

I do not consider it an adequate reply to my criticisms of Mr. Morrison's publications, or to my complaints as to some misrepresentations of my writings by Mr. Morrison, that certain synonyms of mine (corrected previously by myself) are brought up and offered as an answer to the one and as an apology for the other. My original remarks remain rather in full force, with the one exception where they refer to *Agrotis exsertistigma*, for which latter I am sorry and have excused myself on the ground of Mr. Morrison's retention of my material. In reply to Mr. Morrison's justification of *Eutricopis*, there appears no character but the unarmed tibiae to distinguish it from other Heliothid genera in Mr. Morrison's diagnosis, and it is there expressly stated to differ by the "unarmed tibiae." Now the term implies that it is "beautifully armed," and hence is inappropriate. With regard to Mr. Morrison's insinuations as to missing species in my "List," it is the great good fortune of this "List" that it is incomplete and thus awaits changes at Mr. Morrison's hands. My List must be judged, however, by its predecessors in the same field, and not by information acquired subsequent to its issuance. I wish to draw, once for all, attention to the fact, that the most of Mr. Morrison's corrections in the shape of criticisms are *ex post facto*. Mistakes corrected by myself, determinations made by me when in England and France, are taken as part of our common stock of knowledge by Mr. Morrison, and used on occasion against me. I reply also finally to Mr. Morrison's charge as to his redescription of *lilacina*, that the author of a description, and not the authority consulted on the subject, is the one accountable for publication, while I am sorry that in certain of the successful ventures of Mr. Morrison, where my responsibility is equal, I am neither mentioned nor my courtesy acknowledged.

A. R. GROTE.

[Having now given both of our correspondents a fair hearing, our limited space will oblige us to refrain from publishing anything further on this subject.—Ed. C. E.]

DEAR SIR,—

I have recently united *Agrotis scandens* and *muraenula* in opposition to my previously expressed opinion (Trans. Am. Ent. Soc., 1873, 431), that they were distinct. Mr. Lintner now calls my attention to the fact and gives me good reasons for adhering to my previous opinion that the species are distinct. It appears that the specimens in the Buffalo Society's collection do in fact belong to one species, but I am wrong in referring both names to them.

A. R. GROTE.