

CORRESPONDENCE.

FOOD PLANT OF EUPHANESSA MENDICA.

On page 227, Vol. III., CANADIAN ENTOMOLOGIST, I find note of Mr. Saunders's unsuccessful endeavours to find the food plant of this species, and no record of the food plant is contained in Bulletin No. 35 of the United States National Museum, "Bibliographical Catalogue of the Described Transformations of North American Lepidoptera," by Henry Edwards. I offer the following information upon this matter. While picking the common violet, something dropped from one of the leaves, and as the leaf was considerably eaten I at once made careful search. I found a larva in the form of an eye (such as is used by dress makers) among and hardly distinguishable from dried grasses and twigs, except by its peculiar form. I gathered nine or ten of these, in different stages, and reared them to maturity. The larva, so far as I can remember, having made no notes, varies very little in form or colour in any of its stages. The larvæ are very easily reared. The chrysalis is formed between twigs or leaves knit together by several silken threads, in which state it remains about ten days. FRANK LUCOCK, Pittsburg, Pa.

DR. O. HOFMANN, Über die Anordnung der borstentragenden Warzen bei der Raupen der Pterophoriden.

Prof. Grote has kindly sent me a copy of this article by Dr. Hofmann, published in the "Illustrierte Zeitschrift für Entomologie." Dr. Hofmann gives figures showing the arrangement of the warts in the larvæ of certain Pterophoridae. He shows that the setæ may vary from single to multiple, that tubercles i. and ii. may be separate or united and that iv. and v. may be separate (fig. 7). On the basis of this variation, he criticises the value of the larval characters in classification, saying, "After we have seen how many modifications the normal type of wart formation may undergo in the small, well-limited family Pterophoridae, which is evidently a natural family, we cannot give the same high systematic value to it as Dyar does," etc. Dr. Hofmann has encountered an extreme case; but it does not invalidate my larval classification, as he seems to think. I have not contended that family characters were strongly marked in the larvæ, though they are often well indicated. My contention has been for the superfamily groups, and these are not in any way invalidated by Dr. Hofmann's facts, as a reference to my definitions will show.

HARRISON G. DYAR.