

group under a genus. At first sight it may sometimes seem to do so, the species being assorted in twos and threes, but it will be found that whether the coitus embraces two or twenty species, the butterflies under it are most likely such as belong to distinct genera, and sometimes so distinct that one hundred or two hundred pages of Kirby's Catalogue separate them. And an instance of this mis-assortment is found in the coitus *Brenthis*. Under this head are ranged five species, viz., *hecate*, *dictynna*, *thore*, *daphne* and *claudia*, the latter as much out of place in such company as a horse in a drove of asses. But the horse is dapple and the asses are dapple, each has one tail and two ears, and behold a Hübnerian coitus ! The definition of *Brenthis* is "the hind wings below gaily clouded, pale spotted," and it is ranged under the first family of the fifth stirps. This family is called Reticulatæ, and embraces two coitus only, viz., *Phyciodes*, under which our *tharos* comes, and *Brenthis*. The definition of the family is thus given : "The wings above striped like a grating ; the hind wings below spotted with colored spots on a pale yellow ground, marked with eye-like spots." *Thore*, an European species very much like our *bellona*, and congeneric with it as *myrina* is with *euphrosyne*, is placed in *Brenthis*, along with *claudia*, and these are separated from the batch which includes *myrina*, not merely by the limits of a coitus, but of a family even, in order to get them among the Reticulatæ by the side of *tharos*. This next family, the Phalaratæ, is thus defined : "The wings differently spotted, the under side ornamented with pearl-colored spots." And the first coitus under it is *Argynnis*, the definition of which is : "the hind wings below variegated, spotted with shining white." Under this coitus comes *euphrosyne*, and therefore *myrina*, included in this loose definition solely because it has white spots. Two more coitus are made, called *Issoria* and *Acidalia*, which include the larger species of *Argynnis* (not Hübner's), *lathonia*, *cybele*, *diana*, &c. Of these absurd divisions, Mr. Edward Doubleday (Remarks on the genus *Argynnis*) says : "they are so unnatural that they can in no case be adopted."

But suppose these batches were not unnatural, but were co-extensive with genera, how comes *myrina*, which, as it agrees with *euphrosyne*, is placed by Hübner under *Argynnis*, filling in some little degree the requirements of that coitus, to be remanded to the coitus *Brenthis*, which belongs to another family even, placed along side of *Phyciodes tharos*, and the requirements of which coitus it does not fill at all ? It is an unwarranted use of Hübner's name, applying it to what he expressly says it shall not be applied. It is taking one of his blue taws and dropping it among the