

calling numerous things by names that are not scientifically defined. It would be easy to multiply examples in support of this statement, but as space is limited one must here suffice.

The student learning botany at college is told that the genus *Cedrus* includes three and only three species. He learns that one species (*Cedrus deodara*) is indigenous to the Himalaya region in India; a second (*C. Libani*) to the Syrian uplands in Asia Minor; and the third (*C. Atlantica*) to mountainous country in North Africa. He is assured that no true cedar-tree has ever been found in the natural forests of America. Later he discovers that north-west America is a large exporter of cedar timber. Only after long hours of patient searching in books on botany and forestry does he solve the puzzle by finding that American cedar is juniper-wood, or some other wood with the appearance and odour of cedar but not botanically connected with the genus *Cedrus*. If the botanical names and common names of the several timbers were always bracketed together students would be saved a great deal of trouble and waste of time. And, what is still more important, people engaged in the timber trades would be placed in a position to describe and discuss intelligently the various kinds of wood they have to handle or to offer for sale.

The Eucalypts.

Common or vernacular names are applied to trees and other plants in two quite distinct ways. In the one case they denote groups of species; in the other, individual or separate species. As group names they may be useful; as specific names they are generally unnecessary and often misleading. The distinction is very important. It is especially important in the study of the eucalypts. Botanical research to date has named and described over three hundred and fifty distinct forms of *Eucalyptus*. The great majority of the forms are ranked as species; a few as hybrids. A considerable percentage of the species fall into natural groups that have received vernacular names. The validity of the grouping and naming of the groups has been admitted generally by botanists. Where the vernacular names conspicuously fail is not in their application to groups, but in the attempt to use them as specific names. The position will be made clear if we present the case for three of the principal groups by way of illustration.

"GUMS."

A large number of the eucalypts shed their dead bark from their branches and stems, and present a pale-coloured and naked appearance to the eye. These smooth or naked-barked trees are technically called "gums." They vary over a wide range in botanical characters, and are divided into several subgroups, the one common character being the naked bark. There are the "red-gums": they are so called from the red colour of their timber. There are the "blue-gums," which are supposed to be distinguished by a bluish aspect of foliage and bark. There are the "white-gums" and "grey-gums," so named from the appearance of the bark alone. The one thing common to all these "gums," let us repeat, is the shedding of the dead bark and naked appearance of branches and stems. The grouping cannot claim to be scientific, but it stands in a general way for truth, and does not necessarily lead to confusion.