

then, that Haworth's material came from the same source as Stephens's. On page 22 of his article, Mr. Tutt tries to show that the specimen of *subgothica*, Haw., of American writers, found by Mr. Barrett in the old Burney collection, was not likely to have been obtained by Mr. Burney in Haworth's time. However, Rev. R. A. Burney, who was born in 1775 and died in 1836 (three years after Haworth's death), was an ardent collector of insects for 30 years. His collection went to his son, Mr. H. Burney, who continued to collect for over 30 years. It was the latter Burney who died in 1893, but the specimen of *subgothica* recently found by Mr. Barrett (Ent. Month. Mag., XXV., 223) original' came, as he distinctly states, from the collection of the elder Burney, who *was* a contemporary with—and could have and did, Mr. Barrett says, correspond with—Haworth. In regard to the Burney collection, one of England's most noted lepidopterists writes me: "To call his collection a 'scientific lie' is worthy of the person who wrote it. The vast majority of his insects were genuine enough. A few of doubtful nativity were in the collection, but he had removed the most glaring species which had been imposed upon him, and, I think, destroyed some of them."

The above facts show that there could have been and that there was at least one (Haworth himself states he had seen his species in three museums or collections)—Burney's—specimen of the *subgothica* of American writers in English collections in Haworth's time; as Mr. Raddon collected before 1810, Stephens's specimen might also have been one of those seen by Haworth. In the light of the above facts, and especially in connection with what is to follow, it would seem that Mr. Tutt's sarcastic remarks in the closing sentence on page 22 and in the first sentence on page 23 (CAN. ENT., XXVIII.), might equally as well be applied to his own arguments in this discussion; but sarcasm is not science nor logic.

I consider myself fortunate in being able to draw most of my information from English sources, for I thus escape Mr. Tutt's allegation that no American entomologist had or has the slightest knowledge of the British Noctuids. As a final argument in support of my claim that Haworth's *subgothica* is an American insect and not a variety of the European *tritici*, I have to offer a British picture, shown in the lower half of the plate. This photograph was taken by Mr. Gepp, in the British Museum, under the direction of Mr. A. G. Butler and Mr. C. O. Waterhouse. It purports to be a likeness (twice natural size) of Haworth's