

ANNUAL MEETING OF THE LONDON BRANCH.

The annual meeting of the London Branch of the Entomological Society of Ontario was held at the residence of Mr. A. Puddicombe, on the 21st January, 1875.

The following officers were elected :

President, H. B. Bock ; Vice-President, G. Geddes ; Secretary-Treasurer, J. M. Denton ; Curator, C. Chapman ; Auditors, J. H. Mc-Mechan and J. Griffiths.

SYNOPSIS OF NEUROPTERA.

Dr. H. A. Hagen, of Cambridge, Mass., is working on a new and largely augmented edition of his Synopsis of the Pseudo-Neuroptera and Neuroptera of North America, and would like the co-operation of all those interested in this department of Entomology. Collectors having undetermined specimens would aid in this good work by forwarding them to Dr. H. A. Hagen, Museum Comparative Zoology, Cambridge, Mass., who will willingly name them ; the only privilege he claims is to retain for the Museum new, or rare species, which he would find necessary to describe.

CORRESPONDENCE.

ON CALOCAMPA.

DEAR SIR,—

In a paper published in the Annals of the Lyceum of New York, Mr. Morrison discusses my views on the relationship between the North American and European species of this genus. So far as they relate to the resemblance between the American *nupera* and the European *vetusta*, Mr. Morrison may be correct, and my later statement that the species cannot be regarded as "representative," incorrect. Mr. Morrison, however, charges me with saying that "*nupera* is more closely allied to *exoleta*" (i. e., than to *vetusta*), which I have never stated. I say in the

Proc. of the Academy of Natural Sciences, that "*C. nupera* appears to me to resemble the European *C. exoleta*, rather than *C. curvimacula*, in opposition to Mr. Morrison's opinion on the subject." I intended to dissent from Mr. Morrison's assertion that *C. curvimacula* may stand for the American representative of *C. exoleta*, by showing that *C. nupera* was nearer both the European species than *C. curvimacula*. In regard to the position of *solidaginis*, I consider it the type of a distinct genus, following Hübner and Stephens. Gueneé refers the species to *Cloantha*, Lederer to *Calocampa*. Now that we have a closely allied North American representative, and that Mr. Morrison himself gives us at least a single "material structural difference," I feel warranted in considering my adoption of *Lithomia* for *solidaginis* and *germana* authoritative and reasonable.

A. R. GROTE.

ON ADITA.

DEAR SIR,—

Mr. Morrison recently corrects my statement that the tibiae are spinose in this genus. Mr. Morrison says that "the only spines visible are the pair before the spurs on the middle tibiae and a single spine (there possibly may have been two) between the two pair of spurs on the hind tibiae." I have re-examined my specimen, and I find on the outside of the middle tibiae a series of eight spines in irregular pairs before the spur, besides several finer spines, and on the hind tibiae three spines are plainly visible. The spines frequently break off, as has been noticed by European Entomologists. Perfectly fresh specimens will probably show the presence of more spines on the hind tibiae. The fore tibiae are furnished with a stout, terminal claw.

A. R. GROTE.

In reply to Mr. Morrison's enquiry as to the propriety of retaining *Cirroedia* Guen. (1839) instead of *Atethmia* Hubn. (1816) for a genus of Noctuidæ, I would state that I gave the subject careful consideration when preparing my "List." I was finally led to adopt the older name from the following considerations. Dr. Herrich-Schaeffer (Corr.-Bl., 75) remarks that he doubts the validity of Gueneé's genus *Atethmia* for the South American species. The point is here as to *subusta*, of which Mr. Morrison says that it is "South American," as if he were giving a structural character. Again, *Atethmia* is dated 1816, and although Hübner

adds a species "*subusta*" to the genus, such a species was not then published. Hübner's *Atethmia subusta* is given later, in 1823, in his Zutraege, under the numbers 205, 206. Now, Hübner cites in the Verzeichniss "105—106." Perhaps he had intended a different and earlier publication of *subusta* than that which was ultimately carried out. There is also some evidence that Hübner considered the European, and not the South American species as typical of the genus *Atethmia*, to be gathered from the text of the Zutraege itself.

Again, Mr. Morrison says that Gueneé "takes out" of Hübner's genus the European *Xerampelina*. Gueneé, however, in his Essai takes no cognizance whatever of Hübner's generic reference of his species. Gueneé says of *Xerampelina*: L'unique espèce qui compose ce genre a été placée jusqu'ici dans les Xanthies. Again, Gueneé in his "Species General" does not, as Mr. Morrison states, refer *subusta* as the typical species of Hübner's genus. Gueneé there does not know *subusta* at all, and says of the genus: "Ce petit genre, dont je n'ai emprunté à Hübner que le nom, puis que dans son Verzeichniss, il se compose principalement (!) de mes Cirroedia," etc.

The question is one to which I had devoted considerable study, and in a more general List of our moths, upon which I am engaged, I expect to have occasion to note further evidence as to the use of *Atethmia* in European works for *Xerampelina*. I shall be glad always to note corrections to my List, which deviates so greatly from its predecessors that it should not be expected to be everywhere exhaustively correct. And although Mr. Morrison may not always be able "to see the necessity of this change," yet he will find that no generic title is there adopted without a reason.

