The Canadian Entomologist.

VOL. XIX.

LONDON, JULY, 1887.

No. 7

ABOUT NAMES.

BY A. R. GROTE, A. M., BREMEN, GERMANY.

I have read, as all of us have, the review of a book by C. J. Maynard, on our Butterflies, by Mr. W. H. Edwards, and which appeared in the February number of the CANADIAN ENTOMOLOGIST. Whatever Mr. Edwards writes is trenchant and to the point, so that we have received the impression that Mr. Maynard's book is really not what it ought to be, is not up to current scientific knowledge, and is inferior in its illustrations. There is no more to be said about the book on this head ; its publication will probably do very little real good, except perhaps that here and there a reader into whose hands it may chance to fall may have his interest excited in the subject, and so be led to buy a better one, as, for instance, that of Prof. French, to say nothing of Mr. Edwards's splendid volumes. But I was interested in Mr. Edwards's remarks about the names of butterflies, in which the critic leaves his prey to "regret to say that Mr. Scudder is our greatest sinner in this respect" (p. 39). Mr. Scudder, who never defends himself, might well need a champion as far as I understand the average opinion of students. I am all unworthy to assume such a rôle, and am not at all called upon to do so, nevertheless as what I have to say is rather in mitigation of his offence, I must be regarded somewhat in that light. And first, we are all sinners, miserable sinners, as the Church puts into our proper confession, but I doubt if it is right for us to apply the word *inter nos*. There has been quite a shower of adjectives unenlivened by wit, as well as of censure unredeemed by humor, and often unexcused by candor, in our entomological press, and to this I have, in my humble way, quite strongly objected. We are not authorized by our positions to assume so much, nor is our subject sufficiently important, as the world goes, to warrant the issue of ukases upon entomological topics. The particular offence of Mr. Scudder in the matter of names is that of the English ones. Now English names for insects existed before Latin ones, as might indeed be

supposed. I think it is De Saussure who assures us of the ultimate triumph of the English tongue in the contest for existence between the languages, and it is a matter of at least secondary importance that the English names of our butterflies come into use. A butterfly has as good a right to an English, or common name, in an English speaking country, as a plant. And plant names are part of our literature, of our poetry. Perhaps what I said in the "Popular Science Monthly" might be repeated here. The introduction of common names for our Lepidoptera is evidently a matter not to be forced, but to be left to itself. The rule of priority which Linnæus appointed to govern Latin names cannot obtain here. Some of our butterflies have received several English names, as our "Milk-weed butterfly." Some of the names for moths in use in England are very pretty, such as the "Arches" and "Wainscots." English names will, it is to be hoped, gradually appear in our American literature and come into use. The vernacular names proposed in our economic works, mere translations from the Latin, are often very ugly and have nothing to commend them. But see what lovely names they have in England for their moths! The "Kentish Glory," the "Peach Blossom," the "Buff Arches," the "Common Wainscot." About the vernacular names for our moths must come the cooling touch of time; they cannot be struck out in the heat which accompanies the coining of a Latin name for a new species (struggling for priority). Around their cradle some tutelary divinity must hover; some old and idle tale, like an ancient crone, must be its nurse; out of some melody, dedicate to fields and flowers, must the words be taken which are to serve as the common title of the insect haunting these pastures. And not the first but the best known, and in itself the best name, must be chosen, and to exercise this choice there must be some literary taste in the writer, some quaint appositeness in the name itself. Here, in Germany, with its wonderfully supple language, and the frequency of compound words, common names have been easily made and pass current. My young friend Eugene, as to trusting whom with a cyanide bottle I feel some scruples, talks quite glibly and confidently to me about the "Grosser" and "Kleiner Fuchs;" the latter he has not been able to catch yet, but he knows how it looks from his little handbook, which has fairly good figures and the common name preceding the Latin one for each species. It seems to be a fact, and I do not see how Mr. Edwards can get around it, that young ento-

mologists, *aetat* 10 for instance, prefer their living nursery language to the dead one from the tombs. And we are well counselled to remember the little ones always! What would I not have given to have known the common names for our insects on Staten Island in the fifties!

What Mr. Maynard may choose to call our butterflies cannot be thrown up against Mr. Scudder, who, as I understand it, has merely proposed corresponding titles for our butterflies with those used in England, as the "Blues" and "Coppers," using these names in somewhat of a generic sense and supplying some fresh titles of his own, whether fortunately or not, I am not here enquiring. This is a matter subject to a later review on occasion. Certainly we must be guided by some general agreement with English names in use in England for similar but different species, and this without a too vigorous enquiry. Certain hairy caterpillars in England (and in Germany also) are called "Bears" (I don't know what brings Bacon's curious sentence, "the body of nature is elegantly and with deep judgment depicted hairy," etc., into my mind), and there are certain common names used in a generic way from resemblances occurring to the casual observer. These we must use, and for my part I think that, in a natural way, we shall come into using certain common names as collecting becomes popular among the young and as popular books increase with us.

