

comparatively harmless. We subjoin two articles of scientific authority which will throw some light on this important, but, at present, complicated and mysterious subject. Like most attacks of this nature no specific remedy is known, and farmers have, in a great measure, to be passive, leaning on the omnipotent arm of Providence, and trusting in those beneficent compensating arrangements, which belong to the constitution of the natural government of the Deity. Careful observation and scientific research, doubtless tend to enable the cultivator of the soil to mitigate, if he cannot wholly prevent, these attacks on his crops. The application of quick lime or a strong solution of salt, might in case of the army worm, produce some good effect. Strong brine however, cannot be safely applied to our cultivated crops, and such a remedy might prove as bad as the disease. The progress of the worms has, we observe in some instances, been arrested, as they travel from the field to another, by making a deep furrow with the spade or plough, and then trampling them to death. The Hon. David Christie presented some specimens of this destructive pest at a recent meeting of the Board of Agriculture, held in London, and it was deemed of the utmost importance that the most reliable information should be obtained in reference to the habits and progress of this insect, by accurate and extensive observations.

THE ARMY WORM MOTH.

(From the Country Gentleman.)

Messrs. TUCKER—I have an illustration of “the result of knowledge under difficulties” to present. Dr John Bartlett of Pesotum, Champaign Co., Ill., sends us in spirits, in a tin tube, a specimen of the renowned Army worm, and of the moth which is bred from it. Now spirits is the very best vehicle in which to preserve and transport all kinds of worms, spiders and beetles; but insects with delicate wings, such as butterflies, bees and flies are usually ruined by being wet, their wings becoming matted together in a wad, as a wet dish-cloth, and if prettily colored, their colors are liable to be altered or destroyed by spirits. An inexperienced collector, therefore, will do best to place such insects between layers of cotton in a small box, to transmit them without injury by mail or express.

On emptying the tube from Dr. Bartlett it was with deep regret that I saw this moth of the Army worm lying before me, soaked to a soft, shapeless black mass, which might on drying wholly consist of showing me the same colors and spots which naturally belong to it. On carefully disentangling and spreading its wings, and drying

it, my first step was to compare it with the broken and effaced specimens received last year from Dr. Jenkins of Maryland, mentioned in my letter to Hon B. P. Johnson, lately published in the Co. GENT. I hereupon saw that the Army worm in Maryland last year, and that now in Illinois were undoubtedly one and the same insect. And now, by a searching look from one to the other of these soiled and imperfect specimens, I was able to gather from them certain marks by which I thought I could recognize this insect if I chanced to have any other specimens of it in my collection. Upon looking over the moths of the cut worms I find nothing like this among them. Turning then to another group, lo, here I have it!—two perfect specimens, received a few years since in a fine collection from Prof. D. S. Sheldon of Iowa College. *Laus Dei!* The riddle is now read! What for nearly a score of years I have been so anxious to obtain I now have! I know what the moth of this Army worm now is! And in the fulness of my joy hereupon, I thank you, Prof. Sheldon, and you Dr. Bartlett, and Dr. Jenkins, each and all, that you have collectively furnished me with such clues as have enabled me to make this discovery.

A short sketch of the history of this species, as it appears in our works of science, will interest the reader. Long ago, a preserved specimen of this moth found its way into the then celebrated collection of Mr. Francillon in London. Upon the breaking up and sale of that collection, this specimen passed into the possession of Mr. Haworth, who, not doubting but that it had been captured in England, described it very briefly, in the year 1810, in his *Lepidoptera Britannica*, page 174, naming it *Noctua unipuncta* or the White Speck, by which names it has ever since been referred to by English authors and collectors, save that a new generic name, *Leucania*, replaces that of *Noctua*. It appears to have been through inadvertency that Mr. Stephens changed this name to *impuncta*, when he came to describe the species in 1829, in his *British Entomology*, *Haustellata*, vol. iii, p. 80. Later, in 1850, he refers to it under its original name, in the *List of Lepidoptera in the British Museum*, p. 289, it having now been ascertained that it was a North American and not a British insect.

Guenee appears to have overlooked this species of the English authors. In his valuable work on the *Lepidoptera* (vol. v., p. 77—Paris, 1852) he regards it as a new species, naming it *Leucania extranea*. From him we learn that there are specimens of it in several of the Paris collections, whereby they know it to be a common insect in North America, Columbia and Brazil. He also states that a variety of it which is destitute of the white dot on the fore-wings, occurs in the East Indies, Java and Australia. I cannot but think, however, that this East India insect should be ranked as a distinct species from ours, as it differs in such a prominent character, and is so widely separated from it geographically.

From what has now been stated, it will be seen that the original and therefore legitimate scientific name of this insect is *Leucania unipuncta*. And the “Army-worm moth” will undoubtedly be the