

am not aware of any test by which it shall be decided that a genus is sufficiently characterized. When the species is already known, less words are, I should think, needed. It is better to supplement missing characters in a diagnosis, than to needlessly criticize its author, especially in the case where a good number of genera have been fully and clearly made out by him and his work is largely of a pioneer kind, and often has to be accomplished with borrowed specimens or single examples. The difficulty of being always right is shown by Mr. Smith in putting *Polenta* among genera with unarmed tibiæ, while, *per contra*, I wrongly stated as it appears (though hesitatingly) that *Feralia* had no ocelli. There is room for careful work in the *Noctuidæ*, but the species must be fully examined as I have tried to do in the genera allied to *Erotyla*. A good lens, a good or perfect male specimen and a duplicate for dissection, a quick eye and experience are needed. If, with all these, patience and courtesy are possessed by the author, who must also know the literature well, satisfactory work cannot fail to be accomplished. Even with all these the student will be disappointed if he expects to produce a "Synopsis" that shall be correct and complete, in a short time. We probably shall have to classify nearly 2,000 kinds of *Noctuidæ*: I have examined or described about 1,200.

#### Genus PLATYSAMIA Grote.

Hubner's genus *Samia*, erected in the Verzeichniss for species incorrectly associated, and with a diagnosis devoid of characters of value, is used by anti-Hubnerists instead of *Platysamia*, a term fully explained and correctly limited by me to the three or four species, *Cacropia*, *Gloveri*, *Columbia* and *Ccanothi*. Upon what ground this is excused does not appear. It is not consistent; and can only be done by those who give to Hubner's genera the same value as those of scientific writers. Even in this case the procedure is doubtfully defensible. In using Hubner's genera I have been often guided by the prior use of the rejected term, *i. e.* in preferring *Lithophane* to *Xylina*, *Eustrotia* for *Erastria*, etc., both *Xylina* and *Erastria* being previously proposed by Hubner for different genera from those to which Treitschke and Ochseneimer gave the terms. The entire question of Hubner's genera has been treated in a personal way, and every attempt I have made to compromise the matter has been met by unnecessary insistence on unimportant points. As it stands now, and taking the "Brooklyn List" as an example, Hubner seems only to be