

---

CHRYSOPHANUS THOE OF GRAY — WHY IS IT NOT  
C. HYLLUS, CRAMER?

BY A. G. BUTLER, PH. D., BRITISH MUSEUM, LONDON, ENGLAND.

In my Catalogue of Fabrician Diurnal Lepidoptera, p. 173, I (in 1869) unhesitatingly identified examples of a *Chrysophanus* in the British Museum collection with Cramer's *Papilio hyllus*, and at the present time I do not see the slightest valid reason for altering that decision.

In his "Butterflies of the Eastern United States," Dr. Scudder, at the end of his synonymy of *Chrysophanus thoe*, says, "Not *Papilio hyllus*, Cram.;" but, in his account of the species, I find no reason adduced for this assumption, though I can readily believe that the incorrect locality, "Smyrna," given by Cramer, and the somewhat careless drawing of the spots across the disk of primaries, may have influenced him.

That *C. hyllus* is not a European type, in the Staudingerian sense of the term, may be concluded from the fact that it is excluded from Staudinger's Catalogue, and I think I may safely affirm that there is no European species which at all nearly approaches it. On the other hand, anyone acquainted with the utter unreliability of many of Cramer's localities for his species, and with the unequal merit of his drawings, would have no hesitation in at once pronouncing his figures of *P. hyllus* to be a representation of the female of *C. thoe*.

If *C. hyllus* and *C. thoe* are not one and the same species, what is Cramer's insect? Ruhl, in his "Palæarktischen Gross-schmetterlinge," 1892, ignores it entirely; indeed, by general consent, the students of European and allied butterflies are decided as to its having nothing to do with the fauna of Asia Minor or Europe.

If, therefore, *C. hyllus* is not *C. thoe*, it must be an extinct species closely related to the latter, for there is nothing else in the least approaching it. If this conclusion commends itself to American Lepidopterists, well and good, but they must not mind being classed with those who consider it "folly to be wise."