

GROSSULARIA MARCESCENS.

In the year 1874 a Japanese gooseberry was described by Maximowicz in Bulletin de l'Academie Imperiale des Sciences de St. Petersburg, volume 19, page 250, under the name *Ribes grossularioides*. However, Steudel in 1821 had published the same name, *Ribes grossularioides*, in his Nomenclator Botanicus, page 691, for an American species, attributing the name to Michaux, who evidently had used it as a manuscript or herbarium name but had never himself published it. This older publication of the specific name *grossularioides*, in 1821, invalidates the later use of the name *grossularioides* for any other species and it becomes necessary, therefore, to give the Japanese species a new name. In allusion to the persistence of the dried corolla on the mature fruit, the name *Grossularia marcescens* is here proposed as a substitute for the invalid name *Ribes grossularioides* of Maximowicz. The gooseberries are regarded as constituting by themselves a genus, *Grossularia*, distinct from *Ribes*, which comprises the currants.

—Frederick V. Coville.

PHACOCÆRUS AS THE GENERIC NAME OF THE WARTHOGS.

When the validity of a name which has been in universal use for a long period is assailed, it is above all things important that the arguments against its status should be definite and absolute, and not be open to personal divergences of opinion.

Now I hold that the case against *Phacochærus*, as published by Doctor Lyon in the General Notes for June* is not strong enough to warrant our giving up so well known a name. In the first place the fact that it was printed *Phaco chærus* by Cuvier no doubt influenced Doctor Lyon, but an examination of the other similar footnotes in the Règne Animal shows that such notes were printed indiscriminately joined up, hyphenated or separate (*Dasyprocta*, *Arcto-mys*, *Hydro chærus*) so that no stress can be laid on the printing of an individual name. Then we have not to deal with what Cuvier meant to do, but what he did do, and he certainly published the Latin name *Phaco chærus* in connection with the warthogs. Merely to give the explanation of the French Phaco-chæres he should have given the Greek words—as indeed he did in other cases, e. g. “ὄψιπρυμνός.” Finally Doctor Lyon quotes Fischer as the “first reviser,” and if we take him as such, we may say that in referring to “*Phacochærus* F. Cuv. apud. G. Cuv.” as a validly formed name, even though synonymous with that given by him (for which he unjustifiably claimed three years priority) he accepted its standing as such, an acceptance there is not sufficient reason for us to refuse. I am not denying the probable correctness of Dr. Lyon’s interpretation of Cuvier’s meaning, but I claim that technically there is not sufficient reason to make of *Phacochærus* another candidate for a place in the Fiat list.

—Oldfield Thomas.

* Proc. Biol. Soc. Wash., vol. 28, p. 141.