

For the purpose of confining attention to the more radical changes proposed, I will leave for a future time all questions relating to specific names, and consider at present only those affecting genera.

With the exception of some very unimportant examples, these chiefly turn upon the validity of the genera proposed and defined by Dr. Geoffroy in his *Histoire Abregee des Insectes*.

The first edition of this valuable work, in which, as is justly said by Mr. Crotch, he displayed "a degree of acumen far in advance of his age," bears date on the title page, 1764*, and was printed at Paris. The last edition, with supplements, was printed also in Paris, year of the Republic vii, (1799.)

The binominal nomenclature was first distinctly used in zoology in the 10th edition of the *Systema Naturæ*, by Linnæus, in 1758, and repeated in the 12th edition, 1766-67.

After the publication of the work last mentioned, Fabricius and others, devoting themselves more exclusively to entomology than Linnæus had done, divided his genera, and in describing new ones adopted other names for several of those described by Geoffroy.

The names of these later authors have, until the changes proposed by Mr. Crotch, been adopted without cavil.

Thus much as to the history of the question. Now as to the argument.

The most systematic attempt to reduce the laws of nomenclature in zoology to a code, capable of being easily understood and applied, was that of the British Association, acting through a committee, which reported at the meeting held in 1842.

Without discussing the details of this report, some of which might be and, indeed, were subjected to criticism, it is sufficient to state that the principles therein recommended were adopted by the Association, and without important modification, were reaffirmed by the Association of American Geologists and Naturalists at the meeting held in 1845.† These laws have been accepted and acted on by nearly all investigators in Natural History ever since.

Some discussions having taken place which indicated a possibility of improving the code, it was again referred by the British Association to

* Mr. Crotch states 1762, but I know not on what authority.

† Am. Journ., 2nd series, ii, 423—(1846).