

able to induce her to walk on to them every thirty seconds. Six times she returned to the gauze immediately; at the seventh trial she oviposited (2.12) on *V. corymbosum* (calyx). The same course was followed again, and resulted in seven returns to the gauze, and an egg (2.16) on *vacillans* (corolla); then seven returns and another egg on *vacillans* (calyx). The butterfly then refused twenty successive invitations to oviposit, and upon being left undisturbed took up a position on the netting, concealing the primary wings as far as possible between the secondaries, which also hid the abdomen. This appeared to signify that the performance was ended, and, as my duties called me away, I made note of the location of each of the five eggs, and brought my observation to a close.

The growing plant oviposited upon between 11.40 a.m. and 1.40 p.m. was searched (as was also the box and netting), with the result that seven eggs, besides the one first noticed, were found as follows: terminal leaf-bud of longer stem, 4 (2 at base of inner leaf, on lower surface; 2 close together at apex of outer leaf, on upper surface); terminal flower-bud of shorter stem, 2 (at base of cluster, on scales); next lower flower-bud, same stem, 1 (same position).

Two days later another confined female laid an unfertilized egg on the calyx of a *vacillans* flower, and this may be assumed to be the location usually selected when the buds are sufficiently open, otherwise the eggs are placed on the scales of flower-buds, and possibly also on those of leaf-buds.

Number of Eggs.—Edwards obtained fifteen eggs; my female yielded thirteen, and the butterfly dissected in 1905 contained fourteen.

The Egg.—In my discussion of *Incisalia irus* I stated* that the "only published account of the early stages of that species, *except Scudder's description and figures of the egg*" (and, I neglected to add, his description of the larva at birth, the figure of its head, and the coloured illustration of the chrysalis), was to be found in the work of Boisduval and Leconte. As I have pointed out, Scudder borrowed Edwards's descriptions of the other larval instars and of the pupa of *Henrici*, and applied them to *irus* under the impression that they were one and the same species. He did not quote Edwards's description of the egg, but gave his own, based undoubtedly upon personal examination.† There would be nothing

*CANADIAN ENTOMOLOGIST, Vol. XXXVIII, No. 6 (June, 1906), p. 181.

†Dr. Scudder says that he has "in two instances known eggs to be laid by females (*irus*) shut up in chip boxes." Presumably one or more of these furnished the basis of the description and figures.