

tuberculate," and this at once made it more than reasonably doubtful whether his conclusion, "It is therefore a *Feltia*," was justified; because in *Feltia* the front is not tuberculate; it is roughened and protuberant only. A tuberculate front is the chief characteristic of Mr. Grote's genus *Carneades* and of my genus *Porosagrotis*. It became necessary, therefore, for me to examine specimens of *crassa*, and this again presented evidence of Mr. Grote's failure to make strictly accurate, scientific statements. The structure of *crassa*, with the exception of the pectinated antenna, is exactly the same as that of his genus *Carneades*, and it adds force to what I previously said, that Mr. Grote did not recognize the extent of his own genus when he described it. The pectinations of the antennæ in this group are not of generic value. *Feltia* contains some species that have antennæ pectinated, and some that have them serrated. Both *Porosagrotis* and *Carneades* contain species ranging in the same way, with either pectinated or serrated antennæ; but the essential point, the tuberculate clypeus or front is characteristic of Mr. Grote's genus *Carneades*, and this is exactly what he failed to recognize in the European species *crassa*. My genus *Porosagrotis* is the only one ever described by me which is based on genitalic characters. In *Carneades* the clasper is forked, or consists of two prongs. In *Porosagrotis* the clasper is single. Now, in *crassa* we have exactly the same structure that we find in *Porosagrotis*, and the species is rather closely allied in general appearance to what I have described as *dædalus*, and also to Mr. Grote's species, *texana*. If *crassa* is the type of *Agronoma*, *Agronoma* must replace *Porosagrotis*. If *Porosagrotis* is not a good genus, because based on genitalic characters, Mr. Grote's *Carneades* must sink in favour of Hübner's *Agronoma*. It does not make very much difference to me which conclusion is adopted. Mr. Grote expresses himself as much obliged to me for showing the necessity of changing the type of Hübner's genus. I am equally obliged to him for giving me another opportunity to show how little his statements as to structural characters can be trusted.

There is another point that may be mentioned here. Mr. Grote has several times referred to *Mamestra comis*, and has questioned the correctness of my reference of this form to *olivacea*. Most recently he questions the correctness of my identification of the type, and from descriptions refers *circumcincta* as the same as *comis*. I called attention, in speaking of *comis*, to the fact that the insect was peculiarly set and that it was a remarkably pretty specimen, and I may add that the