Far more than on this head am I concerned about Mr. Scudder's proposed book on our butterflies. I think there is a mean between Mr. Scudder's Latin nomenclature and that of Mr. Edwards, which latter is based on Doubleday's, and perhaps since Doubleday we may have advanced in our knowledge as to the structure of butterflies, and are authorized to express this advance in our Latin names. It is many years ago since Mr. Robinson and I set about classifying our Diurnals, and this was before Mr. Scudder's classification. I only published about that time the genera *Feniseca* and *Calephelis*, and as these are not objected to, I think that what I here say, with great diffidence, is entitled to some consideration on both sides. I am quite satisfied, and was before Mr. Scudder, that our Hackberry butterflies, *celtis*, *clyton*, etc., do not belong to the European genus *Apatura*, and that the structural characters separating the two are real and of generic value. Also am I of opinion that our eastern *arthemis*, *ursula*, *disippus*, *eros*, form a group of themselves, distinct from *Limenitis* proper, and that Mr. Scudder's

term *Basilarchia* should be retained. On the other hand I think Mr. Scudder's divisions of *Argynnis* and *Lycaena* are not valid, as now shown by Prof. Peabody and others. I hope Mr. Scudder will not retain these, and also that he will be guided by Dr. Speyer's classification of the *Hesperidae*. These latter afford good, apparent, readily understood generic characters as we understand these in the moths, and there is nothing gained by making too many genera out of them on "measurements." These latter are now proved to be illusory, and should not be again brought forward. As to the general arrangement of the families, the arrangement of Meigen and others, commencing with the groups in which the front legs are useless for walking, and which are taken out of the ambulatory series, has an approved philosophic basis. It is warranted under Prof. Dana's theory of cephalization. Mr. Scudder's paper on the structure of *Papilio* in the Transactions of the American Entomological Society, has not been answered. I think the caterpillars of *Papilio* are of a lower type than those of the rest of the true butterflies, and that there are no reasons for placing the "Swallow Tails" at the head of the rest except that they are large and showy insects. The structure of the feet is evidently of importance no less than the method of pupation, and this is recognized consistently in Mr. Scudder's arrangement. There is certainly no system in commencing with the groups with six walking legs, then following with those of four, and winding up again with those with six. The moths have generally six walking legs, and the abortive front pair may be consistently regarded as a later phase. I have great confidence in Mr. Edwards's remarks as to genera, that these can be traced in all stages from the egg upwards, and in this respect it would be well if Mr. Scudder, for the sake of reason, which, as Zschokke says, is the "daylight of the mind," would abate from hair-splitting. But I have great regard for Mr. Scudder's general appreciation of classificatory characters and those which point to higher or lower rank and which determine the confines of large groups, and on this head it would be well if Mr. Edwards relented from his present views. There is then, to my mind, a possible agreement between the two authorities, and that such an agreement would be of great value cannot be doubted. Where there is any reasonable principle involved, I advise neither to give way. Time, Mr. Strecker's friend, must level such differences by throwing more light on the subject. But much that divides the two scientists lies in the

wide domains of unreason, upon which we all trespass during our earthly journeyings, and where many of us, I am afraid, almost permanently reside.

STUDIES OF THE NORTH AMERICAN PROCTOTRUPIDÆ,
WITH DESCRIPTIONS OF NEW SPECIES FROM FLORIDA.

BY WILLIAM H. ASHMEAD, JACKSONVILLE, FLORIDA.

Sub family PLATYGASTERINÆ.

In this second paper on the North American *Proctotrupidæ*, I have taken up the sub-family *Platygasterinæ*, comprising, for the most part, small black species, all parasitic in larvæ belonging to the Dipterous families *Cecidomyiidae* and *Tipulidae*.

It will be seen that I have recognized in our fauna species in all of the described genera but *Iphetrachelus* Haliday, and one new genus parasitic on Cecidomyious hickory galls.

XLVI. *Iphetrachelus* Haliday.

XLVII. *Allotropa* Foerster.

74 (1). *Allotropa Americana*, n. sp.

♂. Length, .07 inch. Black, sub-opaque, finely punctate, scape and legs pale brown. Antennæ 9-jointed, terminating in a 4-jointed club, joints serrate, flagellum and club dark brown. Mesothorax with two grooves. Scutellum convex, rounded posteriorly. Abdomen black polished, first and second segments striate, the second segment greatly lengthened. Wings hyaline.

Hab.—Florida.

XLVIII. *Metaclisis* Foerster.

75 (1). *Metaclisis belonocnemæ*, n. sp.

♀. Length, .07 inch. Black, finely punctate. The 10-jointed antennæ and legs pale brown. Thorax with two grooves. Wings hyaline.

Hab.—Florida.

Described from one specimen, reared in April, 1883, from galls. *Belonocnema Tretæ* Mayr, probably parasitic on a Cecidomyious guest fly inhabiting this gall,