

student in my capacity, then large numbers of terms throughout Zoology are liable to be overturned any moment by persons as ill-advised as Mr. Morrison. I cite, for example, Mr. Allen's recently described *Loligo Hartingii*, determined specifically upon a figure.

It is true that Mr. Morrison takes no regard as to the meaning of generic terms, and hence has probably taken no cognizance of the derivation of *Eucoptocnemis*, since he establishes himself a new genus under the name *Eutricopis* (my term *Tricopis* with a common prefix), which belies its designation in having the tibiae unarmed! Mr. Morrison incorrectly refers *Eucoptocnemis fimbriaris* to my genus *Pleonectopoda*, where it does not belong, just as he incorrectly refers *Eutolype Rolandi* Grote, under the synonym *vernalis*, to my genus *Copipanolis*, where it is equally out of place.

My List of the Noctuidæ will amply attain the ends proposed if it will continue to call forth corrections and additions, and so be of service in perfecting a knowledge of its subject, the Noctuidæ of N. America.

A. R. GROTE.

Buffalo, N. Y.

DEAR SIR,—

I got a number of larvae of *Papilio asterias* in July, 1874, in Fulton County, Ohio, three of which changed to pupae. One of the pupae I poured chloroform over, and when it stopped moving, put a pin through it. A few days after I looked at it, and found it had grown almost black about the wing cases. I broke off the piece of the pupa skin that covers the head, legs and antennae, and was surprised to see it move. The wings would get dry sometimes, and I would put a drop of water on them to keep them moist. At last the time came for hatching, and with my help, the butterfly got out of the pupa case, but could not expand on account of its wings being dry. Yours truly,

ALLEN Y. MOORE.

Fort Buford, D. T.