CORRESPONDENCE.

CALLIMORPHA.

Ed. Can. Ent.—Dear Sir: In reference to my former note on Callimorpha, I would state that in my "Check List" the white forms were referred to Lecontei as varieties. I was totally unacquainted with what may be a more Northern form, viz., confusa Lyman. Mr. Lyman's excellent plate and paper must be commended, but I must insist that neither Mr. Lyman (nor Mr. Smith for that matter) have done more than separate the forms in the perfect state; and in this Mr. Lyman seems to have shown great tact and is the more correct, having made no fresh synonyms. The yellow species commence the series in my Check List, in which vestalis and fulvicosta are distinguished as different forms or varieties, and I have only to add to my former communication respecting the interchange of yellow and white in this Subfamily, that it notoriously occurs in the sexes of Leucarctia acraea. The American species of Callimorpha are probably not long separated from an original type—they form to-day a pro-genus, like Datana. In such cases where the naturalist attempts to still further separate the species or races as Mr. Smith has done, the work of all previous describers should be studied and certainty attained as to what forms have been already named and what remain without a designa-In all this work there is nothing really original. When some one breeds all these forms, as Mr. Edwards does the doubtful Butterflies, there will be a real scientific addition to our present imperfect knowledge.

A. R. GROTE.

Dear Sir: Dr. Harris, in his well known work on Injurious Insects, states that the caterpillars of the Callimorphas conceal themselves in the day time uncer leaves and stones. According to my experience, the larvæ of Lecontei and confusa may be found on the food plants at all hours of the day. About ten or twelve years ago, Lecontei was rather abundant on certain parts of Montreal Mountain, and I observed quite a number of the larvæ, from some of which I reared the moths. I unfortunately neglected to take a description of the larva, nor did I ascertain what the food plant was. When the Mountain was opened as a public park, a carriage drive was cut right through the Lecontei ground, and since that time it has become very scarce, and I have so far failed to re-discover the

laiva; however, as I have elsewhere stated, I feel confident that careful breeding will prove Lecontei, confusa and contigua to be good species. In his paper on Callimorpha (Can. Ent., vol. xix., p. 237), Mr. Smith is in error in stating that I "assumed the distinctness of Lecontei and militaris." I gave militaris as a variety of Lecontei and assumed the distinctness of Lecontei and confusa, which is a very different thing, and should have aided rather than misled him. I have found hibernated specimens of Lecontei and confusa easy to rear, the latter in confinement feeding freely on almost any kind of leaf. Might not these hibernating Arctians be reared by placing them on ice, as Mr. Edwards has done so successfully with the diurnals?

F. B. CAULFIELD, Montreal.

Dear Sir: In reference to Dr. Hagen's recent notice of Calverley's illustrations of Sphingidæ, I would say that the plates are neither "unknown" nor "forgotten," but simply "unpublished." References to their existence may be found in my printed papers. To certain of the Dr. Hagen makes some remarks as to the figures I furnished the types. quality of the illustrations. It is perhaps not remarkable that he does not notice that many figures are copies from Cramer and Drury, and that the plate of Papilio Calverleyi is the same as published in Proc. Ent. Soc. Phil., on different paper. Copies of Calverley's Sphingidae were sent to a few principal libraries, hence it is not extraordinary that Dr. Hagen should have found one at Harvard. The work owes its inception perhaps to the zeal of the late Mr. Stephen Calverley, who was a correspondent of Doubleday. The names of its two original authors are remembered in Limenitis Weidemeyerii and Papilio Calverleyi, as well as Deilephila Calverleyi from Cuba. The text should have been written by myself, as at one time at least intended, but the plates were finished at such irregular periods and over so many years (1860 to about 1869) that they were never placed complete in my hands for the purpose.

A. R. GROTE.

ERRATUM.—On page 57 (March No.), line II from the bottom, for "vol. xix." read "vol. xx."

Mailed April 10th. Delayed by accidental loss of proofs in transmission.