

considered as the equivalent. I believe that Fabricius' use of the term *Papilio* will not allow us to follow Mr. Scudder's. I remain of the opinion that the older writers before Schrank sufficiently expressed their ideas as to the typical section of the genus, and that the term should be used for a genus of which the European *P. machaon* is the type. As we cannot use *Eugonia*, Hubn., of which *angelica*, Cramer, is the type, I propose the term *Scudderia* for the *Pap. antiopa* of Linnæus.

12. AGLAIS *Dalm.*—This I think we may adopt without hesitation and be thankful for the pretty name.

13. VANESSA, *Fabr.* 14. JUNONIA, *Hubn.* 15. EUPTOIETA, *Doubl.*—The values of these terms have not been altered. The seven genera among which our fritillaries are divided, I think we must agree are tenable. To *Euphydryas* I refer *Melitæa chalcedon*, Boisd., from California.

23. LIBYTHEA, *Fabr.*—We are unfeignedly glad Kirtland's term is retained and that we are not to be vexed by another of Boisduval and Leconte's unfulfilled intentions.

24. CALEPHELIS, *G. & R.*—Mr. Scudder uses erroneously *Polystichtis*. In the *Verzeichniss*, Hubner identifies with an exclamation mark *Papilio fatima*, Cram., 271, A. B., and regards this as the type of *Polystichtis*. It is from Surinam. Our two species from the Atlantic District are generically distinct from the S. American forms. Hubner considers that "*Pap. cereus*" of Linn. is this species of Cramer's, and prefers that name, but this identification may not be correct. Retain *Polystichtis* for the S. American forms, but there is no excuse for stating that "*Papilio cænius*" is the "type" of *Polystichtis*. We were familiar with Hubner some time ago. We doubt that Linnæus intended our *N. pumila* under his "*cereus*," "*cerea*," or "*cænius*." We propose to designate our two species as *Cal. pumila* and *C. borealis*.

So far as we have proceeded some few generic changes seem impossible to be avoided. Many of Hubner's genera are excellently well limited (e. g. *Nisoniades*), even according to our present views. Perhaps it is not hazarding too much to say that his genera are not in the present state of science, more incongruous than those of any one author of or before his time. It is difficult to say on what plea we shall ignore him. The prejudice has been strong that has hitherto neglected him.

As we must adopt *Oeneis*, Hubner, we propose the term *Callæncis* as