

term *Basilarchia* should be retained. On the other hand I think Mr. Scudder's divisions of *Argynnis* and *Lycæna* are not valid, as now shown by Prof. Peabody and others. I hope Mr. Scudder will not retain these, and also that he will be guided by Dr. Speyer's classification of the *Hesperidae*. These latter afford good, apparent, readily understood generic characters as we understand these in the moths, and there is nothing gained by making too many genera out of them on "measurements." These latter are now proved to be illusory, and should not be again brought forward. As to the general arrangement of the families, the arrangement of Meigen and others, commencing with the groups in which the front legs are useless for walking, and which are taken out of the ambulatory series, has an approved philosophic basis. It is warranted under Prof. Dana's theory of cephalization. Mr. Scudder's paper on the structure of *Papilio* in the Transactions of the American Entomological Society, has not been answered. I think the caterpillars of *Papilio* are of a lower type than those of the rest of the true butterflies, and that there are no reasons for placing the "Swallow Tails" at the head of the rest except that they are large and showy insects. The structure of the feet is evidently of importance no less than the method of pupation, and this is recognized consistently in Mr. Scudder's arrangement. There is certainly no system in commencing with the groups with six walking legs, then following with those of four, and winding up again with those with six. The moths have generally six walking legs, and the abortive front pair may be consistently regarded as a later phase. I have great confidence in Mr. Edwards's remarks as to genera, that these can be traced in all stages from the egg upwards, and in this respect it would be well if Mr. Scudder, for the sake of reason, which, as Zschokke says, is the "daylight of the mind," would abate from hair-splitting. But I have great regard for Mr. Scudder's general appreciation of classificatory characters and those which point to higher or lower rank and which determine the confines of large groups, and on this head it would be well if Mr. Edwards relented from his present views. There is then, to my mind, a possible agreement between the two authorities, and that such an agreement would be of great value cannot be doubted. Where there is any reasonable principle involved, I advise neither to give way. Time, Mr. Strecker's friend, must level such differences by throwing more light on the subject. But much that divides the two scientists lies in the