

ignore the British Museum Lists from their defective composition has been answered by us, with subsequent American lepidopterists, in the negative. I may say that American lepidopterists have made visits at a considerable sacrifice to London for the main purpose of finding out what Mr. Walker described, and they have always accepted cheerfully the result of these visits. It was necessary to build up in America a stable, specific nomenclature. As to the generic, it will always be unstable, partly from the difference in opinion as to what constitutes a genus, partly that here tradition has been stronger than priority. In vain I have shown that *Jaspidea* is older than *Bryophila*, *Heliophila* than *Leucania*, *Graphiphora* than *Taeniocampa*. At least the acceptance of these names is but partial, and I myself have hesitated to use two of them. The necessity for a stable basis for our specific nomenclature is clearly greater than necessity for ideal justice towards this or that American describer, and he must bear his synonym, as he has to bear other injustice in this world. One word as to the employment of double names in the Noctuidæ, and I have done. It is extremely desirable that no two Noctuids should bear the same specific title. The value of a Check List is largely dependent on the carrying out of this rule. Guenée went so far as to change all double names. In the more than seven hundred species of N. Am. Noctuidæ I have described, I have never used a name twice except by accident. Of late there has been an unnecessary duplication of such names. The coat of ice, which the works of European writers on North American Lepidoptera laid upon our knowledge of the scientific titles of our insects has been broken, and to this freeing of our literature I have assisted to the extent of my ability. A responsibility now rests with future American students that they keep the current clear and take large and philosophical views in their classifications.

OVIPOSITING OF MELITÆA CHALCEDON IN PAPER ENVELOPES.

BY RICHARD E. KUNZE, M. D., NEW YORK, N. Y.

In March number, Vol. XXIV, of CANADIAN ENTOMOLOGIST, Mr. W. G. Wright, of California, mentions a number of genera of diurnals not requiring plants for ovipositing thereon. Those enumerated belong to *Parnassius*, *Argynnis*, *Euptoieta*, *Neonympha*, *Cœnonympha*, *Hipparchia*,