Mr. Butler has shown himself to be equally possessed. It is not my intention at this time to discuss minor points (such as Mr. Butler's citation of *Philampelus satellitia* Harris to Linne's species of that name instead of to *pandorus*, where it belongs), or the larger questions as to the number of groups, Mr. Butler separating the *Ambulicinue* from the *Chæro-campinæ*, while Grote and Robinson in 1865 left them united. The arrangement, indeed, is virtually that of our synonymical catalogue of 1865; the genus *Acherontia*, not represented in America and left out of consideration by ourselves, is made into a separate sub-family *Acherontiinue* by Mr. Butler. I wish merely to note here the changes which I am at present willing to admit in the arrangement proposed in the "Check List of North American Sphinges" published by myself in 1875.

Haeme rhagia G. & R.

I do not admit that Buffaloensis and uniformis are identical. former is smaller sized and there is a slight toothing or unevenness of the inner margin of the terminal band of the primaries. The discal cell is reduced and the transverse scale line tends to be absorbed by the scales clothing the median vein. Nor do I admit that Kirby's ruficaudis is the same as uniformis: I have shown that Kirby's description boldly contradicts it. There is some warrant for believing that Kirby intended diffinis or a species of Hemaris, as I have shown, CAN. ENT., 6, 170. Butler's ruficaudis is probably uniformis. The Albany collectors take both Buffaloensis and uniformis (Mr. Lintner has reared Buffaloensis), and we may look for further careful and consequently decisive information from them in regard to these points. Although Mr. Butler speaks adversely, and perhaps a little vexatiously, on p. 518, as to the validity of the genus, on p. 521 he says of *Haemorrhagia*: "This may, perhaps, be a genus, the species being more densely scaled than in Hemaris, and having consequently a somewhat different aspect; on the whole, however, I prefer to regard it for the present as a section." The reason, if I remember rightly, that we were not certain of the generic position of radians was that we did not know the species, nor have I seen it since 1865.

Callenyo Grote.

This term should be employed, I think, for carinata as distinguished by Mr. Butler from Alcuron (chloroptera, etc.).