

the characters of the principal genera in the first part of this paper, so far as I have material before me to examine. The present paper is intended to supply material for the future monographist of the *Noctuidæ*, with my other studies already published, and I need not weigh critically the value of certain points of structure at the present time. A recent paper of mine in "Papilio," upon classification, gives briefly the general conclusions to which my experience has led me. I wish only here to show that a study of natural characters leads to a correspondence between the results of different observers which is not attained in any other way. Important discrepancies may be laid to a failure to study enough material or to examine it thoroughly. By the system of Gueneé the limitation of the genera was made more uncertain; by that of Lederer the confines were more clearly exposed. But no finality can be reached until, all the *Noctuidæ* being known, a final arrangement will be arrived at from the mere futility and unimportance of changes dependent to a considerable extent on the mere temper of the writer. Just as *Thalpochares* obtains as against *Trothusa*, so I should retain *Lygranthoezia* as against *Schinia* or my term *Euleucyptera*. It is clearly of less importance what name we give the genus when its limits are agreed upon generally speaking. Even after the minute researches of Lederer and Von Heineman, some species are difficult to place and will oscillate for some time. Many differ in comparative characters only, and about the value of these there will not be easily found an agreement between writers. Gueneé's genera in both *Noctuidæ* and *Geometridæ* are not based on scientific or natural characters, but he arrives at results sometimes identical with those of Lederer. Lederer is decided in his criticism of Gueneé, but not personally hostile or illiberal, hence his remarks have a certain value which they would not otherwise bear. Now quite recently in a monograph which is certainly exhaustive in appearance and the result of a wonderful industry, Dr. Packard very strongly endorses Gueneé and considers his work as superior in value to Lederer's by distinct implication. I myself do not share this opinion, and since my return from Europe in 1867, I have used the natural characters laid down by Lederer and discarded the comparative ones of Gueneé. In fact I could not understand genera comprising "groups" entirely arbitrarily composed, without definition, embracing species with hairy and naked eyes (e. g. *Aplecta*) or with no reference to the structure of the feet. The exceptions to his diagnoses are often more numerous than the typical forms. "Souvent," etc., is a term which seems