

As to the first, Hübner's language is that he submits his Tentamen to skilled persons to be examined and pronounced upon. And this sort of language cannot be fairly tortured to mean anything more than that the work was experimental and tentative rather than absolute and final. What otherwise is all work on this subject? Skilled persons will use of any work what seems to them best and useful, without regard to the opinion of the author on his own work. That Hübner's attitude was modest does not authorize us to ignore him, and should rather urge us to examine with the more care what he has written.

The true criticism of the statement that the Tentamen was not known to writers of Hübner's time is more difficult to give, nevertheless we will attempt it. And first we will examine what Mr. W. H. Edwards, seconded by Dr. Hagen, has to say on the subject. We quote from pp. 44 and 45 of the CAN. ENT. their argument as follows:

Ochsenheimer, Schmiett. Eur. iv, 1816, says: "Hubner has under the title Tentamen, &c., published on a quarto sheet a sketch of a system of Lepidoptera, in which to the divisions adopted by him are given generic names of unequal value. Hubner seems to be aware of this himself, for he says in concluding, 'let no one suppose that this arrangement will require no farther correction.' *This sheet I saw only long after the printing of my 3rd Vol. was done.*" This was then after 1816, as Ochsenheimer's 3rd Vol. bears date that year. Mr. Scudder has inadvertently copied this as 1st Vol., 1807, instead of 3rd Vol., 1816. So as Dr. Hagen, in a note, says, "the Tentamen was not known to the chief Lepidopterologist of his day for ten years or more after it was printed, though he was in intimate communication with Hubner, and that he did not know it shows clearly that Hubner did not think it of importance enough to be communicated to him."

Now we claim that it is a mistaken criticism of the facts to implicate Ochsenheimer as a party to the ignoring of the Tentamen, and that the onus of this procedure falls on Treitschke, his narrower disciple, and on Boisduval, who wrote of "mon genre" at Hübner's expense. And to do this we have to correct Mr. Edwards' dates. The 3rd Volume of Ochsenheimer bears date 1810, instead of 1816. So that, the Tentamen being issued in 1806, Dr. Hagen's *ten* years is reduced at once to four.

We may admire Dr. Hagen's talent for argument, but it is wide of bringing a true conclusion. The times were not favorable to a rapid interchange of publications, and although this consideration may be insufficient, it is not without its force applied to the four years of 1806—1810. But in order to accept Dr. Hagen's conclusion we have to believe that a man deliberately prints a new system of classification "for the purpose of submitting it" to his fellow naturalists and then inexplicably