

to discuss the question of geographical distribution to any purpose or advantage and to arrive at some nearer comprehension of the way in which species may have differentiated. And it seems reasonable that we should express the results of such comparison in our nomenclature. Not expressing them, their record tends to become obliterated. So that in this direction we find that Jacob Hübner in his work is more nearly up to the requirements of to-day than are his critics. And it is only this serious study of Entomology that relieves the whole subject from the charge of childishness which we hear not unfrequently made against it, and which we cannot well otherwise refute. To merely catalogue species of insects is to bring the study of Entomology down to the level of an arrangement of curiosities of any description. It needs some higher spirit to elevate it and to relieve it from the imputation of uselessness.

The second question with regard to Hübner and his works is whether we are to recognize the right of his generic names, proposed so long ago, to be used now for one or more of the species he included under them. It is a question which must be answered in the affirmative under the law of priority, since Hübner is post-Linnean, and wrote on genera from 1806 to 1828.

But it is a question which is confused by technical objections against the form and style of Hübner's generic definitions. Hübner has published two works which we shall here consider (omitting the question as to "Franck's Catalogue" for the time), viz., the *Tentamen* and the *Verzeichniss*. The first is a single leaf and contains a sketch of a system of classification in which a number of generic names are proposed and defined by the enumeration of a single known and named species under each. The second is an attempt to classify all the known Lepidoptera of the world under genera very briefly and superficially described.

To the acceptance of these works and the adoption of the generic names therein contained, comes now Mr. W. H. Edwards in the pages of the *CANADIAN ENTOMOLOGIST* in opposition, and brings with him Dr. Hagen as an ally and one upon whom he depends as full of a knowledge of the literature on the subject. The attack in the March number is mainly on the *Tentamen*, and we will see what it consists in.

There is mainly brought forward, not without ingenuity, the plea that Hübner never intended that the *Tentamen* should be adopted. The argument is sustained in two ways. First by the language of the *Tentamen*; second by the statement that it was not known to contemporary writers on its subject.