would prove a great convenience to the business and scientific public, and equalize the time value of the calendar months and quarters.

A very suitable opportunity to introduce the improved calendar would be on the first recurrence of the leap-year, in 1888. In the mean time the proposed change could be fully discussed and ventilated.

The following table will show the relations of the old and the new calendar to each other:—

Old calendar.		DAY OF YEAR.	New calendar.		
Jan.	31	31	31	Jan.	31
Feb.	28-9	59-60	61	Feb.	30*
March	31	90- 1	92	March	31
	90-1				92
April	30	120- 1	122	April	30
May	31	151- 2	153	May	31
June	30	181- 2	183	June	30
	91				91
July	31	212- 3	213	July	30*
Aug.	31	243- 4	244	Aug.	31
Sept.	30	273- 4	274	Sept.	30
	92				91
Oct.	31	304- 5	305	Oct.	31
Nov.	30	334- 5	335	Nov.	30
Dec.	31	365- 6	365-6	Dec.	30-1
	92				91-2

* In transferring from old calendar to new, from March to July inclusive, deduct *two* days; from August to December, deduct *one* day. Thus March 1 (old calendar) will be Feb. 29 (new calendar); but Aug. 1 (old calendar) will be July 30 (new calendar).

The following adaptation of the old lines may serve to assist the memory:—

30 days, *July*, September,
April, June, and November,
February and *December;*
The last, in leap-year, 31,
And always the remaining five.

Edward P. Gray.

Ingersoll's 'Country cousins.'

Absence from home has delayed until to-day my seeing the extended (and therefore highly complimentary) notice of my "Country cousins: short studies in the natural history of the United States," to which you were good enough to give space in your issue of Feb. 6.

Acknowledging its kindly tone throughout, I wish to retort with equal courtesy (if possible) upon your writer at the point where he seems to find most fault; namely, my assertion that the flukes of the whale and other cetaceans represent the hinder flippers of the seal and the hinder legs of terrestrial quadrupeds. That anybody should deny this, surprised me. The language in which I expressed the statement was less precise than that demanded by a technical treatise, as 'Country cousins' makes no claim to be; but only a captious construction could make out that I meant more by what I said than that in a general way the flukes of the Cetacea were representative (in a greatly altered condition, of course) of the hinder flippers of a seal, and structurally were quite as distinct as they, from the forked tail of a fish.

Leaving my assertion and possible evidence out of the question, I should like to know what the comparative anatomists of the country have to say as to this point between my critic and myself. Do not Dr. Elliott Coues and Dr. Theodore Gill teach that a whale's fluke is directly homologous with the integumentary portion of the hinder limbs of the rest of the Mammalia? Of course, every one knows there are no *bones* there. Has not Professor John Ryder discovered, since my pages were in type, that the nerves which supply the flukes are not those which pass along the spine into the tail (where it exists), but, on the contrary, are homologues of those in the higher mammals, which, branching from the spinal cord in the lumbo-sacral region, supply the hinder limbs? What has embryology to show as to the genesis of the flukes? Do they arise structurally as the forks of a tail, or as limb-appendages? It is just possible that the inaccuracy and carelessness with which I have been rather freely accused have been over-estimated.

Ernest Ingersoll.

New Haven.

[In respect to the criticism of 'Country cousins,' to which the author of the work so warmly but courteously objects, it may be sufficient reply to quote the statement criticised by the reviewer, which is as follows: "If I had the time, I could prove to you that the difference between the fin of a fish and the boneleg of an otter or of a dog, or of our own arm, is not so very great; and it would be easy to show how nearly alike the flipper of the seal and fore-leg of a land mammal really are. . . . The same comparison will hold good for the hind-feet of the otter and the hind-flippers or 'tail' (which is *not* a tail) of the seal; and it is equally true of the walrus, *and of the whale, porpoise, grampus, black-fish, and other cetaceans.*" Not a word is said about the 'flukes' of a whale, nor is any reference made to the 'forked tail of a fish,' in the passage criticised. We again submit that this is 'evidence of either ignorance or carelessness' on the part of the author. It is at least a grossly slipshod use of language. — Reviewer.]

A new method of arranging entomological collections.

A very large proportion of the time of a faithful curator of a growing entomological cabinet is devoted to the re-arrangement of his collections, — to simply pulling pins from one place in a cork-lined box, and putting them into another. In large and well-endowed museums this labor can be lessened somewhat by leaving spaces in the boxes for additions; but in an ordinary entomological cabinet this is obviously impracticable, and, even where this plan is adopted, it affords only partial relief. The advance of knowledge is constantly changing our ideas as to the sequence of species; and from time to time the appearance of a monograph necessitates the re-arrangement of our collections, if we would have them represent the present state of science.

But so great is this labor of re-arrangement, that only few if any of the larger collections are kept in any thing like perfect order. And the faithful curator is forced to give to mere manual labor, time which otherwise would be devoted to original research.

About two years ago I devised and put into use a mode of arranging collections which reduces to a minimum the labor of re-arrangement. This system is an application to entomological cabinets of the principle which underlies the slip system of keeping notes. Its fundamental idea is to fasten in each