defined. The genus being erroneously described, of course fails to represent any idea realized in nature, and the specific name must therefore fall with it, and the whole name be quoted in synonymy, with the error mark (‡) appended.

While I fully recognize the importance of having the same object always spoken of by the same name, I must frankly say that the forced uniformity aimed at by somewhat arbitrary processes, in a few familiar instances, seems to be capable of producing still greater confusion. To take an example: our common tumble-bug is equally known to most students of entomology as CANTHON or COPROBIUS, and specifically as *lævis* or *volvens*, the first generic and specific names having priority. Recently, however, on the authority of Gemminger and Harold, and of Mr. Crotch, the specific name *hudsonias* has been resurrected from Forster's Centuria Insectorum. The priority of this last name is not borne out by any evidence in the books containing the descriptions, and if it be valid, can only be demonstrated by careful bibliographical investigation of a collateral kind. It is unreasonable to expect that our familiar names for common objects, for it is only among them that such changes are likely to be suggested, should thus be altered where there can be any excuse for resisting the innovation. But I will go farther and say, that where two names have become from peculiar circumstances equally known, there can be no serious objection to the writer using that one for which he has preference. If I had occasion to write concerning the great Aristotle, it is certain that all those persons capable of understanding what I would desire to say about him, whether I mentioned him by his name or spoke of him as the Stagyrite, or even as the Preceptor of Alexander, would know who was meant.

When the different names which have been applied to the most common species, have been recognized by competent authorities as synonyms, and have been thus collated in accessible registers, catalogues or systematic works, it is not a subject worth contention which of these equally known names may be used by individual writers. Certainly it is wrong for a person, without a careful study of bibliography, to change his habit in the use of a name, because the latest authority advocates a subversion. It is by no means true in natural history that the latest is the best, and those who are not critical students in these subjects will do well to follow the advice given in the first part of this essay, to *resist innovation*,* until they find

* Confusis enim nominibus omnia confundi necesse est.—CÆSALP. apud Linn., Syst. Nat. xii, i, 13..