

*Nymphæa*, as he called them, was acknowledged by his contemporaries to be due to the sagacity of Salisbury; (2) that the name *Castalia* was at first adopted by Woodville and Wood, in Rees's Cyclopædia, and by other authors, under protest as to the reason for its choice, with correction of the needless changes which Salisbury made in specific appellations, and restoration of the already established ones; and (3) that the generic names proposed subsequently by Smith have been preferred, not from any feeling of antagonism to Salisbury, or desire to lessen his merit, but for reasons that were freely expressed at the time, and held weight subsequently with botanists, so long as every other consideration was not swept away by the now all-prevailing priority idea. Even now, some who incline to accept the name *Castalia*, in itself unobjectionable, in deference to the desire to give preference to priority, may not appreciate Mr. Salisbury's reasons for its selection, which no doubt formed the real obstacle to its adoption at a time when descriptive suitability and propriety of sentiment were thought to be of consequence.

Mr. Britten says: "In 1808 (or 1809) Smith (Fl. Græc. Prodr., I, p. 361) adopted Salisbury's division of the Linnæan genus *Nymphæa*, but did not follow Salisbury's nomenclature. He restricts the name *Nymphæa* to Salisbury's *Castalia*, while he bestows upon the yellow-flowered species, for which Salisbury retained the name *Nymphæa*, a new name *Nuphar*." It is shown that the part of the Prodrômus containing *Nuphar* did not appear until the end of 1808, or, more likely, the beginning of 1809.

Mr. Britten, unlike Prof. Greene, acquits Smith from "displaying any animus against Salisbury personally." He indeed points out Smith's recognition of the correctness of Salisbury's division of *Nymphæa*, in the "Introduction to Botany," to which Mr. Joseph F. James has also called attention, in Torrey Bulletin, Feb. 1888. "I believe," says Smith, "Mr. Salisbury's *Castalia* is well separated from *Nymphæa*." Smith wrote to Bishop Goodenough stating his wish to retain *Nymphæa* for the showy-flowered species, and to adopt *Blephara* for the yellow-flowered ones. Britten quotes Goodenough's reply: "You must and you do reject Salisbury's *Castalia* upon irrefragable [here Britten interjects, 'i.e., classical'] grounds." Not being able to refer to the Smith correspondence at present, I cannot ascertain how far this interpolation is justifiable, but apparently the real ground was notorious at the time and did not need reference in correspondence between Goodenough and Smith. That Salisbury's nomenclature, weighted with so many needless changes, should not have been adopted with alacrity by his contemporaries will not surprise anyone acquainted with the spirit and literature of the time. Salisbury's antagonism to certain Linnæan ideas, and his attempts to belittle Linnaeus and repudiate Linnæan names, his constant desire to change specific names (at that time regarded as more inviolable than generic ones), and the special objection to *Castalia*, not as a name, but on account of the analogy with which he sought to justify it, and which brought down upon him the rebuke of the authors of the article in Rees's Cyclopædia, are quite sufficient to explain why Salisbury's proposed nomenclature was not at once adopted, and to show that the responsibility did not lie with Smith, but with the botanists of the time, who, then few in number, were more disposed to consult and act in concert in such matters than is the custom, or is indeed practicable, now. What could be more frank than Sir James's acknowledgment of Salisbury's merits, as expressed in the quotation already cited from his Introduction to Botany, and in the article NYMPHÆA in Rees's Cyclopædia (XXV.) After noticing the varying views of Linnaeus at different times as to the