

cause I think it is justified. *Cinerea*, as I know by rearing it from the larva is an exceedingly variable species, as some allied European moths are well-known to be. My description included what Grote subsequently described as *laticinerea* and *cinerosa*. Now, if the three forms are worthy of being ranked as species (which I by no means admit), why should any one of them more than another have been chosen as typical of *cinerea*? In answering the question it will be found that opinion has played its part in the matter as against fact, and that the question as to which is *antennata* is quite legitimate! My original description, as stated, included them all, and in fact the *cinerosa* form heads my series. But this name was already preoccupied by Guenée in the same genus, and I would propose the name *Grotei* in its stead, and would thus label the species:

XYLINA ANTENNATA, Walker.

var. *Grotei*, Riley.

var. *laticinerea*, Grote.

—C. V. RILEY.

EGG OF HEMILEUCA YAVAPAI, *Neum.*—Laid in belt-like masses, fastened by a gummy secretion, smooth, rounded, the shape varying according to position in the mass, the inner eggs more elevated and rounded, the outer more elongate, the top flattened, hardly depressed, the surface mottled with a darker green; general color light green.—A. R GROTE.



Grote, Augustus Radcliffe. 1882. "Egg of *Hemileuca yavapai*, Neum." *Papilio* 2(6), 102–102.

View This Item Online: <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/item/39683>

Permalink: <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/partpdf/317868>

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>.