

He quotes at some length a former statement of mine as to the spinose tibiae (made ten years ago), which I at once corrected on examining again the small insect under a larger lens. But he excuses other modern writers with worse mistakes to father. In stating the case fairly, he should have said that although Mr. Grote has been the first American to insist on the natural characters of spinose tibiae, yet once he called the tibiae unarmed, where they were really spinose, but he promptly corrected the mistake. Mr. Smith calls my citing *Rhododipsa volupia* hardly "honest," while he suppresses the fact that I twice described the moth as probably Fitch's species, but Fitch's description, as I explained, will not fit my insect (figured in Illustrated Essay). In my list I only did to this *one* what LeConte did throughout, viz., cite the authority for the combined terms. I differ from Mr. Smith as to the generic characters, and I desired to show that no new specific name was necessary, even if my species was not Fitch's. With regard to the species, there is little variance with regard to their validity. The synonymy is mainly that of my Lists. I do not believe that *persimilis* is the same as *villosa*; at the same time I readily admit that *balba* and *acutilinea* may be color forms of *separata*. Speyer considers, as I do, that *angulata* is distinct from *umbra* (= *exprimeus*). Mr. Hy. Edwards informed me long ago that *sucta* and *Californiensis* were varieties. The statement made by Mr. Smith that I resurrected *Trigonophora* from Hubner, is incorrect. I took the genus from Lederer and Staudinger. I cannot understand why it is that *Schinia* Hubn, which I did "resurrect," is made to supercede my genera; but I scarcely think that any one will call all the species "*Schinia*" that Mr. Smith puts under that genus. I can assure Mr. Smith that my little *limbalis* is not related to Mr. Edwards' *constricta*. From a small unset specimen I established the genus *Epinyctis*, without knowing of Mr. Hulst's description of the moth as *magdalena*. The two, as Mr. Hy. Edwards has told me, are the same. My specimen was very poor, and I have it no longer to again go over its characters, which are, I believe, correctly given by me. The collections I have determined will allow of every certainty as to my species, but I hope that my labels will be respected and not changed, as it is probable that Mr. Smith's work will be modified. It is interesting as the first attempt to review from a scientific standpoint the material brought together by myself, and which there was frequently no opportunity to compare at the time of the original description of the species and genera.