

unprotected survival during the voyage, that this pupa should produce an unique variety, the capture of the perfect moth on a Church step in England, its delivery at the British Museum, taken altogether seem enormous. The fact that the hind-wings are unbanded is paralleled in the case of a new species from South America, which I describe here. According to Mr. Tutt's kind communication: There is a place in Southwark, one of the London districts close by London Bridge, called "Horselydown," and there is a church there called St. John's. As this is very near the river an imported insect might be found there if we suppose it to escape from the shipping on the Thames. But there is also a place called "Horsley" in Surrey, and there. Some well-known "Downs" there which have been entomologically worked over from a long period. But there is no St. John's Church there, and under the theory that Walker named the insect from the Church in England, and not, as I had imagined possible, from the St. John's River, Florida, where Doubleday collected, the Surrey locality must be abandoned. We are, therefore, driven to the conclusion that if the label is genuine, the specimen was really captured at "Horselydown," and that "Horsley Downs" is a mistake for the former on the label. If a normal specimen of *Eudryas grata* had been stated to have been caught in England, while still extraordinary, there would have been nothing so very improbable in the fact, since, according to Wood and other English authors, *Drasteria*, *Eustrotia* and other American moths have been so taken(?); I myself took a specimen of a South American species of Noctuidæ on the Battery in New York. But that this particular specimen should belong also to a very remarkable variety, never observed in America, increases the chances against the story (which may nevertheless be a true one) enormously. *Eudryas*, we may concede, might stand the voyage as a pupa and also escape as a moth in London, but how a *Stæ. Johannis* could have been turned out of a *grata* caterpillar or pupa owing to the "vicissitudes of the voyage" I do not comprehend. The type which I saw in 1868 differed not only from *grata* in its unbanded secondaries, but also by its differently coloured and perhaps marked primaries. While I recognized it as allied to *grata*, I could not help supposing it a distinct species, since I had never known *grata* to vary in that manner. In fact, that it might be a variety did not, I think, occur to me. I did not visit the Museum for the express purpose of studying *Stæ. Johannis*. I took it in rapidly and saw that it was an *Eudryas* and differed from both our common species, *grata* and *unio*, and simply re-