

Sir George Hampson has informed me, both orally and by letter, that he regards the name *Congrua* as a synonym of *Virginica*, and intends to refer it in this way in his forthcoming work, and to retain Strecker's name, *Antigone*. In order to make this matter clear, it is necessary to have Walker's description before us, and I therefore reproduce it.

"White. Tarsi with black bands. Fore coxæ and fore femora luteous, with black spots on the inner side; fore tibiæ striped with black on the inner side. Male.—Head and fore part of the thorax with a slight testaceous tinge. Fore wings with four oblique, very imperfect and irregular bands, composed of pale brown dots. Length of the body 6-7 lines: of the wings 16-20 lines, *a-c* Georgia. From Mr. Milne's collection." Now, Sir George Hampson's contention is that the first part of the description down to the word "Male" applies only to the specimen of *Virginica*, and that therefore the latter, as there were at least two distinct species included under the name, should be regarded as the type of *Congrua*. With this contention, though sorry to differ from Sir George, I am unable to agree for the following reasons:

In the first place, I contend that an author's description must be taken as a whole, and not split up into parts, and that to give the first line of a description priority over the second is carrying the doctrine of priority much further than I, at least, am prepared to carry it.

In the second place, I contend that the first part of the description applies to both types. As both are white moths, neither is yellow, brown or any other colour, and probably to save himself a little trouble, or possibly merely to give variety to the form of his descriptions, Walker gave first the characters applying to both the supposed sexes, and then indicated the points in which one sex, in this case the male, went beyond the description so far given.

But there is a very important point in this connection which Sir George appears to have overlooked, and that is that type *b* has disappeared.

Now, as this was also a female, and, according to the description of Messrs. G. & R., must have been very close in appearance to the *Virginica* type *c*, though not that species, it seems highly probable that it answered as closely as the specimen of *Virginica* to the first section of the description, and, hence, even on Sir George's theory, would be equally entitled to rank as the primary type. Now, while it is impossible to be certain what type *b* was, still, from the fact that an entomologist of Mr. Grote's ability regarded it as of the same species as type *a* and different