EUDRYAS STÆ. JOHANNIS REDIVIVUS.

BY A. RADCLIFFE GROTE, A. M., HILDESHEIM, GERMANY.

Readers of the CANADIAN ENTOMOLOGIST will recall the controversy between Prof. Smith and myself as to the species described by Walker as *Eudryas Stæ. Johannis*, the type of which was examined in 1867 by Grote & Robinson, and pronounced a distinct species allied to *grata*. I had supposed the insect owed its name to the St. John's River, Florida; but, according to Mr. Smith (C. E., XXIV., 133), the type bore a label that it was taken on a church door in England. Mr. Smith, relying on the label, invented the theory that: "in some way the pupa of the insect was transported to England, and through the vicissitudes encountered an aberration was produced." This writer has "no hesitation in referring the species as a suffused aberrant *grata*." There is *no* band on the hind wings, but, nevertheless, it is set down as a "suffused" specimen of *grata*, which always, so far as known, *has* a band! For my answer to this, see my paper, CAN. ENT., XXV., 320, where, aided by Mr. Tutt's memoranda as to the given English locality on the label, I discussed the *pro* and *con.* of the above theory. Now I am in receipt of a letter from Mr. Schaus, that *Eudryas Stæ. Johannis* has been re-discovered in Mexico. My kind correspondent writes: "It will interest you to know that I have recently seen several specimens of *Eudryas Stæ. Johannis*, Walk., from Mexico; they were sent to Mr. Druce by a native who is now collecting." Thus the theory of the "vicissitudes of the voyage" vanishes; the specific validity of *Stæ. Johannis* asserted by us in 1868, before Mr. Smith was (entomologically speaking) born, is vindicated. But more than this: the sequel shows that, instead of adopting the more credible theory that Walker's "type" had in some way been provided with a label belonging to a different specimen, Mr. Smith thought it "probable that in some way the pupa of the insect was transported to England." Having pinned his faith to the label, Mr. Smith then constructed the theory of "suffusion" to account for the differences, and then invented the "vicissitudes of the voyage" to account for the "suffusion." I think it is now plain that sufficient proof is offered that Mr. Smith blindly accepts a label, and that this throws light upon his work in his recent Catalogue, where he has accepted whatever Mr. Butler showed him as being Walker's "types"; whereas the fact is, that Walker did not label his "types" as such, and the specimens now so designated have been shifted and sorted out by Mr. Butler. I have offered evidence that the specimens now shown as the

"types" of *Acronycta cristifera*, *Xylina signosa*, *Hormisa absorptalis*, are not the specimens seen in their original position by myself, Prof. Fernald, and Grote & Robinson. Probably other cases exist. The basis of a specific name is found in literature, not in a collection or a supposed "type." A label may be changed or lost, a specimen may be substituted; the description is clearly the only warrant for the name that cannot be altered. The manner in which Mr. Smith speaks of Walker's and Gueneé's "types," as if he knew anything certain about the specimens shown him as such, his neglect in each and every case to compare the British Museum "type" with the Lists, stamps his method, pursued in the "Catalogue," as uncritical, if not "unscientific." Mr. Smith has made a number of remarks based on the fact that, in Mr. Neumoege's collection, I am supposed to have labelled some specimens (from memory) of difficult Agrotids wrongly. If the fact is really so, these determinations were never intended to be published, but the magnitude of my fault, amplified by Mr. Smith, really pales before the fact that, in the "Revision," Mr. Smith unites my *cupidissima*, *orbis* and *latula*, and invents another *Eudryas Stæ. Johannis* theory (p. 25), that I had "confounded two distinct species, one with open orbicula and one with closed"; while in the Catalogue, after seeing my types, he separates as distinct the three species (p. 56), and abandons the positively stated theory of the "Revision" without a word of apology.

But though the mystery of *Stæ. Johannis* is now cleared up, as to the home of the species, and its undoubted validity, the "type" in the British Museum is still without a certain locality. If *Stæ. Johannis* is found in Mexico, may it not be found on the banks of the St. John's River, in Florida, also? Is it not now somewhat probable that the "type" was really collected there by Doubleday? At any rate, Florida collectors will do well to look for the species, which belongs apparently to the Tropical fauna of America north of the Equator. We have, then, three allied species of the genus forming a group by themselves: *grata*, Fab.; *Stæ. Johannis*, Walk., and *cypris*, Grt. As to the name for the genus, I have given the argument. No one living, probably, regrets more than I do that, in the strict letter of the law, we must abandon the beautiful Wood Nymph for *Euthisanotia*, and use for *timais*, according to Berg's restriction, the name *Xanthopastis*. Thus the type of *Euthisanotia* would be *unio*, and with this, *brevipennis*, Stretch, from California, seems strictly congeneric. I wish Mr. Dyar would examine *Stæ. Johannis* and *grata*, to see if this group offers any structural distinctive characters.