

where I have referred collectively to the species of *Crocota*, I have also expressly referred to Mr. Reakirt's descriptions, giving my reasons for not particularly citing the species by name. Hence, my writings have had the exactly contrary effect, to that stated by Mr. Smith, "of causing others to lose track of" Mr. Reakirt's "descriptions." I always reminded students of the existence of Mr. Reakirt's descriptions, though I confessed I could not make them out. Nor is Mr. Smith apparently any wiser than I. I did, indeed, suppose that *nigricans* was a synonym of *opella*, or founded on the dark form of that species, but I kept this and all other surmises to myself, because I had no certain data to go upon, and a scientific writer must, in such cases, have a reasonable certainty. With regard to *leta*, I, in my first list, am the first to refer *treatii* here, to show that I had probably rediscovered a totally unknown species since Boisduval's figure. I first, in fact, directed attention to this unrecognized figure, which has been copied in Encyc. Brit. To me belongs the credit of directing Mr. Smith's attention to this figure of *leta* and its probable identity with *treatii* in my first Check List. This identification is not quite assured in the absence of any description; hence, in my new Check List, I made a query. If Mr. Smith had written correctly and impartially on the genus *Crocota* he should have said: Mr. Grote first refers this genus to the *Arctiinae* on account of the presence of ocelli, and removes it from the *Lithosiinae* where he leaves *Ameria*. Further, Mr. Grote has figured the species he described in Proc. Ent. Soc., and no doubt exists, in a confusing genus, of the species he intended. Instead of this, with the evident intention of making an adverse criticism *coute qui coute*, we have the perversions above exposed. As was the case when Mr. Smith replied to my statement, that, in the *Deltoidinae*, the eyes were always "naked," that in one genus the eyes were "lashed" (as if these characters were contradictory or exclusive), it must seem clear that the limit of proper criticism is exceeded by Mr. Smith. The errors of an author must be judged by the material at his command in specimens and literature. If under all the circumstances under which he laboured his work is of a character virtually to advance the study of his subject, and if a large proportion of his determinations are accurate and in the state of the science very opportune, no right-minded person should be able to bring himself to prevent such labours. I may remark, in conclusion, that I do not regard *Cydosia*, *Cerathosia* or *Gnophala*, as *Arctiinae*, and I believe