

In the gradual progress of science, and with the multiplication of genera, it came to be considered that the person who recognized the necessity of subdividing an ancient genus, should exercise his judgment regarding the part to which the old name should adhere; and in most instances this was attended with no inconvenience.

Rarely, as in the case of *TEMNOCCHILA* *Ww.*, the name of the original genus *TRUGOSSITA* was retained for a group which did not accord with the original definition; the new name was imposed upon the set of species which should have kept the original name. These instances are but few in number, and the exposure of the error committed is sufficient to cause its immediate correction.

I would therefore infer that the practice of some students in recent times, of applying the older generic names in a different sense from that in which they were restricted by the persons first making the divisions, is founded upon an incorrect interpretation of what was formerly meant by a genus; and that these old authors, were they now alive, would strongly resist the limitation of their generic idea to a single type-species.

When the describer of a genus establishes the genus upon a single species, either because it is the only one known to him, or because, as is sometimes the case, he does not choose to enumerate the others, then of course, from the accident of the case, that particular species becomes typical of the genus, and must remain so as long as the present system of nomenclature is adopted. But when, on the other hand, several species are included in the genus, and they all agree accurately in the possession of the *characters mentioned* as defining the genus, they must in my opinion be regarded as *equally typical*. It would save much confusion in interpreting the modern use made of these restricted older names, if in all instances in systematic works the restricting authority was added in parenthesis.

A more difficult source of confusion is that resulting from the erroneous position ascribed to a genus, which renders it, with the ordinary usages of interpretation, absolutely irrecognizable; as when, for instance, the Byrrhidae genus *AMPHYCYRTA* was described by Mannerheim as a Tenebrionide, under the name *Eucyphus*, and the genus *AMPHIZOA* also as a Tenebrionide (*Dysmathes*). In these two cases Mannerheim's names fail from want of priority, but had this not been the case, I still maintain that the names of erroneous position should be suppressed in favor of later names which may have been independently given, and correctly