

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS

J. R. J. LLEWELLYN JONES, M.A., F.R.E.S.

I have pleasure in welcoming the members of our Society to the 44th Annual Meeting and trust that our deliberations will be both profitable and interesting.

You have received the annual report of the Secretary-Treasurer. It shows a credit balance of \$11.34 after the payment of all bills presented up to the date of the closing of the books. However, in order to do this, it has been necessary, owing to the continued rise in the cost of publishing the PROCEEDINGS to borrow from the Reserve Endowment Fund. The accounts of this fund show a figure of \$76.17 which should be available for transfer to the Reserve, but unfortunately at the moment this cannot be done. You will at an appropriate time in our deliberations, be asked to approve some measure to enable this indebtedness to be met. The present value of the Reserve Endowment Fund is reported at \$85.00. We should try to increase this sum annually, if only by a small figure and so strengthen our Society's financial position.

It is reported that the increase in the cost of publishing the PROCEEDINGS is the chief factor at the moment in bringing about this somewhat unsound and certainly unfortunate situation. It will I am sure be agreed by most of us present that it is imperative that we should take measures to ensure that our publications compare favourably with similar ones put out by other societies both as regards the set up and the contents, and that we should make them as interesting and informative as our financial position will permit.

I notice that we are scheduled to hear a paper entitled "Our journal, The Proceedings" to be read by Mr. H. B. Leech and I hope that, after hearing this and after due consideration and discussion of our finances, a satisfactory motion will be passed to strengthen our position in this respect.

Let us consider during the short time at our disposal the use of scientific and popular names for insects. Being a lepidopterist, the examples which I shall give will be

from the Lepidoptera, though I have no doubt that many statements will also apply equally well in the case of other orders of insects.

Scientific names, both generic and specific, are for the most part derivations of Latin and Greek and are often found to be a combination of both. There are also names from other sources, some of doubtful origin, and others which do not appear to have any meaning.

However, in many cases, the scientific names give us certain information concerning the insect under consideration. For example a certain group of butterflies has been given the name *Polygonia*, a Greek derivative signifying many pointed or many angled, and it seems very appropriate as the wings of these insects are adorned with many indentations producing an almost ragged appearance. In the case of *Vanessa cardui* L. the specific name indicates that the larva feeds upon thistles. With *Hyphantria textor* Harr. the specific name points to the web constructed by the larvae. In other cases it will be noted that the specific name points to some locality or district or to some person. As examples of this may be cited, *Leptarctia californiae* Wlk. the californian tiger, *Feltia vancouverensis* Grt. the Vancouver dart, and *Tolype dayi* Blackmore, Day's lappet. In the cases of *Agrotis c. nigrum* L., *Calocalpe undulata* L. and *Bombycia rectifascia* Sm. it is to the markings on the wings that attention is drawn. Many names however are obscure and it is difficult, if not impossible, to discover any intelligible significance and this is very regrettable.

Authors should be most careful, when bestowing scientific names to ensure that the proposed name has some appropriate significance. This is important inasmuch as scientific names are by international agreement unchangeable once given; the oldest name taking precedence if it is not a homonym, and all others being reduced to the status of synonyms, subspecies, etc. It follows therefore that scientific names are the same in every language and in the

scientific literature of all countries and this is the strongest argument in favour of keeping them in active use.

For most people however, many of whom have not had the benefit of a "classical" education, or who know but little of science as a serious study, these names seem strange and bewildering, because they convey no intelligible meaning. They are known only to the initiated few. What then should we do with them? It is doubtful whether anyone would seriously consider the discontinuance of these names, but many might favour limitations in their use. It will be readily agreed that scientific names are appropriate during the deliberations of learned societies, in scientific literature, or in lecturing to students in scientific subjects. They should not be used, at any rate exclusively, in addresses or lectures given to the general public, in popular literature, or in general conversation with the average individual.

Consider the reaction of someone, who has brought for identification an insect, on being informed that he has caught a specimen of *Pseudothyatira cymatophor*-been *Pseudohazis eglanterina nuttalli* Stkr. Such a person is likely to be quite disappointed because he has not been told anything that he can understand. To him the names sound strange and foreign and he will doubtless forget them very quickly. Had English names been used and the enquirer told that his specimen was the "two-toned lutestring" or Nuttall's sheep moth (though I admit that the former is not one of the best examples of a popular name), interest would probably have been maintained. Especially would this be true of the young, who very often have a distaste for any scientific names, chiefly because they do not understand their meaning, and because they sound odd and unattractive. It will be agreed that we should not neglect nor forget the young people and they should be encouraged in every possible way to become interested in scientific studies and so fill up our ranks in the future.

That a case exists for a more general use of popular names will be granted by most people, but there are certain difficul-

ties to be faced. Popular names are sometimes rather fanciful and not always very appropriate. They are limited as to scope of circulation and possibly may vary from district to district, or province to province. Only a prolonged period of general use would correct this, the name gaining most popular favour being the one eventually accepted. This has now happened to some extent in Great Britain where English names have become standardized and are in quite general use for the macrolepidoptera at least.

