

proposal, notwithstanding its arbitrary and unscientific character, and its injustice to other Entomologists, would perhaps be accepted by those who have more regard for present convenience than for the establishment of a solid foundation for Entomological Science. Unfortunately, however, the proposition, although at first view practicable, leaves the matter exactly where it stood before.

Where is the authority that will be accepted by everyone when that authority is governed, not by those fixed laws which should determine questions of scientific nomenclature, but by individual opinion, the convenience of some particular class, or of the present generation of students? Surely Mr. Mead does not intend, as would be inferred from his article in the June number of the ENTOMOLOGIST, that we should accept the most recent names, or those which, having been published in this country or by some well-known author, are more familiar to or more generally in use among American naturalists.

There are a few species, which from the excellence of their original description and plates, or from their recent publication, have no synonymy; these are the only species which can be properly considered as accepted *by all* (if we reject priority.)

All that the friends of priority ask is that it should be allowed to decide between names already *in use*. Allowing that the term "in use" should be applied in science to any name attached to a recognizable description, published in a work which is or has been on sale; names which are advanced in pamphlets printed for the private use of the author, and only distributed among his friends; and in state agricultural reports not for sale (except at second hand) can not be considered as published at all.

To determine whether a description is recognizable or not is a matter of much more difficulty, for here the judgment of individual students would be likely to differ very much. We do not believe that every name advanced by the older authors, often with but a line or two of loose description, or a plate giving only a general idea of form and color, should be retained. We do think, however, that whenever there exists a valid description, the law of priority should take its course. In some cases in which the description is not definite enough to determine the species, but there exist authenticated types; and in those cases in which the species is