

"considers it of no importance." That Hübner *did* consider it of importance is shown by his having built the later Verzeichniss upon it. We shall find by careful study that Hübner was a most consistent Entomologist, and the criticism which pronounces him as vacillatory to be worthless. So much is to be plainly gathered from his works themselves.

And, after all, after four years' time Ochsenheimer *does* get the Tentamen, and in his fourth volume, 1816, speaks of it in a manner which shows a desire to adopt what he could of it. His language is both friendly and appreciative, and in his list he quotes it in the synonymy and therein adopts certain of the genera on the authority of the Tentamen, as "*Cosmia*," "*Xylota*," "*Agrotis*," "*Graphiphora*," etc. On the whole he adopts more than he rejects, and where he rejects we are given no reason for the discrimination (e. g. *Hebiophila*). But now we can see the value of Mr. W. H. Edwards as a critic. He makes Ochsenheimer to say: "*This sheet I saw only long after the printing of my 3rd Vol. was done,*" and comes to a full stop. *But Ochsenheimer comes to no full stop!* No, he goes on, after a comma, *therefore I could not earlier have adopted anything out of it.** So that Ochsenheimer *apologises* for an unavoidable neglect and in his fourth volume does Hübner a tardy but not altogether inadequate justice. For the names above cited, and others afterwards credited by Ochsenheimer's followers to himself, *are* taken by Ochsenheimer from the Tentamen and credited to Hübner by Ochsenheimer himself. And the criticism that pronounces Ochsenheimer the chief Lepidopterologist of his day we cannot accept. Ochsenheimer was, at best, provincial, and from the nature of his work could not be otherwise. He is not to be compared to Hubner for grasp of his subject. His follower, Treitschke, is still narrower and on him and the school to which he belonged falls the blame for having appropriated, misapplied and ignored the work of Hubner.

A final argument of Dr. Hagen's, that the booksellers of the time did not advertise the Tentamen, may be dismissed with the remark that it certainly was published as proved by Ochsenheimer in 1810, and the question, whether the failure to catalogue a work by a bookseller is sufficient to cancel its publication?

I conclude that if we wish to follow Ochsenheimer we must adopt the Tentamen. I draw attention to the fact that Ochsenheimer's genera

* daher Konnte ich fruher nichts davon aufnehmen, 4, viii.