

I notice, also, Mr. Morrison's remark that I have mistaken the generic characters of *Hydroecia semiaperta*. This species, with hairy eyes, is placed by Mr. Morrison first in *Hydroecia*, a genus which has the eyes *naked*. It was sent to me as a n. s. of *Hydroecia* by Mr. Morrison for examination, and I then returned the species determined as belonging to a genus allied to, but distinct from *Hydroecia*. In the Proceedings of the Academy I merely discuss the priority of the names *Apamea* and *Hydroecia*, show that they are synonyms, and adopt *Apamea* and refer *all* the American species described under *Hydroecia* to *Apamea*. Among them is Mr. Morrison's *semiaperta*. There is not a word as to the structure of the species, and, in fact, I refer to *semiaperta* in the next description as *Hydroecia semiaperta*. It was not my intention then to discuss its structure or erect the new genus, to which I have always in letters stated it to belong.

Mr. Morrison speaks of *nigrescens* as a synonym of *fasciolaris*. I have examined and determined both species as distinct from specimens in the collection of the American Entomological Society. The two are totally, and, I believe, even generically different.

Mr. Morrison allows himself to make an extraordinary statement with regard to one of the few generic names proposed in my List and its Supplement, to the effect that such names without further description need not be adopted. Independent of the fact that it is customary to retain such names as can be proven by the works of Hübner, Ochsenheimer, Walker and many others, the view taken by Mr. Morrison is untenable from the consideration that I have indicated my type and clearly circumscribed the genus by an enumeration of the species in every case. Science is occupied by the fact and not the name; by his criticism Mr. Morrison shows himself affected by the name and not the fact. There can be no doubt that I have made such genera recognizable by including under them described species and thus facts and things admitted by science as existing and already defined. My generic names are as strictly to be preserved in these cases as if they were defined with the minuteness which characterizes Mr. Scudder's definition of *Papilio*. Take, for instance, my genus *Eucloptocnemis*, proposed in my List for the *Heliophobus fimbriaris* of Gueneé. Even the Etymology of the name suggests my reference to Gueneé's statement that his species has armed tibiae, and my inference that then it cannot be a *Heliophobus*, which has them unarmed. If from such data as this no conclusion can be drawn and no action taken by a