

It fits Smith's description and my notes exactly, with the exception that I should not call the discoidal spots in the recent capture "large," and the space between them is scarcely darker than the ground. The expanse is 36 mm., a trifle smaller than the size given of the type. It would never have occurred to me to associate the species with *bicarnea* at all. In type of maculation it comes much nearer to *dislocata* Sm., but the colour differs entirely, being very even "dark, almost blackish brown, with a purplish tinge," except for bright, pale carneous patagia, and a carneous shade in and round the reniform. The apparent purplish tinge is probably really due to slight iridescence. All the tibiae are spined, the fore tibiae on the inner side only, as is often the case with *dislocata* and *calgary*. I was unable, however, to discover any spines on the fore tibiae of the type, but noted that they were not in a position easy for examination. The antennae are minutely ciliate, and in the recent capture at any rate, rather heavily scaled as well. The eyes are without lashes. The head and thorax are thickly clothed with rough hair only, without crests. The wing form and general build is like *dislocata*, in which the antennal structure is similar except that *dislocata* has fewer scales, and rather longer ciliations. The thoracic vestiture is rather rougher than in *dislocata*. As far as these characters go, it seems referable to *Episilia* Hbn., which is used by Hampson as prior to *Pachnobia* Gn. and *Choephora* Grt. It appears to me that both *calgary* and *dislocata*, if not some others which Hampson refers to *Agrotis*, fit better with *Episilia*, as both have loose hairy vestiture without obvious crests. But *acarneae* has one structural peculiarity not hitherto observed in any North American genus referred to the Agrotids except *Trichorthosia*, to which this is quite distantly related. The eyes are sparsely and finely hairy. I mentioned this to Prof. Smith after examining the type, but he was unable to find the hairs and told me that I was mistaken. If I had not been very sure of my point, however, I should not have taken a note on the fact, and on examining the eyes of the recent capture I find the same. The hairs are not easily noticeable, I admit, and anyone might be excused for overlooking them. They are most easily seen in strong sunlight. They are not much easier to find in some specimens of *Perigea alfkenii*, though they are finer in *acarneae*.