

than half as long as in *Eriphia concolorella*. I place it somewhat doubtfully in *Elachista*, because of the neuration, which approaches that of *Laverna*. The submedian of the primaries is not furcate at the base; the cell is narrow and acuminate, with three subcostal branches to the margin from near the end of the cell, besides the apical branch, which is furcate before the apex, with one of its branches to each margin; the median is also three-branched, the last from the end of the cell almost confluent with the furcate apical branch of the subcostal.

In the secondaries the cell is rather wide, unclosed; the subcostal is distinct and furcate, with a branch to each margin; the median is three-branched (or two-branched, with an independent discal branch arising *at* the median and indistinctly continued through the cell, which is unclosed).

Dark bronzy brown; unicolorous. *Al. ex.* a little less than a third of an inch. Not so slender an insect as *Eriphia concolorella*.

*E. parvipulvella*. *N. sp.*

White; a few ochreous yellow scales scattered over the primaries, especially towards the apex. *Al. ex.* scarcely  $\frac{1}{4}$  inch. Season, May, July, August and September.

---

#### CORRESPONDENCE.

---

##### YOUNG OF POLYXENUS.

DEAR SIR,—

During the past summer I have bred the young *Polyxenus* from the egg. The eggs were found under the bark of dead pines, and were in masses of about thirty, I should judge; intermixed with them were numerous hairs from the posterior part of the body of the adult. The eggs are translucent white, sometime before the young appear turning somewhat opaque; in shape oval, long diameter barely one-hundredth of an inch.

Length of the young ten hours from the egg, seven two-hundredths of an inch. The young differ in no marked manner from the adult, except in the smaller number of segments, which are four, and in having only three pairs of legs, attached to the three anterior segments. The fourth segment is small and has the two tufts of silvery hair so characteristic of the adult.

HENRY L. MOODY, Malden, Mass.

## CROCIGRAPHA.

DEAR SIR,—

On page 250 of the CAN. ENT., Mr. Morrison doubts the propriety of the generic reference of *Perigrapha Normani* Grote. I had previously (Bull. B. S. N. S.) noted the different antennal structure of the American species, not being acquainted autoptically with the European forms. The species of *Perigrapha* are regarded as related to *Taeniocampa* by Lederer, and it was natural that in describing an American species, differing by the presence of a prothoracic tuft, that I should refer it to a genus differing by this character from *Taeniocampa*, to which otherwise both were related. Lederer has divided the genus *Taeniocampa* (which should now be known, as I have shown elsewhere, as *Graphiphora*) into sections already, on peculiarities of antennal structure. There can be no propriety of further enlarging the genus by the admission of species with a tufted thorax, so that I propose the above name for *C. Normani*.

DEAR SIR,—

In Mr. Morrison's letter on page 16 of this volume of the CANADIAN ENTOMOLOGIST, he allows himself to call my statements with regard to certain recently described species, "palpable blunders." In the course of his paper, however, the synonyms I claimed that Mr. Morrison has made are admitted, with the exception of two, *Hadena rasilis* and *Agrotis exsertistigma*. With regard to the former insect, I think it much more nearly resembles Hübner's figure of *grata* than *Graphiphora oviduca* does in habitus, size, ornamentation and color, and my blunder (if I had made one) can hardly be called "palpable." With reference to *Agrotis exsertistigma*, I find that I am in error and that the species is valid. I have not known until now the true *exsertistigma*. Mr. Morrison founded this species on two specimens sent him by myself for description with other material, but neither were returned me with the other specimens. Having no duplicates of the material sent him, I inferred that *exsertistigma* was based on specimens with open orbicular, which I referred to *alternata*, but which I now see are Californian specimens of *A. cupida* Grote. Mr. Morrison's non-return of the specimens merely confirmed me in my own wrong identification of *alternata* Grote, as found in California. I am exceedingly sorry to find myself in double error. In the present case the description of Mr. Morrison has helped to mislead me, since *exsertistigma* has a conical abdomen and should not be compared with either *alternata*

or *cupida*, which have it flattened, while *cupida* varies in California in a character (the open orbicular) which Mr. Morrison uses to separate *exsertistigma*.

To the list of synonyms I have given as recently made by Mr. Morrison, Mr. Morrison adds that of *Orthosia baliola*. They would therefore stand as follows :

1. *Copipanolis vernalis* Morr. = *Eutolype Rolandi*.
2. *Mamestra illabefacta* Morr. = *Mamestra lilacina*.
3. *Anthoptera nigrocaput* Morr. = *X. Ridingsii*.
4. *Orthosia baliola* Morr. = *Apamea purpuripennis*.
5. *Hadena rasilis* Morr. = *Elaphria grata*.

Of these five synonyms, one (No. 4) I had not detected, one (No. 5) is not conceded by Mr. Morrison and three (Nos. 1-3) are now admitted by him.

