

northwest than they do in the vicinity of Dahlonega.

Thus the purely physiographic evidence shows that there was a former connection between the upper Tennessee River and the Coosa system by which the molluscan fauna could easily pass from one to the other. It also shows conclusively that a part of the Etowah River has been transferred bodily to the Chattahoochee system. Such a wholesale shifting of divides would result in the transference of such of the Coosa-Tennessee forms as then existed in the headwaters of the Etowah River.

This infusion of new forms spread throughout the Chattahoochee system, even to its headwaters, but the foreign types presumably constituted only a small proportion of the existing fauna. When the Savannah River cut through the divide and captured the upper part of the basin of the Chattahoochee, it carried with it a limited number of forms belonging to the Coosa-Tennessee type. Thus in each successive transfer the percentage of the original forms has grown less and less, until in the Savannah River, as reported by Mr. Simpson, they are scarcely recognizable.

Beyond Savannah, toward the northeast, none of the peculiar Tennessee forms have been found, nor is there any indication in the surface configuration of there having been any drainage changes of consequence in this region.

In most respects the biological evidence simply corroborates the conclusions based upon a study of the surface features, but in the question of age relations it throws some new light upon the problem. The migration of Coosa-Tennessee fauna from west to east shows conclusively that the changes in drainage must have followed a similar order, hence the diversion at Dahlonega must have preceded that which occurred near Tallulah Falls. This important fact presumably could never have been deter-

mined from the physiographic evidence alone.

Throughout the whole region there is a surprisingly close agreement between the biologic and the physiographic evidence which clearly indicates that biology should stand in the same relation to physiography that paleontology does to paleo-physiography.

The following brief statement of the evidence on which Mr. Simpson bases his conclusions was prepared at our suggestion for publication in advance of the more detailed report which the author has in preparation.

C. W. HAYES,

M. R. CAMPBELL.

U. S. GEOLOGICAL SURVEY.

ON THE EVIDENCE OF THE UNIONIDÆ REGARDING THE FORMER COURSES OF THE TENNESSEE AND OTHER SOUTHERN RIVERS.

SEVERAL years ago while studying the life history and distribution of the Unionidæ, or Pearly Fresh Water mussels I was struck by the close relationship existing between that part of the mollusk fauna of the Tennessee River drainage system and that of the Alabama.

Within the Mississippi drainage basin there is found the richest and most wonderful, as well as the most highly developed Unione fauna of any part of the world. Perhaps not less than 400 species, at a most conservative estimate, are found in this area. The Unione fauna of the Tennessee drainage system (including that of the Cumberland) contains a very large proportion of the species found throughout the Mississippi area, and in addition to these a great many peculiar species found nowhere else in the Mississippi system. The genus *Pleurobema*, as I have defined it, a large group of forms having rather heavy, triangular shells, generally tawny colored, with broken, green rays, has its metropolis in the Tennessee

area. Only three species of the genus occur in the Ohio River. Two of these Ohio River species extend west into and across the Mississippi, but I know of no form belonging to the genus that is found in any part of the lower 300 miles of that stream, in the Pearl or the Pascagoula rivers, or any of the small rivers in Mississippi or Louisiana flowing into the Gulf. No member of the genus is found in any of the streams flowing into the Atlantic (with possibly a single exception).

Yet the entire Alabama River system is filled with *Pleurobemas*. There are many of them in the Tombigbee and Black Warrior, still more in the Alabama itself, and the Coosa swarms with them. But not a species of *Pleurobema* found in the Alabama River area is identical with any found in the Tennessee system. Those of the latter drainage area are, for the most part, very closely related to each other, and belong to a single great group typified by the well known *Unio clavus* of Lamarck. There are several closely related groups of *Pleurobema* found in the Alabama system, and all these are nearly related to the *clavus* group, yet no member of the latter group is found in the southern drainage, and no member of any of the southern drainage groups is found in the northern drainage.

