from any species of *Spilosoma* known to him up to that time, it seems in the highest degree probable that it was a typical lightly-marked female of *Antigone*, in which case it seems to me that Sir George Hampson's contention would entirely fall to the ground. In the third place, Messrs. Grote & Robinson published their description of the species in 1868, retaining the name *Congrua* and referring type  $\varepsilon$  correctly to *Virginica*, which should certainly be allowed weight, as all difficulty was thereby cleared up, the name *Congrua* being restricted to a single valid species. And, lastly, it is certain that the species described by Strecker in 1878, ten years after Grote & Robinson's description appeared, had been standing under the name *Congrua* in a great national museum since 1855, that is, for twenty-three years, before it was redescribed by Strecker.

Under these circumstances, I contend that the name Congrua should be used for this species, and the name Antigone be referred as a synonym. Before leaving this subject, I may mention that Sir George Hampson has informed me that as both this species and Prima have the claw on fore tibiæ, they belong to the genus Estigmene, Hübn., = Leucarctia, Pack., and not to Spilosoma.

In regard to the forms which Walker referred to Cunea, it is impossible to be certain, for while there are in the collection quite a number of specimens of this species, a good proportion of these have been received at later dates than those referred to by Walker. But of one thing we can be certain, and that is, that so far at least as the males go, he must have referred to Punctatissima, and it is a remarkable fact that in the collection there are no less than eight specimens of this species (7.3) and 1 2) having the hind wings more or less spotted, though in two males the spots are barely perceptible. But Walker's description of the female as "Hind wings with some brown submarginal spots," was probably based upon the one specimen of the heavily-spotted Gomin form of Spilosoma, or, I suppose, I should say Estigmene, which was entered in the Register, under number 950, as Arctia Cunea, and as received on 19th June, 1839, from Mr. Milne's collection. Another specimer, No. 951, was entered under the same name, but there is only the one specimen of the Gomin form in the collection.

Sir George Hampson called my attention to a specimen which he said agreed exactly with Walker's type of *Spilosoma Mutans*, which is in the museum at Oxford, and which specimen is only a very ordinary form of *Cunea* or *Punctatissima*. Sir George also showed me Walker's type of