

must be observed that Doubleday was the authoritative link binding the "Stephens" generation with the present, and his independent opinion alone would not have to be lightly passed over. My own conclusion being at one with his as to *subgothica*, Haw., I take as affording one more link in the strong chain of independent evidence that I have been able to collect. On p. 305, Mr. Slingerland says:—"Curiously enough" (had I been he I should have said 'naturally enough'), "the English authors 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." In Doubleday's time, *Agrotis tritici* and *A. aquilina* were considered as distinct species, but for the last thirty or forty years it has been well known that *aquilina* is simply a local form of *tritici*, and that the two erstwhile supposed species copulate indiscriminately\*. The Continental (European) and British Entomologists have long ago deprived it of specific rank. Therefore, Mr. Doubleday's conclusion and mine are identical.

Mr. Slingerland says that "the evidence in support of considering Haworth's *subgothica* as a variety of *tritici* (or *aquilina*) seems to be confined principally to the simple statement of Doubleday, although Tutt intimates that he has seen Haworth's description." This is really too ingenuous. Haworth's *Lepidoptera Britannica* was the hand book of British Lepidoptera, and in the hands of every British collector until the publication of Stainton's *Manual* in 1858. Every British collector had his "Haworth" then, just as everyone has his "Stainton" now, and I can only hope that this statement will be sufficient to brush out any doubtful remnants of the implied suggestion contained in this remarkable paragraph.

I am totally unable to untangle the line of thought in which Mr. Slingerland has got on p. 303 when he writes:—"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." Evidently, when our leading lepidopterists had worked out the true position of Haworth's *subgothica*, it would disappear

\*For purposes of sale British collectors still keep them separate, and some conservative lepidopterists, who believe nothing they do not see themselves, even write of them as being so. —J. W. T.,