CORRESPONDENCE.

DEAR SIR,-

In the September number of the "Entomologist" I find my name mentioned as one of a committee appointed by the entomologists at the late meeting of the American Association, at Portland, to codify rules of nomenclature for the guidance of entomologists.

I was not present when this action was taken, and immediately notified the Secretary that I declined to act upon any such committee, which, in my judgment, should only be selected by and among zoologists in general.

SAMUEL H. SCUDDER.

DEAR SIR,-

I have to respond to Mr. Andrews' remarks, by requesting you to publish one of Mr. Strecker's letters to me regarding the species of Hemaris. This will show that I could not have known anything of Mr. Andrews. Mr. Strecker, it will be seen, asks my assistance. Possibly Mr. Strecker may have expected I would determine the species as "new," or publish my observations in his very defective work. I knew nothing of the fact that Mr. Andrews expected a dedication, or that I was to do the work of determination to enable Mr. Strecker to perform that graceful office. Mr. Strecker, for his private gratification, has instigated Mr. Andrews to figure in a most absurd manner before the public, and the whole exhibition is arranged for the purpose of bringing Mr. Strecker's indifferent publication into notoriety, at the expense of Mr. Andrews' desires to figure as an Entomological, or other, authority. From the letter following it will appear that Mr. Strecker could not determine the species sent me. For. when the specimens came to hand, "No. I Diffinis" was Hemaris tenuis : "No. 2, like Diffinis," was Hemaris diffinis ; "No. 6" was H. uniformis, and, in consequence of my determination, it is so cited in page 12 of Mr. Strecker's work. "No. 4" was not received by me; "No. 3" was my Hemaris marginalis; "No. 5, Thysbe," was not the usual form of that species. None of the species named by Mr. Strecker were correctly determined. Considering that I had written at length on the genera