

Smith afterwards confirms the decision. That the specimen considered by Butler and Smith to be the "type" of *cristifera*, Walk., is really *lubens*, I do not doubt. But that this specimen was described by Walker and seen by me, I do not only doubt, but I shall try to show the impossibility of. Let me premise that, so far as I can find out, in every case where I have positively identified Walker's species, after seeing the Brit. Mus. Collection, my identification is adopted and verified afterwards by Prof. Smith, as a study of his synonymy will show. In every case but this; for even where, from the poor condition of the specimen, I only ventured to suggest the identity, as with *A. muraenula*, the supposition is confirmed. Let me also premise that, in the search for "types," Prof. Smith has not stopped to verify the supposed "type" by the description. Yet the description is the sole real authority for the authenticity of the "type." A number of times have I, in print, drawn attention to this fact, that when a supposed "type" contradicts the published description, the "type" must be held to be spurious. Not only does literature bring ample evidence that "types" have been subsequently made, but a mistake in labelling, a changing of the label, may not infrequently occur, and has often occurred as the result of accident. We may go further and say that a description must tolerably well conform to the appearance and character of the specimen, to be accepted as having been drawn up from it. But, in the present case, we may waive all such argument, weakened as it must be by Walker's poor descriptive methods. The description of *cristifera* simply contradicts the supposition that a specimen of *lubens* could have served for its basis. It bears out my independent testimony, written without consulting the B. Mus. Lists, that a sordid, dusky or "brownish" gray insect, without any brighter colouring, was before Mr. Walker. Accessory evidence is that *lubens* is not, so far as known, a northern species at all, not else known in the Hudson Bay collections; while the form I saw had the northern aspect of *Polia aspera*. Again, Mr. Walker's generic references are wild, but there is still some method in them. A moth to be referred by him to *Acronycta* must have something gray, black and white, about it, to say the least. Now *lubens* is not gray after this fashion. It is more brown than gray. It is very dark grayish with generally over all a distinct reddish flush and tinge, especially basally. The reniform spot is upright and yellowish, not kidney-shaped. Beneath it is even brighter coloured, tinged with carmine or bright red. The hind wings are not gray or "cinereous" at all, but