affinities of the order, Smith says: "We heartily concur with Mr. Salisbury's decision concerning the affinities of the genus, though not in the name, which he has transferred from the true plant of the ancients, and replaced by *Castalia*, a word incorrect in etymology as well as meaning, and altogether superfluous."

It is not desirable that space should be occupied here with discussion of the laws of nomenclature, which will need to be dealt with by botanists ere long on wider principles than have been hitherto recognised. It may be remarked, however, that the "law of priority" is no doubt, as has been expressed, "the only sound principle." The difficulty is to secure agreement as to what is meant by priority, and whether it should apply to generic and specific terms separately, or only when these are united or combined as names, and how far authorities for them are to be used in cases where terms are not strictly equivalent. Many subsidiary questions arise, rendering uniformity difficult. Mr. Beeby justly observes, that something more is required than the hunting-up of the oldest name ever applied, but sometimes applicable only in the most general way; the far more difficult task remains of finding out the oldest name which is sufficiently exact in meaning to be applicable in a strict sense to the plant it is intended to represent. The fact is, that while general rules are useful as a guide, individual cases must be judged on their own merits. Bentham, as a classicist and philologist, adopted the idea that a specific term, being usually an adjective, was not in itself complete without the substantive generic word; that the combination of the two formed the name, to which alone the law of priority would consequently apply. Prof. D. C. Eaton, in his magnificent work on the Ferns of North America, lays down the same rule. The way in which Linnæus indexed his books, giving first an Index Generum, then an Index Synonymorum, and lastly an Index Triviale, does not lend favour to this view, neither does his custom of joining together generic and specific names of different genders. But there is a strong and a practical argument against it in the practice adopted by chemists, with results so satisfactory, in the naming of the elements, and of their chemical compounds—of groups, radicals, bases, acids, and the salts and complex compounds formed by their union. The names of the elements, or of simple or, as we may call them, Elementary groups (radicals), are always treated as complete terms, even when used in adjective forms, and are, as far as conveniently possible, expressed, in form suitably modified, in the name of the more complex compound, just as symbols are treated as perfect, complete and immutable terms in the construction of formulæ. We shall never have a permanent system of nomenclature of plants, until generic and specific names (so called) are treated in the same way as separate terms, essentially complete in themselves, and available for permanent use by combination in the construction of binary names.

As Mr. Britten states, the second volume of Annals of Botany, in which Salisbury's paper was printed, is dated on the title page 1806 (there are no dates of publication on the parts as bound in volumes); "but internal evidence shows that this first part was issued in 1805." As the internal evidence is not very obvious, and the Annals contain other important memoirs bearing on questions of priority, it may be worth while to determine, with some approach to accuracy, the actual date of publication. This work is styled on its title page "Annals of Botany. Editors, Charles Konig, F.L.S., and John Sims, M.D., F.L.S." (London. "Vol. I, 1805." "Vol. II, 1806.") These dates of publication are so quoted in DeCandolle's "Systema Naturale." The complete work forms two