

This excellent paper treats, in a masterly way, a most interesting subject. It is marred solely by inaccurate or incomplete taxonomy. The taxonomic faults may be summarized as follows:

*Acridiidae* = *Acrididae*.

*Rhomalea* = *Romalea*.

*Tettigida* = *Acrydiina*.

*Tettix granulatus* = *Acrydium granulatum*.

The references in this paper to *Acrydium* are correctly referable to that genus, of which *granulatum* is a member.

*Locustidae* = *Tettigoniidae*.

*Conocephalus* = *Neoconocephalus*, a genus including but few North American species. It has been recently revised and the specific determination would, in consequence, have been easily made.

*Xiphidium* = *Conocephalus*.

*Microcentrum*. As there are but two, widely distributed, North American species of this genus, *laurifolium* and *retinerve*, the specific assignment could have been readily made.

*Gryllus pennsylvanicus* = *Gryllus assimilis*.

The taxonomy in this paper could have been corrected by a systematist in a few minutes. Would it not be desirable to have all such papers correct throughout, rather than satisfactory as far as the subject being studied is concerned, but full of inexcusable taxonomic flaws?

#### NOTE ON MR. HEBARD'S ARTICLE.

The Editor, having given some attention to the taxonomy of the Orthoptera, was aware that the nomenclature followed in Mr. Du Porte's paper was not up-to-date, but considered it inadvisable to alter it, since the names employed have long been in common use, and are more or less familiar to the general student, for whom the paper is intended. The nomenclature of Orthoptera has undergone numerous changes in late years, and some of these changes, though doubtless necessary, if the law of priority is to be followed, are of a most unfortunate character. Many old familiar generic terms have been abandoned, or what is more confusing, transferred to other forms. For example, the little "grouse-locusts," generally known as *Tettix* are now *Acrydium*, while the large locusts formerly called *Acridium* are now *Locusta*, a name which used to be employed for insects of another family. Again, the name *Conocephalus*, so long and appropriately given to the large "cone-headed grasshoppers" must now be shifted to the little meadow grasshoppers familiar to all as *Xiphidium*, the cone-heads becoming *Neoconocephalus*. Such changes as these are, of course, very confusing to all but the specialist. Were they really permanent, it would indeed be desirable to promote their use as rapidly as possible, but what guarantee have we that they will remain more than a few years? They are not even universally accepted by specialists.

Is there such a thing as "correct taxonomy?" We think, at least, that systematists are inclined to over-estimate its importance; and while we agree with Mr. Hebard's contention that morphologists are too apt to be careless in regard to taxonomic matters, we think that the converse is equally true, that the systematist is usually very inaccurate in the use of morphological terms, and indifferent as to the morphological significance of the structures he describes.