

ences relied on by Mr. Edwards," he refers to my plates and text in Vol. 2, B. N. A., 1875; and I should here say that when those plates were published, my information as to all these forms was very meagre, and very few examples were in collections. As to *Gigas*, I had never seen the male, and the only one known to be in any collection was the type specimen in the British Museum. So my figure was given from a drawing made for the purpose at the Museum, and it was badly coloured, and inadequately represented the under side of the hind wing, which in this genus is usually the most characteristic part of the insect. As to the female, it was copied from the best of three poor examples which I had from Mr. Crotch, and these were the only examples of the species in American collections. The figures of *Californica* and *Iduna* are well done. I intend before Vol. 3 closes to re-figure *Gigas*, and to give all the stages I may then be able to; and all the stages of the other two except the pupæ. As to *Nevadensis*, it is not a fourth species, though I let it stand alone, not knowing to which of the three it was intended to apply. It was impossible to decide from the very poor figure or the description. I rather thought it was meant to represent *Californica*, but Dr. Holland is confident that it was intended for *Gigas*. If this is so, apparently the name of the Vancouver species should be *Nevadensis*, as the catalogues date it 1867, whereas *Gigas* dates 1868. But Mr. Butler has informed me that Felder antedated by one year his species. It was really not published and on sale till 1868, and subsequent to the issue of the Cat. of Satyr., which figured and described *Gigas*, and so *Gigas* would have priority. A vast deal has been learned respecting these species since 1875, and they are now by no means uncommon in collections.

That Mr. Elwes is sometimes willing to allow that habitat and habits of flight are a factor in determining species, as well as distinct geographical ranges, appears in what he says of *Ivallda*, on p. 469:—"I was inclined to think *Ivallda* was a pale form of this (*Chryxus*), as I could not see any distinction but that of colour. Prof. Owen, however, who has taken both, assures me that the habitat and flight of the two differ; and, as the geographical range of *Ivallda*, which, so far as we know, is confined to the Sierra Nevada, in Placer County, California, and about Lake Tahoe, is quite distinct from that of *Chryxus*, which is not known to occur in the Rockies in the U. S., it may probably be looked on as a constantly distinct species." This is really sensible and to the point. Mr. Bruce had written me from Colorado, last summer, after spending a day