The Canadian Antomologist.

VOL. XXIII.

LONDON, MARCH, 1891.

No. 3.

REMARKS ON PROF. JOHN B. SMITH'S REVISION OF THE GENUS AGROTIS.

BY A. R. GROTE, A. M., BREMEN, GERMANY.

To the great kindness of Prof. French I owe a copy of the Bulletin of the U. S. National Museum No 33, which contains Prof. Smith's Revision of the North American Species of Agrotis. In view of the fact that out of the 252 species reviewed by Prof. Smith, no less than 110 are credited to myself, besi 'es five species "not placed," it might be reasonably supposed that I was interested to receive this publication and that I must regret not having received it before publishing my New Check List.

With regard to the classification of the group it is conducted upon the basis first suggested by myself, i. e., the forms with unarmed fore tibiæ are separated, and other divisions are based upon genitalia and sexual characters. These latter, in my opinion, are not sufficient for generic distinctions in the noctuidæ, and we may thus regard the whole as forming one genus, the more so as the European species are not fully drawn into comparison. Prof. Smith is quite right in saying that I had no idea of the extent of my genus Carneades. I only regard as belonging to it species with tuberculated clypeus. At the time of establishing the genus upon moerens and citricolor, I had no longer the opportunity of comparing my former material. I believe there can only be a question of three genera at the expense of Agrotis as considered by modern authorities: one in which the anterior tibiæ are unarmed; one in which the tibiæ are all armed, both of these with smooth clypeus; the third (Carneades Grote) in which the front is tuberculate. I do not know that the generic term Noctua can be used for any of these divisions, according to the rules of zoological nomenclature, because I believe it was previously used in the Birds. For the characters to be used in separating the groups of Agrotis, I refer the student to my paper on the genus in the CANA-DIAN ENTOMOLOGIST, Vol. XV., p. 51, et seq. The type of the genus, as pointed out by me, is assumed by Prof. Smith to be the European segetum.