

markings less distinct," which, whilst it applies to my Finland specimens, as compared to my British series of *festiva*, mostly from Scotland, is not in accordance with Treitschke's description. Moreover, the Finland male has antennæ similar to those of both *calgary* and *dislocata*, viz., ciliate only, with the joints scarcely marked. The antennæ of my series of *festiva*, fifteen in number, are serrate-fasciculate, though not strongly so. These are nearly all lighter in colour than my series of *calgary*, but besides the antennal differences and slightly rougher vestiture of the British specimens, I see no structural differences. Hampson places *calgary* in *Agrotis*, and *festiva* in *Episilia*, but I cannot see that a generic separation is warranted. In the tables *Episilia* is diagnosed as "head and thorax clothed with hair only," and *Agrotis*, "head and thorax clothed with hair and scales and with more or less developed thoracic crests." A slightly greater development of vestiture in *festiva* I have already referred to, but the admixture of hair-like scales is sometimes present in that species also. The vestiture of the Finland specimens is like that of *dislocata* and *calgary* rather than of *festiva*. It remains to be discovered what the real name of the Finland specimens is. The differences noted, antennal and otherwise, may perhaps prove to be variable and to connect with *festiva*, but I am loth to believe that *dislocata* is otherwise than distinct from *calgary*, and observation of the two in nature supports this view, though they are undoubtedly very closely allied.

216. *N. inopinatus* Smith.—As I before suggested, I see no reason whatever for considering this form distinct from *haruspica*. It is indeed hard to find any species of Noctuid, particularly of an Agrotid, which does not manifest certain phases of variation peculiar to different regions. In a very large number of instances such local forms have been described as distinct species, or perhaps merely as races, and subsequently listed as species without further justification. In some cases, where the variation in one locality does not obviously overlap that from another, there seems no reason why a well marked form should not be designated by a distinguishing name, though it seems arbitrary to designate it as a species. But where, as in the present instance, extremes meet, and the variation in one local series includes that in another, whether specimens in the two actually match or not, it does not seem that a species name for each is justified, and it certainly causes confusion.

I happen to possess only two specimens from New York, the type locality of *haruspica*, but have no reason for considering them distinct from