

be allowed to rest there unless the determination can be proved erroneous.

Borkhausen's *luridaria* had "dull black glossy ground colour nearly as in *Ph. Bombyx jacobaeae*, the hindwing becoming lighter at base, shading off in some measure to black-grey. Lines of forewing straight, on their reverse sides light-edged; in addition traces of a sub-basal line. Hindwing unmarked."

The melanic form of *O. scotica* is as yet unnamed, and I propose to name it

ab. **nigrescens** n. ab.

The large discoidal spot often separated into two parts and the wavy lines of typical *scotica* are visible. In some specimens the antemedian from the costa to the subcostal nervure runs towards the base and not towards the apex as in *mucronata*. The ground colour is blackish grey, not so dark as in melanic *mucronata*, and the lines are blackish, showing little or none of the rust colour so characteristic of melanic *mucronata*. The sub-basal line is edged distally by a clear light line and the antemedian is edged proximally and the postmedian distally by a line equally pale and clear. In some specimens the line distal to the postmedian is not sharply defined, but merges into the ground colour, which become gradually darker towards the termen. In such specimens the submarginal line is clearly visible. The ground colour in some is darker in the basal and median areas, so that the space between the sub-basal and antemedian appears distinctly lighter. The light edges to the lines are much more conspicuous than in melanic *mucronata*. The hindwings are grey with a darker grey transverse line edged by light grey, and the discoidal spot is more distinct than in melanic *mucronata*. Like typical *scotica*, it is smaller and has narrower wings than melanic *mucronata*.

There are 9 males in beautiful condition in the British Museum (E. R. Banks Coll.) taken at Aviemore, Inverness-shire, 9-22.vi.1909, by E. R. Banks. I have a slightly damaged female without abdomen with no data from Canon Cruttwell's collection. All these can be taken as syntypes. I have a male also without data from Canon Cruttwell's collection. This is darker without light lines, but with large discoidal spots in both fore and hindwings. The lines, though straighter than in most *scotica*, are not rust coloured. It is probably a melanic *scotica*. It is not unlikely that these came from Rannoch, where Canon Cruttwell used to collect. We have, therefore, *Ortholitha mucronata*, Scop., ab. *luridaria*, Bkh., 1794 (ab. *nigrescens*, Ckll., 1889) and *O. scotica* Ckyne., ab. *nigrescens*, n. ab. So far no melanic form of *O. umbrifera*, Prout, has come under my notice.

*O. mucronata*, ab. *luridaria* appears to be rare, but widely spread. There are three in the Zoological Museum, Tring, a male labelled New Forest, 15.vii.1886, and two females, one from the O'Reilly collection, labelled Tunbridge Wells, 1868, and the other without data. Mr C. N. Hawkins has a fine male from the New Forest, and Mr A. A. W. Buckstone has some taken the first week of July at Headley. Apart from those mentioned above, I know of no *O. scotica*, ab. *nigrescens*.

## GLANURES MYRMÉCOLOGIQUES.

By HORACE DONISTHORPE, F.Z.S., F.R.E.S., etc.

## HYMENOPTERA—FORMICIDÆ.

In Dr F. Santschi's "Fourmis d'Indochine. Faune Entomologique de L'Indochine Française, 8, 95-117 (1924)," all the species and varieties described, and recorded as new, had already been described by him in *Ann. Soc. Ent. Belg.*, 60, 158-176 (1920). In fact, the two papers are almost identical, except that the figures in the 1920 publication do not appear in that of the 1924; and in the latter a few forms are recorded from Indo-China not mentioned in the 1920 paper!

This is very misleading, as, of course, the dates for the publication of the species are incorrect when recorded again in the *Zoological Record* for 1926 (in which the 1924 names appear).

## PSEUDOMYRMINÆ—TRIBE PSEUDOMYRMINI—PSEUDOMYRMA.

De Dalla Torre (1893) and Wheeler (1911) give Lund as the author of this genus, and Emery (1921) gives Latreille. As neither of these views is correct, I have gone into the matter, and give the results of my investigations in full as follows:—

LUND [*Annales des Sciences Naturelles*, 23, 137 (1831)] in a letter addressed to M. Audouin on the habits of some ants from Brazil, after mentioning some species with very large eyes and solitary habits, says—"M. Latreille, à qui j'ai fait part de ces individus, a proposé de leur donner le nom de *Pseudomyrme* qui leur convient en effet parfaitement. J'en ai rapporté cinq à six espèces."

