

same species the abdomina are singularly unlike. Indeed, Mr. Slingerland's references to the figures seem remarkably unhappy, for if Wood's figure is one of the best figures of the American insect ever published, it is singularly unlike the figure from nature above it, and to suppose that Wood's figure (1b) and Stephens's (1a) are from the same specimen seems to suggest great incapacity on the part of one of the artists to reproduce what he saw. Figs. 1 and 1d represent nothing British, but for the remainder there is nothing to add.

I would now draw Mr. Slingerland's attention to an important fact that he has altogether overlooked, viz., the connection between Doubleday and Guenée. It is a matter of history that almost all the N. American species Guenée possessed were obtained from Doubleday and Desvignes, and that most of his work was submitted to Doubleday before publication. It was, therefore, with Doubleday's full knowledge that *jaculifera* was described, and I observe that Guenée in his *Histoire, etc. (Noctuelles)*, Vol. V., p. 262, actually described his *jaculifera*, var. B., from specimens in Doubleday's collection. It is quite evident that with the mutual understanding between Doubleday and Guenée, that Doubleday agreed with Guenée's nomenclature of the American species in 1852, and equally certain, in the face of what he had written in 1847, that he considered the species quite distinct from *subgothica*, Haw.

Mr. Slingerland, in his quotation of my note that "I do not know the American *subgothica*," rather misstates my present position. I have examined all the specimens in the British museum repeatedly since 1891, and know well what I am talking about, and his suggestion that I am an "English writer, who does not know the American insect," is rather startling and far-fetched, and would have been more warranted had Mr. Slingerland written his article five years ago.

One other point only interests me in the note, and in that I am pleased to be able to agree with Mr. Slingerland. There is no doubt Guenée's name, *jaculifera*, refers to the insect known as such, that his var. B. must be called *triosa*, Lintner, and that his var. B. = *herilis*, Grote. It may be interesting as bearing out Mr. Slingerland's position that Guenée probably had no specimens of *jaculifera*, but that he described Desvignes and Doubleday's specimens; that these Entomologists must have had several specimens is pretty evident, for Guenée writes (*Ibid.*, p. 262): "Amerique Septentrionale; Canada Coll. Div. Paraît très-commune: whilst of var. B. he specially notes: "Etat de New-Yorck, Coll., Dbday."

I have tried to be explicit even at the risk of offending our Editor by being too verbose. I am afraid even now that I may have to explain doubtful points. At any rate I trust I have been logical enough to convince my two good friends, Prof. Grote and Prof. Smith, that on the score of "scientific truth," as well as on the score of "expediency," it is not well that two distinct species should be known in Europe and America by the same name, and that the true name henceforth for the American species—much as I detest upsetting old associations—must be *Agrotis jaculifera*, Gn.