

of North America, when he is aware that there is not a man outside of his peculiar school who agrees with him. Not satisfied with altering the genera of LEPIDOPTERA, to suit his fancy, he now issues a book wherein the greater portion of our butterflies are introduced under newly invented common names. *The Canadian Entomologist* says: "It were far better, in our opinion (with few exceptions), to use the specific name of the insect for this purpose, which is as easily learnt and conveys a more definite idea than is possible with such common names as those given by this author." W. H. Edwards, author of "The Butterflies of North America," says: "Throughout this book *Archippus* is ostentatiously called THE MONARCH, I apprehend, in right of its amazing history. If it lives as long for a butterfly as Methusaleh lived among men, it may be entitled to some sort of distinctive appellation, and if it has so changed the habits of its kind as to breed like a mammal, laying eggs at intervals in the closing half of its long life and gathering its progeny about its tibize, perhaps it ought to have some superlative title. We read that Methusaleh lived, after he begat Lamech, seven hundred and eighty-two years, and begat sons and daughters, but his long life appears to have been that venerable man's claim to distinction. We do not read that he attained regal honours, or even the chieftainship of a tribe. In view, therefore, of this high precedent, I suggest that the correct thing would have been to designate this long-lived phenomenal butterfly not THE MONARCH, but 'THE PATRIARCH.'"

Then, again, there are compilers of Entomological Catalogues, who, without giving any distinct reason for so doing, take upon themselves to alter well-established genera for seemingly no other purpose than the honour of having their names attached. So much for the piratical way in which these alterations are made, and in order to show how some of them are accomplished, we will instance one or two cases:—

Mr. S. H. Scudder, in his researches, discovered that our common butterfly, the Camberwell Beauty, everywhere known to entomologists as *Vanessa antiopa*, Linn., should not be placed under the genus VANESSA. By a resurrection of old documents he has managed in a miserable way to transfer this butterfly from the latter genus to that of PAPILIO, calling it *Papilio antiopa*, Scudder. This is one of the many innovations which this author places before the Entomologists of America. The same attempt has been made in regard to the COLEOPTERA (Beetles) of this country, and unless the subject is strictly dealt with by the Entomological Section of the Association, the nomenclature of North American insects will be such that ten generations of students will pass away before it is properly understood.

In Botany also, attempts have been made in a similar manner. Suffice to say that a botanist discovered a new species of California *Convolvulus* which he described and felt satisfied that it was placed under the correct genus. It did not belong to the climbing, but to the creeping genera. Some time ago the describer of the plant was horrified to find his species re-described under another genus with the name *Gray* appended to it. Now, we do not wish to see any more of this mode of obtaining material, but possibly Mr. Gray, who is a celebrated botanist, may account for his name being there. Mistakes of this nature will sometimes occur, and one of them was made by the Rev. Mr. Provancher, of Cap-Rouge, Q., who attached, in his work on Canadian Coleoptera, the name of Fabricius to a species discovered and described by the writer of this article. We claim that when any one describes a new animal, mineral or plant, that the species (if properly and morally named) is legitimately his to the end of time, and he who takes the name from him to place his own to it robs another man of his intelligence and labour, discouraging and deterring him from going on with his work of doing good to mankind.