

we aanwinsten voor de fauna, en van 7 soorten voor de eerste maal bijzonderheden over de levenswijze; voorts tal van voedselplanten vastgesteld en vele determineertabellen. Een degelijk en nuttig stuk werk! De uitgave, die met steun van het „Insulinde Fonds” tot stand is gekomen, is keurig verzorgd en gedrukt op uitstekend papier. Aan de onpractische opzet van de uitgaven der Akademie (i.c. titels en afkortingswijzen), een struikelblok voor iedere bibliothecaris, is echter helaas nog steeds geen eind gemaakt. — *Lieftinck*.

Prehistoric and fossil rhinoceroses of the Malay Archipelago and India, door D. A. Hooyer. Diss., Leiden, 1946, VI + 138 pp., 10 pl.

Certainly it is largely important that herewith another part of the collection Dubois has been worked. For those who (like Ref.) have arrived to the conclusion that a taxonomy or a faunistica (zoogeography), directed exclusively on the recent forms, cannot possibly be thorough, the state of insufficient description of this material was a eyesore.

Unfortunately the author does not always make it easy for us. Nearly an hour I had to seek before I discovered which material was meant in the Tables at the end of the book under the nos. 1, 2, 3 etc. (no clue is given). Nor do we find any summary of the author's conclusions or results at the end of the book. We will try to give one here, but this can be done much better by the author himself.

After an introductory part on the “terminology of the upper teeth of Rhinoceros”, on “the recent occurrence of *Rh. sondaicus* in Sumatra” and on “the distinguishing dental characters of *Dicerorhinus sumatrensis* and *Rh. sondaicus*”, the author systematically discusses the available material and finds in it as fossil species for Java: *Rh. sondaicus*, *Rh. kendengindicus* and *Aceratherium boschi*, for Sumatra: *Rh. sondaicus* and *D. sumatrensis*, for India (Punjab): *A. perimense*.

Fortunately the author is very circumstantial, so that we can well check his conclusions and, then, can differ from opinion with him. The principal point therewith is his — to our mind: undesirable — ignorance of subspecies (I believe that this word does not occur in the whole book). Of a (generally recognized) form as *D. lasiotus* he simply says that it “has no right to distinction from *D. sumatrensis*, since this would be on the ground of size alone”. Certainly he means here specific distinction. But then, in modern literature, *D. lasiotus* is already generally understood as a subspecies of *D. sumatrensis*. Likewise we are not satisfied with his complete suppressions of *Rh. sivasondaicus*, concerning which his conclusion again reads only that “the small difference from *sondaicus* certainly is not sufficient for specific distinction”. We consider this perfect ignorance of subspecific questions too large a

hiatus. The Ref. has lying ready a treatise on “the essence and denomination of subspecies and formas”. Therein he argues that, beside the generally recognized geographic subspecies, still more kinds of subspecies ought to be distinguished. For one of these he proposes the name “phyletic subspecies”, a name which may speak for itself. On p. 29 of his book the author describes a very fine instance of our phyletic subspecies, without, however, paying any attention to it. From the measurements of the fossil and recent Sumatraspecimens of *D. sumatrensis*, he concludes: “it is now evident that in Sumatra the rhinoceros has undergone a diminution in size during the Holocene period”. It would lead us too far to discuss at this place all concerned questions (such as the genetical mooring of differences in size and other characters), but we consider the case certain enough for at once naming this fossil race, and we propose for it the name *Dicerorhinus sumatrensis eugenei* subsp. n. (Type: M², coll. Dubois, no. 662a, Ngatau Lida Ajer, near Pajakombo, Sumatra).

Further we seize this opportunity to revert to the question of the type locality of *Rh. sondaicus*. Both Hooijer and myself („De Javaansche Neushoorn, *Rh. sondaicus*, historisch en biologisch”, Buitenzorg, 1941, VIII + 156 pp.) mentioned the known fact that in the original description of this species “Sumatra” was given as the locality of the type-specimen, collected by Diard & Duvaucel. Afterwards Sumatra was substituted by “Java” (without any comment). I myself (i.c. p. 61) give utterance to my doubt: whether this “correction” was really a correction, but could not decide because I no more could prove that the original statement was right. At present I believe to be able to do so. The type-specimen, described by Desmarest, was collected by Diard and Duvaucel. Dr H.C.D. de Wit, who made a historical study of these old collectors, informed me that really Diard and Duvaucel collected together in Sumatra. In Java, however, collecting was done by Diard alone: Duvaucel never visited this island. I think we are now justified to consider Sumatra as the type-locality of *Rh. sondaicus*.

Though in some respects we are not quite satisfied with the authors conclusions, we must certainly express our thanks for the extensive labour he has done and by which so many data have become available to us.

Buitenzorg, 3-VI-1946.

H.J.V. Sody.

Examen en diploma van Botanisch Analyst (Diploma F).

Op voorstel van de Centrale Commissie voor het Analytistenexamen heeft het algemeen bestuur der Nederlandsche Chemische Vereeniging, hierbij handelende in samenwerking met de Koninklijke Nederlandsche Botanische Vereeniging, besloten over te gaan tot de instelling van een examen en een diploma van Botanisch Analyst.