boro, Md., and from Williamsport, Md., where it attacked the peach, and from the District of Columbia. As far as known to me, the N. American literature contains nothing more concerning this beetle.

In Europe the beetle is first quoted by F. Sturm (Catalog, meiner Insecten Sammlung, 1826, p. 194), with the manuscript name, Scolytus haemorrhous Megerle. In V. Kollar (Naturgeschichte der schaedl. Insecten, 1837, p. 270, and English transl. p. 263) the co-editor, J. Schmidberger, gives about the best account in existence of the beetle and its habits, with the same name, S. haemorrhous. Professor Ratzeburg, 1837. Forstinsecten, vol. i., p. 187, and Ed. ii., 1839, p. 230, gives in a note a description with the name Eccoptogaster rugulosus Koch, and quotes as synonym, Scolytus haemorrhous Ulrich. A good figure of the beetle is given pl. x., f. 10, and of the craddle and galleries in the bark, pl. 17, f. The name Ulrich is explained by Schmidberger's statement that the beetle had been determined for him, by Mr. Ulrich as S. haemorrhous Megerle, and the article begins with this full name of the beetle. name Koch, used by Ratzeburg, is a manuscript name. probably a student of the Professor, has nothing published. Nevertheless the beetle has been often quoted as S. rugulosus Koch, and only in later years as S. rugulosus Ratzeb. I do not understand why Ratzeburg has not adopted Schmidberger's name. That he has known this publication (though of the same year) is proved by the quotation of Ulrich's name. I am not able to see Schmidberger's work (Beitraege zur Obstbaumzucht und zur Naturgeschichte der-schaedlichen Insecten, 1827 to 1836), which probably contains the same statements as in 1837. The description by Ratzeburg without the figures would not allow a surer determination than those of Schmidberger, who gives besides a full history of the life and habits of the beetle. During the following time the literature on S. rugu-I have compared Noerdlinger, Letzner, Chapnis, Eichoff, losus is large. Chapmann, Schmidt-goebel, for the observations on its habits. It attacks the branches, and often mere twigs, of living trees belonging to the genera Pyrus and Prunus, in great numbers, so that the infested part of the tree must perish, because it cannot continue to grow with injured bark and strongly pierced sap-wood. It appears to multiply very fast, and a double brood is supposed to occur. A few females laid so many eggs that the larvæ produced from them destroyed the bark of the stem, nearly a foot They cannot easily be eradicated, or at least diminished in numbers, but by removing and burning the trees attacked by them.