

to classify the moth as a Lithosian before asserting it to be an Arctian, "next to Utetheisa." I have already pointed out Mr. Smith's misstatements as to the neuration. These corrected, we have before us a Noctuid in all structural characters, except that the secondaries have vein eight of seven; but thus also paralleled by *Stilbia*. On the fore wings vein five originates near four, and runs nearer four than six. The clypeal tubercle and the legs, with a claw on fore-tibiæ, recall, as I have said, the *Stiriini*, and, so far as I can see from my six specimens, the tegulæ do not lie close to the thorax. But the squamation resembles that of *Tarache*, and we may place the moth after this group and before *Spragueia* and the *Eustrotiini*. Since 1868, I have been occupied in bringing our *Noctuidæ* into natural genera, founded on characters exposed by Lederer, characters used also by prominent recent specialists, such as Prof. Fernald and Lord Walsingham. It is therefore ridiculous for Mr. Smith to accuse me of ignorance of Lederer's definitions. But it will be better not to discuss any further Mr. Smith's remarks on this genus. The question whether relatively slight variations in the neuration can establish natural families in the Lepidoptera, is not to be decided after the fashion of Mr. Smith, but must be reasonably discussed. I have shown cases of individual variation in neuration, and science has not yet removed the scales and studied the veins of all the species of moths. We must not fall into the fault of tucking away an insect under a scientific label, but constantly occupy our minds with its various characters until its affinities become clear to us.

We may now enumerate the tribes into which I have divided the *Noctuina*. It may be premised that the genera thus associated may, in some instances, need transference. The limits between certain of these tribes seem faint, and I have had to rely often on somewhat vague and general characters for their definition. Unlike the Coleoptera, the investigator of the Lepidoptera is often at a loss to find structural features, so uniform is the general character, so soft the body parts, clothed with dense hair and scales, difficult to remove so that the external skeleton be studied. I have recognized the divisions of tribes, sub-families and families, and have endeavored to follow Leconte in his classification of the Coleoptera in my nomenclature. I think we should make a distinction between the characters employed for these divisions, and that we should not allow for a subordinate structural character a "family" value. On