

ON THE STATUS OF *HELIOPETES SUBLINEA* (HESPERIIDAE)H. A. FREEMAN¹

1605 Lewis Dr., Garland, Texas

For some time there seems to have been considerable confusion concerning the exact status of *Heliopetes sublinea* Schaus. This species was described in 1902 from a specimen from Mexico, and since that time it has either been omitted from publications or considered to be a synonym of *Heliopetes macaira* Reakirt. Draudt, in Seitz (1924) does not mention this name, nor did Hoffmann in his "Catalogo sistematico y zoogeografico de los Lepidopteros Mexicanos" (1941). Evans in American HesperIIDae, part III (1953), records this species in the synonymy of *macaira* as "? *sublinea* Schaus 1902: Mexico."

During June 1935, while collecting in the general vicinity of Victoria, Tamaulipas, Mexico, I collected two males of a species of *Heliopetes* unfamiliar to me, and the following year during July I caught another male at Tamazunchale, San Luis Potosi, Mexico. In 1940 I sent one of the specimens to E. L. Bell for determination. He stated that it corresponded very well with a female that they had at the American Museum of Natural History in their unidentified HesperIIDae. In February, 1941, Bell wrote that the specimen had been identified as *sublinea* Schaus. He stated that the genitalia of it and the type had been compared and were found to be the same. After receiving this information I considered the matter closed, but when Evans' works on the American HesperIIDae appeared, I was concerned to find his remark concerning his idea of the status of *sublinea*. Recently I examined the genitalia of one of the other specimens that I had collected in 1935, and found that it certainly differs considerably from *macaira*, and, in fact, from any of the known species of *Heliopetes* figured by Evans, thus confirming the validity of the name *sublinea*.

Recently I received a large number of Mexican HesperIIDae from Dr. T. Escalante, Mexico, D. F., and among the material was a male *sublinea* from "Sn. Francisco," Tamaulipas, Mexico, VIII-64. In specimens received from Stallings & Turner collected in Mexico there were found the following specimens of *sublinea*: 2 males, Monterrey, Nuevo Leon, V-28-41; 1 male, Victoria, Tamaulipas, VI-10-41; and 1 male, Mante, Tamaulipas, VI-9-41. From the information available it seems that *sublinea* is confined to the area from Monterrey to Tamazunchale in Mexico. Flying in the same general region with this species are the

¹I would like to express my thanks to the National Science Foundation for research grant GB-4122 which is making this study of the Mexican HesperIIDae possible.

following members of the genus *Heliopetes*: *domicella* Erichson, *macaira* Reakirt, *laviana* Hewitson, and *arsalte* (L.). This includes all of the species of that genus recorded from mainland Mexico except *ericetorum* (Bdv.), which Hoffmann records from "Region noroeste hasta Guerrero," and *alana* Reakirt, which occurs over all of the southern part of Mexico.

LITERATURE CITED

- DRAUDT, M., 1924. Hesperidae, in: Seitz, Macrolepidoptera of the world. Vol. 5. The American Rhopalocera. Stuttgart, vii, 1139 pp., 203 pl.
- EVANS, W. H., 1953. A catalogue of the American Hesperidae indicating the classification and nomenclature adopted in the British Museum. Part III, Pyrginae. Sec. 2. London: British Museum, 246 pp., pls. 26-53.
- HOFFMANN, C. C., 1941. Catalogo sistematico y zoogeografico de los Lepidopteros Mexicanos. Segunda parte-Hesperioidea. An. Inst. Biol. Mexico, 12: 237-294.

OBSERVATIONS ON ARKANSAS RHOPALOCERA AND A LIST OF SPECIES OCCURRING IN NORTHEASTERN ARKANSAS

JOHN H. MASTERS

P.O. Box 7511, Saint Paul, Minnesota

The only recent extensive butterfly collecting in Arkansas has been by H. Avery Freeman, Kilian Roever, Richard Heitzman, Leo J. Paulisen and myself. I was the first resident collector in northeastern Arkansas and the only person to have collected butterflies extensively there. This paper summarizes collecting records and observations of over six hundred field hours in northeastern Arkansas between 1961 and 1965.

Northeastern Arkansas is defined as those counties bisected by Crowley's Ridge (Clay, Greene, Craighead, Poinsett, Cross, St. Francis, Lee and Phillips) and those eastward (Mississippi and Crittenden). This area is not generally favorable for Rhopalocera, and transient collectors are not likely to collect there. The area is highly cultivated in cotton, soybeans and rice—crops that are frequently sprayed with insecticides. Collecting is best on the hillier uncultivated sections of Crowley's Ridge and in areas along the Mississippi, Saint Francis and L'Anguille Rivers. Crowley's Ridge is the outstanding geographic feature of the region, elevations along the ridge are only 300 to 500 feet above sea level but the surrounding region is flat with elevations under 250 feet. Crowley's Ridge still contains forested areas (especially in the St. Francis State Forest) and most of the species native to the original dense hardwood forests of the region should remain there.