

I have followed the recommendation of the Committee of the British Association of 1842, by giving the terminations of family and sub-family names in *idæ* and *inæ*, a practice very generally adopted since that day and both simple and convenient.

And I have aimed at presenting the genera, at least as far as Hesperidæ, as nearly as possible as they existed thirty years ago, when Doubleday's great work was published, in which each genus was carefully and elaborately defined. This was before the tendency towards incorporating the whole of Hübner's bekannter Schmetterlinge into the nomenclature began to prevail, or creating genera by wholesale by mere indication of types, without definition, or encroaching on the rights of species by creating so-called genera on infinitesimal differences.

The Rules adopted at Buffalo have in great degree delivered us from these evils. If genera are founded in nature, then nature should be followed, and a compact group like Parnassius, Colias, Callidryas, Argynnis, should receive a genus name. And if subdivisions be desirable for the sake of convenience, in the genera which have numerous species, they should be divided into sections. Such sections whether natural or artificial are not genera. Nevertheless it has been the fashion of late to split up a genus into numerous, co-equal, so-called genera, with no clue in their several names to their relationship. If genera are artificial creations, made for convenience, it must be in the last degree improper that they should be multiplied so as to overwhelm the science, and bury it out of sight. I follow the example of Doubleday and Boisduval in this matter.

And as a first step in the much needed reform, I strike out the name of Hübner wherever it is appended to a genus, neither believing Hübner's coitus to be genera, nor even could they be so held, that they received from Hübner satisfactory definition. Doubleday introduced a few of these coitus names for his own genera, and out of courtesy attached the letters "Hüb." to them. His example has finally led to the wholesale displacement of his own name and the names of his associates, and of the many distinguished lepidopterists of the last two generations, by the accrediting a large proportion of the existing genera to Hübner. I have shown elsewhere (Can. Ent. vol. 8), the injustice of these proceedings, and I refuse to be a party to them. In every case, the genus in this Catalogue is, or is intended to be, credited to the author who first proposed and described it, and courtesy gives place to justice.

It remains to speak of the arrangement of the Hesperidæ. Mr.