

lections was not that of Stephens, then one of the few great English collections. Thus, I believe that the weight of evidence indicates that the *subgothica* of Haworth and Stephens were the same species.

But, curiously enough, while all American entomologists have claimed the name *subgothica*, Haw., for our insect, the English authors since Doubleday have claimed Haworth's insect as a variety of their *tritici*. Doubleday said it was "simply a variety of either *tritici* or *aquilina*," but it was soon restricted to the former in British lists, and it is still considered as such by Mr. Tutt. The evidence in support of this seems to be confined principally to the simple statement of Doubleday, although Tutt intimates that he has seen Haworth's description; but Tutt does not (CAN. ENT., XXIII., 159) know our American insect. I think the evidence produced to show that Haworth's *subgothica* is our American insect outweighs any opinion which English writers, who do not know our insect, may form from the original description alone.

The name *jaculifera*, which occupies so conspicuous a part in the synonymy of this insect, was proposed by Guenée, in 1852, for an American insect. His description of the species includes a good characterization of the type, followed by brief descriptions of two varieties, A and B. I think both Mr. Grote and Prof. Smith agree that Guenée's figure (reproduced at 1 d on the plate) and his description of the type of the species correspond to what American writers have been calling *subgothica*, Haw., for the past quarter of a century. *Jaculifera*, Gn., was first placed in the synonymy of *subgothica*, Haw., in 1873, by Mr. Grote, and on the same page he described both of Guenée's varieties, A and B, as a new species—*herilis*. In 1874, Dr. Lintner made a careful study of the forms included under Guenée's specific title *jaculifera*, with the result that Mr. Grote's *herilis* was restricted to *jaculifera*, var. B, Gn., and var. A was described as a new species—*tricolor*.

No one has since questioned the specific rank of Guenée's varieties. Therefore, according to Canon XXVIII. of the A. O. U. Code of Nomenclature, the name *jaculifera* must be restricted to the first or main part of Guenée's description; this is the only portion of the description that can apply to his figure or to the insect under discussion. It is true, as Prof. Smith says (Bull. 38, U. S. Nat. Mus., p. 113): "Under all circumstances Guenée's name must stand for one of the forms, since he had all three before him," but in 1873 and 1874 the name was restricted to, or "was retained for that portion of the group to which it was first applied"