This article was downloaded by: [University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign]

On: 14 March 2015, At: 06:32

Publisher: Taylor & Francis

Informa Ltd Registered in England and Wales Registered Number: 1072954 Registered office: Mortimer House, 37-41 Mortimer Street, London W1T 3JH, UK

Annals and Magazine of Natural History: Series 5

Publication details, including instructions for authors and subscription information:
<http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/tnah11>

LII.—Notes on synonymy of Australian Lepidoptera described by Mr. Rosenstock

E. Meyrick B.A. F.E.S. ^a

^a The King's School, Parramatta, N.S.W.
Published online: 12 Oct 2009.

To cite this article: E. Meyrick B.A. F.E.S. (1886) LII.—Notes on synonymy of Australian Lepidoptera described by Mr. Rosenstock, *Annals and Magazine of Natural History: Series 5*, 17:102, 528-530, DOI: [10.1080/00222938609460186](http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00222938609460186)

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00222938609460186>

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

Taylor & Francis makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of all the information (the "Content") contained in the publications on our platform. However, Taylor & Francis, our agents, and our licensors make no representations or warranties whatsoever as to the accuracy, completeness, or suitability for any purpose of the Content. Any opinions and views expressed in this publication are the opinions and views of the authors, and are not the views of or endorsed by Taylor & Francis. The accuracy of the Content should not be relied upon and should be independently verified

with primary sources of information. Taylor and Francis shall not be liable for any losses, actions, claims, proceedings, demands, costs, expenses, damages, and other liabilities whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with, in relation to or arising out of the use of the Content.

This article may be used for research, teaching, and private study purposes. Any substantial or systematic reproduction, redistribution, reselling, loan, sub-licensing, systematic supply, or distribution in any form to anyone is expressly forbidden.

Terms & Conditions of access and use can be found at <http://www.tandfonline.com/page/terms-and-conditions>

LII.—*Notes on Synonymy of Australian Lepidoptera described by Mr. Rosenstock.* By E. MEYRICK, B.A., F.E.S.

IN the 'Annals and Magazine of Natural History' for 1885 (vol. xvi. pp. 376–385, 421–443) is a paper on Australian Lepidoptera by Mr. Rosenstock, which requires a good deal of correction in order to make it available for scientific use. It appeared to me therefore desirable to embody in a short note the principal alterations which require to be made in respect of the Geometrina and Microlepidoptera, to which most of my attention is given. I may add that, as Dr. Lucas (the collector of the insects described) has placed in my hands types of the greater number of his species, I am enabled in most cases to speak with confidence of the identification of those described by Mr. Rosenstock, of which the descriptions are not always sufficiently precise. Mr. Rosenstock expresses an opinion that I have overlooked descriptions of several species, and in some cases (only one is mentioned) described neuration wrongly; this is possible enough, but by reference to the notes hereafter following it will be seen that in every instance quoted he is mistaken.

Messatis, Walk., is stated to be distinct from *Endotricha*, but no points of difference are given; without these it is obvious that no attention can be paid to the assertion. The species (*E. pyrosalis*, Gn.) agrees with *Endotricha* in every character known to me, as I have elsewhere pointed out.

Scopula segestusalis, Walk., is, as admitted, too much worn for recognition, and was intentionally neglected. I should add that my paper on Australian Pyralidina did not profess to be exhaustive, and that several probably good species described by Walker were purposely omitted for want of specimens for examination.

Isopteryx nitidalis, Walk. Stated to be overlooked by me; it will be found in the genus *Musotima*, and has no connexion with *Isopteryx*.

Scoparia pusilla, Ros. I have not seen an authentic specimen, and cannot recognize this, but think it may probably be *S. spelæa*, Meyr.

The genus *Thalaina*, Walk., is placed (following Walker) among the Liparidæ; it belongs to the Boarmiadæ.

The species included in the genera *Fidonia*, *Panagra*, and *Dasyuris* have in no instance any connexion with those genera.

C. lucidulata, Walk., is stated "to present all the cha-

racters" of *Chrysolarentia*, Butl.; these are defined by Butler to be that the fore wings are "rather more acute" (than in *Larentia*, but the difference is imaginary), and that the hind wings are "usually yellow;" it is impossible to regard this as a generic characterization.

