to select any other species of the original section as the type of his new genus." Mr. Crotch says (Cist. Ent., 1872) "No genus can be considered defined until its type is indicated," but when this is not done by the original author, "I am not inclined to cut the knot by taking the first species, but to trace the genus historically until it has a type given to it;" and "Cuvier (1799) gives precision to the old genera by characterizing them and indicating their types."

Let us apply these dicta to Vanessa Antiopa as metamorphosed into Papilio Antiopa by Mr. Scudder. He says:—"The generic name Papilio was applied by Linnæus to all the butterflies at the foundation of the binomial system of Nomenclature. Fabricius, in his later works, restricted it to the Nymphales and Papilionides. Schrank was the next author to restrict the name, limiting it, in 1801, to most of the Nymphales."

By Rule 5, or by Mr. Kirby's Rule, the original name having to be restricted to the typical section, Schrank should have left it with some part of the Papilionides of Fabricius, for I suppose no one can doubt that the swallow-tailed butterflies were the typical section of Linnæus (Equites), even though his typical species may be in question. Had he bound himself by the ornithological dictum, he would also have restricted the name to the *Papilionides*, *Priamus* being the typical species.

By that of Mr. Crotch he would still have been restricted to the *Papilionides*, making *P. Machaon* the type, because Cuvier (in 1799) made this species the type of the genus *Papilio* (and so it is recognized to-day and I hope will be for all future time.)

But, says Mr. Scudder, "If the laws of priority have any force or meaning, I do not see how we can refuse to acknowledge the claims of Schrank. I select, accordingly, from among the species grouped under Papilic by Linnæus, Fabricius and Schrank, one of the best known European butterflies as most suitable for the type of the genus." And by this curious process, one of the best known species being selected as the type, we get the astonishing creation Papilio Antiopa.—(Scud.) And this is equivalent to enunciating another dictum, being the fourth on this head, by which the best known species of a genus is to be the typical. Moreover, such exceedingly minute definition is given to the new genus that it would appear to be impossible that a second species could ever be embraced within it.\*

<sup>\*</sup> I notice that Mr. Scudder speaks of the "insufficiency of their generic descriptions" being "the reproach of Lepidopterists." Mr. Wallace, on the other hand,