

In that famous entomological year, 1877, I took *Scopelosomas* for the first time; they were in great abundance. From the latter part of September to the first day of December I took about 800 moths, mostly *Scopelosoma* and *Lithophane*, the bulk of the *Scops.* being of that form now known as *Moffatiana*. I had noticed a difference in the depth of shading in the yellow ones, but thought it the result of age and exposure.

In November I visited Mr. Grote in Buffalo, taking with me representatives of my recent captures, and received from him over a dozen names of *Scops.* and *Liths.*, and amongst them *S. Graefiana*. In following years I observed that the yellowish form was just as fresh as the reddish one, and that in some localities one would greatly outnumber the other, and I began to suspect that we might have in these forms different moths. About this time Roland Thaxter, who is now, I understand, entitled to the prefix of Dr., opened communication with me, with a view to exchange; to him I expressed my suspicion, and sent to him an example of the light form as being least abundant with me, and received the reply, that he saw no difference in it from those he took. I then sent him the reddish form; he expressed delight, never having seen the same before, and enquired if Mr. Grote had seen it. I told him that I had got the name from just such specimens.

I supplied him with a good series, and he went into communication with Mr. Grote about it, and it seems with some difficulty succeeded in persuading Mr. Grote that it was deserving of a separate name. And now Prof. Smith, by the examination of the genitalia, finds them widely apart. I, by observing their habits, had suspected this might be the case, but could not prove it, whilst from appearance alone Mr. Grote had failed even to suspect it.

As resemblance is not always proof that they are one, so the lack of it is not a demonstration that they are separate. In the early part of 1890 I had an opportunity of examining an extensive series of *Lithophanes* in the collection of Capt. Geddes, Toronto. I could arrange in line 30 or 40 *Disposita*, *Petulca*, *Ferrealis*, *Signosa*, *Bethunei*, in such a way as to make it appear impossible to tell where the separation should be made. What verdict would the genitalia give in this case? I would expect it to be in favour of their being artificial species of one natural species; yet it may not, but suppose it did? let no one think that I would favour the obliterating of a single name.

J. ALSTON MOFFAT.