There are a number of Uniones which have a somewhat general distribution in the Mississippi area including the Tennessee system, that are found in the Alabama River drainage, such as the *Unio tuberculatus*, of Barnes, *U. ebenus* Lea, *U. multiplicatus* Lea, *U. cornutus* Barnes, *U. pustulosus* Lea, *U. rectus* Lamarck, *U. trigonus* Lea, and *U. obliquus* Lamarck. There are others which are only found in the Tennessee and Alabama systems such as *U. cumberlandicus* Lea, *U. conradicus* Lea, and *U. varicosus* Lea; the latter, however, extends into the Ohio River.

Yet all these which occur in the Ala-

bama and its branches have some slight characters by which they differ from the same species when found in the Tennessee; not enough to separate them specifically or perhaps varietally from each other, yet an expert will generally be able to tell at a glance from which system a given specimen has been obtained. *Unio gibbosus* of Barnes, an abundant, widely distributed and variable Mississippi drainage species, is found in the Alabama system, but it is shorter, smaller and more humped than the type, and Dr. Lea believing it to be a valid species called it *Unio subgibbosus*. I believe that it is only a variety or geographical race of *U. gibbosus*. *Unio poulsoni* Conrad found in the Alabama River is, I am sure, only a variety of the *U. alatus* Say, a species widely distributed in the central part of the United States.

A few species of *Pleurobema*, and certain species of other genera of Unionidæ closely related to forms found in the Mississippi valley, and evidently derived from the fauna of that region are found in the Chattahoochee, the Flint River, and some of the streams of Southeastern Alabama.

In the streams draining into the Atlantic from Labrador to Georgia there is found everywhere a group of Unios typified by *Unio complanatus* Dillwyn. There are a great many forms belonging to this group which have received specific names at the hands of authors, many of which are, apparently, only mere variations of a few leading forms and not worthy of even varietal names. Quite a large number of forms belonging to this group also occur in the Chattahoochee River system, some of which appear to differ a little from the Atlantic drainage species while others do not seem to be specifically different. Many of the forms of this group in both the areas mentioned seem to be merely incipient species and the synonymy is in a hopeless tangle. *Unio columbensis* Lea, a member of the *Tetra-*

lasmus group of *Unios*, found abundantly in the Chattahoochee River, can hardly be separated from forms of *Unio obesus* Lea, found in the streams of the Atlantic drainage from North Carolina to Florida. Two or three members of the *Buckleyi* group of *Unios* seem to inhabit both the Chattahoochee River and its branches, and the Savannah River and nearby streams of the Atlantic drainage. One member of this group, *Unio tortivus* Lea, is common to certain streams flowing into the Atlantic, a considerable part of Florida, the Chattahoochee River system and the Black Warrior River, in Alabama.

These remarkable facts of *Unione* distribution led me long ago to believe that at a former period, during the lifetime of some of the present species of *Unionidæ*, sometime in the middle or later Tertiary, perhaps, the Tennessee River must have flowed southward into some one of the streams of the Alabama drainage, and through this discharged its waters into the Gulf of Mexico. It seemed most likely that this connection was by way of the Coosa on account of its nearness to Tennessee, and because the genus *Pleurobema* is more abundantly represented in that river than in the Cahawba or Black Warrior. It seemed likely, too, that during this or some nearby time there had been for a limited period connection between the waters of the Tennessee and the Chattahoochee system, either directly across to the upper part of the latter, or in some way by the Alabama system. I could account for the distribution of these forms of life in no other way, because they cannot travel overland from river to river, but must have water communication in order to pass from one stream to another.

I concluded that the connection of the Tennessee with the Alabama drainage had been severed permanently, certainly as far back as the later Tertiary. That the *Pleurobemas* being somewhat susceptible to the

influence of environment had changed until new though closely allied groups had been developed in the Alabama region since the Tennessee began to flow into the Ohio; that other species of southern drainage had developed from closely allied ancestors of northern origin. Others less susceptible to environmental influence had only changed to new varieties in their new location, while still others in which the characters were firmly fixed only changed slightly in appearance.

