

species was fully in our mind when we visited Dr. Boisduval in Paris. In the collection of this savant is the typical specimen of Godart, and it is a specimen of *Thecla calanus*, nobis, for which we have used the name of *Thecla Edwardsii* as a synonym. But we are by no means satisfied that Mr. Scudder is right. Opinions may well differ as to a figure without description, which even Mr. Scudder finds faulty. It may be said with equal justice that Hubner's figure represents *T. calanus*, nob. (*T. Edwardsii*), and only where it is defective does it approach *T. inorata* (*T. calanus*, Scudder).

The chances are also against Hubner's having figured both sexes of the usually unspotted *T. inorata* with the spotted secondaries of *T. calanus*, nob. Leconte has certainly figured *T. inorata*, and as we stated before, Boisduval has used the specimen of Godart's *T. falacer* (*T. Edwardsii*, Saund.), while furnishing the text. Boisduval considered Leconte's plate as representing a form of *T. falacer*, Godart, and erroneously so, as Leconte figured for the first and only time *Thecla inorata*; Mr. Scudder's version of Hubner's plate to the contrary notwithstanding. We are at a loss to understand Mr. Scudder's remark, that we have come to an "erroneous conclusion respecting Boisduval and Leconte's plate, which, bad as it is, can certainly only represent *calanus*," (i. e. *T. inorata*). With the exception of the stricture, this accurately represents our published opinion with regard to that plate.

Dr. Boisduval cited Hubner's *calanus* in the text to *T. falacer*, because he considered, and in our opinion correctly, that Hubner's figure represented Godart's species, which latter he had before him. But that he mistrusted both Hubner's and Leconte's figures is very evident. He preferred Godart's later name and used his type.

With respect to the citations of Mr. Scudder, under the synonymy of the two species, there is much that is unnecessary as well as erroneous. Any reference to such an inaccurate compilation as that of Mr. Weidemeyer is a work of supererogation in a matter like the present. Leaving Hubner's figure on one side, we have Godart and Harris's description of *Thecla falacer*, and our own of *T. inorata* to fall back upon, so that the certain determination of the two species with all necessary citations is as follows:

THECLA INORATA:

Thecla inorata, G. and R. Descrip. Am. Lep. No. 3, p. 1, January, 1868.

Thecla falacer, Boisd. Lec. plate xxix., figs 1-5.

Thecla inorata, Saund. Can. Ent., Vol. II., 61-64; G. and R. Trans. Am. Ent. Soc. I. 172-3.

THECLA FALACER:

Thecla falacer, Godart Encyc. ix. 600, 633; Boisd. Lec. (text in part); Harris, Treat. Ins. Veg. Ed. 1862, 276.

Thecla Edwardsii, Saunders i. Litt. G. and R. Trans. Am. Ent. Soc. I. 172.

(?) *Rusticus armatus calanus*, Hubner, Exot. Schm. i., figs. 1-4.

Thecla calanus, Westw. Gen. Diurn. Lep. ii., 486; G. and R. Trans. Am. Ent. Soc. I. 172-3.