

of the Museum; my extras came in a few days later. No one has responded as yet, so I do not know whether I have made converts or not.

Under these circumstances, Mr. H. H. Lyman's paper on the species of *Callimorpha*, CAN. ENT., Oct., 1887, agreeing as it does in the main with my own conclusions, was most gratifying, and restores to some extent my faith in the intelligence of Lepidopterists. Mr. Lyman, while agreeing in the main with my results (he could not have seen my paper), presents some differences to which I beg to call attention. I will do it under the call of species, following his order, which differs from my own.

C. LECONTEI Bd.

Mr. Lyman accuses me of mistaking the type of this species, and he is right. My excuse is that I have never seen *lecontei* as Mr. Lyman here fixes it. I had seen Boisduval's figure, and Herrich-Schaeffer's figure, which evidently referred to the same species. I have never seen specimens like Mr. Lyman's figures 1, 2 and 3. His figure 4 and all the others are familiar to me. The most obvious and striking point in Boisduval's figure was the transverse black band near the base of the primaries, and as I knew only one species that had this peculiarity, I referred the name to that species, crediting the figures with sufficient inaccuracy to cover the differences between them and my specimens. I did not deem it possible that there was a form that I had not seen, so close as to be confusing. As it proves, I was mistaken, and I confess Mr. Lyman's figures 1, 2 and 3 were a surprise to me. He is undoubtedly correct, however, in his references and identification of the species.

Var. *confinis* Wlk. This is without doubt a mere synonym of *militaris* Harr. Mr. Butler kindly sent me a drawing of that form. The Museum series readily fills all gaps between figures 6 and 8 on Mr. Lyman's plate.

Query.—Is the typical *lecontei* local? It seems passing strange that none of the numerous collections I have seen should have a single specimen referable to it, so as to save me from blundering!

C. CONTIGUA Wlk.

This needs no further reference. I thoroughly agree with Mr. Lyman in all he says. It may be well to say here that in my paper I have described and figured the genitalia of nearly all the species, and the differences there noted bear out the conclusions otherwise reached.

C. CONFUSA Lyman.

Undoubtedly a good species, which in my paper I have referred to as