

CONCERNING PROTESTS AND OTHER THINGS.

BY JOHN B. SMITH, SC. D., RUTGERS COLLEGE, NEW BRUNSWICK, N. J.

There never yet was anything new or revolutionary advanced or suggested that was not met with a "protest" from some quarter. When machinery was introduced the hand-workers protested; when railroads supplanted stage coaches the coachmen protested; and so on. So we never had a new list in any order of insects, where changes in nomenclature were made, which was not denounced by someone who found himself or herself compelled thereby to take new views or learn new names.

Of course, protests have their uses, and are always interesting; so, that by Mr. Heath, in the September number of the *CANADIAN ENTOMOLOGIST*, was carefully read by me. Of course, it should really be answered by Dr. George D. Hulst; but he is, unfortunately, dead, and as he was a very good friend of mine, I will do the best I can in his behalf as well as my own, for I must plead guilty to being an American, and am uneasily suspicious that, since I happen to know about *Tephroclystis*, I must be included among the pseudo-savants.

Let me say first of all that Mr. Heath has been for some time a very good correspondent of mine, that I have found him always open-handed and open-minded, ready to do all in his power to further entomological science, anxious to aid, and willing to be aided; therefore, whatever I may say here is not meant as a reflection upon him—only an appeal to his natural love of justice, and a plea that he do not scold too hastily.

A protest always carries weight in proportion to the authority or knowledge of him that makes it, or the force of fact or argument with which it is backed up. Now, what does Mr. Heath really protest against? Specifically, only the use of *Tephroclystis* is mentioned, but inferentially other "new" and unfamiliar names are included in the ban. *Tephroclystis* is not so well known perhaps as *Eupithecia*, though it may rival "pugs" in familiarity; but would it not have been fair for Mr. Heath to show, first, that it is really a new name, and second, that there was no sound reason for the change other than that it did not mean "pugs." Before making his protest and scolding "American pseudo-savants" he should have made sure of his ground, and become genuinely "savant" himself. Had he done so he would have found that *Tephroclystis* is a Hubnerian term far antedating *Eupithecia*, Curtis, and that, following the law of priority, Hubner's name simply had to be used. If