

that these insects are specifically distinct one from the other. In the meantime it *is* surprising that Mr. Lyman, above everybody else, should countenance a question whether these insects are so distinct, for such a question implies a suspicion that *that eminent entomologist, Dr. Riley, confused two or more species of moths.*

It requires considerable courage and self-confidence for a man to assume the rôle of general critic and censor, and a critic should be careful not to misrepresent those whom he attacks. Where is the relevancy, or the correctness, of Mr. Lyman's statement that I overlooked the fact of the priority of the name *punctatissima* over that of *textor*, seeing that, on page 369 in the December number of the CANADIAN ENTOMOLOGIST, I arranged the Hyphantrians thus :

HYPHANTRIA, Harris.

Punctatissima, S. & A.

*textor*, Harris ?

Again, on page 128 he says, speaking of myself, "He is wrong in implying that Dr. Ottolengui doubted the identity of *cunea*, Drury, and *punctatissima*, A. & S." I implied nothing of the sort.

He continues, "What Dr. Ottolengui expressed a doubt about was whether *textor*, Harris, and *punctatissima*, A. & S., were the same." Is not that what I said? My words were, "By these forms I understand him to mean *punctatissima* and *textor*." Mr. Lyman failed to perceive that I was showing the weakness of Riley's theory in *two* particulars, testing the chain at two points.

It is usually understood that Riley was his own artist (and a very good artist too!). Whether he drew the figures 86 and 87, of which so much has been said, does not appear; but in the figures there are no lines of dimensions, in the letterpress there is no word as to enlargement or inaccuracy. We must therefore conclude that the figures are what Riley intended them to be. Yet Mr. Lyman speaks of the dimensions of Fig. 86 as "absurd," and alludes to inaccuracies in the wing-series. *In fact, I have to thank him for fully sustaining my second contention*, for if, as he says, Riley's series of wing-figures were merely intended to show the *range* of variations of a variable species, how can they be regarded as "a proof amounting to a demonstration" that *cunea*, Drury; *congrua*, Walker; *textor*, Harris; *punctatissima*, S. & A., etc., etc., are one and the same species?