

Yet, somehow, the idea seems to be current that all my work, in *Agrotis* at least, is based on genitalic characters only! Mr. Dyar, in a book notice, CAN. ENT., XXVII., 225, says: "Under *Agrotis* the *genitalic divisions** of Prof. Smith are given subgeneric value only, a proceeding which commends itself to the present reviewer." So Mr. Slingerland, on pp. 306 and 307 of the paper already cited, accepts this as a correct statement, and voices a doubt as to the value of such a basis. I was interested enough to write Mr. Slingerland on the subject, and he frankly acknowledged in return: "Yes; I simply followed Grote and Dyar in my statements regarding your divisions of the genus *Agrotis*." And Mr. Dyar, I have no doubt, simply followed Mr. Grote! Now, I would not be understood as questioning for a moment the divine right of a critic to condemn without reading or understanding the work criticised, or to impute views to suit himself; but I must confess that I am inclined to have more regard for comments when the criticism indicates an understanding of the author's actual position. But perhaps this is merely a prejudice on my part!

Yet it is something of a surprise that Mr. Grote's statements concerning my work or views should find unquestioned acceptance anywhere. When any of my papers are under his consideration, condemnation is nearly always certain, and Mr. Grote is always a much-abused individual. If the facts do not bear out the desired conclusion, why so much the worse for the facts. For instance, we find in the CAN. ENT. for 1894, Vol. XXVI., pp. 82 and 83, the following plaint:—"Prof. Smith goes still further. He suppresses my reference of the species described by Moeschler as *islandica* to *opipara*, in 1892, as cited above, and has the courage to write, 'the error is Mr. Grote's for condemning Mr. Morrison's species on insufficient grounds!' By also suppressing Moeschler's original determination, I am brought in for a synonym I never committed!" If reference is made to my Revision of *Agrotis*, Bulletin No. 38, U. S. Nat. Mus., p. 183, the following will be found: "Mr. Grote was correct in referring *opipara* and *islandica*, Moeschl. (nec Stgr.), as synonymous. The error is Moeschler's in failing to recognize the distinction between the forms, and Mr. Grote's for so positively condemning Mr. Morrison's species on insufficient grounds." How much now remains of Mr. Grote's complaint? If the curious reader will take the trouble to look into the

*The italics are mine. Note the plural. Mr. Grote uses *all* my divisions as subgenera.