こうちょうちょう たいちょう うちまたがた こうちょう

and the second state of the second state of the second state of the

tion of the European Dahlii, I may say that Mr. Morrison himself sent me phyllophora determined as Dahlii var. of Gueneé, and that I corrected this determination. I may say, to conclude with Mr. Morrison, that sometime after the circumstances which led to our difference transpired. Mr. Morrison wrote me a letter in which he acknowledged that he had misled me on several occasions, for the reason that he imagined I had acted in bad faith to him in sending him (at his request) species to describe, which he thought I knew not to be new. These species were, however, really new, and I described them, upon Mr. Morrison's refusal, myself. whereupon Mr. Morrison candidly acknowledged his suspicions, of which he relieved me, and this matter brought our correspondence to a close. With reference to the remarks on page 38, with regard to Mr. Henry Edwards's types of Agrotis, I would say that I returned the types of A. niveivenosa, A. pallidicollis and A. milleri to Mr. Edwards, and that I did so at his special request. No other "types" were "borrowed" by me, and all other specimens of Agrotis received by me from this source were given to me by Mr. Edwards, as a due return for my general determinations of his material in the family. I relinquished to Mr. Edwards really valuable and veritable "types" of Aegeriadæ in the exercise of a like courtesy, as Mr. Edwards was studying that group. Mr. Edwards's specimens of Californian Agrotis were, however, not "types" until worked over by me, and had little value aside from my work upon them. I gave Prof. Smith also several types of Noctuidæ and Mr. Neumoegen of Arctia. I may here remark that Prof. Smith is fond of citing specimens determined by me which are in various collections and do not belong to my species. In some few cases, as in the exsertistigma group, these determinations may well be the result of error on my part. But in by far the greater number of cases I believe that the determinations were not positively made by me, that in all, or nearly all, of them I never compared the specimens with my types or had the opportunity of doing so. Names given by me under a reservation would not unlikely be used by the owner of the specimen without that reservation. I think, when my types come to be examined that A. orbis will be shown to be distinct from cupidissima, and probably the species described by Prof. Smith under the latter title. But on the whole, and granting all that can be said, and while I am certainly not directly responsible for all the mistakes in the different private collections cited by Prof. Smith, which I have never had the opportunity thoroughly to see, much less to study, it must