

## A REPLY TO PROF. SMITH.

BY A. RADCLIFFE GROTE, A. M., HILDESHEIM, GERMANY.

With regard to *Mamestra comis*, the whole question as to the setting of the type has been introduced by Prof. Smith, and I submit that this has nothing to do with the matter. I have merely shown that Prof. Smith's statement that the type of *comis* was "typical *olivacea*, but so set as to make it appear differently marked," etc., is inaccurate and impossible, as my description refers to colour and marking, and these cannot be produced by any freak of setting. As I failed to notice any peculiarity of setting in my type, it is probably not very obvious, and as now described by Dr. Smith, must be very slight. I call further attention to the fact that in colour and marking the description of *circumcincta* agrees well with mine of *comis*. I believe, therefore, it possible that *circumcincta* is *comis*. I do not assert it—I have not seen the type of *comis* since the seventies—but I think it possible, nay, probable. Mr. Beutenmüller writes me that the type of *comis* differs more from "typical *olivacea*" than the type of *circumcincta* does. I want these types examined by some competent person who can settle the matter as to whether *comis* is a variety of *olivacea* or not, and what the standing of *circumcincta* really is as compared with either. That *comis* is not "typical *olivacea*" seems now virtually admitted by Dr. Smith, and this is in reality all my contention, and that no amount of abnormal setting can produce differences in colour and marking. This closes my case as to *Mamestra comis*.

Now, as to the type of *Agronoma*, which is *crassa*. If *crassa* agrees with the type of *Porosagrotis* I am glad to hear it, and we shall get a little more light into the matter. The reason I wrote that the front was roughened and tuberculate was that I felt it with a pin's point. My microscope I left behind in America, and there is none in the museum here. I could not distinguish, with the pin, between tuberculate and roughened. *Crassa* does not belong to *Carneades*, because the antennæ are pectinate, and in my opinion the structure of the antennæ offers points of generic value. I have therefore not been able to compare *Feltia* and *Agronoma* as closely as I should have liked; first, because I had no species of the former; secondly, no microscope. But the work of bringing the groups of North American *Agrotis* into correspondence with the European progresses, nevertheless, as we see. That *Feltia* should not be represented in Europe seems not likely, since Haworth's name *subgothica* is held by Mr. Tutt to represent a variety of *tritici*, & Dr. Fitch to be *jaculifera*. In a little