CORRESPONDENCE.

[Correspondents are requested to write briefly and to the point. No attention will be paid to anonymous communications.]

The Generic Name Troglodytes.

To the Editors of The Auk:-

Sirs: Is there not a universally accepted rule among scientists, that the same generic name cannot occur twice in the nomenclature of the animal kingdom? How is it, then, that in the family Simiadæ (Mammalia) there is a genus Troglodytes, and that in the family Troglodytidæ (Aves) the the same generic name occurs? I am merely asking for information concerning what appears to me to be a standing violation of a very necessary rule.

Yours sincerely,

Ottawa, July 7, 1884.

W. L. Scott.

[The name Troglodytes has priority in ornithology, having been proposed by Vieillot in 1807. E. Geoffroy, in 1812, adopted the same name for a genus of anthropoid apes, and its continued use in mammalogy is in violation of the very important and almost universally accepted rule that the same generic name cannot be employed twice in the same kingdom. The apes referred by Geoffroy to Troglodytes were long since provided with other generic names, which are employed for them by careful authors, to the exclusion of Troglodytes in that connection.—J. A. A.]

Strickland as an Advocate of 'Linnæus at '58.'

To the Editors of the Auk:-

Sirs: In a copy of Moehring's 'Avium Genera,' 1752, examined in the Stricklandian library in the museum of Cambridge, England, I find written on the fly-leaf the following, in the handwriting of Mr. Strickland:—

"Moehring's Genera are *not* to be adopted, being six years prior to 1758, the date of Linn. Syst. Nat. ed. 10, in which the *binomial system* was first introduced. II. E. Strickland."

This would seem to show that the person whose name is most closely connected with the Code of Nomenclature which takes Linnæus at '66 was himself a '58-er.

Mus. Cantab., 15 June, 1884.

ELLIOTT COUES.

Indian Bird Names.

To the Editors of the Auk:-

Sirs: The July issue of 'The Auk' contains an article by Mr. W. Cooke, entitled 'Bird Nomenclature of the Chippewa Indians.' The article is an interesting one to ornithologists, but it possesses an equal if not a greater value to ethnologists. It is chiefly for the latter reason that I