

tical "type" of Walker's was what he called *brassica*? I have not the literature at the moment to refer to. It has no immediate bearing on my conclusion, which is this, that the species I have named in American collections *Mamestra lubens* must retain its name.

I do not belong to the school which would ignore the British Museum Catalogue altogether. As much as any one I have worked out Walker's species and generally adopted his names when earlier. It is true I lose more than any one else by Walker's insufficient descriptions. I do not object to this, for the reason that our main need is a stable nomenclature. This latter cannot be established by the procedure of taking a specimen as Walker's "type" which does not answer his published description. The real basis for our nomenclature is our literature. If *lubens* is dropped for *crisifera*, then this basis is fundamentally attacked. What is called a "type" supersedes it. But labelling a specimen can never constitute a publication. Walker's text must conform always and in every case sufficiently with his supposed "type," and at least not contradict it. In this case the description does not conform and does contradict the assumption of Mr. Butler. There may be other cases, but I have no means to look into them. I am quite willing that Walker's names should be restored and credited to him as if he had fully described his material. That so many of my species should be thus drawn in, is certainly no fault of mine. The labour of comparing Walker's "types" is no greater than that of determining any other lot of specimens; but the labour used in trying to make out his descriptions will in almost every case be always in vain. After I had satisfied myself of this in 1868, I ceased to trouble myself to look through the Catalogues for a possible identification, which, in the best case, would be a doubtful one. It was much better to write recognizable descriptions of our Noctuidæ and run the risk with Mr. Walker. And when all is restored that can be restored to Mr. Walker, it may, I think, be said of my work with justice, that at a time when we in America had no names at all for our Owlet moths, I built up gradually a nomenclature which, for the greatest part, will endure.

Two other points remain to be elucidated. I am persistently credited by Prof. Smith with the description of *lorca* under the name *dodgei*. I have not the literature, but my memory is that I never described such a species, but that Mr. Morrison did. The last point relates to the type of *ferrealis*. I received this from Morrison's late Montana collections. It is very