

pean *testacea*, which Lederer includes under *Apamea* Tr. Probably the true type of *Apamea* may be found in *nictitans*, one of the original species.

Of neither *Luperina* Boisd. (= *Apamea* Led.), or *Ledereria* m. (= *Luperina* Led. non Boisd.), do I know American species. *Apamea nictitans* occurs with us however, from California to the East probably as an unchanged survival, not only in the typical, but also in the varietal European forms. Whether *nictitans* and certain allied species are distinct from *Gortyna*, I, however, doubt, and it is probable that we have but one genus which European authors call *Hydracia* Guen. Now the type of *Hydracia* is *micacea*, as cited in the Species Général. But the type of *Gortyna* is already designated by Hübner as *micacea*, consequently *Hydracia* must fall. For *Gortyna* Led., with its one species *flavago*, which differs from *Hydracia* by its mucronate clypeus, the term *Ochria* must be used, as I have pointed out. The objectors to Hübner must be told that Ochsenheimer cites him as authority, himself giving no diagnoses to the Noctuid genera; that the older Noctuid generic names are all incompletely founded, that there is no standard for exact generic definition, and finally, that Hübner has given us more information and a better classification for the *Noctuidæ* than any author before his time. Hübner separates the *Thyatirine* correctly for the first time; he is the author of the leading generic divisions and names, *Apatela*, *Agrotis*, *Heliothis*, etc., names which have been wrongly credited to his successors. The North American species of *Gortyna* (including those separated by me with *nictitans*) are much more numerous than the European. The finest species is our beautiful *Gortyna speciosissima*. We have two species with mucronate clypeus; one from the East, *buffalocensis*, and another from the West. In ornamentation these species resemble the other *Gortynæ*, but we must refer them to *Ochria*, together with the European *flavago*. Our North American species which most nearly resembles the European *flavago*, is, however, my *Cataphracta*, but here the front is smooth. The question then arises as to the value of the frontal tubercle; whether it may not be developed as easily as modifications in the color or pattern of ornamentation. Such questions are beyond our present ability to answer. We must use what characters we find upon which to found our genera, but the difficulties which the subject presents should preclude all notion that our present opinions are infallible, or that we have any reasonable pretext to arrogate to ourselves a superiority in our classi-