Although it is possible that forms of the *Complanatus* and other groups of *Unios* might have migrated from the Atlantic along the low shores, of a former strait in upper Florida connecting that ocean with the Gulf of Mexico, and from thence up the Chattahoochee River system, yet it would seem more likely that these had passed from the Savannah to the Chattahoochee River by water connection at or near the head of these two streams which have their sources very near together.

In this brief sketch I have not gone exhaustively into the evidence presented by the *Unionidæ*. There are many other species found in the Alabama River system which are evidently identical or nearly related to Tennessee River forms, but which have no very close relationships with the species of any other region and which are, most likely, descendants of Tennessee forms. In fact it is probable that nearly all the *Unionidæ* of the Alabama River system have been derived from the Tennessee.

This subject will be discussed to some extent in my forthcoming synopsis of the *Naiades*.

These conclusions almost exactly coincide with those arrived at by Messrs. Hayes and Campbell, who have made a very careful and exhaustive study of the geomorphology of the Southern Appalachians. And it is indeed interesting that the geologist and biologist, though working along entirely

different lines, should have met on common ground.

CHAS. T. SIMPSON.

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION.

EDUCATION AT THE PARIS EXPOSITION.

THE general official catalogue of the Universal International Exposition of 1900 enumerates 121 classes distributed through 18 groups, of which group 1 is education and instruction comprising 6 classes, viz :

1. Education of infants, primary instruction, instruction of adults.
2. Secondary instruction.
3. Higher instruction, scientific institutions.
4. Special instruction, artistic.
5. Special instruction, agriculture.
6. Special instruction, industrial and commercial.

Thirty political divisions are represented in the exposition of class 3 and about 900 exhibits are found in the revised list. France and colonies including Algeria and Indo-China have about 500 exhibits, United States 70, Hungary 65, Mexico 42, Russia 36, Italy 21, Great Britain 20, Portugal 20, Croatia and Slavonia 17, Japan 13, Belgium 11, Roumania 10, Greece, Guatemala and Norway 4 each, Austria, Bulgaria, Sweden and Switzerland 3 each, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Equador, Holland and Servia 2 each, and one each from China, Cuba, Spain, Monaco, Republic South Africa.

The jury passing on the awards to be assigned the exhibits is threefold ; first a jury of class comprising a certain number of French jurors designated by the commission and at most an equal number of foreign jurors. The class jury's organization consists of a president, vice-president (of other nation than the president), a reporter and a secretary. The president, vice-president and reporter of the class juries comprise the members of the group jury whose organization is completed by the election of a president, vice-president and secretary. Thus the jury of the first group will be composed of 18 members, 3 from each of the 6 classes.

The presidents and vice-presidents of the 18 groups will be members of the superior jury with others provided by the commissioners.

The superior jury revises the work of the group jury and determines any appeals presented to it by the lower juries. The group jury revises the work of the class jury and refers disputed questions not settled by the group to the superior jury. The class jury inspects the exhibits and assigns recompenses of five degrees, viz :

1. Grand Prix, the highest.
2. Diplomes, etc., Medaille d'or.
3. " " d'argent.
4. " " d'bronze.
5. " " mention honorable.

On the completion of the work of inspection the class jury presents two lists : (1) a list of exhibits not competing by reason of the exhibitor being a member of a jury, or from other cause ; (2) a list of the awards in alphabetic order, each diploma grouped by itself irrespective of country ; *e. g.*, all the grand prizes, the gold medals, etc.

The jury of class 3, higher instruction and scientific institutions, completed its work on time, *i. e.*, on or before June 30, 1900. To the 900 exhibits it assigned 64 grand prizes, 92 gold and 105 silver. The bronze and honorable mentions were naturally more numerous and all may be changed slightly by revision. 27 grand prizes were given to French exhibits, 9 to United States, 5 to Great Britain, 3 each to Hungary, Japan and Russia, 2 each to Belgium, Mexico, Roumania, Italy, and 1 each to Austria, Canada, Croatia, Portugal, Norway and Sweden ; total 64.

France received 44 gold prizes, United States 9, Russia 8, Hungary 6, Great Britain 5, Mexico 3, seven others 2, and three others 1 ; total 92.

As the awards to the United States were in several instances collective, *i. e.*, one