

Lepidoptera go, there is no case where a natural genus does not show its distinctive characters in the preparatory stages, either in all of them, or part. There is no more natural genus than *Colias*, and it seems to me enough that the differences in the imagos should be indicated by groups merely. A group may stand for a sub-genus, but the differences in *Colias* are hardly enough to make sub-genus of. Therefore, I do not approve of the genus *Megonostoma*, created by Reakirt in 1863 to accommodate *Eurydice* and *Cæsonia*, and a supposed species called by Mr. Reakirt *Helena*, but which is a variety of one of the others. Mr. Reakirt was, at that date, a zealous collector, but, like myself, was but a beginner, and undertook to generalize in this case on very slight grounds. His most important character for the new genus consisted "in peculiar appendages, found on the middle and posterior legs of the female," to which he gives the name *Eupronychia*. "To be found on the under side of the tarsi, respectively, at two-thirds and three-fourths of their length, as two small membraneous appendages, each being tri-jointed." And nearly a whole page of the Proc. Ent. Soc., Phil., Vol. II., is devoted to a description and elaborate measurements of those appendages, running into the hundred thousandths of a millimeter. Now, I never was able to find in any example of *Cæsonia* or *Eurydice* any such appendages, and I recollect very well that at the time this genus was made known, another lepidopterist said the appendages were merely spiculæ from some flower, probably of *Asclepias*. Recently I made a fresh examination and have found nothing, though I have a great many females of these species to make examination of. Desiring the observations of some one besides myself, I wrote Mr. E. M. Aaron, at Phil., asking him to subject examples to the action of a powerful microscope. He replied: "After a careful examination of a number of specimens, I fail to find anything that will answer to Reakirt's *Eupronychia*. It would seem that this characteristic is worthless, at least. The microscope used is a most powerful one." In the other characters cited by Mr. Reakirt—as eyes, oval, projecting, &c., &c.—there is nowhere a generic distinction. *Eurydice* and *Cæsonia* have falcate fore wings, but that is not a generic difference, else *Papilio Rutulus* would have to be separated from *P. Turnus*. Between the imagos of these two species and *Eurytheme* and *Philodice* are resemblances which bind them closely together, and which can have come only from a common ancestor: as the discal spots, the sub-marginal points on under side, the spots at base of hind wings, and the patches at outer