Eubolia undulata, Ros., is a species of *Cephalissa*.

The specimens identified (probably quite correctly) as *Coremia permissata*, Walk., and *C. regulata*, Walk., are (according to Dr. Lucas's types) both identical with *Epyaxa subidaria*, Gn.

Coremia languescens, Ros., is a species of *Cephalissa*.

Diptychophora ochracealis, Walk. Mr. Rosenstock appears to have overlooked my correction of the synonymy of this.

Thinasotia aurantiaca, Meyr. This identification is incorrect, unless Dr. Lucas mixed the two species, which is improbable, as *T. aurantiaca* does not to my knowledge occur south of the Hunter River: the species intended is (according to Dr. Lucas's specimen) *T. bivittella*, Don. Both are correctly referred to the genus *Hednota*.

Sorocostia vetustella, Walk. Stated to be quite overlooked by me, and described as a new genus of Crambidae; it is, however, a *Nola* (Lithosiadæ), and was of course intentionally omitted; it was described by Zeller again under the name of *Nola strictalis* (Verh. zool.-bot. Ges. Wien, 1872).

Prionophora ruptella, Walk. (quoted under *Ancylolomia*). Mr. Rosenstock has overlooked my reference of this species (confirmed by Zeller) to the Noctuidæ.

Tortrix leucaniana, Walk. This reference is certainly erroneous; the species intended is *T. glaphyrana*, Meyr. *T. leucaniana* is confined to New Zealand, without doubt, and could not be mistaken for *T. glaphyrana* by any one well acquainted with both (I have seen both in thousands), though the females are very similar, as in all the allied species. I have seen Dr. Lucas's types.

Bondia nigella, Newm. It is asserted, on the strength of the examination of one specimen, that veins three and four of the hind wings are from a point, and not remote, as stated by me. I have again examined the six specimens which I possess, and find that in all the veins are remote, as I originally stated, though to a variable degree; hence, while Mr. Rosenstock's observation may be quite correct, it fails to prove that mine was incorrect; the just inference is either that the one specimen was exceptional, or that the species varies more than was at first observed.

Tinea fraudulens, Ros. This specific name must positively be written *fraudenta*, the form adopted being a frightful

solecism. The species is a good one, but it is not a true *Tinea*; it belongs to a new genus allied to *Tinea*, but distinguished from it (as correctly indicated by Mr. Rosenstock) by the antennæ, which are as long as the fore wings. I propose for this genus the name *Chrysoryctis*; to it may be referred also *Æcophora irruptella*, Walk. (nec Zell.), and *Incurvaria purella*, Walk., and I have several other species.

Adela chrysolamprella, Ros. This appears to be *Nemotois sparsellus*, Walk., of which *Adela laurella*, Newm., is also a synonym; it is a true *Nemotois*, not an *Adela*.

Hypertropha divitiosa, Walk. This was not overlooked by me, nor again is it a distinct species (I have compared Walker's type); it is identical with *desumptana*, Walk., of which (as I have noted elsewhere) *tortriciformis*, Gn., is the oldest name.

Eulechria leucopsina, Ros. This is a synonym of *Peltophora atricollis*, Meyr.

Æcophora apertella, Walk. I have not seen a specimen of what Dr. Lucas sent; but I have no hesitation in saying that it was not the species named, which is a yellow species of *Æcophora*, peculiar to New Zealand; probably the insect intended is not a true *Æcophora*.

Philobota athletica, Ros. This is a synonym of *Cæsyra annularis*, Meyr.

Without entering into the subject of the other groups, I may say that *Discophlebia Lucasii*, Ros., is the female of *D. catoculina*, Feld.; the affinities of this curious insect need not be discussed here.

To this list of criticisms I should, in fairness, add that some genera and species appear to have been so carefully examined (considering the imperfect material available) that it is a pity the same attention was not bestowed upon all.

The King's School, Parramatta, N. S. W.

April 3, 1886.

LIII.—*Contributions to a Knowledge of Malayan Entomology.* Part V. By W. L. DISTANT.

THE following descriptions are of butterflies received from the Malay Peninsula, an area which possesses a particularly rich Rhopalocerous fauna, and one which continually exhibits novelties in almost every collection.