

IN RE *SPILOSOMA CONGRUA*, WALK.

BY A. RADCLIFFE GROTE, A. M., ROEMER MUSEUM, HILDESHEIM, GERMANY.

In reference to the present controversy my testimony is as follows : I examined, in 1867, Mr. Walker's material. This represented a form unknown to me, undoubtedly a *Spilosoma*, not a species or form of *Hyphantria*. I was so struck with this that I drew up a description and carefully compared the palpi and antennæ. From these and the slightly larger size, I felt confident that it was a *Spilosoma* unknown to me at the time. The description is published in Trans. Am. Ent. Soc., 1868, but I have no copy, unfortunately, at this writing, of the paper. My memory is vivid that I compared it with *Hyphantria cunea*, and it was not that species nor any form of it. I conjectured even, at the time, that the material might be European with a wrong locality, so dissimilar was it from *S. virginica* or *S. latipennis*, the latter form being known to me from Stephen Calverley's collections from Long Island before, long before, its description by Stretch. Years afterwards, Dr. Thaxter sent me specimens from the East, which I at once recognized as *S. congrua* from my memory and my notes. These specimens belonged to *S. antigone*, which I set down accordingly as a synonym of *S. congrua* in the pages of the CANADIAN ENTOMOLOGIST.

There is, finally, one point to which I call attention. In 1867 Mr. Walker was arranging the collection. I directed his notice at the time to the fact that he had quite often mixed up different species under one name. It may be, then, that there were two species under *congrua*, but I think not. Mr. Walker adopted, at the moment, some of my suggestions, but the time was too brief to allow me to overhaul the whole of the American material, about which, as a whole, I knew besides, at the time, too little. But I knew *Spilosoma* and *Hyphantria* sufficiently as to give my determination weight. Now, it is a fact that Mr. Butler sorted over the collection, and as to this work Prof. Smith's Cat. No. 44 gives us, incidentally, valuable information. And it is a fact that I found in the Noctuids, in 1867, more mixing of species than comes out after Butler and Smith's sorting and taking or fixing of Mr. Walker's types. This was done without sufficient study of Mr. Walker's text in the B. Mus. Lists. Mr. Walker's material bore no type label ; it was in 1867 (and, I think, again in 1880) simply stuck above the printed name, cut out of the B. M. Lists, as I remember. Misidentifications of Walker's description or determination occur in the genera *Apatela*, *Hadena*, *Mamestra*, *Hypena*, etc. See my papers in the CANADIAN ENTOMOLOGIST and in the Proc. of the American Philosophical Society.