

from the British lists, for, from that time forth, it ceased to exist as a distinct species, and became naturally a synonym of the older name of the same species *tritici*, Linn., unless the list contained varietal names as well as specific, when *subgothica*, Haw., would naturally fall as a variety of *tritici*, Linn. To say that *subgothica*, Haw., has "never been taken in England since Stephens's time" is absurd, and begging the whole question, for dozens are taken every year (from my point of view), whereas if Mr. Slingerland refers to Guenée *jaculifera*. it, of course, never has been taken in England, neither in Stephens's time, before his time, or "since his time."

We come now to the first introduction of the species into American literature, the year 1856, Mr. Slingerland informs us, and then Dr. Fitch applied to an American species the name *subgothica*, Haw. On what grounds Dr. Fitch did this we cannot tell; evidently he did not know of Doubleday's conclusion in 1847, but I will say this—that the general similarity between some examples of the two species, and the small amount of systematic work which had been done in the American *Noctuae* in 1856, are more than enough to excuse Dr. Fitch for supposing they were identical; nor do I think that Mr. Slingerland scores a point when he states that "no American writer has seriously questioned the identity of our species with the *subgothica* of Stephens and later English writers, or even with the *subgothica* of Haworth until 1891, when Mr. Grote changed his mind in accordance with the opinion of Mr. Tutt." Can Mr. Slingerland wonder at this? What American entomologist had the slightest knowledge of our British *Noctuae*? I will go farther and ask—What American *has*? And now I will execute a bouleversement and ask—What British entomologist knows anything of American *Noctuae*? You may answer, Mr. Walker and Mr. Butler; but Mr. Walker's ignorance was notorious, and the present condition of the *Noctuae* in the British Museum is sufficient proof that Mr. Butler cannot name the commonest British species. The whole thing is too absurd. The name was never questioned, because there was no one to question it.

Now we come to Doubleday's statement *re* "the species described and figured by Stephens is American," and his explanation that he had "traced all the specimens which he had seen of this species (the one described by Stephens) in collections of British Lepidoptera to one source, and I believe the gentleman who distributed them inadvertently mixed a number of the North American insects with his British ones,"