

species run much closer together than the species of *Thyatira*; in the size, the characteristic wavy markings, they are nearly alike. Although, the European species of *Thyatira* is sufficiently distinct from *Bombycia* (*Cymatophora*), so that the ground for these genera being placed together is not obvious until we compare the neuration of the secondaries, the American western representatives approach each other more nearly in external characters. Of the two genera, it is *Habrosyne* (*Gonophora*) which is most aberrant, most like the typical Noctuae, most like the genus *Plusia*. And I would here record a most singular fact: older European writers, as Meigen, etc., place *Thyatira* near *Plusia*. Probably the cut of the wing in *derasa*, and the tufts, together with the bright tints of both *batis* and *derasa*, influenced their decision. But there are no special resemblances between the species of *Plusia* and *Thyatira* in the European fauna. Now, in North America, we have two species of *Plusia*, which actually mimic species of *Leptina* and *Thyatira*. The first of these is *Plusia formosa* Gr., which so closely resembles a *Leptina* that, at the commencement of my studies, I described the type under this genus. I had my doubts, owing to the long *Plusia*-like labial palpi, to which I especially alluded. It so happened, that I at once returned the type to Mr. Treat, while I never afterwards saw a specimen, owing in part to the undoubted rarity of the species. I could not myself then subsequently make the correction, which was supplied by the late Mr. Morrison, (who was largely indebted to me for generic and specific determinations in the *Noctuidæ*,) in the Annals of the N. Y. Lyceum of Natural History. The second instance, as its name implies, is the *Plusia thyatiroides* of Guenée, which, in its rosy patches on primaries, reminds one of *T. pudens*. Had these two forms occurred in Europe, they might have strengthened, or of themselves suggested the opinion that *Thyatira* and *Plusia* were allied. As it is, the case is one of the most singular which I have met with in the moths. It is to Hübner that we owe the more correct classification of this group. How much we do owe to this author! This fact alone, and that he has correctly limited the genera, should oblige us to retain Hübner's nomenclature in this sub-family. Writers, who themselves make mistakes in describing structure, should be more modest in their criticisms of Hübner:

The various genera into which the typical European forms are divided by Hübner, are probably valid: *Bombycia*, *Asphalia*, etc. As against