as *Idalia*. Suppose I had followed the example of the lumpers and *Cipris* had been overlooked altogether! What gain would have accrued?

I will lay down another rule that is infallible in Argynnis. species has its own style of silver spots, and there is practically no variation throughout the species, or in the range of it. Coronis Behr. abounds in South California, flies in all the intervening States to Montana, and in Oregon and Washington, and varies as much in coloration of both surfaces as any American species. But take it where we may, the great eggshaped spots are always the same. It does not follow, though, that every specimen with egg-shaped spots is therefore a Coronis. Cybele always has silver spots of its own type; so has Leto, so Nokomis. In no case does one of these species approach the other. In Macaria the spots are at their maximum, in Chitone at their minimum; yet, in the list, both are put down as vars. of one other species. I would commend a careful course of study in these points to the author of the paper.

Mr. Elwes is sure that Mr. Edwards "will one day regret" having "in his earlier years created a great number of synonymus." I am sorry that he should be pained on my account. I am as much of a sinner in my later years as in my earlier, and have within a week described two species of Argynnis, which Mr. Elwes will regard as either "vars. or bona sp., or trans. ad Zerene." "His later views, as expressed in such papers as he has written on P. Napi and its vars., and in Lyc. Pseudar giolus, give evidence of a correct appreciation of the variation of species," for which condescending and patronizing approval I am duly grateful. But the illustration of L. Pseudargiolus is not so pat as was intended. named both L. Violacca and Neglecta as species, and figured them as such in Vol I., Butt. But, when eggs were got, the whole curious and complicated relationship was made out, and these forms and several others were proven to be polymorphic forms of the one species Pseudargiolus. And I will venture to say I proceeded scientifically from first to last.

With regard to *P. Napi*, all I attempted to do was to show how a parent species could originate distinct derivative forms, and though I called all *Napi*, yet the derivatives, every one of them, are good and true species, or dimorphic forms of species, breeding true, not intermixing, and in the next edition of my Catalogue I shall put them down as such. I think I can see how the derivation from a single form occurred, but the derivatives are now species, and at present entirely separated from the parent *Napi*.