

single one in coll. Tepper as genuine, while conceding elsewhere that Mr. Morrison was very liberal in labelling specimens as "types." To conclude, in the Synonymic Catalogue the locality for *carnea*, Mount Washington, reappears! On whose authority if not on mine based on Morrison's specimens? What has happened between the Revision and the Catalogue? Has Prof. Smith seen my specimens sent by Morrison and found them really *carnea*? In the Synonymic Catalogue several of my *Agrotis* species are reinstated, and perhaps finally my determination of these two Alpine forms may gradually come to be acknowledged. Where an examination of my collection has resulted in establishing my determinations so very largely, it seems hardly worth while to pursue the subject further. There remain but a few cases of specific determination where I am still of a different opinion from the author of the Synonymic Catalogue, and I reserve my views on these until a proper time.

AGROTIS EXSERTISTIGMA.

This species was described by Mr. Morrison on material furnished by me and credited to me, and I figured, in the Buffalo Bulletin, the specimens returned as "types" of *Exsertistigma* by Mr. Morrison. But it appears that one of my specimens was not returned me, that this specimen, also marked as "type" of *exsertistigma*, found its way into Mr. Tepper's possession, and that this specimen belongs to a species afterwards described by me as *observabilis*. It may be truly said that Mr. Morrison's original description was totally inadequate, and that therefore the species should remain as figured and determined by myself. There is nothing to prove the Tepper specimen the genuine one, and mine not genuine. My publication was the only sufficient one. Probably, almost certainly, Mr. Morrison considered them all the same, in which case my determination was decisive. If Mr. Morrison considered my specimens credited to me and Mr. Tepper's one species, I was free to determine one as *exsertistigma* and re-describe the other (of the existence of which in Mr. Tepper's collection I was, however, ignorant). I think, with justice, my original determination should prevail. But my original determinations have been overturned by Prof. Smith; only this author has overlooked the fact that his new name for my *exsertistigma*, viz., *confusa*, must fall before *Morrisonistigma*, proposed by me in Buff. Bulletin.

THYATIRA ANTICOSTIENSIS.

I would draw attention to the fact that this form of *T. pudens*, Guen., taken by Mr. Wm. Couper on Anticosti, is described by me, CAN. ENT.,