

CORRESPONDENCE.

ANTIGASTER VS. EUPELMUS.

DEAR SIR,—

I have read with interest Mr. Howard's remarks on p. 31, *ff.* In the article in the *American Entomologist* which he refers to, I stated distinctly that he gives reasons for considering *Antigaster* and *Eupelmus* synonymous, and, as I consider the reasons good, I have no criticism to make thereon. My remarks were intended to show rather that his reflection on Walsh that there were "no grounds for the founding of the genus *Antigaster*" was hardly justified. I endeavored to show that with the light then at his command Walsh had reasons for erecting the genus. The characters of *Eupelmus* as set forth by Mr. Howard are mostly brought together from works subsequent to Walsh's characterization of *Antigaster*. The close relationship of this last with *Eupelmus* was recognized by me as previously stated by Mr. Howard, and whether, in the light of subsequent writings, the two should be combined generically is a question depending on the limitation or comprehensiveness we deem best to give to generic divisions, on which subject I have no reason for differing from my friend who, from special study of the family, is most competent to decide.

C. V. RILEY, Washington, D. C.

HOW WE CAPTURED A HORNET'S NEST.

DEAR SIR,—

One fine day last October, while enjoying a ramble in the woods near Belleville, with two of my sons, one of them took hold of a knot which projected from a small half-decayed log, intending to turn it over to search for beetles beneath it. The piece, however, came away in his hand and disclosed the entrance of a nest of black hornets. Of course we retreated "at the double" before the disturbed insects recovered from their first surprise, leaving them to settle down at their leisure. A few days after, taking advantage of a cool morning, I sent my two boys to the wood with a small bottle of chloroform and a hard rubber syringe. According to directions, they injected about a drachm of the liquid into the hole, and threw a handkerchief over the entrance. In about five minutes they opened up the nest, when they found the inmates in a perfect state of slumber, and transferred them without trouble to their cyanide bottles. In about an hour they returned, bringing me forty-eight specimens of the insect

J. T. BELL.



THE COLORADO BEETLE.

DEAR SIR,—

The following extract from an English newspaper, the *Bristol Mercury*, will show how carefully the Colorado Beetle is looked after in England and how great a risk he runs if he sets foot within the United Kingdom. He is far more sternly outlawed than was Robin Hood or Smith O'Brien, and if only a suspicion of his presence is felt, all, from the Privy Council downwards, are up in arms to crush him with all the terror of the law. Let us hope they will succeed in making the country too hot for even the ten-lined Spearman.

“Mr. Borlase put a question as to the discovery of a Colorado Beetle in South Devon.”

“Mr. Mundella answered, saying the Colorado Beetle was in his department (a laugh). He then gave the facts of the discovery of a live Colorado Beetle in the possession of a man at Yealmpton, who refused to give it up. Upon instructions from the department he was prosecuted under the Destructive Insects Act of 1877, and fined the mitigated penalty of £5, he pleading ignorance of the law and agreeing to the destruction of the beetle.”

E. W. C.

DEAR SIR,—

I always look for the coming of the CAN. ENT. with pleasure. Having seen several articles in the ENTOMOLOGIST relative to the abundance or scarcity of insects, as compared with past seasons, I would inform you that in 1879 I did not see a single specimen of *Terias nicippe*, while this year they were abundant, in fact more numerous than *Colias philodice*.

Columbus, O., Dec. 2, 1880.

W. N. TALLANT.

DEAR SIR,—

On the 6th Oct., 1880, I took six *cresphontes* larvæ feeding on prickly ash. Some of them fed for several days afterwards, and in due time they all transformed to chrysalids. Now they have all emerged as butterflies; the first appeared on the 22nd of March, the last on the 17th of April, 1881. They measure from $3\frac{3}{4}$ to $4\frac{1}{2}$ inches in expanse of wing, perfect in form and rich in coloring.

J. ALSTON MOFFAT.

Hamilton, April, 1881.

DEAR SIR,—

In your last issue Dr. LeConte pronounces my record of the capture here of *Alaus gorgops* to be "probably erroneous," because he has not known any instance of that insect having been taken north of Texas and Western Louisiana, and that therefore my specimen *must* be *Alaus oculatus*.

Alaus oculatus is of such common occurrence here that I have long ceased to collect specimens, unless remarkable for beauty or for abnormal size, either large or small, and with over twenty years' acquaintance I ought to be tolerably familiar with its appearance and proportions. The specimen in dispute was found resting on a stump in Bleecker's Woods, about half a mile from our city limits, and was taken by me as an unusually fine and large example of *Alaus oculatus*, and placed as such among my seasonal captures; but on placing it in my cabinet I observed so marked and manifest a difference between it and the other specimens, that I thought it might be a distinct species. Finding from Crotch's List that there were only three species known, and possessing examples of two of them, I obtained a specimen of *A. gorgops* from Mr. E. P. Austin, of Boston, for the sake of comparison, which came to hand ticketed "Dallas, Texas." On placing this side by side with mine, I was unable to distinguish the slightest shade of difference except that mine is rather the larger and fresher specimen. In order to show the identity of these two examples, and their common difference from *A. oculatus*, I append their respective measurements as taken at the time, and carefully repeated and verified, as also the dimensions of my largest specimen of *A. oculatus*:

	Mr. Austin's sp'n.	My own.	<i>A. oculatus</i> .
Total length,	41 mm. (about 1 $\frac{2}{3}$ in.)	42 mm.	42 $\frac{1}{2}$ mm.
Length of thorax,	12 mm. (sharp.)	12 mm. (full.)	12 $\frac{1}{2}$ "
Breadth of thorax,	11 $\frac{1}{2}$ mm.	12 mm.	11 "
Breadth of elytra,	11 $\frac{1}{2}$ mm. (full.)	12 $\frac{1}{2}$ "	11 $\frac{1}{2}$ "

The ocular spots on the thorax are much larger and more circular in shape than those of *A. oculatus*, and the white marginal lines are much broader and more distinctly marked, in all which characters Mr. Austin's specimen and mine thoroughly agree. I am thus led to the conclusion that either my specimen is *Alaus gorgops*, or that Mr. Austin's *is not*.

I have in my collection examples of *A. oculatus* varying in length from 42 $\frac{1}{2}$ mm. to 25 mm.

JAMES T. BELL.

Belleville, April 29th, 1881.