

men had not reached him earlier. Probably some of the opposition to Hübner had its origin in the prejudice against a multiplicity of genera. With all such matters of feeling science has nothing to do in its impersonal researches after an exact generic nomenclature. What we seek is a stable name for certain generic types of structure, not a choice between authorities.

All who have studied the recent progress in the classification of our North American Noctuidæ, will recognize the fact that it is being carried out upon the lines laid down by me in the pages of this journal, lines which I took up from the writings of Stephens and Lederer on the Old World fauna and applied to the arrangement of the North American species. The new catalogues adopt my groupings. Here and there my reference of a species to a wrong genus, from a neglect to examine the single type, having no microscope at hand, or from a fear of injuring it before its return, is corrected—some half a dozen—but, as a whole, the species remain as I arranged them, and what changes are made are the natural result of observations on larger material, and, in any event, more apparent than real. That our classification can be bettered is certain. No one lifetime is long enough, outside of other occupation, to finally study our nearly 2,000 species of owlet moths and make all the comparisons necessary with the European and South American faunæ. It is hardly necessary for me to say this in the way of apology for the incompleteness of my work. All our work is fragmentary and incomplete. This fact is often forgotten, usually forgotten by new or younger writers, as also that all undue and unjust criticism will tell in the end against the user of such a weapon. Underlying all our entomological activities is the individual person, the more or less educated character, the mental force which time and opportunity develops and cultivation softens and perfects. Even in our very nature itself we are dual; our actions are not always in accordance with our conceptions. I am reminded of this fact by an interesting statement of Prof. J. B. Smith's, who testifies to this duality (Proc. National Mus., XIV. 257) where he acknowledges that he had redescribed my *Mamestra purpurissata*, which has hairy eyes, as a species of *Hadenæ*, in which genus the eyes are naked. Prof. J. B. Smith says (l. c.): "How I came to refer the insect to *Hadenæ*, I can not now understand, since my memoranda show that I *knew* the eyes were hairy."

Here is, then, the place for me to correct a former citation (with regard to Noctuid genera) of mine in the Buffalo Check List, 1876. Hübner is