

For a scientific man, Mr. Slingerland must be easily satisfied; but I would urge again that guesswork is not science. I maintain that Haworth's description of *subgothica* refers word for word to a certain form of *Agrotis tritici*. I maintain that Mr. Slingerland has not brought forward one scintilla of evidence to upset Haworth's statement that his species has its "habitat in Anglia; I maintain that Mr. Slingerland has not brought forward the ghost of a fact to assume that *subgothica*, Haw., is or is not even identical with *subgothica*, Steph.

With regard to the latter, I must assume that Mr. Slingerland has had at least as much experience with the various forms of *Agrotis jaculifera* as I have had with those of *Agrotis tritici*, and, therefore, that his opinion is as good as mine; but I still maintain mine, he will maintain his.

Now we come to a matter of expediency. Is it worth while to perpetuate a name about which so much doubt exists? Suppose Mr. Slingerland and myself let our difference die a natural death, the same duel will be fought again and again between our successors, who will view the matter from our respective standpoints.

Now, about Guenée's figure (1d) there can be no doubt. It does not represent any possible form of *Agrotis tritici*. Here, then, is the first unquestioned figure of the American insect. It is the only reasonable name to apply to it, but that is a matter for Mr. Grote and Prof. Smith, and not for me. I simply state facts. *Agrotis tritici*, var. *subgothica*, Haw., is a living fact to me, so is *Agrotis jaculifera*, Gn. For my part I shall continue to write:—

*Agrotis tritici*, Linn.

ab. *subgothica*, Haw.

2. *Agrotis jaculifera*, Gn.

And Mr. Slingerland can add, if he chooses, to the latter (? *subgothica*, St.). This is what facts warrant, and when we change facts for opinion we are doing a sorry thing for science.

Mr. Slingerland says, p. 303: "This figure, which is reproduced as 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 species ever published." I have compared it carefully with the figure from nature, and mark the differences: Wood's figure (1b) may be the best of the figures of the American species ever published, but it represents equally well many specimens of *A. tritici* in my cabinet, and the question arises how far we are justified in considering these as two distinct species at all; whilst for two male specimens of the