1965. Larval food plants and distribution notes for twenty-four Texas Hesperiidae. Jour. Lepid. Soc., 19: 1–33.

TILDEN, J. W., 1964. Two species of Hesperiidae previously unrecorded from the United States. Jour. Lepid. Soc., 18: 214–216.

1965. Urbanus procne and Urbanus simplicius (Hesperiidae). Jour. Lepid. Soc., 19: 53-55.

TURNER, B. L., 1959. The Legumes of Texas. University of Texas, Austin.

## OCCURRENCE OF CALLOPHRYS ERYPHON (LYCAENIDAE) IN MICHIGAN

## M. C. NIELSEN

3415 Overlea Dr., Lansing, Michigan, U.S.A.

For some time now, the record of *Callophrys eryphon* (Boisduval) from Michigan has been in doubt. Specimens representing this record have been assumed by many lepidopterists to fall within the usual *C. niphon* (Huebner) variation. Moore (1960) listed *eryphon* from Mackinac County, referring to two specimens collected on May 18, 30, one near St. Ignace and the other near Naubinway; however, the specimens were never positively determined to represent this hairstreak.

Recently, while examining butterflies in the collection at Northern Michigan College, I found a specimen in their *Callophrys niphon* series that strongly resembled *eryphon*, and it had been collected in Marquette County. Then on May 16, 1964, I collected four specimens in Chippewa and Luce counties (in the eastern Upper Peninsula) which fitted the description of *eryphon*. The specimens from Chippewa, Luce, and Marquette counties were subsequently examined by Harry K. Clench of the Carnegie Museum and found to be *C. eryphon*. The following is a quote from Clench's letter of September 16, 1964:

"The *eryphon* are . . . perfectly good *eryphon* though a little peculiar: they run slightly smaller; the females are more extensively fulvous above (but are nicely matched in this by a series from Moffat County, Colorado); and on the underside there is a tendency towards an increased suffusion of hoary gray scaling in the terminal spots of the hind wing, faintly reminiscent of the condition typical of *niphon*. All of these traits are exceedingly slight, however, and there is certainly no reason at this time to even think of separating them as a different subspecies."

The Marquette specimen is a slightly torn female taken by Richard L. Lake on May 22, 1960, a few blocks from the campus of Northern Michigan College within the city of Marquette—Township 49 North, Range 25 West, Section 10. This specimen is now in the writer's collection.

The Chippewa County specimens are two fresh females collected in company with females of *C. niphon clarki* (Freeman) (determined by H. Clench) and *C. augustinus* (Kirby) while sunning on a sandy road on

May 16 at 10:00 to 11:00 A.M. in Township 45 North, Range 5 West, Section 36. This road separates a large sphagnum-heath bog from an upland area of mixed pine and miscellaneous hardwoods and shrubs. Jack, red, and white pines (*Pinus banksiana, resinosa*, and *strobus*, respectively) were found in this vicinity, all possible foodplants for both *eryphon* and *niphon*.

In Luce County, the *eryphon* specimens, two fine males, were collected later in the day on May 16, resting on sedges in a small opening within old growth hardwoods less than a mile north of Tahquamenon Falls in Township 48 North, Range 8 West, Section 1. A few white pines, seedlings, and mature trees, were noted in the perimeter of this opening representing a possible foodplant. Other species taken here with *eryphon* were *Celastrina argiolus pseudargiolus* (Boisduval & Le Conte) (fresh) and *Vanessa virginiensis* (Drury).

It is extremely interesting to find this western species in Michigan and to find it strictly sympatric with its very near relative, *niphon*, in the Upper Peninsula. Klots (1951) does not list *eryphon*, nor refer to it in his list of casual species, as occurring east of the Great Plains. In Ehrlich & Ehrlich (1961), Clench cites Nebraska and northern Manitoba as the eastern limit of *eryphon*. It would therefore appear that these records represent a considerable eastward range extension of *eryphon* in North America. Additional observations and collections will be necessary to determine to what extent *C. eryphon* is permanently established in Michigan's Upper Peninsula and to what extent it can coexist with *niphon* in the same habitat. I strongly urge collectors in Ontario and the northern Lake States to reexamine their *niphon* series for the possibility of masquerading *eryphon* specimens. All doubtful material can be forwarded to Harry Clench for critical examination.

## Acknowledgments

I would like to thank Dr. Gordon D. Gill, Department of Biology, Northern Michigan College, for permitting me to examine the butterfly collection from that institution and for providing information relative to the Marquette *eryphon*. Also, my sincere appreciation is extended to Harry K. Clench for his examination and verification of the *Callophrys* specimens, and for reviewing the manuscript and suggesting helpful comments.

## LITERATURE CITED

EHRLICH, P. R., & A. H. EHRLICH, 1961. How to Know the Butterflies. William C. Brown Co., Dubuque, Iowa, 262 pp., 525 figs.

- KLOTS, A. B., 1951. A Field Guide to the Butterflies of North America, east of the Great Plains. Houghton Mifflin Co., Boston, 349 pp., 40 pls.
- MOORE, S., 1960. A revised annotated list of the butterflies of Michigan. Occ. Papers Mus. of Zool., Univ. Mich., Ann Arbor, 617, 39 pp., 1 pl., 1 fig.