

and the outer portion of the nervures of the primaries about the apical portion being blackish, which makes it look as if slightly scorched at the tips as described by the Doctor. Dr. Ottolengui expresses his conviction that *congrua* is distinct from *cunea*, but this was surely unnecessary, and shows that he misunderstood Dr. Fyles's meaning, as no one has suggested that the ground-feeding *S. antigone* is identical with the tree-feeding *H. punctatissima*.

In the same number Dr. Fyles had a second paper upon the same tangled question.

Dr. Fyles derives the name *cunea* from the Greek *κυνή* (a dog's skin), from a supposed fancied resemblance in coloration to the spotted carriage-dog of Europe, but I think Mr. Westwood's derivation from the Latin *cuneus* (a wedge) quite as probable, Drury having especially referred to the triangular marks. Dr. Fyles draws attention to the fact that the hind tibiae are not shown in Drury's figure, and that Walker did not describe the hind tibiae of what he supposed to be *cunea* or of what he described as *congrua*, but these points are of very minor importance, especially as in Drury's day entomological artists were not so particular about a spine or so, more or less, on the legs of insects.

Dr. Fyles says, in regard to *cunea*, that "we have nothing to guide us except Drury's figure, and Walker's description."

This is a very extraordinary statement, as we have Drury's description as well as figure; but how Walker's description of a few specimens of moths which he supposed to be identical with Drury's *cunea* could have any weight in deciding what Drury's moth really was, I fail to see.

Dr. Fyles, however, does not lay much stress on Walker's description of *supposed cunea*, but falls back on Drury's figure and finds it sufficient. I am not at all surprised at that, as I think that practically everybody else finds it sufficient also, as I believe that until Dr. Fyles became guilty of his present heresy, the belief that Drury's figure of *cunea* represented the much-spotted ermine moth of the South was one of those doctrines to which the formula "*semper, ubique et ab omnibus*" could be applied.

Dr. Fyles lays great stress on the fact that not one of the eight figures given by Riley to illustrate the supposed variation of *cunea* agrees exactly with Drury's figure, but this is really of no significance, as Riley was not trying to match that figure at all, but merely to show the range of variation, and in the case of so variable a species it might be possible to give a hundred figures and yet not have two exactly alike.