

The 2nd Stirps, Archontes, thus: "The palpi entirely hairy; the antennæ clubbed, bent; the wings large; the fore legs much like the others, but spineless and the abdomen free." Comprises the Papilios and Parnassians.

The 3rd Stirps, Andropoda, thus: "All the members pretty badly shaped (ziemlich schlechtformig), the wings pale colored and black." Part of the Pieridae.

The 4th Stirps, Hypati, thus: "Palpi large, directed forward, the antennæ club-shaped, the wings angled and jagged." The Libytheidae.

The 5th Stirps, Telchinae, includes heterocerous moths, and I omit it.

The 6th Stirps, Astyci, thus: "The forehead broad, the palpi thickly haired; short-snouted; the antennæ beset with a little lock on their knoblets, hooked at the end; the wings pretty broad, moderately large." The Hesperidae.*

Now it strikes me that nothing more is needed than to give these definitions in full to show that they are almost if not wholly worthless. If in the 1st and 2nd Stirps of the *nymphales*, and the 2nd and 6th of the *gentiles*, there is a somewhat full definition, embracing the antennæ, palpi, legs and shape of the wings, in the remainder there is a singular indefiniteness and hesitancy. In some the wings are not mentioned at all (Napaeæ, Agrodiaeti), in others the members are not (Hamadryades, Lemniades), in others still the antennæ alone are coupled with the

* NOTE.—The language used by Hubner throughout this volume is uncouth and that of an unlettered man, a condition not at all incompatible with skill in delineating and coloring. Consequently, while his plates are models of excellence, his text is boorish. To him, fore wings are pinions, schwingen; hind wings sinkers, senken; the fore legs arms, aerme; the antennæ ears, ohren; the proboscis a two snouted nose, zweischnaubigen nase, &c. One of the coitus of the Astyci is thus characterized: "The wings spotted with white like a sausage," which is Hubnerian for mottled. Dr. Hagen, to whom I applied for light respecting certain words, writes thus: "Hubner was illiterate. His language cannot be called in any sense plain German. He invented a number of words for things and parts for which words existed long ago in German, and were used and adopted fifty or even a hundred years before Hubner. Apparently he had no knowledge of these words or of the works in which they were used. The consequence is that neither science nor even any popular writer has adopted Hubner's words. They are known to nobody, and for some of them the sense can only be guessed. You will find them in no German dictionary. They are simply self-made barbarisms." Geyer, Thon's Archiv., 1827, in his notice of Hubner and his works, calls his language "illiterate (schwunglose sprache), greatly marred by self-made words."