large bas-relief in plaster of Linnaeus, by Jacob Eriksson, of Stockholm. The figure is life size, and shows the father of botany leaning against a tree admiring a wild flower in his buttonhole. The pose is admirable, and the expression just what a person familiar with the character of the great naturalist will regard as best portraying his nature. In the arch above is crouching Flora with an armful of flowers. The piece is valued at $1,500. It has been secured by a Swedish gentleman of Chicago and will be presented to the Chicago Art Institute at the close of the Exposition. The sculptor is now in Paris executing the same piece in marble to be placed in the Museum of Stockholm.—J. C. A.

EDITORIAL.

All botanists who wish to promote the interests of this vast science in America (and who does not) must feel gratified at the outcome of the gatherings of botanists in the latter part of August at Madison. For almost two weeks daily meetings were being held with which botanists were more or less closely identified. Numerous papers of scientific importance were presented at these gatherings. Section G, the new section of botany colonized from section F, was one of the busiest of the sections. Thirty-four papers were presented before it, and only thirty-five before the long established and popular section of anthropology.

But our gratulation is based not so much on the number and character of these papers as upon the amount of work undertaken not for selfish ends but for the purpose of advancing the interests of botanical research and instruction, and especially upon the unanimity with which all these schemes were undertaken. This spirit of cordial cooperation is one of the most promising evidences of the good-fellowship which seems to characterize botanists more than some other scientific groups we could name. The manifestation of it at these Madison meetings has been even more marked than at Rochester last year when we commented upon it. It is to be hoped that the feeling here is only the precursor of a similar sentiment of international scope.

The sustained interest in these annual gatherings is also noticeable. Although the attendance upon the American Association as a whole fell far below expectations, the registration scarcely reaching 300, the number of botanists present was almost if not quite as great as at Rochester. It is safe to say that the number of botanists in Madison did not fall much short of one hundred.
Two matters of special importance with reference to the teaching of botany were taken in hand by section G. At the request of the committee on program, Professor MacMillan had prepared a paper on the present condition of the teaching of botany in colleges and universities. The facts presented, though only a summary of the information collected, proved to be of such interest that Professor MacMillan was invited to continue his work in this direction; and the Council approved the resolution sent to it by section G, asking that the Commissioner of Education print the report as a Circular of Information. The section also asked the Council to appoint a standing committee on instruction in botany in secondary schools, which was done. We hope this committee will be active.

The body of taxonomic nomenclature was not obtrusive enough to trouble the gentlest histologist. The Botanical Club increased its committee on nomenclature by adding to it Messrs. Trelease and Greene, and referred the minor questions to the committee with power. The Check List which the committee has prepared was ordered printed and enough copies were subscribed for to insure the early accomplishment of this work. The Club also endorsed by a large majority the plan for the formation of a restricted botanical society, to membership in which amateurs and the younger men might look forward as a distinct honor. For it is to be only after a man has won his spurs by worthy work that he can become a member.

In spite of the fact that the attendance of foreign botanists at the Congress was almost nil this gathering must be counted a distinct success. It has at least taken the initiative in much important work relating to usage, and if the committees follow up the work as some of them will undoubtedly do, we may look for some good results. But even if none of them does what it was appointed to do, the discussions which occurred upon the reports of the various committees on program cannot fail to be of much help to those who participated in them or heard them. It is to be noted that these discussions were peculiar in that they were based upon the working knowledge of the members of the congress, and not upon the research of one who had investigated the subject thoroughly. All therefore stood practically upon the same plane. Whatever disadvantages that method may have had, it had the distinct advantage of opening the mental eyes to one's limitations, and of seeing what the working knowledge of some of the most active American botanists amounted to. The showing was creditable. We should have had no occasion to be ashamed had Germany and England and France been well represented. Moreover the wide range of topics discussed must have had the effect of increasing one's appreciation of the scope and complexity of the science of which we delight to declare ourselves disciples, though each can know only a small part of it.
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