F. E. GUÉRIN MÉNEVILLE ["*Iconographie du Règne Animal* de G. Cuvier," *Insectes*, p. 427 (1844), Paris, 1829-1858. Sub. "Sous-genre *Pseudomyrma*"] gives a good description and writes—"Après avoir écrit ces lignes, nous trouvons à la fin d'une lettre de M. Lund sur les habitudes des Fourmis du Brésil (*Ann. des Sc. Nat. 1st Série*, t. 23, p. 137) l'indication d'un groupe de Fourmis solitaires, dont les yeux sont grands et dont le pédicule de l'abdomen est formé de deux noeuds. Latreille, à qui M. Lund avait montré cinq à six espèces différentes, a en la même idée que nous, et il se proposait de créer un genre avec ses espèces sous le nom de *Pseudomyrme*. Nous adoptons cette dénomination."

SMITH [*Trans. Ent. Soc. Lond.*, 3, 156-7 (1855)] in a paper on some ants from Brazil under *Pseudomyrma*, writes "Genus *Pseudomyrma*, Guér. The name *Pseudomyrma* is proposed for the insects comprised in this genus by Lund in the *Annales des Sciences Naturelles*, 1831; but the only character there given is the extraordinary size of the eyes; the genus is fully characterized by Guérin in the *Iconographie du Règne Animal*."

SMITH [*Cat. Hym. Ins. Brit. Mus.*, 6, *Formicidæ*, 153 (1858)—"Genus 9, *Pseudomyrma*. *Pseudomyrma*, Guér., *Icon. Règ. Anim.*, 427 (1835-8)."

DE DALLA TORRE [*Cat. Hym.*, 7, *Formicidæ*, 55 (1893)]—"Pseudomyrma, Lund, *Ann. Sc. Nat.*, 1831, p. 137."

WHEELER, in a paper "A List of the Type Species of the Genera and Subgenera of *Formicidae*" [*Ann. New York Acad. Sci.*, 21, 171 (1911)]. gives "*Pseudomyrma*, Lund, *Ann. Sci. Nat.*, xxiii, p. 137, 1831."

EMERY, *Genera Insectorum*, Fasc. 174 A, p. 28 (1921), gives "*Pseudomyrma*, Latreille, in Lund. *Pseudomyrme*, Latreille, in Lund, *Ann. Sci. Nat.*, Vol. 23, p. 131 (1831)."

SHERBORN, *Index Animalium*, 1801-1850. March, 1929, p. 5196, gives "*Pseudomyrma*, F. E. Guérin, M. *Iconographie*, 1844, Ins. 427, Hem. (sic!). *Pseudomyrme*, Latreille, *Ann. Sci. Nat.*, xxiii (90), June, 1831, 137, Hym."

NOMENCLATOR ANIMALIUM, 1758-1922, *Preus. Akad. Wissens. Zu. Berlin*, Bd. 4, N-P., p. 2916 (1935). Berlin, 1932-35, gives "*Pseudomyrma* [pro. *Pseudomyrme*, A. W. Lund, 1831]. F. E. Guérin, *Méneville, Iconogr. Règne an.*, V. 3, Ins., p. 427, 1844, Hym. Form."

NEAVE, *Nomenclator Zoologicus*, Vol. iii, M-P., p. 993 (1940):—"*Pseudomyrma* (pro. *me*, Latreille, 1831). Guérin Méneville, 1844, *Iconographie*, Ins. 427, Hem. *Pseudomyrme*, Latreille, 1831, *Ann. Sci. Nat.*, 33 (90), 137, Hym."

Lund (1831) did not describe the genus sufficiently; furthermore, "*Pseudomyrme*" is in the vernacular and cannot stand.

Latreille did not describe it at all.

Guérin (1844) gave a good description, and was also the first to latinize "*Pseudomyrme*" into *Pseudomyrma*; therefore he is the author of the genus.

Smith was correct (1855), only he overlooked the fact that in Lund "*Pseudomyrme*" was proposed, not *Pseudomyrma*.

