The list is beautifully and clearly printed and the proof reading has been exceedingly careful. After having gone over a number of names and after spending some hours with the book, I have found but one error of spelling. The labor of compiling the list has been evidently great, and Mr. Scudder speaks of it in terms which shows how arduous it really was. The author was helped by those to whom he applied for lists of the generic names proposed by them, however, and Prof. Marsh went to the trouble of printing the references to his own numerous genera.

The list can hardly be thoroughly tested by any one student, who can only be expected to know his own genera and those of others in his In the Noctuida and the Moths generally I find a larger number of omissions than I should have expected. In the Butterflies I find no reference to the genus Feniseca, a name used by Mr. Scudder and all who have written on Tarquinius since it was proposed. I also find two mistakes which should not have been made. The genus Euclemensia is given as = Hamadryas of Boisduval, whereas it was proposed for Hamadryas of Clemens, preoccupied by Boisduval and Hübner. the genus Copablepharon is credited wrongly to me, and the original citation for Argyrophyes is not given. If these are fair samples of the reliability of the work, it would be wrong to praise it and its usefulness might be considered doubtful. It is probable, however, that the intention was not to give all the genera (as they have not, I think, been all collated out of the books of which Mr. Scudder gives a list), and the mistakes above pointed out may be exceptions. Of this each student will be able to judge, and it would be well for the work to be publicly examined by different scientists and the mistakes pointed out before Mr. Scudder publishes again on the subject.

The error of spelling alluded to above is on page 130, where Eufitchia is written Eufichia. It will be of course impossible to get all the names, but about twenty-five names proposed for genera of Lepidoptera which I looked for, I could not find in the List. These names were published within twenty years up to 1880. This number is very likely less than the real omissions of names for genera in the order Lepidoptic. There has been probably too great reliance placed on the contributions of authors, at the expense of personal research. We cannot suppose that there has been any private influence brought to bear on a compilation of this character, but there has been an effort to display very fully the generic names of certain authorities, while the genera proposed by those who have not