

A FURTHER NOTE ON EUCHŒCA COMPTARIA AND THE ALLIED SPECIES.

BY GEO. W. TAYLOR, WELLINGTON, B. C.

I am glad that Dr. Dyar has given us a note on the *Euchœca comptaria* problem, and that up to a certain point he supports my view.

Without a doubt, he is right in insisting that the type species of *Nomenia* must be called *12-lineata*, Packard.

I am pleased, too, that he has associated Mr. Pearsall's name with another part of the *12-lineata* of authors. I should have suggested this course in the present paper had I not been anticipated.

We are now, I think, all agreed that *E. comptaria*, Walker, is the correct designation for the insect which has hitherto been considered to represent *12-lineata* in the east, and not for the one commonly known as *perlineata*, Pack. This is what I asserted in my first note,¹ and is *not* the view taken by Hulst in Dyar's Catalogue. But Mr. Pearsall now claims, and apparently Dr. Dyar takes it for granted that he is right, that this supposed eastern form of *12-lineata* is really the *perlineata*, Packard, and he brings forward as evidence two specimens now in the Packard collection at Cambridge, bearing labels "*perlineata*" "type."

But, in the first place, it is quite evident from the locality labels on these insects that they are not really types at all. The original types of *perlineata*² were ♂ and ♀ from "Albany, New York, Lintner." These specimens have disappeared. The specimens now in the collection, and which Mr. Pearsall has examined, are two males, "West Virginia, Mead."

In the second place, if these two moths are really *comptaria* rather than *perlineata*, which I cannot yet feel quite sure of in my own mind, and if we accept them as genuine types, which, as I have just shown, they cannot be, even then we cannot allow them to have any weight as against the excellent description³ and the two capital figures³ published by Packard.

It is naturally very satisfactory when a type specimen is available to confirm an original, perhaps too meagre, description, but if description and type conflict, then the rule is, or, at any rate, the *practice* is, to give the weight to the *description*. It is the *description*, and that only, that is

1. CAN. ENT., XXXVII., 239.

2. Proc. Bost. Soc. Nat. Hist., XVI., p. 20.

3. Mon. Geom. Moths, Plate VIII., figs. 25 and 68.

June, 1906