The Canadian Entomologist.

VOL. XLII.

LONDON, JUNE, 1910.

No. 6.

NOCTUID NOTES.

BY F. H. WOLLEY DOD, MILLARVILLE, ALTA.

Xylina Treit. (*Graptolitha* Hübn., Hamps. Cat.).

Amongst the many errors in nomenclature brought to light by Sir George Hampson's most valued work on the Noctuidæ, is one concerning two of our commonest eastern *Xylinas*.

In 1871 Riley described what he believed to be a very variable species as *X. cinerea*. In 1874 Grote recognized that the name referred to a mixture of species, and choosing a specimen of one of them as a type to hold Dr. Riley's name, described another form as *laticinerea*. In 1879 Prof. Fernald discovered that Walker's *antennata*, which had been described in 1858 from an unknown locality, came from North America, and was the species chosen by Grote to hold Riley's name, which therefore sank. Grote made the reference, and at the same time tentatively separated and described a third form from the group as *cinerosa*. Then Riley, finding *cinerosa* preoccupied in the genus by a European species of Guenée's, cited *Grotei* as the name to be used for Grote's *cinerosa*.

The foregoing is old, and well known, but Sir George Hampson's changes are more recent, and as yet but little known. The European *cinerosa* Gn., has now turned out to be a synonym, and Hampson therefore restores Grote's name in place of the long familiar *Grotei*. But he has also shown us that hitherto Grote's two species have generally stood reversed in collections, and that the large gray-sprinkled species, with whitish contrasting orbicular, and without brown in reniform, is really *cinerosa* = *Grotei*, and that *laticinerea* is the smaller, less gray, and more common species, of which *Winnipeg* Smith is correctly referred by him as a synonym. I have studied the types of all the above names. The variation is apt to be confusing, and *cinerosa* and *laticinerea* appeared to me to be mixed at the British Museum as elsewhere, but the type of *laticinerea* is figured by Hampson, and a specimen like the type of *cinerosa*, and both figures are easily recognizable. The synonymy now stands ;

Xylina cinerosa Grt.	} Large, gray-sprinkled; orbicular whitish, contrasting. No brown in reniform.
Grotei Riley	
laticinerea Grt.	} Smaller, duller, orbicular scarcely contrasting, usually with brown in reniform.
Winnipeg Smith	
antennata, Walk.	} (No change.)
cinerea Riley	

The characters given for the first two species were designated by Grote himself. Holland's figure of *laticinerea* happens to be correct, but in Prof. Smith's monograph, Pl. v, figs. 29 and 30, the names are reversed.

A species standing wrongly under *Winnipeg* in collections, and often mixed with the true species, is the Manitoba form of *animada*, which is rather more strongly marked than typical.

X. hemina Grt.—This name has long been applied to *disposita*, from which it has been thought questionably distinct. Nearly all the specimens I have seen standing in collections as *hemina*, I believe to be *disposita*. At any rate, none have been *hemina*, the two being really quite unlike, as my notes on, and Hampson's figure of the type of *hemina* show. Though I have known *disposita* for long, until I saw the type in the British Museum about a year ago, I had never seen *hemina*. My notes on the type tell me that it is a strigate species, and "so unlike *disposita* that comparison is superfluous." The type comes from Lewis Co., N. Y., and it appears to be a very rare species. Though I have seen several of the principal collections, I have not yet identified this with certainty in any of them. Grote in his description says that it is longer winged than *disposita*, with "spots and lines less distinctly limited, and more as in *petulca*." He adds that it has a peculiar general resemblance in ornamentation and colour to *Hadena vulgaris*. The type, a male, came from the Hill collection, which contained other specimens. Where that collection now is, I have not heard. Smith's Monograph, Pl. iii, fig. 2, called "*hemina*, melanic form," I rather suspect of being a pale *oriunda*. Fig. 4 I should call about normal *petulca*, and the same as fig. 13, called *rignosa*, a name of which I cannot at present arrive at the true status.

Taniocampa Gn. (*Monima* Hbn.; Hamps. Cat.)

It will come, I fear, as a shock to many, to learn that both the names *alia* Gn., and *pacifica* Harv., are everywhere wrongly used. The type of *Taniocampa alia* Gn., is a good specimen, a female, in the British

Museum. It was described in 1852 from "U. S. A." It is the common and widely distributed species hitherto everywhere known as *Hadena suffusca* Morr., described twenty-three years later, of which, however, I have not yet seen the type. Assuming *suffusca* to have been correctly identified, *alia* Gn., which has smooth eyes, and is therefore not a *Tæniocampa*, has priority.

The next name up till now in the synonymy of *alia* being *hibisci* Gn., that must be used for the common eastern *Tæniocampa*. I have not seen the type, but merely assume that it has been correctly referred, not to *alia*, but to the species we have mistaken therefor. Hampson's figure of *alia* is not of the type, but the species I now call *hibisci*. Whether Guenée intended the name *alia* to apply to the species which bears the type label may be open to question. I have not seen the description, but am guided by the type. Though the *Tæniocampa* sometimes resembles *alia* in colour, and they have a similar subterminal line and shade, they can scarcely be confused by anyone acquainted with both, even apart from generic characters. From the foregoing it follows that Holland's figure of *alia* should be called *hibisci*.

