PSYCHE.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS., JANUARY 1889.

Communications, exchanges and editors' copies should be addressed to EDITORS OF PSYCHE, *Cambridge, Mass. Communications for publication in* PSYCHE *must be properly authenticated, and no anonymous articles will be published.*

Editors and contributors are only responsible for the statements made in their own communications.

Works on subjects not related to entomology will not be reviewed in PSYCHE.

For rates of subscription and of advertising, see advertising columns.

INACCURATE FIGURE OF A BUTTERFLY'S EGG.

I have always wondered where the figure of the egg of the vanessid butterfly *polychloros* of Europe came from, as it was manifestly incorrect, although it has been extensively copied, and so far as I know, never found fault with. Dr. Riley has just lent me the volumes of Sepp's Nederlandsche Insecten, and there I find the culprit. It is figured as having the shape of a pear or perhaps better of a gourd, being much constricted and produced at the top. In Sepp's other figures of eggs which are laid in batches, the clusters are figured likewise, as for instance in the case of *urticae*, but here this is not done, and I am strongly under the impression that Sepp, whose accuracy is well known, must have mistaken the egg of some other insect for that of *polychloros*, the eggs of which are laid in clusters and resemble those of *antiopa*, both in their manner of deposition and in their form, so closely that they can hardly be distinguished.

S. H. Scudder.

MACULATION AND PUPATION OF SMERINTHUS EXCAECATUS.

In Lexington, Mass., 17 Aug. 1888, I confined a large female *Smerinthus excaecatus* in a breeding cage. In a few hours she began to lay, attaching, singly or in small clusters, some eighty roundish, light-green eggs to the netting with which the cage was covered. I then removed them to a glass jar, to prevent the escape of the young larvae—should they hatch—through the meshes of the netting. On 25 Aug. the eggs began to hatch, and the larvae ate freely of willow (*Salix*), with which I supplied them. The first molt was taking place 2 Sept., and the second 11 Sept. Up to this time I had noticed no red spots, but after this they appeared on less than one-half of the specimens then alive. As is the case amongst most of the *sphingidae*, I believe, while young, the mortality of my *S. geminatus* and *S. excaecatus* has been great, so that at the completion of their second molt less than half had survived, though I had taken much pains to keep their jar clean and well supplied with fresh twigs of willow.

The red spots, besides being present in only a part of my specimens, were unequally distributed in these, some having both the stigmatal and dorsal, while others had only the stigmatal spots.

About 25 Sept. the greater part of these larvae stopped eating and settled to rest in the bottom of their jar. As they were apparently very far from being fully grown, having reached a size perhaps half or two-thirds of that which should normally be attained by these larvae, I was disinclined to consider their behavior a preliminary to pupating. After a few hours, however, to my great surprise, they pupated, forming of course very small chrysalids. The interesting question in regard to these larvae is this:— did I overlook two molts, owing to the habit that this larva has of eating all of its cast-off skin but the head, or did they pupate when they had accomplished only two of their orthodox number of molts? The former supposition seems to be rendered unlikely from the fact that at the time of pupating they were so far from having attained their normal size, not to speak of the improbability