fruit of the faroah plant (*Bixa orellana*) was not successful. Then, these methods of enticing the insects were completed by inverting a round quake (a wide-mouthed basket of very open wicker-work) over the bait, taking care to raise the quake so that its lower edge was some inches from the ground. The butterflies, attracted by the flowers, made their way under the raised edge of the quake, and when the Indians approached flew, not out under the edge of the quake, but upward into the top, where they were captured."—E. C. R.

Notes on British Ants.—Ernest André, in his Spécies des Hyménoptères Formicides, pp. 271, 272, exposes an error into which entomologists have fallen with respect to the supposed males of *Stenamma Westwoodi* and *Asemorhoptrum lippula*, and clearly shows that at present the ♂ of one species only has actually been described; for my share in this blunder, I must apologize, as I described the ♂ of *Asemorhoptrum* from nature, but borrowed my characters of *Stenamma* from Smith, Mayr, &c., and did not see the actual type, as I ought to have, which would probably have saved me from the error.

Westwood originally described *Stenamma Westwoodi*, Stephens, MSS., from the ♂, not knowing any other sex; to this ♂, the ♀ and ☿ of a quite distinct species have been associated, so that what we have known, and F. Smith and myself have described, as *Stenamma Westwoodi*, has been the ♂ of one species, and the ☿ and ♀ of another. The ♂ of what we have called *Asemorhoptrum lippula* exists in several collections, and it now turns out, from Mons. André's examination, that these two males are identical. As Westwood described his *Stenamma Westwoodi* before Nylander characterized his *Myrmica lippula*, what we now know as *lippula* will have to be called *Stenamma Westwoodi*, and the ♀ and ☿ of what we have called *S. Westwoodi* will have to be known as *Formicoxenus nitidulus*, Nyl., the ♂ of this latter being as yet undescribed, the synonymy standing thus:

Stenamma Westwoodi, West.
= *Stenamma Westwoodi*, F. Smith, E. Saund., &c., ♂ (*nec* ♀, ☿).
= *Asemorhoptrum lippula*, F. Smith, E. Saund., et auct., ♂, ♀, ☿.

Formicoxenus nitidulus, Nyl.
= *Stenamma Westwoodi*, Smith, E. Saund. (excl. ♂), *nec* West.

While on the subject of British ants, I want to say a few words on the Bournemouth ant, which I have referred to *Formica gagates*, and for which Mr. Farren White, in his recent book, "Ants and their ways," has proposed the name "*glabra*."

I think there is no doubt that Forel and Emery are right in uniting *fusca*, *cinerea*, *cunicularia*, and *gagates* as races under the one species, *fusca*, Linn. Of these four races, *fusca*, *cinerea*, and *cunicularia*, have the abdomen clothed with silken hairs, *gagates* has it glabrous with stiff bristles round the apex of the segments; the specimen I have described from has the abdomen glabrous as in *gagates* true, but is undoubtedly smaller and paler than continental specimens. On the continent there are also intermediate forms, known as *fusco-gagates*, *fusco-cinerea*, *cinereo-rufibarbis*, and *fusco-rufibarbis*. Surely, it is more likely that our specimens belong to some such intermediate form (possibly, *cuniculario-gagates*, if there is such a thing), than to a new species "*glabra*," not known on the continent at all, especially as my specimen only differs from typical *gagates* in being smaller and paler, and because

paler, having the bristles at the apex of the segments less conspicuous. I should be only too pleased to add a new ant to our list, *i. e.*, if indigenous and not introduced directly by unnatural means, but I really think a form in the midst of the confusion of *gagates*, *cunicularia*, *fusca*, &c., should not be singled out for that purpose.—Edward Saunders, Holmesdale, Upper Tooting: *8th May*, 1883.

On the habits of the larva of Eupœcilia rupicola.—I have found these larvæ commonly, wherever *Eupatorium cannabinum* grows, *not*, however, in the standing stems of last year's plants, but in old broken and rotten bits, lying prostrate on the ground and covered over with moss and rubbish.

If the old stems happen to have been broken, or mown off, within three or four inches of the ground, there is pretty certain to be a larva spun up in a long cocoon, fastened to the outer wall of the stem, much in the same way as that of *E. udana* is, or else among the half-eaten pith.

Whether the larva at first feeds in the flowers and descends to make up in the rubbish I cannot say, but certainly the pith of the old stems is eaten. Sometimes two or three larvæ may be found, one behind the other, in a very narrow stalk just large enough to hold them. These larvæ are bright yellowish-pink on the back, paler beneath. Very sluggish, and if disturbed, not wandering away as the larva of *udana* does, but contentedly spinning themselves up again in the old spot. Unfortunately they are terribly subject to ichneumons, which are already beginning to appear. I have not found a single larva in a standing stem of last season.—W. Warren, Merton Cottage, Cambridge: *April 20th*, 1883.

On the hibernation as full-fed larvæ of some species of Nepticula.—Dr. Wocke has remarked in the Stettin. ent. Zeit., 1871, p. 428, that the larvæ of *Nepticula sericopeza* may be found spinning their cocoons on maple-trunks in spring, and it seems probable that others may have the same habit, ignorance of which is possibly the cause of failure or difficulty in breeding these species. Last autumn I placed a few pear-leaves, with larvæ of *N. minusculella* in their mines, within a glass vessel half-full of earth and rubbish. The top was covered over with a piece of white muslin. I took particular care of these insects, because, though I had bred them easily from the summer brood, I had always failed with the winter one.

Well, I examined the vessel carefully last autumn, and also at times during the winter, without seeing any trace of cocoon or larva in the earth through the glass. Last week, on putting the vessel along with others containing *Nepticulæ* in the recess of a window, exposed to the sunshine, I was startled to find a fresh yellow cocoon attached to the muslin at the top of the glass. Now, as I have had the covering off many times during the winter, and examined it each time, the cocoon must have certainly been newly spun, so that I cannot help thinking that the larva of *minusculella* hibernates in the ground and spins up only in spring.

In confirmation of this supposition I may mention that, three years ago, I had collected a large number of larvæ of *Nepticula atricollis*, some of which were kept in an ordinary flower-pot half-full of earth, and others in a tin without earth. In the summer following, I bred large numbers of the imago from the flower-pot, but failed to find within the earth the slightest trace of a cocoon; while from the tin I