

I could have shown Mr. Elwes the points of difference in difficult sub-groups, and could have named all his specimens "authentically." But he preferred to take counsel of this and that "collector," with the plain result that his specimens are not named "authentically," and that his collection must be a hopeless jumble. It is clear as can be from his list that in half the cases he does not know what he is talking of. For example: "*A. Aphrodite*, *A. Cybele*, *A. Alcestis*, *A. Cipris*, *A. Halcyone*. This is a group of species or forms which are extremely hard to define; and though Edwards and Scudder, and most other North American Entomologists, agree in keeping them separate, I think it is very difficult, if not impossible, to identify them, unless you know their habitat." (One would think that such cases were unheard of elsewhere. Habitat is an important aid in determining between closely allied species, and zoologists in every branch, and botanists, take it into consideration.) I have a pretty good series of all, except *Cipris*, which must be very close to, if not identical with *Alcestis*, etc." Plainly, he does not know *Cipris* then, a species closer to *Aphrodite* than to *Alcestis*. "Either such experienced collectors as Morrison or Geddes did not know *Aphrodite* when they saw it out of its usual range, or *Scudder and Edwards are mistaken*." Truly, it does look so. However, it is not remarkable that the collectors named did not distinguish *Cipris*, inasmuch as, in their day of collecting, it had not been separated. "Mr. Edwards perhaps would say that my *Halcyone*, which were sent by Mr. Strecker, and taken near Denver, are not true to name; but what can they be from that locality?" Here it seems that locality helps him to decide on a species. "What can they be?" I can answer this pathetic appeal: *Halcyone* is not "taken near Denver," but *Cipris* is, and Mr. Elwes was viewing a *Cipris* undoubtedly. Now *Halcyone* does not belong to the *Aphrodite* sub-group, as anyone can see by the figure of the female in Butt. N. A., vol. 3, part IX. It has the peculiar cut of wings of *Edwardsii*, and great egg-shaped silver spots. So, here are two species our author is at fault about.

And he is bothered with *Chitone*, "sent by H. Edwards from Nevada," which "does not agree with W. H. Edwards' description on the under side" (which is the important side), "and is nearer *Nevadensis*." He never saw *Chitone*, a species not taken in Nevada, but in Southern Utah and in Weber Mountains, and totally different on both sides from *Nevadensis*.