

long known as *T. aquilegifolium*. By some one's blunder, the fruit of the well known Old World plant was placed before the botanist for diagnosis instead of that of the new Canadian species. Presumably the two were growing side by side in that Paris garden, and, by the time the plants were in fruit, the one became mistaken for the other; but the result was that we can make no use of the rather full description of Cornut in our attempt to identify that particular Canadian *Thalictrum*.

As regards the plant itself, its fertility on Old World soil, its free dissemination to other gardens near to and far from Paris, and its universal recognition as an American and even a Canadian species, there is copious evidence. We trace it easily in the published records of various European gardens and in other prints, all the way from Cornu. in 1635 to Moench in 1794, a period of 160 years. It is mentioned usually as *T. Canadense*, Cornu., in the works of Hermann, Tournefort and others on the continent, and in those of Parkinson, of Ray, of Morison and of Philip Miller in England. Meanwhile Linnæus had arbitrarily altered the name to *T. Cornuti*. It was in no respect more appropriate than the original, and in Linnæus's time already long established *T. Canadense*. A mere caprice often seems to have ruled the mind of that nomenclator, so that changes in nomenclature were made as if in sheer defiance of the principle of priority. But Philip Miller very soon restored the original name put forth by Cornut. Nevertheless so abject was the Linnæolatry of the after years that, until almost the end of the nineteenth century the name *T. Cornuti* was the one that stood in almost all the books, whether of American or of universal botany. Moench, indeed, in the year 1794, displaced both names, averse as he was to using either personal or geographic specific names. He called the plant from Canada *T. confertum*; and so a third appellation had been assigned, yet all the while no such description of the species had ever been published as would enable the most expert descriptive botanist to identify the plant. *T. Canadense*, *T. Cornuti* and *T. confertum* were all three little or no better than *nomina nuda*, names only, and therefore without any title whatsoever to adoption in any kind of systematic botany.

In respect only to the *T. Canadense* of Philip Miller will this comment of mine be likely to be called in question. Miller devotes quite a paragraph of his Dictionary to an informal account of the plant. It is the fifth of his meadow-rues, and he says of it:

"The fifth sort grows naturally in North America. This has a fibrous root of a dark colour. The stalks are smooth, of a purple colour, and rise three or four feet high, branching toward the top. The leaves are like those of the Columbine, of a