

clothing; its habit of settling on the trunks of trees and its bold rapid style of flight very much resemble the manner of the Ageroniæ, and I am quite satisfied that the true position of the genus Pandora is in proximity with Ageronia. There are two grand species of this latter genus new to me also found here, one of which has the greater part of the under surface of the hind wings red, and the other has the same part saffron-yellow: they fly in company with Pandora at the place on the borders of the forest, but do not wander so far in their flight. I wish to mention here that I think there is quite an erroneous conception established by lepidopterists, of the nature and affinities of the Ageroniæ. M. Lacordaire and Mr. Wallace have said that the chrysalis is secured by a ligature round the body; I think there is some mistake about this: I have bred two species of the genus, and most certainly the chrysalis is suspended by the tail like all the other Nymphalidæ. In our systems the Ageroniæ are placed at the head of the Nymphalidæ, near the true Papilionidæ, as though forming the connexion between the families. I think all this is a misconception. There is no proximate affinity at all between the Papilionidæ and the Nymphalidæ; the two families are separated by the whole mass of the Erycinidæ. I should as little expect to find an Ageronia chrysalis with a ligature round the body, as a true Papilio chrysalis suspended only by the tail. The larvæ of Ageronia are spinose; the lines of thoracic segments densely ramose. In their flight they make a smacking noise with their wings like the clicking of castanets, but rarely repeated. The Pandora does not produce this noise."

The Secretary read the following paper by Mr. A. R. Wallace:—

*A disputed case of Priority in Nomenclature.*

"Allow me to call the attention of the Entomological Society to what seems to me a novel and most erroneous as well as inconvenient interpretation of the law of priority: it is, that of transferring a name long borne by one insect (but which it has lost by being found to be but a sex or variety) to another insect which has been erroneously referred to the same species. This has been done by the late Mr. Doubleday, who has changed Ornithoptera Remus, a name which for fifty years has been invariably borne by one well-known species, into O. Panthous, a name which for a still longer period has been applied to the female of O. Priamus. Such a change would be most inadvisable, even were the principle on which it was made a good one; whereas it is one which gives, at it were, a premium to error. Linnæus described the female of Priamus as a distinct species (Panthous) and Remus as the male of Panthous. Cramer corrected the latter error and figured the two sexes of Remus correctly, giving the species for the first time a distinct name. This name it appears to me cannot be changed for that of Linnæus, who erroneously supposed the species to be the same as one he had previously named, although that name has been reduced to a synonym. The two errors of Linnæus should not be allowed to take precedence of Cramer, who first correctly named the species. The question here raised is of importance because an analogous case is now open for decision. P. Darsius of G. R. Gray was previously figured by Doubleday as the male of Amphimedon. Now, Amphimedon is certainly the female of Helena, and, if the rule holds good, the new species Darsius must take the old name of Amphimedon, just as Remus has been made by Messrs. E. Doubleday and G. R. Gray, to take the name of Panthous. Such a practice will certainly not be generally followed, and I would humbly suggest that it is one of the duties of an Entomological

Society, to check, by an expression of their opinion, all that tends still further to confuse the nomenclature and synonymy.

“Amboyna, January 1, 1858.”

The Secretary read “Descriptions of six New British Neuroptera sent by Mr. Dale to the British Museum,” by Dr. Hagen; and the following paper by Mr. Newman:—

*Note on Scolytus destructor.*

“Having heard from Mr. Stainton that the Royal Botanic Society had awarded a gold medal to our fellow-member, Captain Cox, for certain successful experiments in recovering elm trees from the attacks of *Scolytus destructor*, I was delighted to receive for the press that elaborate paper with which the Society was favoured at its last meeting. That paper is published in our ‘Proceedings,’ and will afford to the world abundant proof that we are now regarding Entomology in a utilitarian as well as a scientific spirit. ‘It is,’ as the writer observes, ‘peculiarly fitting that Science should step in and prove that over one pest at least we have power, and if not made use of the fault lies entirely with the public.’ I cannot sufficiently regret my absence from so interesting a meeting, since, had I been present, I should have endeavoured to elicit still further information from a gentleman who has so successfully studied this important branch of rural economy; more especially, as the Parisians, in their bungling attempts to employ the draw-shave, have sacrificed the finest elm trees around the French metropolis. I may perhaps be allowed to state, touching the bibliography of *Scolytus destructor*, that I think Captain Cox scarcely goes back far enough, when he dates the knowledge of its economy from 1840: previously to that year the late M. Audouin had thoroughly mastered its history; and six years earlier still, an obscure writer in the ‘Entomological Magazine’ (i. 425), under the assumed name of ‘Rusticus’—the habit of assuming names cannot be sufficiently reprobated—described its economy so minutely as to induce the idea that Captain Cox must have been at the writer’s elbow even while he held the pen, and dictated what he wrote: before Rusticus, Kirby and Spence seem to have been cognizant of its doings; and to go back still further, the very name carries with it an idea of some knowledge of its economy. Captain Cox has, however, added one most interesting fact overlooked by previous writers: that ‘the female dies at the entrance of her tube, thus performing a maternal duty by closing the aperture to her young ones with her own dead body.’ The points, however, on which I would solicit for the Society additional information are these: Captain Cox states his firm conviction that healthy trees are attacked by *Scolytus*; and that this insect is the cause of premature decay and eventual death. He narrates with great perspicuity that eighteen dying elm trees were placed at his disposal, that he experimented on every one of them, by taking off the surface bark with a draw-shave; and that seventeen out of the eighteen completely recovered: the operation is most simple, and I believe every one will admit that its very simplicity adds to its beauty and its value. Before commencing his experiments, Captain Cox numbered the trees from 1 to 18, and made a careful memorandum of the state of each; the summary of these memoranda may be thus briefly stated. Fifteen were suffering severely from the ravages of *Cossus ligniperda*; and out of these fifteen, nine were also infested with *Scolytus*: three, making up the eighteen, were attacked by *Scolytus*, but all these three “slightly.” Now, to a superficial observer, it will occur