

MELITAEA PULCHELLA BOISDUVAL 1852, A REPLACEMENT  
NAME

J. W. TILDEN

125 Cedar Lane, San Jose, California 95127

Tilden (1969) considered the name *pulchella* Boisduval a synonym of *tharos* Drury 1773. Some question was raised about this action. It was pointed out that there is in the United States National Museum, a specimen that is labelled as the type of *Melitaea pulchella* Boisduval.

W. D. Field kindly examined this specimen and stated that he considered it a specimen of *Phyciodes campestris campestris* (Behr) but agreed with my opinion that Boisduval had not described this insect in his original statement concerning *pulchella*. He expressed the belief that *pulchella* was a replacement name, since, as pointed out by Tilden (1969), Boisduval had merely cited Drury's figure as representing his *Melitaea pulchella*.

In July 1973 I was able to examine the type of *M. pulchella*. It is indeed a specimen of *Phyciodes campestris*, without locality or date labels. It is thus not possible to be sure when this specimen was selected by Boisduval. It may have been at the time of the original citation, or later.

Boisduval's statement that *Melitaea pulchella* (which he considered to be represented by figs. 5 & 6 on Plate 1 of Drury's *Illust. Nat. Hist.*) should not be confused with *Papilio tharos* Cramer, indicated that he gave priority to *tharos* Cramer and thus intended *pulchella* as a replacement name for *Papilio tharos* Drury.

There is no description of any insect, either here or in later references to *pulchella* by Boisduval.

It makes no difference what insect is labelled as the type of *pulchella*, since this insect so labelled is not described and so is without status. By Boisduval's own statements, *pulchella* is a replacement name for *Papilio tharos* Drury, not *Papilio tharos* Cramer.

Cramer (Tom. II p. 12, & Plate CLXIX, figs. E, F) figures *Papilio tharos* and refers to Drury, Tom. I, pl. 12, figs. 5, 6. *Papilio tharos* Drury dates to 1773, *P. tharos* Cramer to 1777.

On the basis of Boisduval's statements, *Melitaea pulchella* must be considered a synonym of *Papilio tharos* Drury, and cannot replace *Phyciodes campestris* (Behr) 1863 even though the "type" of *pulchella* is a specimen of *campestris*.

## LITERATURE CITED

- BOISDUVAL, J. 1852. Ann. Soc. Entomol. France (2)10(2): 306, no. 4.  
 ———. 1869. Ann. Soc. Entomol. Belg. 12: 20, no. 50.  
 CRAMER, P. "1779" (1777). Uit. Kap., Tom II, p. 12, pl. CLXIX, figs. E, F.  
 DRURY, D. 1773. Illust. Nat. Hist., pl. 21, figs. 5, 6.  
 TILDEN, J. W. 1969 (1970). Concerning the names and status of certain North American members of the genus *Phyciodes*. J. Res. Lepid. 8(4): 94-98.

A NEW FOODPLANT RECORD FOR *SATYRIUM KINGI* (LYCAENIDAE)

Harris (1972, Butterflies of Georgia, Univ. Oklahoma Press) reports that John C. Symmes found and reared *Satyrium kingi* (Klots & Clench) on Flame Azalea (*Rhododendron calendulaceum*) in the Atlanta, Georgia area; but that H. L. King collected *kingi* at the type locality (Savannah, Georgia), where he saw females ovipositing on a small plant not related to azalea. Moreover, King noted that he found no native azalea plants in the area around where he collected his specimens. These facts, of course, suggest that *kingi* has more than one foodplant. More recently Gattelle (1974, J. Lepid. Soc. 28: 33-37) has raised the question of the relationship between possible subspecifically distinct populations of *kingi* and differences in the choice of foodplant in these different populations. More specifically, the inference might be made that the northern (inland or upland) population not only represents a subspecies distinct from the lowland (or coastal) population, but that the northern population may feed on a different foodplant from the lowland population.

I wish to report a second foodplant for the northern population of *kingi*, horse sugar tree, *Symplocos tinctoria* (L.). On 10 May 1966, on a ridge near the Chattahoochee River just north of Atlanta, Georgia, I found three larvae that were unfamiliar to me on a single bushy plant. The three larvae, along with an ample supply of the foodplant, were collected; and the larvae were reared at my home in Atlanta. On 17 May 1966 the first larva pupated and the other two pupated several days later. The first adult emerged on 28 May 1966 and the other two emerged several days later. Upon identifying the specimens as *Satyrium kingi*, I pressed a branch of the foodplant (which was still quite fresh even 18 days after it had been collected). The foodplant was later identified as horse sugar tree by Dr. Robert Godfrey, Department of Botany, Florida State University. The larvae I reared fit the general description given by Harris (loc. cit.), and were similar in appearance to a single larva of *Satyrium liparops* (Boisduval & Le Conte) which I collected almost a year later (2 April 1967) on wild cherry (*Prunus* sp.) less than 300 meters from the spot where the *kingi* larvae were found. The *liparops* larva pupated on 6 April 1967 and the adult emerged on 16 April 1967.

Single adult specimens of *kingi* were collected in the same general area of upland hardwoods on 3 June 1966 and 9 June 1967. Other members of the family Lycaenidae that I collected at the same location in 1966 and 1967 included *Chrysophanus titus mopsus* (Hübner) on 9 June 1967; *Satyrium edwardsii* (Grote & Robinson) on 9 June 1967; *Strymon melinus* (Hübner) on 9 June 1967; *Satyrium calanus falacer* (Godart) on 3 June 1966; *Calycopis cecrops* (Fabricius) on 17 April 1967; *Atlides halesus* (Cramer) on 13 March 1967; and *Callophrys augustinus croesides* (Scudder) on 13 March 1967.

J. C. FLOYD, 5106 Arrowhead Drive, Baytown, Texas 77520.