

and detailed to be useful. It may, perhaps, be answered that most of the species are not collected by the writers themselves, and the collectors sent no exact localities. Probably not, but were they asked for them? Collectors will supply proper localities, and often very interesting details if they are given to understand that these are wanted—as is plainly evident from the fact, that some few careful authors always manage to know where their species come from, and a good deal about them besides.

My own idea in the matter is, that every description of new species ought, if possible, to have the collector's own notes appended thereto, so that we might have some idea of what the *living* insect was like, and not only have an account of its dried remains impaled on a pin. Fancy, if someone undertook to write an account of the human race, founded entirely upon information obtained in the post-mortem room and anatomical museums! But, if we cannot have biological notes, let us at least have localities—they can be got when they are wanted, and indeed, I have known some instances in which names of localities have been duly sent in, but never mentioned by the describing author.

Sometimes authors take it for granted that because they write from a certain place, it will be understood that the species were captured there, but I could easily demonstrate that such an assumption, in all cases in which the locality is not given, would lead us into quite ridiculous errors, and this being so, how are we to discriminate? One usually precise author, who has described a very large number of new species of late years, has given for most of them only the name of the state in which he resides, and for many no locality at all. Now, according to Packard, this state embraces two distinct Zoö-geographical regions, so it becomes of especial importance to know exactly where the insects in question came from. So I wrote to this author, expostulating with him on this point, and he replied that he quite agreed with me that localities should be properly defined, and all the species I alluded to were to be understood to come from the vicinity of the town in which he resided. Now, this is excellent, provided that the lacking or indefinite localities *are* so understood; but on the face of it, until I had this information from the author, this fact was not always evident. Perhaps it has been stated somewhere in his writings; but this hardly better matters for the student, who naturally takes one paper at a time, and considers it on its own merits, unless referred back to previous remarks bearing upon it.

Fortunately, there are some systematists who do appreciate the value