is very distinct from *C. Tarpeia*; the latter comes nearer to *C. Chryxus*, being quite a fulvous species, with blind ocelli on under surface. The band of secondaries also is altogether different in outline"; and Mr. Butler gives me a drawing of the wing and band. His drawing and description in all points named agree with what Mr. Scudder formerly described as *C. Calais*, from a single female taken by Mr. Drexler 20 years ago, at Rupert House, Hudson's Bay, and on carefully comparing this (which remains unique in my collection) with a series of *C. Chryxus* from the Rocky Mts., I see that it is a distinct species, and not *Chryxus*, as of late I had assumed.

NOTE ON LIMENITIS URSULA.

BY W. H. EDWARDS.

In my paper on *L. Arthemis* and its alleged second brood, in Dec., 1881, I stated that some caterpillars of *L. Ursula* did go on to chrysalis and butterfly late in the year, in Ohio, though others of same lot went into their hibernacula when half grown; and that I had dissected one female *Ursula* which emerged in September last, and could discover no signs of eggs, or at any rate, there were no formed eggs. Also that I had sent a second female of same lot to Prof. Minot for examination. I now have his report, as follows: "There were certainly no ripe eggs in the abdomen, although there were a great many eggs in an immature condition." I stated in the above mentioned paper, that the existence of the species *Ursula* did not depend on these late, or September butterflies; and the reason is, that the female coming so late, and with immature eggs, the season would either not allow the eggs to ripen, or if it did, and they were impregnated, which would be doubtful, it would not allow the larvæ to hatch and to reach the hibernating stage. There is not time for all this before frosts or cold weather. Of course, the same would hold good of *Arthemis*, if possibly any females of a second brood should emerge.

ON TWO GENERA OF PHYCIDÆ.

BY A. R. GROTE.

I find that unless we use neurational characters to separate the genera of *Phycidæ*, that it will be impossible to classify the species with accuracy. All characters drawn from the periphery, the appendages of the body, will

be found subject to very gradual modifications, but I do not think we can afford to reject any of them, because of their relative want of stability. Indeed the neurulation in the Lepidoptera seems to be as useful as in the Diptera, although there are certain cases (as I long ago pointed out with regard to *Thyridopteryx*) where it varies not only in the species, but in the opposite wings of the same specimen. I think that we must regard as generically distinct from *Pempelia* the North American species *Pravella*, which has 8, instead of 7 veins to the hind wings (see Bull. U. S. Geol. Surv. 4, 694). For this species, the structure of which I have quite fully described, I propose the generic name *Meroptera*. I also find that our two species, found in Texas and Colorado, and which probably mine the Agave, viz., *Bollii* and *Dentata*, are distinct from the European types of *Zophodia*, to which Prof. Zeller referred *Bollii*, the type of the new genus *Megaphycis*. In the structure of the palpi, shape of the wings, greater size and length of body, our two large species differ strongly.

I have also here to correct a mistake of mine in the use of the term "porrect" in this group as applied to the labial palpi (e. g. in *Pinipestis*). I meant by it *ascending*, whereas it appears that it is equivalent to *extended forwards*. The term appears inconvenient to use, and perhaps I am not alone in mistaking its sense.

A NEW APPLE TREE PEST.

BY CHARLES R. DODGE, WASHINGTON, D. C.

As if the apple tree with its sixty or more insect enemies were not sufficiently afflicted, a distant relative of the Canker-worm has been making itself so notorious in Georgia, as to give apprehension of the total destruction of apple orchards in the locality infested. The insect complained of is *Eugonia subsignaria* Pack., a measuring worm which at times has been a veritable nuisance upon shade trees in New York and Philadelphia.

In pursuance of my duties as a Special Agent of the Census Office (in the fruit interest), and through subsequent correspondence, the following facts were obtained from Mr. Adam Davenport, of Fannin County, in the State named. In his first communication, received some months since, it is stated that the worm made its appearance upon Rich Mountain, a spur of the Blue Ridge, about four years ago, attacking forest and fruit trees ;