

A REPLY TO MR. W. H. EDWARDS.

BY H. J. ELWES, COLESBORNE, CHELTENHAM, ENGLAND.

I did not suppose that anything I wrote on North American Butterflies was likely to find favour in Mr. Edwards's eyes, but in a long criticism of my paper on *Æneis*, which I have just seen in the CANADIAN ENTOMOLOGIST, there are two or three points on which he has so much misunderstood or misrepresented me that I cannot pass them by, as I shall do the greater part of his remarks, as unworthy of notice.

As to the specific distinction of *Californica*, *iduna* and *gigas*, I could find nothing in Mr. Edwards's own figures or writings to guide me in separating them, and now I only see that he relies on Messrs. Wright and Fletcher, as he has seen none of them in life himself. It is quite possible that there is as much variation in the larva as in the imago, and if there is any invariable character by which they can be known apart, I am just as ready to admit it as in the case of *ivallda*. Only I must wait for Mr. Edwards to show it, which he has not yet done, so far as I am capable of judging.

Next, with regard to *Uhleri* and *varuna*; I quite admit that one and the same species of *Æneis* is not likely to fly on low, grassy plains and on alpine peaks, though I have taken both *Parnassius smintheus* and *Erebia epirosodea* in quite as dissimilar situations. But where did I say that *varuna* was found on alpine peaks? Kananaskis, though 4,000 feet above sea-level, is just such a grassy level valley in the mountains as *Uhleri* frequents in Colorado, and the elevation of 4,000 feet there is, with regard to timber line, equal to about 7,000 or 8,000 feet in Colorado—just the level at which *Uhleri* seems most abundant. It is *Uhleri*, as Mr. Edwards says, and so are the specimens found at other localities farther east in Alberta. If they have a difference sufficient to distinguish them it is for Mr. Edwards to define the range of both and give us something more definite than he has done as differential characters.

Now we come to *Æno* Bvd. a name which I have ignored, because I cannot identify it certainly with any species. Mr. Edwards, having adopted the name on other people's authority, feels bound, I suppose, to support it. But it is not consistent of him after doing so to refuse to recognize the much better evidence I have given for the identification of the name *subhyalina*; simply, as it seems, because he prefers to suppose that the type is not really the specimen described by Curtis. He says that it was described sixty years ago, and "in course of sixty odd years