

I have elsewhere explained myself. There are several other points in Prof. Smith's paper to which I could reply, or as to which I could express an adverse opinion, but I am so much gratified that a needed revision of the species of *Agrotis* has been accomplished, that my own justification or the vindication of my priority in particular instances, becomes a matter of little moment. Any errors it may contain will no doubt be rectified in the future, and in the meantime we have in it a valuable repository of our knowledge of the North American species of *Agrotis*.

ON THE POSITION OF LIMENITIS PROSERPINA, EDW.

BY W. H. EDWARDS, COALBURGH, WEST VA.

Mr. Scudder, in Butt. N. E., argues at length in favor of considering *Proserpina* as neither more or less than a hybrid between *L. Artemis* and *L. Ursula* (called *Astyanax**). I differ from him, holding *Proserpina* to be a dimorphic form of *Arthemis*, just as *Papilio Glaucus* is a dimorphic form of *P. Turnus*.

**Astyanax* is one of the resurrected names which I, with many entomologists, hold to be objectionable and not to be adopted to the exclusion of names long in use and familiar, repeatedly treated of and figured in books. In the words of the late B. D. Walsh, one might as well "tell New Yorkers to call their city New Amsterdam, or the English to have their letters addressed to Londinium, because these were the original names." Fabricius, in 1775, named the species *Astyanax*. In 1793 he renamed it *Ursula*, for the following reason: it then stood in the genus *Papilio*, in which also stood another species by name of *Astyanax*. He therefore changed the first of these to *Ursula*, and by this name the species has been known to this day—almost 100 years. It is so figured by Abbott and Smith, 1797, and by Boisduval and Leconte, 1833. That Fabricius was right in changing the name to avoid a duplicate in the same genus is undoubted, and although the second *Astyanax* has since been found to be the female of something else, there is no reason for now disturbing *Ursula*. It was a common practice with the early naturalists, and especially with Linnaeus, to change a name given for another, and the change was accepted by their contemporaries. In some cases we can to-day see the reason; in others we cannot, but that there was a sufficient reason at the time is not to be questioned. There was no "priority rule" at that day. To deny that Linnaeus had the right to change one of his own names if he saw fit is a piece of impertinence. No rule of the kind spoken of was ever adopted till 1842, and that could properly have no retroactive effect. The resurrection of obsolete names has been the greatest possible nuisance during the last 20 years or since the publication of Kirby's Catalogue. Two years after the appearance of this Catalogue in 1872 1st July, as appears by the Trans Ent. Soc., London, the following circular, addressed to entomologists, was laid before the Society, with signatures of most of the leading British entomologists appended:—"ENTOMOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE.—The undersigned considering the confusion with which entomological nomenclature is threatened (and from which it is already to no small extent suffering) by the reinstatement of forgotten names to supersede