

The Canadian Entomologist.

VOL. XXVIII. LONDON, DECEMBER, 1896.

No. 12.

THE AGROTIS SUBGOTHICA OF HAWORTH, AGAIN.

BY M. V. SLINGERLAND, CORNELL UNIVERSITY, ITHACA, N. Y.

In the CAN. ENT. for November, 1895 (Vol. XXVII., 301-307), I discussed all the evidence then accessible to me in regard to the identity of this insect. According to Prof. J. B. Smith, our American authority on American Noctuids, I showed "very conclusively that *subgothica*, Haw., is correctly used for our American species" (CAN. ENT., XXVIII., 4). However, Mr. J. W. Tutt, who has written much about British Noctuids, in an opinionated reply (CAN. ENT., XXVIII., 17), tries to prove that Haworth described a variety of *tritici*, a well-known European (not an American) insect. After a careful study of several authentic specimens of *tritici*, representing nearly as many varieties, from Dr. Staudinger, and after considerable correspondence with both English and American lepidopterists who are familiar with *tritici*, I became convinced that the species, in any of its numerous variations, never approaches near enough to what Americans have called *subgothica*, Haw., to be easily mistaken for the latter: their antennæ are quite different structurally. But Mr. Tutt states: "I can match exactly the specimens which Stephens figures, and Humphrey and Westwood copy, with undoubted genuine specimens of *Agrotis tritici*." Naturally, I was anxious to see one of these specimens, and, under the circumstances, I anticipated that a request to examine one of them would be readily granted. My first polite request remaining unanswered, I wrote a second time, but, as yet, Mr. Tutt has not even replied to either request. The above facts, and especially those which follow, I think demand that Mr. Tutt publish a photographic illustration of one of these specimens of *tritici* var. that it may be compared with the figures on my plate in CAN. ENT. for November, 1895, and especially with the two on the plate accompanying this article.

The following extracts from an interesting and valuable letter, written in response to several of my queries, by one of England's most respected lepidopterists, will throw much light on some obscure points and straighten out some of Mr. Tutt's misconceptions: "Stephens's and Wood's figures