

Prof. Comstock finds that Fabricius in 1792 uses "Noctua" for 380 species, and this is not in the "Nomenclator." More than this, I have found that Fabricius uses the term "Noctua" for 309 species already in the Mantissa, 1787.* So that we are getting more light and more facts, and it may be that my rejection, although warranted by the "Nomenclator," may have to be reconsidered. But there remains the fact that the type is unknown [pending what we may hope to hear from Mr. Kirby's researches] and, also, that no author is obliged to use a generic term which has not a properly designated type. In this case I have shown at least the necessity for reviewing Guenée's statement, that *his* genus "Noctua" is a proper restriction of the Linnean term.

And now as to *Agrotis* and Prof. Smith's statements on page 6. He does not quote my full text on p. 16 of the Bremen List, where I show that he copies the sense and as near as may be my words as to the characters on which we may divide the genus, without any acknowledgment. He excuses the omission now by the "bald statement" that the contents of my paper† were not "in any sense of the word original," and that Lederer used the characters in his work on "the European Noctuids so long ago as 1857." This is the first I have heard that Lederer had worked up the American Agrotids; it would have spared me much trouble had it been so. In reality Lederer only discusses the European species, and my work on the American and my suggestions as to the characters to be found serviceable was in so far original. But the statement that the characters proposed and observed by me were not "original" seems incorrect. First: Lederer does not propose to use the unarmed fore tibiae as an excluding character. He alternates groups of the species with armed and unarmed tibiae.‡ So that I should have been credited for this original suggestion. Second: I am the first to discover the tuberculate front in *Agrotis*; this discovery is "original" and it does not detract from its originality that I only applied *Carneades* to the two species which I examined and only could examine at the time of my discovery, I being then very ill and having parted with my collection. That some of the European species probably have the tuberculate front is implied by Prof. Smith when suggesting that *Chera* should replace *Carneades*. But Lederer does not mention the clypeal tubercle or elevation at all.

* Grote, Die Apateliden, Mitt. Roem. Mus. San., 1896.

† CAN. ENT., XV., 51, 1883.

‡ Lederer, Syst. Noct., p. 81. I have constantly in my writings given Lederer every credit for his observations on the characters in this family.