

Grote wishes to keep tied to it. Not only so, but if the tendencies which produced this form continued, the form *Nitela* might become extinct, and yet *Nebris* would only be var. *Nebris* of the extinct *Nitela*.

Surely we must classify species as we find them existing at present, and not on the basis of any man's conjecture of what they may have been hundreds of thousands of years ago. If the law of priority is to be carried back to primeval times, it will be invested with new terrors.

In regard to my remarks on *Lophodonta Angulosa* and *Lophodonta Georgica*, or, as Dr. Packard in his work on the Bombycine Moths gives them, *Lophodonta Angulosa* and *Drymonia Georgica*, I confess that I had overlooked the paper by Messrs. Grote and Robinson in the Annals of the N. Y. Lyceum N. Hist.

Of course, theoretically, anyone who ventures to write on any entomological subject is supposed to be acquainted with everything which has ever been published on that subject in his own country, and in every other country, but practically if we attempted to follow that rule, I am afraid that little, if anything, would be written. We have to take some chances, and a man away from large entomological libraries must depend to a certain extent upon catalogues and indexes, and in no record or catalogue which I possess is this paper referred to.

I am much obliged to Mr. Grote for calling my attention to it, and may point out that the authors fell into the error of giving the number of Abbot & Smith's plate as 78 instead of 83, as given by me.

I disagree with those gentlemen, however, in their conclusions, as there is not a particle of evidence pointing to the probability of the "lower right-hand figure" of Abbot's plate being a male. It was figured as a female, and presumably belonged to that sex. It is, of course, possible that Abbot may have been mistaken, and it may have been a male, just as he figured a small female of *Phobetron Pithecium* as the male of that species, a not very heinous error when the extremely aberrant character of the male is considered, but even if it was a male, I fail to see that that would make any difference. The upper left-hand figure was the one described as the typical form, it being distinctly stated that the males and the majority of the females were of that type, while the lower right-hand figure was given merely as a variety of colour.

Mr. Grote says that Abbot & Smith's name became restricted to this supposed "variety of colour" by Herrick-Schaffer's description of *Georgica*, but he did not describe it; he merely published a figure, a