

says he obtained from a Mr. Raddon, who had evidently labelled it "near Barnstaple, Devon." A photographic copy of Stephens's figure is reproduced at *1a* on the plate. This figure is accepted by Mr. Grote (CAN. ENT., XXIII., 202) as that of *jaculifera*, Gn., but Prof. Smith doubts it (Bull. 44, U.S. Nat. Mus., p. 81). However, I think that a glance at the next figure of the insect that appeared, taken doubtless from Stephens's specimen, will remove all doubt as to what insect Stephens tried to represent. This figure, which is reproduced at *1b* on the plate [it is enlarged to natural size], is from Wood's Index Entomologicus, pl. 9, fig. 149 (1839). All must admit that it is one of the best figures of our American insect ever published. Although Wood does not state definitely that his figure was made from Stephens's specimen, we know he did thus make use of Stephens's collection for many of his figures, as he states in his preface. But one more figure of the insect seems to have appeared in English works. This one, by Humphrey (in Humphrey and Westwood's British Moths and their Trans., I., pl. xxiv., fig. 1, 1843), was recently referred to by Mr. Barrett (Ent. Month. Mag., XXV., 224) as being certainly a variety of *A. tritici*. The fact is, as Humphrey states, that his figure was copied from Stephens's figure; this was evidently not known to Mr. Barrett, as the context of his article indicates. Humphrey's figure is reproduced at *1c* on the plate.

Up to 1847, the English entomologists considered *subgothica* a British insect and a distinct species. Then, Mr. Doubleday stated (The Zoologist, V., 1728) that "Haworth's insect is evidently simply a variety of either *Agrotis tritici* or *aquilina*. The species described and figured by Stephens is American." For many years after this the name *subgothica* rarely appeared in British lists and only as a variety of *tritici*; it apparently does not occur at all in recent lists. It has never been taken in England, so far as I can find any record, since Stephens's time.

The name *subgothica*, Haw., was introduced into American literature by Dr. Fitch in 1856 (Second Rept. on Insects of N. Y., p. 546). It has been in universal use here since, and 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. I think that all now agree that the species under discussion is distinctly American. It undoubtedly has never occurred in England, notwithstanding the records of its English habitat by the earlier English