

## CORRESPONDENCE.

DEAR SIR,—

In the September number of the "Entomologist" I find my name mentioned as one of a committee appointed by the entomologists at the late meeting of the American Association, at Portland, to codify rules of nomenclature for the guidance of entomologists.

I was not present when this action was taken, and immediately notified the Secretary that I declined to act upon any such committee, which, in my judgment, should only be selected by and among zoologists in general.

SAMUEL H. SCUDDER.

DEAR SIR,—

I have to respond to Mr. Andrews' remarks, by requesting you to publish one of Mr. Strecker's letters to me regarding the species of *Hemaris*. This will show that I could not have known anything of Mr. Andrews. Mr. Strecker, it will be seen, asks my assistance. Possibly Mr. Strecker may have expected I would determine the species as "new," or publish my observations in his very defective work. I knew nothing of the fact that Mr. Andrews expected a dedication, or that I was to do the work of determination to enable Mr. Strecker to perform that graceful office. Mr. Strecker, for his private gratification, has instigated Mr. Andrews to figure in a most absurd manner before the public, and the whole exhibition is arranged for the purpose of bringing Mr. Strecker's indifferent publication into notoriety, at the expense of Mr. Andrews' desires to figure as an Entomological, or other, authority. From the letter following it will appear that Mr. Strecker could not determine the species sent me. For, when the specimens came to hand, "No. 1 Diffinis" was *Hemaris tenuis*; "No. 2, like Diffinis," was *Hemaris diffinis*; "No. 6" was *H. uniformis*, and in consequence of my determination, it is so cited in page 12 of Mr. Strecker's work. "No. 4" was not received by me; "No. 3" was my *Hemaris marginalis*; "No. 5, Thysbe," was not the usual form of that species. None of the species named by Mr. Strecker were correctly determined. Considering that I had written at length on the genera

Hemaris (*Sesia*, Grote, restr.) and Haemorrhagia, and had described six out of the nine species previously catalogued, I was not struck with any impropriety on the part of Mr. Strecker in submitting his material for determination to me. Mr. Strecker's letter is as follows\* :

Reading, March 13, 1873.

DEAR MR. GROTE,—

I am in a muddle with my *Sesidæ*. In your catalogue you have *thetis*, *diffinis*, *axillaris*, *gracilis*, *buffaloensis*, *thysbe*, *fusicaudis*, *Floridensis*; those underscored I know, the others I don't know by a shot and a half. I have read your description of *axillaris*, and I think I have it, but ain't sure. Here is the way they are in my collection :

1. *Diffinis*.
2. Like *Diffinis*, but margin of fore wings slightly scalloped inside.
3. Like *Diffinis*, but margin acutely dentated inside and broader ; from Michigan.
4. *Thetis*.
5. *Thysbe*.
6. Like *Thysbe*, but margin of wings not dentated inwardly ; abdomen more robust, not so long ; from Labrador. No. 6 may be *Buffaloensis* ; I thought I had *Buffaloensis*, but if this be it not, then I have not that species ; can't you get me an example of it and *gracilis* ?

What are *fusicaudis* and *Floridensis* ? Where can they be seen ? If I could borrow the examples not in my collection I would figure the whole lot of them, all the N. Am. species on one plate, and with your aid in the accompanying text the world might be set to rights on that bothersome genus as far as the N. Am. species are concerned. Can you help me to get the material for my plate ? also, can you tell me what my Nos. 2 and 3 are by what I have written above ?

Write soon to yours truly,

HERMAN STRECKER,  
Box 111, Reading P. O., Berks C'y, Pa.

I wish, at least for the moment, to "let the whole thing drop together, as Mr. Andrews suggests, with the following note from Mr. Andrews, which is rather different in tone from those printed on pages

---

\* This letter is set up from the original. In Mr. Grote's communication, pp. 176-177, for "Heman's" read everywhere "*Hemaris*."—ED. CAN. ENT.

177 and 178. It was occasioned by my sending him entire (by the hands of my friend) Strecker's letters to me, showing his entire concealment of Andrews' connection with the specimens, and absence of any restriction as to their use. While Mr. Andrews prints in one style, trying to justify an unprovoked attack, he writes in a different vein. I may be "public property," at least Mr. Andrews says I am, but I certainly am not the *private* property of either Mr. Andrews or Mr. Strecker, as which they would treat me. Mr. Andrews' simile of the five dollar bill enures to my credit, for Mr. Strecker sent me uncurrent ones and I returned good species that will pass current anywhere. Mr. Andrews would quarrel with a man who supplied him with the information by which his doubtful money became genuine. On further provocation I am prepared to furnish additional information relative to this absurdly disgusting plot in which Mr. Strecker is the most to blame, but in the exposure of which he has shrewdly placed Mr. Andrews in the position of suffering most. The "Press Copy" alluded to below was the letter on page 178.

Room 4, No. 117 Broadway, New York, Sept. 18, 1873.

DEAR SIR,—

Enclosed herewith please find Press Copy of a letter I have addressed to the "Canadian Entomologist." In justice to both parties I do not think I can say more or less.

In writing to Mr. Grote you will be kind enough to express my great regret that any occasion should have existed justifying my action in the premises, and my confident belief that he has not wilfully done wrong to me.

Yours very truly,

W. V. ANDREWS.

E. L. Graef, Esq., 40 Court St., Brooklyn.

I apologize for taking up so much of your valuable room.

Yours truly,

AUG. R. GROTE.

Our limited space forbids any further continuance of this correspondence.—ED. C. E.