gives the Aino population in Kitami, Kushiro, Tokachi, and Teshiwo as ranging from 350 to 1,500 in each, when it is well known that they are full of Ainos, as any one travelling there will see, their villages being thickly scattered along the coast and the banks of all the larger rivers. I should estimate from those seen at such points that there must be more than 50,000 Ainos in all. Taking Penhallow's figures for Iburi and Hitaka as correct, and assuming that the four provinces named above must have as many Ainos as Hitaka, we should have about 28,000 in these five. Granting that Ischicari, Shiribeshi, and Nemuro have also been taken as much too thickly populated, still we must give them 4,000 more than Penhallow allows; i.e., about 6,000.

Now add to them Penhallow's number for Iburi, nearly 4,000, and the small remnant of Oshima, (Penhallow, 250), and lastly for Chishima (not Chisuma) or the Kuriles a minimum of 750, we get 33,000 as the minimum for Yezo. Saghalien having 10,000 to 12,000, and South Kamchatka 5,000 to 6,000 (perhaps less), there cannot be fewer than 50,000 Ainos altogether.

D. BRAUNS.

### The Iroquois.

A close study of the Mohawks of Quebec province, Canada, after the plan and in the service of the Bureau of ethnology, reveals several facts hitherto unnoticed in the various histories of the Iroquois.

Isolated by the early Jesuit fathers from their former Pagan friends and surroundings, every trace of their old folk-lore and of their Pagan customs has disappeared. The division and nomenclature of their gentes differ materially from those of any of the other tribes, and present an interesting field of inquiry. The Mohawk gentes, as given by Morgan, are the wolf, bear, and turtle. Among the Mohawks at Oka, we find, in addition to those, the lark and the eel, while at Caughnawaga they are the bear, wolf, calumet, rock, lark, turtle, and dove.

Among the wampum belts of this tribe is a very fine one, upon which the calumet is figured in white