

PIERIS BRASSICÆ.

BY ALBERT F. WINN, WESTMOUNT, P. QUE.

On September 4th I found, feeding on leaves of *Nasturtium*, two larvæ which I had never seen before, and which agree exactly with figures and descriptions of the larvæ of the "Large White Butterfly" of Europe, *Pieris brassicæ*.

Both of these larvæ succumbed to attacks of Hymenopterous parasites, and while it is to be hoped that the rest of the larvæ in the neighbourhood have shared the same fate, it is scarcely likely, as there are large fields of cabbage within a short distance of the place where the two were found, and unless the winter kills them off, I fear we shall have another immigrant to add to our list, and a most unwelcome one. Next summer will tell the tale as to whether the species has established itself permanently or not, and any specimens seen should be at once reported.

NOTE ON SOME GEOMETRIDÆ IN THE HULST COLLECTION, RECENTLY EXAMINED BY DR. DYAR.

BY GEO. W. TAYLOR, WELLINGTON, B. C.

Dr. Harrison G. Dyar, in the Proceedings of the Entomological Society of Washington, VI., No. 4, has given us a very interesting and important paper on the Hulst collection of *Geometridæ*.

In this paper he has shown, from an examination of the type specimens, that a considerable number of Dr. Hulst's supposed species are not really entitled to specific rank. Of course, any entomologist describing as freely as Dr. Hulst did would be sure to make some mistakes and create some synonyms, and I have no doubt that Dr. Dyar is perfectly correct in his judgment in the majority of cases that he cites.

When, for instance, he tells us that the types of *Thallophaga fautaria* and *Tetracis hyperborea* are specimens of the well-known *Anthelia nigroseriata*, of Packard, we can readily believe it, because on referring to Hulst's descriptions we can see that *nigroseriata* must have been the insect before him, and so we cross *fautaria* and *hyperborea* off our lists, and it is the same in the case of most of the species with which Dr. Dyar's paper deals. But there are one or two cases in which, while not doubting Dr. Dyar's facts, I find I cannot accept his conclusions. In these cases the Doctor's determinations of the types seem to raise a real difficulty. For instance, he tells us that the type of *Somatolophia umbripennis* is a specimen (a single female) of *Alcis Haydenata*, and he adds, "Thus both genus and species fall."

Now, Hulst described *Somatolophia umbripennis* (Trans. Am. Ent. Soc., XXIII., p. 350) from a specimen or specimens, he does not say how many, from Colorado, and from the description I should have expected his type to have been a *male*, because he gives all the male characters in the new genus he proposes for the species, and says not a word about the female. He describes his genus *Somatolophia* minutely, telling us that the male has *no hair pencil* on the hind tibiæ, and has *long* pectinations to the antennæ, both characters at variance with the genus *Alcis*. He also tells us that the 1st and 3rd segments of the abdomen bear *dense* dorsal tufts of hairs, and in his description of the species *umbripennis* he adds that the hairs on the 1st segment in that species are black.

Now, it seems to me absolutely inconceivable that Dr. Hulst could have drawn up either the generic or specific description from a single female *Alcis Haydenata*. It is quite true that in the brief diagnosis of *umbripennis* there are many points of resemblance to *Haydenata*, and I have many times gone over the description with specimens of *Haydenata* in my hand, but I have always given up when I came to those dense dorsal abdominal tufts, which certainly are not present in the slightest degree in *Alcis Haydenata*.

The explanation suggesting itself to my mind is that Dr. Hulst had other specimens before him when he drew up his description of *S. umbripennis*, that he mixed with them this female *Haydenata* and that at some later date the original male type in some way came to grief, leaving only the female, which was not really conspecific, to represent the species in his collection. But the point I want to raise is this: Ought we to strike out the genus and species on the evidence of a specimen marked type when it is evident that that specimen was not the one from which the original descriptions were made? For my own part I doubt the propriety of doing this, so I shall for the present retain the names in the expectation that sooner or later the genuine *Somatolophia umbripennis* will come to light.

A similar case is that of *Diastictis festa*. Dr. Dyar says that the type is a specimen of the moth subsequently named by Hulst himself, *Deilinia pulveraria*. Here the description of *festa* (Trans. Am. Ent. Soc., XXVII., p. 335) is manifestly that of a *Diastictis*, not a *Deilinia*, and in this case, too, I am convinced that the specimen now doing duty as type cannot be the one from which the species was described. For the present, therefore, I retain *D. pulveraria* on our lists as a good species and not a synonym of *festa*. The moth in question (*pulveraria*) is not rare in the Kootenay district.