

the stamp of Fabricius, or Latreille, or Hubner, and each successive "resurrectionist," as these exhumers of dry bones are irreverently called, would but glory in upsetting the platforms of his predecessors, and would prove to a nicety that they and their systems were all wrong. Now, it is a matter for admiration that, notwithstanding the imposing names attached to these generic creations, every one of them is the result of the labor of Brown, Smith or Jones, alive and industriously working, and that the ancient worthies, so honorably preferred, lived and died in happy ignorance of the progeny after ages would attribute to them.

Now, it is insisted by those who rigidly adhere to the application of the priority theory to generic names that the original name given to a genus must never be lost, no matter what changes are made with the genus, although to retain such name may be to attribute to its original author exactly what he did not mean, and perhaps never would have sanctioned.

Rule 4th says:—"A generic name, when once established, should never be cancelled in any subsequent subdivision of the group, but retained, in a restricted sense, for one of the constituent portions." And Rule 5th:—"The generic name should always be retained for that portion of the original genus which was considered typical by its author."

That is to say, *Papilio* of Linnæus embraced what is now divided into very many genera, and the name *Papilio* must somewhere be retained. What particular species Linnæus would have chosen for the type of the genus, had he foreseen its future disintegration, is not known, and in the absence of such knowledge, authors now would differ in selecting the typical species; and unless there is agreement on that, it is plain that nothing but discord can follow. Mr. Kirby says, following the Rules:—"In subdividing a genus, the original name should be restricted to the typical sections if this can be ascertained." I have asked of an eminent Ornithologist what would be done in such case in his science, and he replied as follows:—"It is our custom to take the *first name mentioned* by an author as the type of his genus, unless another be especially claimed; and, if this genus be subsequently subdivided, to insist that the original name must be retained for the *first species of the original list*, unless there are very grave reasons to the contrary. I notice, in the 10th edition of Linnæus, the first *Papilio* is Priamus, from Amboyna. I should, therefore, be inclined to maintain that the name *Papilio* should be retained for that first mentioned species, whatever else might befall the group. This being premised, the author engaged in overhauling a group has the right