Smith (1858) correct, except for the date.

It is curious that such authorities as Dalla Torre (1893), Wheeler (1911), and Emery (1921) should go back to Lund, and Latreille, as the authors of this genus.

Sherborn (1929) showed that the part containing *Pseudomyrma* was published in 1844. He unfortunately writes "Hem." (Hemiptera) instead of Hym. (Hymenoptera), no doubt as a slip; and Neave (1940) repeated the error by copying Sherborn.

I should quote the reference to this genus thus:—*Pseudomyrma*, Guér., *Iconogr. Règ. An. Ins.*, 427 (1844).

(To be continued.)

## COLLECTING NOTES.

NOTES ON BRITISH MOTHS.—Continued from page 20.

*Drepana falcataria*.—I have taken these larvae, fairly commonly, on young Birch bushes, from July to October. Moths have emerged as early as the 17th May; but the main emergence appears throughout June. Stragglers (of ? a second brood) have come out in July and August.

*Drepana binaria*.—I have beaten full-fed larvae, from Oak trees, throughout September. Moths have emerged, in my cages, during the following May. I caught a female, in my moth-trap, on the 28th of August.

*Drepana cultraria*.—I have never succeeded in finding the larva of this beech-feeding species; but I have disturbed the moths from Beech

trees in May and June and, again, in September. When on the wing, the moth might be mistaken for the common "Yellow Shell" (*C. bilineata*).

*Drepana lacertinaria*.—I have found full-fed larvae of *lacertinaria* throughout August and September, up to early October. Moths usually emerge in May, but have appeared as early as the 17th of April. A second brood is "on the wing" in July and August. The earlier emergences produce moths of a browner colour and more closely striated pattern. Moths of the second brood are of a more uniform tawny colour.

*Cilix glaucata*.—Full-fed larvae occurred in September, on *Crataegus oxyacantha*. Their presence is indicated by the skeletonization of the upper surface of the leaves. Moths have appeared in May and—again—in July and August.

*Earias chlorana*.—I have usually found these larvae within leaves on the terminal shoots of willow. But, when collecting Tortrix larvae on Sallow bushes, in a swampy field near Aldershot, I was surprised to find a larva of this species amongst my collection of Sallow shoots. This larva formed a boat-shaped cocoon on the 18th of August and the moth emerged on the 22nd of the following March. Larvae found on willow, in July, have not appeared, as moths, before May.

*Hylophila prasinana*.—Full-fed larvae are common on the underside of Oak leaves, towards the end of September. They are recognizable by the crimson line on each side of the anal claspers. Moths have appeared, in my cages, towards the end of April up to mid-June.

*Hylophila bicolorana*.—I have beaten out young larvae, from Oak trees, in September and October; but have never brought them through to the adult stage. I have taken the moths, at light, in June and July.

*Sarothripus revayana*.—Larvae are abundant on Oaks during July and—again—in September. They may be recognized by the sparse white hairs on the back. I have found the boat-shaped cocoons, surmounted on a short pedicel, attached to Oak leaves in June. Moths have emerged towards the end of July and during August. The moth apparently hibernates as I have beaten it out from bushes quite late in the year.

*Nola cucullatella*.—I have not seen the larva of this species; but have, on several occasions, found the cocoons attached to twigs of hawthorn. The resulting moths have appeared in July.

*Nola strigula*.—I have collected moths, on tree-trunks in the New Forest, in July.

*Nola confusalis*.—This species is common at Camberley, where I have taken it, on tree-trunks, in May and June. I have also taken it, at light, early in July.

*Arctia caja*.—Larvae of the so-called "Garden Tiger" are common objects in most gardens. My first interest in entomology dates from when, a child of six years, I was allowed to keep one of these caterpillars in a cardboard box, with a panel cut out of it and muslin pasted over it, and was encouraged to watch its transformations from larva to cocoon and then to the gorgeous moth appearing in July. I have never succeeded in raising any of the remarkable varieties that appear in many collections.

*Arctia villica*.—A friend (Mr Gordon Cuff) raised, from ova, a series of larvae, which he fed through the winter on "Chickweed." He gave me some of the cocoons, which produced moths in April and May.