A. R. GROTE.

DEAR SIR,—

Mr. Grote's letters in your last issue seem to contain, in the main, the reasons why he made certain errors in regard to my work, and a repetition of his former statement, to the effect that I had made five synonyms in one of my papers containing descriptions of about sixty species; the former statement does not call for any word from me, but perhaps it would not be out of the way (since we are on the subject of re-descriptions of old species) to ask why Mr. Grote has re-described within six months the common *Agrotis incivis* Guen. as a new genus and species, under the title of *Anicla Alabama*; or why the well-known *Orthosia ferruginoides*

Guen. is re-described as *Xanthia ralla* G. & R. ; or *Acronycta brumosa* Guen. and *innotata* Guen. as *A. verrilli* G. & R. and *Diphthera graefi* Grote ; or *Celiptera frustulum* Guen. as a new genus and species, *Litonitus elongatus* Grote ; or *Plusia ou* Guen. as *Plusia fratella* Grote ; or —but we say no more. It is only human for the best of naturalists to make mistakes occasionally.

In regard to the latter statement of Mr. Grote, it is perhaps unnecessary to repeat again that of the five species of mine which Mr. Grote considers as synonyms, three were published in papers contemporaneous with mine, having priority by one day, and which I could not have foreseen ; one was published on the authority of Mr. Grote himself (*Mamestra illabefacta*), and the other (*Hadena rasilis*) is not a synonym, but a distinct species, and Mr. Grote is in error in considering it identical with *Elaphria grata* Hübn.

In ignoring Mr. Grote's genera *Eucoptocnemis*, *Exyra* and others, I simply follow the example of Dr. Speyer and the best European authorities in not recognizing catalogue names unaccompanied by a generic description.

With regard to Mr. Grote's remarks on my genus *Eutricopis*, I consider *Tricopis* (which, by the way, is a synonym of *Euleucyptera*, founded by the same author) as a generic term covering all the characters of the insect or group of insects which it was founded to contain ; the three-clawed tibiae is but one of many characters. Therefore, when I discovered a genus which approached *Tricopis* in many of its characters, but was sufficiently distinct from it, I very properly gave it the name of *Eutricopis*.

Mr. Grote does not agree with me when I unite *Bolina nigrescens* G. & R. with *fasciolaris* Hübn. *Bolina fasciolaris* is a very common and variable species ; I have examined a large series, among which many agree with Grote and Robinson's excellent figure, and as they are from the same locality, Texas, I have no doubt that it is their species which I have identified. I have also carefully examined several copies of Hübner's figures, and am confident that the two species are identical.

Mr. Grote closes with some remarks in regard to his "List," the great value of which I cheerfully acknowledge ; however, it is open to criticism in many particulars ; for instance, the omission of several of M. Guenee's species, one of the omitted species being described by Mr. Grote under a different name, and is in addition placed in a genus to which it by no means belongs. I also object to the admission at present of the genus

Ammoconia to our fauna. *A. badicollis* Grote, referred to that genus in the List, is a true *Agrotis*. I have examined the two European species of this genus, and am satisfied that it can not be retained there.

I remain yours truly,

H. K. MORRISON.

Dr. Harris, writing to Hentr. (Harr. Cor., p. 11), says: "Have you ever seen a *Rhagium*? In January I obtained from beneath the bark of a tree nearly twenty males and females of *R. lineatum* Oliver."

My object in writing is to ask your readers if they have ever found *R. lineatum* at such a time of the year and in such a situation. In the summer of 1873 (being absent from home I cannot give the exact dates but probably in May or June) I spent a week in Baltimore, Md., and every morning captured several examples of this species on the walls of a church—none elsewhere. I learned from Mr. Baumhauer, of that city, that he also had taken the same species at the same place several year, in succession.

W. V. ANDREWS, New York.

RARE CAPTURES.

On the 15th Sept., as my brother and myself were returning from an Entomological foray, I saw something like a flash of orange light flit past me, and turning, I saw an insect which I did not know was found here, viz., *Colias eurytheme*. Away it was flying like a ray of sunlight, flitting from flower to flower, resting only for about the smallest conceivable portion of time, and it was only after a long and exciting chase that I managed to capture my prize. It was in beautiful condition, apparently just fresh from chrysalis, and I consider myself very lucky in obtaining it.

Among our rarities, I would also mention a very fine specimen of *Smerinthus modesta* which I obtained from a friend who found it clinging to the eaves of his cottage. We have also among our Catocalidæ, a specimen of *C. concumbens* with abdomen of a bright pink on the upper surface, closely resembling the European *C. pacta* in this respect, only the color is not quite so vivid.

C. W. PEARSON, Montreal.

CORRECTIONS.—Gaspé is on the south shore of the St. Lawrence, opposite Anticosti. In my note on p. 18 regarding *P. brevicauda*, you make it north. Also, Mr. Edward's name should have been inserted as the writer of the leading quotation in the article on *Glaucopsyche Couperi*.
—WM. COUPER, 67 Bonaventure St., Montreal.