eye." Is the difference between the first and second of these as great as that between sharp six and flat seven of the musical scale?

The ratios said to exist between the lengths of fore, middle and hind tibiæ, are expressed definitely in numbers. If we reduce the fractions to common denominators in the usual way, that we may compare their numerators, we find the terms so large as to be unweildy. Let us change the fractions to tenths; the resulting numbers are, for ratios of fore tibiæ to hind tibiæ, $.6\frac{1}{4} + .6\frac{2}{3}$, .6 + .30, and $.7\frac{1}{2}$; for middle tibiæ to hind tibiæ, they are .8, $.8\frac{1}{3}$, $.8\frac{1}{3}$, .9 or 1.0—. The entire range of variation is less than one and one-half tenths in the first case, less than two-tenths in the second case. The difference between first and third, first series, is one-fortieth; between first and second is one-twenty-fourth. Are these differences, or even the sum of them, ultimate peculiarities of structure?

One item remains, the venation of the wings. The first superior branch of the subcostal nervure arises "in the middle of the outer two-thirds of the upper border of the cell"—is there any circumlocution in this?—" somewhat beyond the middle of the upper border of the cell," "at scarcely two-thirds the distance from the base to the apex of the cell," "a little beyond the middle of the upper border of the cell. In fractions, $\frac{2}{3}$, $\frac{1}{2}$ + , $\frac{2}{3}$ —, $\frac{1}{2}$ + .

How, then, does Lycæides differ from another, Glaucopsyche, for instance? 1. Its eyes are naked rather than delicately and sparsely pilose 2. It has about 32 rather than about 31 joints in with very short hairs. 3. Its palpi are a little less than twice, rather than a little more than one and a half times, as long as the eye. 4. The ratio of fore tibiae to hind tibiae is 14 rather than 14. 5. That of middle tibiae to hind 6. The 1st sup. branch of subcostal nervure tibiae is 34 rather than 35. arises at 18 rather than at 17 the length of the cell. Upon which of these six points rests the distinction between these genera? Will the integration of all these differentials with whatever may be implied in the shades of meaning between scarcely and barely, considerably and slightly, suffice to make a gross sum which amounts to more than a difference in the proportions of parts properly accounted for as specific? Why may not these find ample room and exact determination in the same genus? Any other of the six pairs which these four names would make, if taken two by two, gives a series of differences of the same nature and of equal weight. The discussion of any other of the tables which lie before us leads to conclusions equally forcible and equally direct. In this resuscitation of