

Since its publication in 1891, Prof. J. B. Smith's List has been generally adopted, and most collections are labelled in accordance with it. Some changes in generic names have here and there been accepted, and specific names have in various cases been dropped into synonymy, their places being taken by others whose authority has been established. These changes, however, have not been numerous, and their propriety has usually been made evident. In the new List, to take the butterflies alone, we find that Dr. Dyar gives 652 species, and divides them into no less than 158 genera. Dr. Skinner's List, in 1898, gave 645 species and 65 genera, and Prof. Smith's, 640 species and 74 genera. While the number of species has been very slightly increased, the number of genera is more than doubled.

These generic names, set forth by Dr. Dyar, are, for the most part, those of Hubner and Dr. Scudder. Thirty years ago controversy raged over the adoption of Hubner's names and those contained in Dr. Scudder's "Systematic Revision of some of the North American Butterflies." Mr. W. H. Edwards, author of the magnificent work on "The Butterflies of North America," led what may be called the conservative party, while those who favoured the revolution ranged themselves under the banner of Dr. Scudder. In process of time the conflict died out, and many of the names so strongly objected to were adopted by common consent, while others were dropped, even by Dr. Scudder himself in his subsequent grand work on "The Butterflies of the Eastern United States and Canada." In the List before us, Dr. Dyar has not implicitly followed Dr. Scudder's final work, but has made a certain number of changes even from it. He may be abundantly justified by "the laws of priority" in nearly all that he has done—we cannot pretend to have such a knowledge of the literature as would permit us to deny it—but it seems a pity that genera should be split up where structural differences do not require it, merely because Hubner set forth a variety of names more than a century ago.

The list is admirably printed, and provides a most welcome reference to the literature of the subject in the case of every genus and species, but we must complain that no mention is made of the familiar generic names that have been dropped, which surely might have been recorded as synonyms. Such old-established names as *Pieris*, *Colias*, *Melitæa*, *Grapta*, *Pyrameis*, *Lycæna*, *Callimorpha*, *Hydræcia* and others have disappeared, and are not even to be found in the very comprehensive