

CORRESPONDENCE.

SIR,—I am glad to note that Mr. H. H. Lyman, in his review of my paper on the Argynnis of North America, sums up the matter so well in his last paragraph, wherein he states that "The whole paper shows that much more knowledge is needed before a satisfactory revision of the very difficult North American forms can be made." That is just what the author thought, and why the paper was not called, or thought to be, a *Revision of the genus Argynnis*.

When first written, it was to be read before the Chicago Entomological Society, to my especial friends who knew of my interest in the genus, and the paper was called "A Contribution to the Better Knowledge of the genus Argynnis." The author does not want his friends to think that he has yet attempted to completely solve the Argynnis puzzle, and takes this opportunity to say that any satisfactory revision must be accompanied by plates in natural colours, showing both the upper and under side of each species, a work which can only be accomplished successfully at great expense of time and money.

The author is not a believer in the infallibility of those who name species. His collection contains specimens which have been given three different names by three men supposed to know the species of the genus Argynnis, and specimens taken "in coitu" have been called different species by well-versed students of the genus. What was stated as the polygamous habits of the members of the genus was given as partial proof of what the author believes to be a fact, that many so-called species are varieties or hybrids. He did not, however, feel justified, without further proof, in "relegating a number of names to the synonymy."

Reference was made to the polygamous habits simply to make plain the fact that some of the so-called species are freaks, the result of hybridism. Naturalists, especially closet naturalists, who do not consider it worth their time to study specimens alive, may reach dogmatic conclusions which are entirely satisfactory to themselves, yet which are based on study of a few poor specimens, or even a single individual. The past summer has added to the evidence for hybridism. A correspondent in the field wrote me: "Collecting yesterday where Eurynome was rather abundant, in two instances I found a male Eurynome paying court to females of a dark species double its size, or about same size as Aphrodite. If it is usual for Eurynome to form attachments outside of the species, it may account for several allied forms." This writer is a live naturalist,