produced apically, the hind margin convex (in Bellona it is concave or sinuous), the base less obscured, beneath paler." If these characters are not enough on which to found a species, or separate two species, how much further must we look? But in addition there are other separating characters.

What are we to think of a transient visitor on the strength of his desultory experience "going through" such collections as he had access to, pencil in hand and carpet bag in the hall, and of his "authentically named" specimens from "experienced collectors," making a list after this fashion? Confessing at every step that he is lost, groping his way by query marks, uncertain whether to call a thing a var. or a good species; but, all the same, putting each incomprehensible form under something else. He laments his trouble, but can't approve of Edwards' way of getting over the difficulty (Elwes' difficulty) by creating other species, p. 566. Everywhere trans. ad Zerene, vel Edwardsii, vel Monticola, vel Behrensii, vel Callippe, vel Meadii, one species half the time trans. to at least two others. The result of this floundering is a paper and list on the lines of, and level with, Strecker's Catalogue! With a difference, however, in favor of Mr. Strecker: that no matter how ignorant he is, he never allows it, but is cock sure that Cybele and Leto and Nokomis are but the same thing; and Colias Eriphyle, Philodice and Eurytheme; and Satyrus Nephele, Ariane, Boopis, Gabbii, Alope, Pegala, Wheeleri, all one (vide Cat.). We do not find him dealing in query marks or alternatives. Such assurance is at least refreshing in contrast with the painful uncertainty and confusion of this paper.

Indefinite knowledge is definite ignorance, but when one is in the latter state, why take the world into his confidence?

I suppose, before Darwin, all naturalists were perforce lumpers of species. Each species was a little world with its group of satellites. But, since 1861, the view is changed, and in this country lumpers are nearly as scarce as dodes.

I myself am the reverse of a lumper in my method of work, and as I have always avowed the fact, my position is well understood. "I apprehend," says Prof. Owen, "that few naturalists nowadays, in describing and proposing a name for what they call 'a new species," use that term to signify what was meant by it twenty or thirty years ago. " * * * The proposer