

species at Wooster, Ohio, where it had for several years been excessively abundant, even up to the latter part of August and early September of last year, 1899. This abrupt termination of the period of activity was at the time attributed to the effect of a parasitic species, *Ichneutes*, sp. ?, which had in the meantime become also excessively abundant.

Although the purslane has grown luxuriantly and is unusually abundant this year, so much so that gardeners are complaining bitterly of its abundance and vigour, up to September but a single female *Schizocerus* has been observed, and but a single instance of the work of the larvæ noted, though the writer has searched most carefully for both during the entire season. In fact, it was hoped this year that the full life-history of the species might be carefully gone over again and completely studied, but this has unexpectedly been rendered impossible.

#### BOOK NOTICE.

THE ARGYNNIDS OF NORTH AMERICA.—To Mr. Arthur J. Snyder we are indebted for a paper published in the Occasional Memoirs of the Chicago Entomological Society, Vol. I., No. 1, 1900, on the much-vexed question of the Argynnidæ of North America.

The author follows Doubleday, Westwood, Edwards, Elwes and others in rejecting the division of the group, made by some systematists, into the two genera, *Argynnis* and *Brenthis*, as he considers this division based on "hair-splitting distinctions." In referring to the range of the genus, he is not quite correct in saying that the group is wholly unrepresented in the tropics, as one species, *A. Hanningtoni*, was collected near Mount Kilimanjaro, in tropical Africa, by the lamented Bishop Hannington, and was dedicated to his memory by Mr. Elwes.

The author states that he "has on several occasions taken the sexes of different species *in coitu*, and from personal observations satisfied himself that the Argynnidæ are polygamous in their habits," and a little further down he says, "*Artonis* and *Eurynome* cohabit, also *Eurynome* and *Clio*. The same is undoubtedly true of several other species."

Surely this is a railing accusation to bring against these unfortunate creatures who have never had it explained to them that they are really different species and should behave as such, and certainly shows a sublime faith in the infallibility of the authors who have named these forms as distinct to which the reviewer, possibly because he was born on St. Thomas's day, has never been able to attain.