

MR. SMITH ON CERATHOSIA.

BY A. R. GROTE, A. M., BREMEN.

In reply to Mr. Smith's paper, somewhat inappropriately styled "*Arctiida vs. Noctuida*," I would state that my original paper in Entom. Amer. on *Cerathosia* had for its *main* object the pointing out of the errors contained in Mr. Smith's original description of the genus in the neuration. When these errors are corrected according to my statements (which latter in the main seem to be acknowledged by Mr. Smith as correct), the probability that the moth is an *Arctian* next to *Utetheisa* is weakened, and, as I have shown it is not a *Lithosian*, the chances are we must look for its position elsewhere. The *secondary* object of my paper was to suggest that we might find a better place for *Cerathosia* next to *Acopa*, etc., in the *Noctuida*. Now, in reply to Mr. Moeschler, and Mr. Smith, I have to say, that I did not discuss vein 8 of *Cerathosia*. I have also to complain that Mr. Smith is an unfair writer, who indulges in large expressions of condemnation upon small grounds (as for instance the fact that some *Lithosians* have an accessory cell, while I give no accessory cell as a character of the sub-family), and above all a writer who misrepresents the party he desires to criticize. Mr. Smith alludes to a paper on *Cerathosia* "not yet reached." I advise him when that paper is reached, to have any statement it may contain as to the neuration of *Cerathosia* corrected according to my original corrections. I have no objections to my writings being "handled without gloves," as Prof. Fernald says Mr. Smith does, when the criticism is fair and reasonable.

A FINAL WORD ABOUT THE GENUS RILEYA.

BY WM. H. ASHMEAD.

In the last issue of the CAN. ENT. Mr. Howard, with a commendable solicitude for my entomological reputation, and under a heavy discharge of deadly parallel columns, seeks to evade the question at issue between us, *i. e.*, who has *priority in the use of the generic term Riley*, and notwithstanding the opportunity was afforded him to rechristen his interesting genus, he seems loath to do so, and again, by a misrepresentation, makes a claim of priority in publication.

Had Mr. Howard written *read* instead of "published," he would have been nearer the truth. However, this may have been another *lapsus*