

adds a species "*subusta*" to the genus, such a species was not then published. Hübner's *Atethmia subusta* is given later, in 1823, in his Zutraege, under the numbers 205, 206. Now, Hübner cites in the Verzeichniss "105—106." Perhaps he had intended a different and earlier publication of *subusta* than that which was ultimately carried out. There is also some evidence that Hübner considered the European, and not the South American species as typical of the genus *Atethmia*, to be gathered from the text of the Zutraege itself.

Again, Mr. Morrison says that Gueneé "takes out" of Hübner's genus the European *Xerampelina*. Gueneé, however, in his Essai takes no cognizance whatever of Hübner's generic reference of his species. Gueneé says of *Xerampelina*: "L'unique espèce qui compose ce genre a été placée jusqu'ici dans les Xanthies. Again, Gueneé in his "Species General" does not, as Mr. Morrison states, refer *subusta* as the typical species of Hübner's genus. Gueneé there does not know *subusta* at all, and says of the genus: "Ce petit genre, dont je n'ai emprunté a Hübner que le nom, puis que dans son Verzeichniss, il se compose principalement (!) de mes *Cirroedia*," etc.

The question is one to which I had devoted considerable study, and in a more general List of our moths, upon which I am engaged, I expect to have occasion to note further evidence as to the use of *Atethmia* in European works for *Xerampelina*. I shall be glad always to note corrections to my List, which deviates so greatly from its predecessors that it should not be expected to be everywhere exhaustively correct. And although Mr. Morrison may not always be able "to see the necessity of this change," yet he will find that no generic title is there adopted without a reason.

A. R. GROTE.

DEAR SIR,—

Mr. Grote's letters in your last issue seem to contain, in the main, the reasons why he made certain errors in regard to my work, and a repetition of his former statement, to the effect that I had made five synonyms in one of my papers containing descriptions of about sixty species; the former statement does not call for any word from me, but perhaps it would not be out of the way (since we are on the subject of re-descriptions of old species) to ask why Mr. Grote has re-described within six months the common *Agrotis incivis* Guen. as a new genus and species, under the title of *Anicla Alabama*; or why the well-known *Orthosia ferruginoides*