NOTE ON HEMARIS UNIFORMIS AND ARCTIA SAUNDERSII.

BY A. R. GROTE, BREMEN, GERMANY.

I have sufficiently shown in various places (and the enquiring student may consult the originals) that Kirby's description of *Ruficaudis* contradicts that of *Uniformis*, in what we must regard as essential particulars in this genus.   We have not here to do with a species; but, according to Mr. Hulst's statements, with a dimorphic form of *Thysbe*, in which the inner margin of the terminal band of primaries is *even*, not *dentate*, on the interspaces.   Now this character is not at all alluded to by Kirby.   He describes a *Sesia* allied to the European, and he says and knows nothing about *Thysbe* or *Pelasgus* or *Cimbiciformis*.   Kirby should not have described *Uniformis* without comparing it with its ally—its other well known form.   Notwithstanding the probabilities of the case or the possibilities, it never can be proved from the books that Kirby did describe *Uniformis* as *Ruficaudis*.   This is a matter of scientific importance, because we are the first to point out that two distinct "forms" if not "species" were passing as *Thysbe*, the differences which constantly divide them being first pointed out by us, first used as the basis by which they can be correctly separated and named in collections.   It is therefore no matter of simply restoring an older name.   It is an attempt at construing an older name and one which does not really apply.   The attempt is therefore to be deprecated as unscientific.   The whole point lies in the separation of the forms passing current as "*Thysbe.*"   In this lay the scientific value of the writings of Mr. Robinson and myself.   This discovery, important or not important (real it certainly is), was made by us and is covered by the designation we apply to the plain form, and, according to all sense and the principles of scientific nomenclature, this name should henceforward apply.   Clemens does not recognize *Ruficaudis;* Fernald mentions our insect as "*Uniformis;*" I take it for granted that these or similar considerations have influenced his course.   It is years and years ago since I studied Kirby in the original, at least fifteen years before Mr. Hulst's time.   It needed not that this industrious, but in his earlier studies somewhat inconsiderate writer, should tell *me* of the probabilities of what Kirby's might be.   At the best they are probabilities.   I take it, that to be correct, scientifically correct, the form of *Thysbe* with *even* edge to the external band of primaries and of the same or similar size with the type,