

Guen. is re-described as *Xanthia ralla* G. & R. ; or *Acronycta brumosa* Guen. and *innolata* Guen. as *A. verrilli* G. & R. and *Diphthera graefii* Grote ; or *Celiptera frustulum* Guen. as a new genus and species, *Litomitus elongatus* Grote ; or *Plusia ou* Guen. as *Plusia fratella* Grote ; or —but we say no more. It is only human for the best of naturalists to make mistakes occasionally.

In regard to the latter statement of Mr. Grote, it is perhaps unnecessary to repeat again that of the five species of mine which Mr. Grote considers as synonyms, three were published in papers contemporaneous with mine, having priority by one day, and which I could not have foreseen ; one was published on the authority of Mr. Grote himself (*Mamestra illabefacta*), and the other (*Hadena rasilis*) is not a synonym, but a distinct species, and Mr. Grote is in error in considering it identical with *Elaphria grata* Hübn.

In ignoring Mr. Grote's genera *Eucoptocnemis*, *Exyra* and others, I simply follow the example of Dr. Speyer and the best European authorities in not recognizing catalogue names unaccompanied by a generic description.

With regard to Mr. Grote's remarks on my genus *Eutricopis*, I consider *Tricopis* (which, by the way, is a synonym of *Euleucyptera*, founded by the same author) as a generic term covering all the characters of the insect or group of insects which it was founded to contain ; the three-clawed tibiae is but one of many characters. Therefore, when I discovered a genus which approached *Tricopis* in many of its characters, but was sufficiently distinct from it, I very properly gave it the name of *Eutricopis*.

Mr. Grote does not agree with me when I unite *Bolina nigrescens* G. & R. with *fasciolaris* Hübn. *Bolina fasciolaris* is a very common and variable species ; I have examined a large series, among which many agree with Grote and Robinson's excellent figure, and as they are from the same locality, Texas, I have no doubt that it is their species which I have identified. I have also carefully examined several copies of Hübner's figures, and am confident that the two species are identical.

Mr. Grote closes with some remarks in regard to his "List," the great value of which I cheerfully acknowledge ; however, it is open to criticism in many particulars ; for instance, the omission of several of M. Guenee's species, one of the omitted species being described by Mr. Grote under a different name, and is in addition placed in a genus to which it by no means belongs. I also object to the admission at present of the genus