

should have preferred in the face of apparently so carefully made experiments to examine first, if one of the two authors, either Dr. Adler or Mr. Cameron had not determined wrongly one species of the pairs. But a stronger objection against Mr. Cameron's assertion is that I possess two of the four doubted pairs from the same locality. The May number of the Ent. Month. Mag., just arrived, has on its first page a notice by Mr. J. E. Fletcher, stating that galls made by *Neuroterus numismatis* proved to be those of *Spathogaster vesicatrix*. This is the third of the four pairs doubted by Mr. Cameron. After all I may quote against such kind of evidence the following remarks of the late Mr. B. D. Walsh in his Cynips paper (p. 11):

"I once argued in print that it was impossible that the army worm moth should exist in the Eastern States, for if it did it must have been found there either by Dr. Harris or by Dr. Fitch, and that scarcely had the argument been printed, when it was proved by indubitable evidence that it did exist."

Mr. P. Cameron's objections against the fifth pair, *Aph. radialis* and *Andricus noduli* show simply that the German text was not understood.

Now where are the direct and well continued observations of facts to blow to the winds this theory? I may add that the unprecedented observation that he put some specimens of *Aphilotrix radialis* in spirits for a week (!) and that they revived, when taken out, would be rather difficult to be repeated.

If such facts, as given by Dr. Adler, are not to be accepted as true, I think they can not be called "hypothesis or theory," but simply a fiction, or in plain English, a forgery—which nobody able to understand the German text will accept.

ON EUPROSERPINUS PHAETON.

BY A. R. GROTE,

Director of the Museum, Buffalo Society Natural Sciences.

The fact that Mr. Strecker has seen fit to misstate the circumstances under which this species was named has induced me to correct the impression he may have created as far as possible.