

The difference made between authors, to which I above allude, as to generic names, is, that catalogue names, to which no description is appended, but under which the species are simply listed, are held to be of less value. But we can always know what is meant by them, and all that we seek in the present case is to find out an exact generic title for any one species as an impersonal literary fact. In an opposite view no criterion exists by which we can test the description. Almost all the older descriptions, so far as matter is concerned, are waste paper. Take for instance the cases of Walker and Hübner. Walker's generic descriptions in the *Noctuide* contain statements out of which we can usually make nothing. Take, for instance, that of *Feltia*. What is said would cover almost any of the entire *Noctuinae*. The synonyms made by Walker would not and could not have been detected unless I, or some one else, had inspected his type. Had any one told him that his *Feltia ducens* was a specimen of *Agrotis jaculifera*, Guen. (*subgothica* of Authors nec Haworth), Walker would have been obliged for the information, and simply thrown his label and MS. into the waste paper basket, where both rightly belonged. The real difference between Walker and Hübner is, that Walker says more and conveys little, while Hübner says little and conveys more. Practically we can never be at a loss for the proper use of a single generic title published by Hübner, so that under the law of priority we can properly refer all of them, without, as is often the case with Walker, first having to identify a badly described species. Where both authors propose genera for known species, there is in reason no difference to be made between them. Walker's diagnoses are generally no better than no description at all; not unfrequently are they positively misleading.

Leaving these two authors, we come to Ochsenheimer, and here the fact presents itself that Ochsenheimer's names which did not meet the adverse fate of Hübner's in the Tentamen, are also no better founded, and are "catalogue names" without a description. What sort of a description could Ochsenheimer indeed have given? So that several names now in use and never doubted have the same original right as Hübner's Tentamen names. I think this fact ought to lend my argument conclusive weight, added to the fact, proven by me, that Ochsenheimer adopted Hübner's names, and considered the Tentamen as properly published and as of authority. Ochsenheimer apologizes, in fact, for not having adopted more of Hübner's titles, because the sheet of the Tenta-