

does not seem to be warranted by the Rules of the British Association. Rule 12th says:—"A name which has never been clearly defined in some published work, should be changed for the earliest name by which the object shall have been so defined." And in the explanatory remarks it is said, "Definition properly implies a distinct exposition of essential characters, *and in all cases we conceive this to be indispensable.*"

Now this Rule merely embodied the feeling and practice of naturalists, and it had been acted on for thirty years, before it had been formally enunciated, in this very case of Hubner, whose work had been systematically set aside as an authority by most European Entomologists, because it was felt that his so-called genera were mere guesses founded on *facies* alone,—happy guesses, no doubt, sometimes—but as frequently wrong as right, and wholly without such definition as was held, even in his own day, to be required to constitute a new genus. Boisduval expressly states this, and his non-recognition of Hubner's genera has been followed in almost all the great systematic works which have since been published. If we take Hubner's first four genera and the characters he gives them, we shall be able to judge of the reasons for this course. They are as follows:—

*Hymenitis*,.....upper wings half banded.  
*Ithomia*,....." " one-banded.  
*Oleria*....." " twice-banded  
*Thyridia*,.....both wings banded.

Such a mode of defining genera, though it has the merit of being simple and symmetrical, is undoubtedly superficial, and it can only be by the purest accident that a group so characterized can correspond in extent to any real genus. \* \* \* In Mr. Kirby's own work, we find Hubner's condemnation in almost every page, in the utter want of agreement between his groups and modern genera. The modern restricted genus *Heliconius*, for instance, contains species belonging to seven Hubnerian genera; *Pieris* comprises five, and *Thecla* twelve of these hap-hazard groups; while, in other cases, the species comprising Hubner's groups are divided among several unrelated modern genera. \* \* \* \* The names sought to be reinstated, rank as mere catalogue names for want of proper definition, and should therefore never be quoted. \* \* \* Even as a matter of justice it may be maintained that we should recognize the careful and elaborate definitions of a Doubleday or Westwood, rather than the childish guesses of a Hubner. \* \* \* The proper course to be taken is to rein-