

MONOGRAPH OF THE BOMBYCINE MOTHS: *I. Notodontidae*; by Alpheus S. Packard, M. D., National Academy of Sciences, Vol. VII.

This magnificent work is, without doubt, an immense credit to the author, and will take a permanent place among the triumphs of American Lepidopterology. It is not my intention to discuss matters of general classification or nomenclature here. My reasons for differing on certain points as to the latter have all been given elsewhere, and the merits of the Comstock-Dyar classification have been insisted upon by Dr. Dyar. Dr. Packard's work, as a whole, with its superb technical execution, has a value which could have been only enhanced by his attention to points of nomenclature, which I believe cannot be properly contradicted, and by his adhesion to a scheme of general classification, which I believe cannot be adequately gainsaid. I can here, out of my present limited knowledge, merely mention a few points, which may be of general or only of particular interest. There are a few errors in authorities. I do not know why my *Notodonta stragula* and *Schizura leptinoides* and *S. eximia* are given to Grote and Robinson (plates). Nor do I know why my name is placed in brackets after *Heterocampa Belfragei*. I described the latter as a *Heterocampa*, and have no responsibility for its having been placed under *Litodonta*, a reference which never occurred to me. I differ from Dr. Packard as to the validity of *Litodonta*. The costa is straighter, the primary fuller outwardly over internal angle, apex sharper, while the antennal structure is decisive, as compared with *Heterocampa subrotata*; the orange spots are peculiar. *H. subrotata* is a miniature *obliqua*, and is placed next in my list. *H. celtiphaga* is founded on obscurely marked and small specimens, probably not different specifically. *Litodonta* may be a more specialized form, from the character of the female antennæ; the discovery of the larva will be attended with interest. The unhappy influence which Mr. Walker has exercised is very apparent, and the synonymy of *Schizura ipomeæ* exhibits this at its worst. I do not insist upon the validity of *S. telifer* as a species; the black streaks are very distinct in both sexes and our nomenclature was invented to designate such forms, if not as species then as varieties. With regard to *Hyparpax*, and in connection with Dr. Packard's remarks upon *H. erophoroides*, I again draw attention to my previous statements as to Abbot and Smith's plate, that the figure of the female *aurora* at least approaches that form. The late Mr. Hy. Edwards sent me at one time a damaged specimen (I think without head or feet) of a well-sized pink