Mr. Morrison is in error in stating that I remark that his *vulgivaga* is "probably a re-description of *H. apamiformis*." I quote the species on page 215 as a distinct species unknown to me, and merely say "from the description I think it not improbable," etc., which is a very different thing. I make no positive statement with regard to either *sericea* or *vulgivaga*. I am glad that *sericea* is not founded on the specimen sent me as a "n. s." allied to *apiata*, because that was *apiata*. I thought *sericea* might be the insect, because Mr. Morrison disputed my determination and thought it distinct, and because he speaks comparatively of *apiata* in his description of *sericea*.

In CAN. ENT., 6, 250, Mr. Morrison states that "Mr. Grote refers *Ceramica* to *Taeniocampa*." In my paper (Bul. Buff. S. N. S., 2, 122) I give the genera (as elsewhere) separately and distinctly, but cite their names under the same heading in a short synoptical table, with the remark, "I have no perfectly preserved specimens of *Ceramica exusta*, and the structural difference from *Taeniocampa* is not apparent to me," as an excuse for so doing.

Mr. Morrison's remark as to my identification of *Agrotis lycarum* I think is unfairly put. This identification was always made hesitatingly from a figure, and had been finally abandoned before Mr. Morrison had written on the subject. Again, *repentis* G. & R. was described in Europe and the name a ms. one of Guenee's. That we had not then identified *messoria* was, perhaps, pardonable, Mr. Riley also having redescribed Harris' species as *Cochrani*.

I notice, also, Mr. Morrison's remark that I have mistaken the generic characters of *Hydroecia semiaperta*. This species, with hairy eyes, is placed by Mr. Morrison first in *Hydroecia*, a genus which has the eyes *naked*. It was sent to me as a n. s. of *Hydroecia* by Mr. Morrison for examination, and I then returned the species determined as belonging to a genus allied to, but distinct from *Hydroecia*. In the Proceedings of the Academy I merely discuss the priority of the names *Apamea* and *Hydroecia*, show that they are synonyms, and adopt *Apamea* and refer *all* the American species described under *Hydroecia* to *Apamea*. Among them is Mr. Morrison's *semiaperta*. There is not a word as to the structure of the species, and, in fact, I refer to *semiaperta* in the next description as *Hydroecia semiaperta*. It was not my intention then to discuss its structure or erect the new genus, to which I have always in letters stated it to belong.

Mr. Morrison speaks of *nigrescens* as a synonym of *fasciolaris*. I have examined and determined both species as distinct from specimens in the collection of the American Entomological Society. The two are totally, and, I believe, even generically different.

Mr. Morrison allows himself to make an extraordinary statement with regard to one of the few generic names proposed in my List and its Supplement, to the effect that such names without further description need not be adopted. Independent of the fact that it is customary to retain such names as can be proven by the works of Hübner, Ochsenheimer, Walker and many others, the view taken by Mr. Morrison is untenable from the consideration that I have indicated my type and clearly circumscribed the genus by an enumeration of the species in every case. Science is occupied by the fact and not the name; by his criticism Mr. Morrison shows himself affected by the name and not the fact. There can be no doubt that I have made such genera recognizable by including under them described species and thus facts and things admitted by science as existing and already defined. My generic names are as strictly to be preserved in these cases as if they were defined with the minuteness which characterizes Mr. Scudder's definition of *Papilio*. Take, for instance, my genus *Eucoptocnemis*, proposed in my List for the *Heliophobus fimbriaris* of Gueneé. Even the Etymology of the name suggests my reference to Gueneé's statement that his species has armed tibiæ, and my inference that then it cannot be a *Heliophobus*, which has them unarmed. If from such data as this no conclusion can be drawn and no action taken by a

student in my capacity, then large numbers of terms throughout Zoology are liable to be overturned any moment by persons as ill-advised as Mr. Morrison. I cite, for example, Mr. Allen's recently described *Loligo Hartingii*, determined specifically upon a figure.

It is true that Mr. Morrison takes no regard as to the meaning of generic terms, and hence has probably taken no cognizance of the derivation of *Eucoptocnemis*, since he establishes himself a new genus under the name *Eutricopis* (my term *Tricopis* with a common prefix), which belies its designation in having the tibiæ unarmed! Mr. Morrison incorrectly refers *Eucoptocnemis fimbriaris* to my genus *Pleonectopoda*, where it does not belong, just as he incorrectly refers *Eutolype Rolandi* Grote, under the synonym *vernalis*, to my genus *Copipanolis*, where it is equally out of place.

My List of the Noctuidæ will amply attain the ends proposed if it will continue to call forth corrections and additions, and so be of service in perfecting a knowledge of its subject, the Noctuidæ of N. America.

A. R. GROTE.

Buffalo, N. Y.

1

10

101

DEAR SIR,—

I got a number of larvae of *Papilio asterias* in July, 1874, in Fulton County, Ohio, three of which changed to pupæ. One of the pupæ I poured chloroform over, and when it stopped moving, put a pin through it. A few days after I looked at it, and found it had grown almost black about the wing cases. I broke off the piece of the pupa skin that covers the head, legs and antennæ, and was surprised to see it move. The wings would get dry sometimes, and I would put a drop of water on them, to keep them moist. At last the time came for hatching, and with my help, the butterfly got out of the pupa case, but could not expand on account of its wings being dry. Yours truly,

ALLEN Y. MOORE.

Fort Buford, D. T.