NOTE ON HEMARIS UNIFORMIS AND ARCTIA SAUNDERSII.

BY A. R. GROTE, BREMEN, GERMANY.

I have sufficiently shown in various places (and the enquiring student may consult the originals) that Kirby's description of *Ruficaudis* contradicts that of *Uniformis*, in what we must regard as essential particulars in this genus. We have not here to do with a species; but, according to Mr. Hulst's statements, with a dimorphic form of *Thysbe*, in which the inner margin of the terminal band of primaries is *even*, not *dentate*, on the interspaces. Now this character is not at all alluded to by Kirby. He describes a *Sesia* allied to the European, and he says and knows nothing about *Thysbe* or *Pelagus* or *Cimbiciformis*. Kirby should not have described *Uniformis* without comparing it with its ally—its other well known form. Notwithstanding the probabilities of the case or the possibilities, it never can be proved from the books that Kirby did describe *Uniformis* as *Ruficaudis*. This is a matter of scientific importance, because we are the first to point out that two distinct "forms" if not "species" were passing as *Thysbe*, the differences which constantly divide them being first pointed out by us, first used as the basis by which they can be correctly separated and named in collections. It is therefore no matter of simply restoring an older name. It is an attempt at construing an older name and one which does not really apply. The attempt is therefore to be deprecated as unscientific. The whole point lies in the separation of the forms passing current as "*Thysbe*." In this lay the scientific value of the writings of Mr. Robinson and myself. This discovery, important or not important (real it certainly is), was made by us and is covered by the designation we apply to the plain form, and, according to all sense and the principles of scientific nomenclature, this name should henceforward apply. Clemens does not recognize *Ruficaudis*; Fernald mentions our insect as "*Uniformis*;" I take it for granted that these or similar considerations have influenced his course. It is years and years ago since I studied Kirby in the original, at least fifteen years before Mr. Hulst's time. It needed not that this industrious, but in his earlier studies somewhat inconsiderate writer, should tell *me* of the probabilities of what Kirby's might be. At the best they are probabilities. I take it, that to be correct, scientifically correct, the form of *Thysbe* with *even* edge to the external band of primaries and of the same or similar size with the type,

should be called *Uniformis* G. & R., without any reasonable doubt. I will not enter here into the question of the even banded forms, *Buffaloensis* and *Floridensis*. The larva of the former is described by Professor Lintner. The latter has not been examined in sufficient quantity. I think now that both these forms are distinct, certainly sufficiently so as to merit a distinct title, if not of specific value. *Fuscicaudis*, Boisd., is, from the markings of the abdomen, certainly a distinct species. After myself examining specimens I can come to no other conclusion.

Quite similar arguments show that we are justified in calling the smaller of the two forms of *Arctia*, which have buff striped, black fore wings, and red, spotted secondaries, by the name *Saundersii*. I carefully considered Kirby's description of *Parthenice* after my discovery that two species were passing as *Arctia virgo* in collections. The character which separates the two is the narrower ochre veining of *Saundersii*. Again as with the *Hemaris*, Kirby fails to compare his species with *Virgo* Linn., which it was his business to know had he intended to describe as closely allied a species as *Saundersii* is. I pass by the probably correct surmise of Mr. Hy. Edwards that Kirby describes an unimportant variety of *Virgo*, assuming this author to be correct. But be this as it may, I am the first to scientifically separate the forms, to carefully describe them, to figure them side by side (at my own expense, which was a good deal in those days), to give the essential characters by which they may be known and named henceforth. This being so, it is inconsiderate, and, scientifically speaking, an erroneous view which would overturn this real work and restore a name which can never be proved to be correctly applied. Always there must be a doubt hanging over the name *Parthenice*, from Kirby's own fault in ignoring *Virgo*. But there is no doubt about *Virgo* or *Saundersii*. I cleared those doubts up years ago, and Mr. Hulst should have profited by my work rather than attempt to re-introduce the uncertainty which I had, I think properly, dissipated.

ELAPHIDION VILLOSUM, FABR.

BY FREDERICK CLARKSON, NEW YORK.

In support of the record relating to the periods of transformation of this beetle, and the probable cause of their pruning the branches of the Oak, which I had the pleasure to contribute to the XVII Vol. of this