

it be objected that nomenclature ought not to be disturbed, and things ought not to be upset, it might be in order to suggest that Lord Walsingham and Mr. C. Hartley Durrant, both good Englishmen, have been the greatest disturbing factors of the decade so far as reinstating Hubner's names is concerned. A great part of Mr. Heath's scolding in the second paragraph, therefore, applies to them more perfectly than to any American entomologist. Finally, it may be noted that in Staudinger and Rebel's catalogue, just issued, *Eupithecia* is replaced by *Tephroclystis*, Hbn., and *Chloroclystis*, Hbn. Dr. Hulst was, therefore, neither arbitrary nor singular in using the term.

I am greatly afraid that, unless he wishes to remain solitary, Mr. Heath must give up *Eupithecia*, though there is no canon of nomenclature that opposes his hold on "pugs."

American entomologists and American naturalists generally are accused of being narrow, and confining their ideas "to their own little collections," etc., and this charge is just about as well based as the other. The truth is there are no broader students, literally and otherwise, to be found anywhere than in America; which is not saying that we do not have the other kind as well. But specialists are needed as yet where so much material remains undescribed, and the would-be monographer of a world-wide fauna finds himself very frequently compelled to limit his ambition by the wealth of new local material coming in to him.

There are many of the newer entomological recruits who do not realize the difficulties with which the earlier students had to contend. Before 1860, almost all American Lepidoptera were described in foreign publications, from Linné to Guenée and Walker. So, of necessity, the American student became familiar with the general world classification to that date. For years afterward everything was compared with European species, and, so far as possible, American forms were identified with those of other countries. Students like Zeller, Speyer, Moeschler and Staudinger co-operated, and the charge that American work was done without regard to what has been done elsewhere is simply absurd.

Of course, as in all countries, the work of special students was more or less confined to the local fauna. The fact that in so many countries work was simultaneously done has resulted in duplicating descriptions of similar structural combinations under different generic names. It is the work of the student now, to collate and systematize, as Sir George F. Hampson is doing with the British Museum material at command. This