

jointed, 3rd joint not incised. Abdomen small, slender, shining. First segment equal in length to all the others. Length (dry) .08.

This species is often quite abundant in the limited space where I have found it. In describing the galls I should have added that the larva is not enclosed in a larval cell.

Habitat—Conn.

---

### LIMENITIS EROS VERSUS VAR. FLORIDENSIS.

BY THEODORE L. MEAD, NEW YORK.

Among the generally accepted canons of nomenclature is the rule that if a description includes two or more species, it shall be valid for neither as against subsequent authors who discriminate the forms properly.

While all of us may not be willing to push this rule to its limit and reject the first name altogether, it certainly is a wholesome restriction against a custom which has prevailed in some quarters, notably in France, of making loose and indefinite descriptions, waiting until some more careful writer has separated one of the forms as distinct and named it, and then declaring that the latter was the species really intended by the indefinite description, thus at one stroke of the pen creating a synonym and finding a new species to be named.

It seems to me that Mr. Strecker's reclamation as to *Limenitis* var. *Floridensis* and *L. Eros*, on page 29, is of this nature.

He speaks of his *Limenitis* as "the form found in the extreme south." Now there is a darker form of *Lim. Misippus* at the south—some specimens from West Virginia show a darker color than those from the Catskills; in Texas and even in Southern Illinois specimens are found of a deep mahogany color. This is the "southern form" of *Misippus* which differs notably from *Eros* in the absence of the white band on under side, to which the mention of v. *Floridensis* does not allude. This mention, it seems to me, is too brief and indefinite to rank as a description, especially as the names have now been fixed by careful descriptions and the status of *Eros* established as a distinct species.

The New York Entomological Club has a committee whose duty it is to consider cases of disputed nomenclature; their decision, when ratified, of course carries only the weight due to the unanimous opinion of the entomologists composing the Club. But this is a gain over the unorganized