In 1874 Dr. Harvey, or more probably perhaps really Grote, under Harvey's name, described *pacifica* from Sanzalito, Calif., comparing it to *alia*, undoubtedly meaning thereby, not the *Hadena*, but *hibisci*. Harvey's name has also been wrongly applied to a very common and widely distributed British Columbian form which intergrades in Alberta with *hibisci*. His type is a female in the British Museum, where there are four other similar Californian specimens, and one from Vancouver Island. Other true *pacifica* that I have seen are, one in my own collection from Oakland (which is close to the place repeatedly called "Sanzalito" in Hampson's Catalogue, though I believe Sancelito is correct); one in Prof. Smith's collection labelled "Canada"; and a male from Victoria, B. C., in the Neumogen collection at Brooklyn. I may have seen one or two more, but can find no note of them at present. It is evidently a very rare species. It is characterized by the paler colour, obsolescent orbicular, narrow, somewhat constricted reniform, contrasting with the pale, even ground, but not conspicuously pale ringed, and a slight w in the s. t. line, which is preceded by a narrow dark band of even width.

The common B. C. form hitherto passing as *pacifica*, as it intergrades with the eastern *hibisci* in Alberta, I cannot recognize as distinct, though on the B. C. coast it is certainly a well-marked local race. In view of this fact, and as it has for years passed as a species, being larger and far

brighter coloured than eastern specimens, I propose the racial name *latirena*, which will serve to distinguish it from *pacifica*. I consider no description necessary, and make no type. Hampson does not figure the type of *pacifica*, and his figure under that name is *latirena*.

Quinquefasciata Sm. (Journ. N. Y. Ent. Soc., XVII, p. 65, 1909), is a well-marked form of *latirena*, with distinct cross-lines and ventral shade, which I have had in my collection for fifteen years, and have often vainly tried to separate out as a species. I am no better able to do so after seeing the types, and believe it to be merely a varietal form, occurring throughout the range of the *latirena* form of *hibisci*.

The synonymy of the above mentioned species will now stand :

Hadena alia Gn.

suffusca Morr.

Tæniocampa pacifica Harv.

“ *hibisci* Gn.

a. *latirena* Auct.

b. *quinquefasciata* Sm.

T. mecrona Sm. (Journ. N. Y. Ent. Soc., XVI, p. 95, 1908). A good species, I believe, described from Kaslo, and recognized by Mr. Cockle and the writer two years before. It is the “grayer and smoother first brood of *communis*” referred to by Dr. Dyar in the Kaslo list, and a large number of the co-types of *communis* are *mecrona*. I have separated them in the Washington collection. It is characterized by being slightly larger and longer winged, less red, having cross-lines fainter, orbicular usually larger and rarely dark-centered, and less of shade before s. t. line. The two are very close allies, and must be well studied in good series to be separated. I have a specimen from Oakland, Calif.

T. Smithii Dyar, its author refers, in Proc. U. S. Nat. Mus., XXVII, p. 868, 1904, as “at least a different race from *communis*.” The female type at Washington is from “N. Ill.,” and I believe it to be the same species as Morrison’s type of *incinata*, male, without locality, in the same collection. It is a broader winged species than *communis*, with male antennæ bipectinate with rather long branches. A Colorado female there in the *incinata* series, and one from Mr. Val. Fernaker (? Wisconsin), as well as type *Smithii*, have double pale-filled t. a. line. Type *incinata* and a ♀ “N. Ill.” have it single, but they seemed to me all one species.

T. alurina, Sm.—The type is a Chicago male in Prof. Smith’s collection, where there is also a male from Pittsburg, Pa. It is an ally of

hibisci, but is broader winged, and has more strongly serrate-fasciculate antennæ, almost pectinate, as mentioned in the description.

T. saleppa Smith (Trans. Am. Ent. Soc., XXXIII, p. 132, 1907.)—Described from Wellington and Victoria, B. C., as a close ally of *prases* Grt. Prof. Smith has in his collection two short series as *prases* and *saleppa*, including the type of the former, and B. C. specimens under both. Those under *saleppa* are paler and more ochreous than the rest, but I am unable to recognize two species, and do not think that B. C. collectors can do so either.

MOSQUITO OBSERVATIONS.—CONTINUED.

BY C. S. LUDLOW, PH. D.

Army Medical Museum, Washington, D. C.

In an article published last year* I described the female of *Oculiomyia Fulleri* mihi, and since then have received several specimens of each sex. The male resembles the female closely in colour markings, but it is of some interest to note that in each of the three males the verticels of the antennæ are in part specially developed. In one instance the 6th and 7th joints show them short, heavy, wrinkled and scale-like; on the other two specimens the 6th, 7th and 8th joints have the verticels altered in this way, while in one of these, on one antenna, the verticels at one joint appear as long slenderly spatulate flat scales about half as long as the normal verticels. The specimens are, as a whole, in bad condition, only one leg remaining on the males, and as it broke off before I noticed its attachment I cannot be sure which it is; the ungues on it are unequal and simple.

There have also been received two apparently new forms, described below, and the female of *Popea lutea* mihi, the male of which was described† in 1905, and no other specimens received until this year.

Popea lutea mihi (female).

The general markings agree well with those of the males, but are, as a whole, darker.

Antennæ brown, white, unscaled at the joints, basal joint testaceous, 1st joint with many dark brown flat scales, verticels and pubescence brown or light, according to the direction of the light; palpi short;

* New Philippine Mosquitoes. Can. Ent., Mch., 1909.

† Mosquito Notes, No. 3. Can. Ent., Mch., 1905.

June, 1910