

ing the insect as *erato*, and overlooking our Synonymical Catalogue. In his larger work on the Sphingidæ Dr. Boisduval adopts our name for the insect and again overlooks the fact that we had described the species nearly *three years* previous to our acquaintance with himself (though he quotes our work), and supposes that we have chosen a fresh name for the species, when we had never heard of the name *erato* until Dr. Boisduval published it, and, moreover, we had credited the name *phaeton* to him in 1865! How the misunderstanding came about it is now difficult to say. Perhaps Mr. Weidemeyer or Dr. Behr can give the proper light as to where the name *phaeton* came from. I have previously suggested either that the name *phaeton* came from Lorquin or Dr. Behr, or that a transposition of names occurred between Dr. Boisduval and the Californian Entomologists. That Lorquin gave names to species which Dr. Boisduval adopted as his own in some cases is, I think, suggested in the case of the species of *Nemeophila* and others, where the insects are named after the food plants. It is evident that Walker has used Dr. Boisduval's MSS. names without credit. With regard to mistakes of names by transposition, the student need only be reminded of the error with regard to *Oeneis semidea* and an *Aegerian* (See Scudder, Proc. Ent. Soc. Phil., 1865, 13, and elsewhere). As to Dr. Boisduval's inattention to previously published papers Mr. A. G. Butler says this "author's worst fault is a too great appreciation of his own MS. names, for which he does not scruple to sacrifice both genera and species long described by other authors." I do not think, in conclusion, that there can be the slightest ground for the suspicion that we intended any wrong in the matter of the name of this species, since we gave Dr. Boisduval full credit for the manuscript name *phaeton*, giving him precedence in the synonymy, a fact which it suits Mr. Strecker to omit. There remains also no doubt that the correct name of the species is *phaeton*, since our original description is perfectly recognizable and since Dr. Boisduval himself adopts this name in his important work on the Sphingidæ in preference to his own later name of *erato*, giving us credit for the species. I do not think that it will be possible to consider the species either a *Macroglossa* or a *Proserpinus*, and that the generic name *Euproserpinus* must stand.

I feel also at liberty to state, what many of Mr. Strecker's readers may have suspected, that there is a very different reason for his personal attacks upon me than that they are called for by my publications. But I am quite confident that in all my writings I have endeavored to give full