

DISTINCT PHYLA OF RHINOCEROSSES.

IN 1900 Osborn attempted to demonstrate that the rhinoceroses, so far from being included in a single genus, should be separated into at least six lines of descent, which have been distinct for so long a period that they are almost entitled to subfamily value, extending back to the Lower Miocene and even probably into the Oligocene. Oldfield Thomas and R. Lydekker, of the British Museum, have recently accepted this conclusion in the main, and the former* proposes to divide the living types into three genera, namely, *Rhinoceros*, the Indian forms (*R. unicornis*, *R. sondaicus*), *Dicerorhinus* Gloger, the two-horned Sumatran types (Thomas points out that this name has the priority over *Ceratorhinus* Gray), and *Diceros* Gray for the African two-horned species (this name taking precedence over *Atelodus* Pomel). It is pointed out that Osborn was in error in describing the smaller African rhinoceros (*D. bicornis*) as dolichocephalic since its head is much shorter than that of *D. simus*, the white rhinoceros. Professor A. Nehring, of Berlin, also dwells in a recent paper upon the extraordinary dolichocephaly of the white rhinoceros, showing that the skull surpasses in length even the longest recorded skull of the woolly rhinoceros (*D. tichorhinus*).

H. F. O.

THE BOTANICAL SECTION OF THE CONCILIIUM BIBLIOGRAPHICUM IN ZÜRICH.

FOR some years past the increasing success of the Concilium Bibliographicum in the zoological part of its work induced a number of botanists to urge this institute to undertake a botanical bibliography on similar lines to those followed in zoology. Such a course was also recommended by the chief of the Swiss 'Department of Interior' in awarding the government subsidy to the work. Such wishes have always found a sympathetic echo with the committee in charge of the Concilium, as well as with the founder of the Institution. It seemed, however, unwise to extend the enter-

* 'Notes on the Type Specimen of *Rhinoceros lasiotis* Scalter; with Remarks on the Generic Position of the Living Species of Rhinoceros.' *Proc. Zool. Soc.*, June 4, 1901, pp. 154-158.

prise to other branches, until the finances had become quite satisfactory. For this reason, no public statement of our intention in this regard has been made, save such general allusions as are to be found, for example, in the presidential address to the Botanical Section of the American Association meeting in 1900.

Recently, however, the committee of the new 'Association Internationale des Botanistes' has offered us means for organizing such a section of the Concilium without involving the latter in financial liabilities greater than it could with safety assume. The negotiations which were begun by telegraph late in January have been carried on with great rapidity, and we are now able to announce the organization of a botanical section comprising two energetic Zürich botanists, Dr. Stephan Bruneis and Mr. Emil Schoch-Etzensperger. For the year 1902 it is of course out of the question to issue a card catalogue. The year will be spent in preparation, so that the difficulties encountered in the first two years of the zoological card bibliography may be entirely avoided. Also no attempt will yet be made to record new species and genera, as is done in zoology. For the present merely the well-known bibliography of the *Centralblatt* will be continued, with certain minor improvements. The main object of this announcement is to make a direct personal appeal to all those who publish botanical papers, urging them to send copies to the *Concilium Bibliographicum, Zürich-Neumünster, Switzerland*. It is particularly important that this appeal should be brought home to editors and publishers of periodicals containing botanical notices; for the journals are far easier to excerpt than authors' reprints. Journals already reaching a Zürich library need not be sent; but we hope that all botanists will assure themselves of this fact before assuming that their collaboration in the matter of securing a given publication is unnecessary. The response that zoologists in America have given to our former appeals justifies the hope that their botanical brethren will show similar public spirit.

HERBERT HAVILAND FIELD.

ZÜRICH.