Agrotis vetusta, Wlk., C. B. M., Lep. Het. XXXII., 691, 1865.

This species is not represented in the material sent, and I am entirely unable to apply the description to any form known to me, either in the agrotids or in the noctuids as a whole. According to Dr. Bethune's statements the type, mentioned by Walker as in his collection, has no present existence, and as the description cannot be satisfactorily applied, the name must drop. I have reprinted the description in my Revision of the Agrotids, p. 212.

Walker has described under the specific name vetusta an Agrotis, a Mamestra and a Mythimna. It was Mythimna vetusta which Mr. Grote suggested might be his muranula, not the Agrotis as I erroneously suggested in my transcript, nor the Mamestra as Mr. Grote stated in the last number of the Can. Ent.

Agrotis inextricata, Wlk.

A specimen of *Carneades messoria*, Harris, is so labelled in Walker's handwriting, but I cannot find any description of the species under that genus. Walker does, however, describe a *Mamestra inextricata* (C. B. M., Lep. Het., XXXII., 658, 1865), and as the description applies well enough and the specimen is said to be in Dr. Bethune's collection, it may be accepted as type, and cited as a synonym to *Carneades messoria*.

Agrotis indirecta, Wlk., C. B. M., Lep. Het., XXXII., 659, 1865.

In this case also the species is described under *Mamestra*, and the species applies well to the specimen labelled *Agrotis indirecta* in Walker's handwriting. The specimen is *Carneades messoria*, making the fifth name applied to this species in Dr. Bethune's material alone!

How many more of Walker's names can be applied to this species when the types are studied, it is interesting to contemplate? Thus far no redescriptions of *Carneades tessellata* have been identified; but it seems scarcely possible that the species should not have been represented in material received by the British Museum, and its variations must have afforded full scope to Walker's peculiar genius.

Hadena tenebrifera, Wlk., C. B. M., Lep. Het., XXXIII., 714, 1865. A male specimen in very fair condition is Semiophora catherina, Grt., (CAN. ENT., VI., 116, 1874, Matuta). The specimen bears Walker's label, agrees with the description, and is unquestionably the type. The species must be known in future as Semiophora tenebrifera, Wlk., and Catherina, Grt., cited as a synonym.