

In May, 1904, my brother, Mr. Harry Cook, called my attention to the fact that some of the males (as proclaimed by the genitalia) were *without the stigma*. As many specimens were taken as the lateness and unfavourableness of the season permitted, and all the material collected in former years was again carefully sexed. This resulted in a complete readjustment of the previously accepted form-series, and brought order out of chaos (at least among the males).

Correlated in every instance with the absence of the discal stigma are characters which clearly distinguish these males from typical *irus*. The most striking are: (1) the uniform blackish-brown of the basal half of the secondaries beneath; (2) the definiteness of the boundary of this area and its almost equal projection between the median nervules (in *irus* this projection is constantly greater between the second and third than between the first and second); (3) the continuity of the extramesial line running from the costal margin of the primaries—under surface—to the first median nervule (in *irus* this is represented by a series of short dashes between the nervules, which, being at different distances from the outer margin, give the appearance of a much broken or crenulate line). I moreover failed to find any androconia at all on the individuals without the stigma. There are other differences between the two series quite as noticeable, but not constant enough to serve as distinguishing characters.

On a basis of the three constant and best differentiated characters of the males, the females were separated very satisfactorily, and in their turn exhibited correlative differences of minor importance.

The above generalizations are made from sixty-three specimens.

It is to be noted that the series thus removed from *I. irus* agrees in detail with the description of *I. Henrici*, as published by Grote and Robinson in 1867 (Trans. Am. Ent. Soc., I, 174). Scudder has sunk *Henrici* as a synonym; Dyar retains the name, regarding the forms as distinct.

The original description fails to mention the stigma, although it seems reasonable to believe that the absence of so obvious a mark would have attracted the attention of two such experienced observers as the authors, especially since its absence from the ♀ of another species is remarked in the same paper (p. 173).

Edwards, who bred what he thought to be a *Henrici* (*Papilio*, I., 150-152)—the description of the early stages of which has since passed, with many, for a description of the early stages of *irus*—was certainly