mologists, aetat 10 for instance, prefer their living nursery language to the dead one from the tombs. And we are well counselled to remember the little ones always! What would I not have given to have known the common names for our insects on Staten Island in the fifties!

What Mr. Maynard may choose to call our butterflies cannot be thrown up against Mr. Scudder, who, as I understand it, has merely proposed corresponding titles for our butterflies with those used in England, as the "Blues" and "Coppers," using these names in somewhat of a generic sense and supplying some fresh titles of his own, whether fortunately or not, I am not here enquiring. This is a matter subject to a later review on occasion. Certainly we must be guided by some general agreement with English names in use in England for similar but different species, and this without a too vigorous enquiry. Certain hairy caterpillars in England (and in Germany also) are called "Bears" (I don't know what brings Bacon's curious sentence, "the body of nature is elegantly and with deep judgment depicted hairy," etc., into my mind), and there are certain common names used in a generic way from resemblances occurring to the casual observer. These we must use, and for my part I think that, in a natural way, we shall come into using certain common names as collecting becomes popular among the young and as popular books increase with us.

Far more than on this head am I concerned about Mr. Scudder's proposed book on our butterflies. I think there is a mean between Mr. Scudder's Latin nomenclature and that of Mr. Edwards, which latter is based on Doubleday's, and perhaps since Doubleday we may have advanced in our knowledge as to the structure of butterflies, and are authorized to express this advance in our Latin names. It is many years ago since Mr. Robinson and I set about classifying our Diurnals, and this was before Mr. Scudder's classification. I only published about that time the genera Feniseca and Calephelis, and as these are not objected to, I think that what I here say, with great diffidence, is entitled to some consideration on both sides. I am quite satisfied, and was before Mr. Scudder, that our Hackberry butterflies, celtis, clyton, etc., do not belong to the European genus Apatura, and that the structural characters separating the two are real and of generic value. Also am I of opinion that our eastern arthemis, ursula, disippus, eros, form a group of themselves, distinct from Limenitis proper, and that Mr. Scudder's