shortly before the time of laying the eggs for the Summer brood of larvæ. The eggs of this brood can be laid, therefore, on both deciduous and liveoaks with the happiest of outcomes. Perhaps it is just this successful outcome of the Spring's essays in maternity that breeds in Phryganidia that unwarranted confidence in the white oak that is annually attended with such fatal results to the Autumn young. Phryganidia has already one serious obstacle to its increase in the person of one Pimpla behrensii, who makes a point of killing a large proportion of the Phryganidia youth each year, and it will be well for our interesting moth to refrain from too many imprudences if it wishes to hold its own in the lively struggle for living.

ON THE GENUS MELEOMA A. Fitch.—The very interesting article by Mr. Banks in the Ent. News for March, 1896 (pp. 95, 96), induced me to re-examine my material for this genus. I find two forms in four examples, all collected by the late H. K. Morrison and received by me from him. One specimen from Mt. Washington was seen by the late Dr. Hagen and bears his label, "O. signoreti;" another, from Mt. Washington agrees perfectly therewith, save that the antennæ are paler; both of these agree structurally with M. signoreti as defined by Mr. Banks. A third from Colorado, and the fourth, from Mt. Washington, agree structurally and otherwise with the description of M. slossonæ Banks, the only discrepancy between them being that in the third the black line on the sides of the face is continuous (as described), whereas in the fourth this line is broken up into two separate spots one on the genæ, the other on the clypeus (such a variation is very frequent in Chrysopidæ). These two forms differ immensely in the structure of the apex of the abdomen, and were unhesitatingly placed in my collection as the sexes of one species; such also was Dr. Hagen's opinion according to notes he sent to me. Now, however, Mr. Banks says he has the female of M. slossonæ, and that it differs from Chrysopa chiefly in the antennæ of that sex being placed more widely apart. Amongst my numerous North American Chrysopidæ I can find nothing that will answer to this description. That the two *M. signoreti* and the two *M. slossonæ* in my collection are respectively of different sexes is, I think, certain. In writing these notes I would by no means imply an error of observation on the part of Mr. Banks, but the facts are sufficiently suggestive to warrant further inquiry. While on the subject of North American Chrysopidæ it occurs to me that several species have been lately described as pertaining to my genus

While on the subject of North American Chrysopidæ it occurs to me that several species have been lately described as pertaining to my genus Nothochrysa. I possess only one of these, from California. In facies it differs somewhat from the Old World species, and more resembles Hypochrysa, and it is probably on the strength of such a suggestion somewhere published by me in years gone by that this latter genus has been considered North American. I think, however, its position is in Nothochrysa rather than in Hypochrysa. According to the description, Chrysopa virginica A. Fitch, probably belongs to Nothochrysa.—ROBERT MCLACHIAN

McLachlan.



McLachlan, Robert. 1896. "On the genus Meleoma A. Fitch." *Entomological news, and proceedings of the Entomological Section of the Academy of Natural Sciences of Philadelphia* 7, 175.

View This Item Online: https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/item/20228

Permalink: https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/partpdf/20879

Holding Institution

Smithsonian Libraries and Archives

Sponsored by

Smithsonian

Copyright & Reuse

Copyright Status: NOT_IN_COPYRIGHT

This document was created from content at the **Biodiversity Heritage Library**, the world's largest open access digital library for biodiversity literature and archives. Visit BHL at https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org.