

smaller peculiarities by a distinctive generic name, and that still, with every disposition to be particular, both Mr. Scudder and myself, finding that we cannot separate certain species generically, i. e. the species of *Polygonia*, *Smerinthus*, etc., are justified in feeling that our genera stand on a scientific basis. There must be differences of opinion in Entomology as in other matters. For instance, Mr. Morrison describes under the name of *Agrotis scropulana** a species from the White Mountains, and says of it that its "delicate shades of brown, blue and creamy white place it among the most beautiful in the Noctuidæ." And another species, called by him *Agrotis opipara*, "almost approaches" the first "in beauty." The first to me seems very like the Labradorian *Pachnobia carnea*, the latter like *Agrotis islandica*. And it is obvious here that, if these resemblances are founded, we must examine our appreciation of the generic characters of *Pachnobia* carefully, that we may come to a clear understanding of whether we have to do with an *Agrotis* or not. And again, if my suggestions eventuate, we will have fresh affinities of the Mount Washington Insect Fauna with that of Labrador, and more material to illustrate the relationship of the animals which formerly may have taken refuge on Mount Washington during a period of the decline of the Glacial Epoch, when the body of the species moved further north.

ON SOME OF OUR COMMON INSECTS.

Drasteria crichtea, Cram.

BY THE EDITOR.

In fig. 12 we have this insect in the perfect state well represented.



Although it is one of our commonest moths, a day-flier, abundant almost everywhere, yet we have never heard of its having had a common name bestowed upon it. We are not going to christen it, for we are no admirer of common names where they can be avoided, and we think they can in this instance. *Drasteria crichtea* is not harsh and unpronounceable, as is the case with

* *Psyche*, 1, 42.