As a basis for introducing popular names for the macrolepidoptera of this Province we have the check list prepared by the late E. H. Blackmore and published for the Provincial Museum in 1927. It contains, thanks to the efforts of Francis Kermode, a former Director of the Museum, popular names for nearly all the species found in this Province at that time.

Popular names are also found in W. J. Holland's "Butterfly Book" and in his "Moth Book", also in J. A. Comstock's book "The Butterflies of California." A scrutiny of these works will show a measure of agreement, though, as is to be expected, there are a few differences. For instance *Vanessa atalanta* L. generally known as the red admiral and so called by Holland and Blackmore, is by Comstock named the alderman, who states that this is an old English name for it, though at the same time admitting that it is less familiar and justifying his choice by stating that he wishes "to avoid confusion with the true admirals of the Genus *Basilarchia*." These he names the admirals but they are better called the white admirals as is done by Holland and Blackmore. However, *Vanessa cardui* L. is called the painted lady by all three, and this is a well established name. Among the moths *Aemelia roseata* Wlk. is named by Holland the rosy aemilia but by Blackmore the rosy tiger; the latter is to be preferred.

Speaking generally of the Blackmore list, the popular names there given follow closely those adopted by British writers in cases where either the genera or species occur in both areas and this would seem satisfactory, embodying as it does some

well established names. We find the Sphingidae designated by the well known term hawk-moths. However for the genus *Hemaris* of this same family the name clearwing has been used to replace the bee hawks of British authors. This would seem regrettable as it may cause confusion with another large group of lepidoptera, now relegated to a position close to the microlepidoptera, for which the name clearwings is extensively used in Britain. The name tiger has been used for the subfamily Arctiinae and this is a well established popular name. Here we find one slight variation. *Arctia caja* L. is known in Great Britain as either the garden tiger or the common tiger. Blackmore terms our local sub-species *Arctia caja americana* Harr. the great tiger, probably wishing to draw attention to the status of our insect as a sub-species. Moths of the family Notodontidae are styled prominents, also in accord with British writers, having reference to the humps and excrescences found adorning many of the larvae in this group. Species of the genus *Cerura* have been termed kittens carrying on a tradition handed down by British lepidopterists whereby a large species of moth of an allied genus *Dicranura vinula* was called the puss moth and species of the genus *Cerura*, being similar both in the larval and perfect stages but at the same time being much smaller, were called kittens. The origin of the name puss moth is thought by some to be due to the curious habit of the larva when disturbed of hunching its back much after the manner of an infuriated cat under similar circumstances. Also it may be noted that the colouring of the moths much resembles that of a pale tabby cat, in many of the species comprising this group.

Among the geometers or loopers, moths of the genus *Hydriomena* have been styled highflyers. Holland gives no popular name here. Those of the genus *Eupithecia* have been dubbed pugs. Both are well established names for these genera.

We would do well to study the popular names which we already have more carefully and try to make wider use of them, hoping that where there are diversities of name for one insect, usage will eventually decide the issue.

In cases where there are no popular names, such a name should be given. It should be a comparatively simple one and should preferably describe or point to some peculiarity or notable feature in the insect during one of its stages. As an example, the family Drepanidae were named hook-tips because in many of the species the primaries have hooked tips.

Care however should be exercised not to produce a meaningless name, which might easily happen by attempting a mere translation of the scientific one. The best popular names in use are in no way translations. There is a valuable list of over a thousand names ("Common names of insects approved by the American Association of Economic Entomologists." Jour. Econ. Ent. 35(1):83-101. February 1942), approved by a committee of both the A.A.E.E. and the Entomological Society of America. This paper lists the insects alphabetically, first by their common names, then by their scientific ones, and is thus an excellent quick reference medium. Copies may be obtained from the business manager of the A.A.E.E., Dr. E. N. Cory, College Park, Maryland, U.S.A.

To conclude: both scientific and popular names are desirable, but care must be taken to use the appropriate one at the opportune moment and on a suitable occasion.

LIMONIUS RUFIHUMERALIS IN BRITISH COLUMBIA (Coleoptera: Elateridae).—Some specimens of the red-shouldered *Limonius* placed as *crotchi* (Horn) in collections, prove to be the recently described *L. rufihumeralis* Lane (1941. Pan-Pacific Ent. 17 (3): 133-139). Examples of this species in the Hopping

Collection are labelled as follows: Vernon, June 5, 1921, and May 1, 1924 (Ralph Hopping); Aspen Grove, May 30, 1931 (H. Richmond), and June 4, 1931 (J. R. Howell); Midday Val., Merritt, June 14, 1926 (Wm. Mathers); Trinity Valley, June 25, 1929 (J. R. Howell).—Hugh B. Leech.