

But southward there is a second brood of *textor* which is noted for its variations. The most spotted of these, the extreme variety, is supposed to have been the *Bombyx cunea*, figured by Drury in 1770. And therefore it is said the name of the variety must take the place of the specific name given by Harris, and till very lately generally accepted.

Both Professor Riley and Professor Smith have well and clearly expressed the contention as it now stands. The former says :

"The moths vary greatly, both in size and coloration. They have, in consequence of such variation, received many names, such as *cunea*, Drury; *textor*, Harris; *punctata*, Fitch; *punctatissima*, Smith. But there is no doubt, as proven from frequent breeding of specimens, that all of these names apply to the very same insect, or at most to slight varieties, and that Drury's name, *cunea*, having priority, must be used for the species." (Riley quoted in Packard's *Forest Insects*, pp. 246-7.)

The latter says :

"In Mr. Grote's list of 1882, *textor* and *punctata* stand without number, but in Roman letters, and therefore not as synonyms. There is no doubt at all of the identity of all these forms. Prof. Riley has proved that to demonstration, if proof were required to the statements of earlier writers." (CAN. ENT., XXII., p. 165-6.) And in his *List of Lepidoptera of Boreal America* he gives :

HYPHANTRIA, Harr.

1096. *Cunea*, Drury.

*punctatissima*, S. & A.

*punctata*, Fitch.

*congrua*, Walker.

*textor*, Harris.

*candida*, Walker.

*ab. pallida*, Pack.

But is there really no room for doubt? Is the proof so entirely satisfactory? It might have been were there but one variable insect in the field to meet the requirements, but with two or more the matter is fairly open to question.

Let us consider the illustrations that accompany Prof. Riley's statement. I have them by me in that valuable work, Packard's *Forest Insects*, p. 245-6. First compare with the illustration of the Fall Webworm Moth on page 245, the illustrations accompanying Dr. Bethune's and Prof. Saunders's articles above referred to — the disproportion in