Scudder² in which one pair of wings is yellow and the other black. He describes this as a hermaphrodite—really a gynandromorph—while the specimen from Allenton is a normal female with the normal female coloration of both forms and with her abdomen distended with eggs.

Knowing nothing of its antecedents, it is idle to speculate as to the genetic status of this specimen. It probably represents a case of imperfect dominance, but whether this appeared as a mutation is, of course, impossible to say. There is a valuable problem for geneticists.

DENDROIDES CANADENSIS LATREILLE—
SYNONYMY

BY H. S. BARBER

U. S. National Museum, Washington, D. C.

Those rejecting the adoption in LeConte 1855 of *Dendroides canadensis* Latreille 1810 with *bicolor* Newman 1837 in synonymy as the proper name of our commonest Pyrochroid beetle probably did not realize that Latreille's designation (p. 430) of the type species for his monobasic genus erected in the same work (p. 212) connected his new specific name, *canadensis*, with the diagnosis, thereby making LeConte's use of the name the only proper choice under the International Code of Nomenclature. The misstatements in Lacordaire 1859 evidently led to the synonymy wrongly adopted in Gemminger and Harold 1870, this synonymy being followed by European workers and accepted in Leng 1920. The current synonymy should be reversed and we should go back to the usage reflected in the catalogues by Melsheimer 1853, LeConte 1866, Crotch 1874, and Henshaw 1885, as well as in numerous more local lists prior to 1920. In the admirably brief but important statement by Miss Payne 1931, recording her six years' observations on larvæ which could not pupate except as stimulated by a particular food, her use of the name

² Scudder, S. H. *The Butterflies of the Eastern United States*.

canadensis seems to have fortunately been passed over without being standardized into conformity with the last catalogue.

In the following list of works consulted, the asterisk indicates use of the valid prior name (*canadensis* Latreille 1810) instead of its synonym (*bicolor* Newman 1837).

*1810 Latreille, Consid. General.—Crust. Arach. Ins. Paris, p. 212, 430.

*1825 Lapeletier & Serville, Encyl. meth., Ins., vol. 10, p. 169, 261.

1837 Newman, Ent. Mag., vol. 5, p. 375.

*1853 Melsheimer, Cat. Coleop. U. S., p. 148.

*1855 LeConte, Proc. Acad. Nat. Sci. Phila., vol. 7, p. 275.

1859 Lacordaire, Gen. Coleop., vol. 5, p. 603, footnote 3.

*1866 LeConte, List Coleop. N. A., p. 64.

1870 Gemmiger & Harold, Cat. Coleop., p. 2104.

*1874 Crotch, Check List Coleop. Am. N. of Mex., p. 109.

*1885 Henshaw, List Coleop. Am. N. of Mex., p. 129.

1914 Blair, Ann. Mag. Nat. Hist., Ser. 8, vol. 13, p. 313.

1920 Leng, Cat. Coleop. Am. N. of Mex., p. 161.

1928 Blair, Coleop, Cat., Junk, pt. 99, Pyrochroidæ, p. 2.

*1931 Payne, Ent. News, vol. 42, p. 13-15.

A WIREWORM DOUBLE MONSTER (*LIMONIUS CANUS* LEC., ELATERIDÆ, COLEOPTERA)

BY CHAS. E. WOODWORTH

Associate Entomologist, Division of Truck Crop Insects,
U. S. Bureau of Entomology

Quite recently it was my good fortune to find and preserve an interesting monstrosity among some newly hatched wireworm larvæ. In the course of examining about eighteen thousand of these, only one abnormal individual was noted. Besides the great scarcity of anomalies in this group the fact that wireworms are of subterranean