APPENDIX.

I give the definitions of Sections and Genera of the Hesperidæ as sent by Dr. Speyer, with his notes. The last three Genera were not mentioned by him. It is proper to say that Dr. Speyer ascribed Thymelicus, Pyrgus and Nisoniades to Hübner, and Amblyscirtes and Pholisora to Scudder. I am compelled, however, to substitute for these authors the names of the first one who defined each of these genera, and in the case of Thymelicus and the last two named, for this reason, to Dr. Speyer himself. If there has been an earlier definition of Thymelicus I have not been able to find it, though the name has been used by many authors from Stephens to this day. Nisoniades (1816) being rejected as a coitus name, and, were that not enough, for want of satisfactory definition, though it was used and defined by Westwood (1852), would give way to Thanaos, Boisd. (1832). Mr. Butler, who uses the coitus names liberally, nevertheless employs Thanaos, Bd. with this explanation: "the genus Nisoniades cannot stand, as its type is an Achylodes." Ent. Mo. Mag. 7, 97.—E.

HESPERIDÆ.

SECTION I.

Tibiæ generally with spines, at least the middle ones; male always without costal fold; usually, a black, scaleless discoidal stripe (stigma) on fore wings.

Note.—I have been unable to find a sharp limit between the two principal divisions of Hesperidæ characterized by Mr. Scudder, (Buf. Bul. 1, 195), and I doubt if such an one exists, unless perhaps indicated by the—not examined by myself—presence or absence of the corneous sheath "at the posterior extremity of the alimentary canal" in the males, which Mr. Scudder gives as a difference. The costal fold, mentioned by him, is wanting in some species of his Hesperides. (Pyrgus *Sao*, *Orbifer*, etc., Thanaos *Marloyi*). Nevertheless though the first quoted character should not be prevailing, the two tribes of Mr. Scudder seem to me to possess some natural rights. Therefore I have tried at least to indicate them. It seemed to me most natural to begin the series with those genera which are related to the bulk of the other Rhopalocera by the non-existence of the tibial epiphysis and the spurs on the middle tibiæ; the more as there exists no costal fold. I will not contend that this arrangement is the most natural; such