

210. *N. calgary* Smith.—I am not in a position to make the reference at present, but it seems to me not improbable that this will prove identical with *esurialis* Grote, which certainly has no nearer ally known to me on this continent. The type of the latter is a male in the British Museum from Washington State, and is a good specimen, except that it lacks antennæ. It is well figured by Hampson, only the specimen is really a bit more even in colour, and the oblique orbicular a little more open. There are no other specimens in the collection under the name.

*Esurialis* has at times been associated with both *jucunda* and *rosaria*. Both these associations I seem able to explain. There are, in the British Museum, three *Anticosti* specimens which have long been associated with *jucunda*, and which are referred to by the late J. W. Tutt in "British Noctuæ and Their Varieties" (IV, p. 16 of the introduction). These specimens I should call *calgary*, as well as a male in the same series labelled "U. S. A., Grote collection." *Calgary*, too, has often been confused with *rosaria*, as witness my own confusion in former days, and Sir George Hampson's more recently. In the "Kootenai List" Dr. Dyar seems to suggest that *esurialis* is *rosaria*. What he had for comparison as true *esurialis* I do not exactly know, but it was probably a confusion of *rosaria* with *calgary* over again. I have no note of having anywhere seen *calgary* from Kaslo, though it probably will be found there. But *esurialis* is not *rosaria*. In the Washington collection I found about a dozen specimens standing under *Pachnobia carnea*, from Popoff Islands, Alaska (July 16th, 1899), which seemed to me to be *Noctua calgary*, one of which was almost exactly like Hampson's figure of the type *esurialis*.

211. *N. dislocata* Smith.—More of this species have come to hand, including females that I feel quite certain of, though only one of this sex now remains in my own collection. I feel convinced of its distinctness from *calgary*, and cannot improve upon my former diagnosis of the species. But Prof. Smith's ♀ type happens to be *calgary*, as I had supposed, the male alone holding good. *Dislocata* appears to occur in Europe, as I have a pair from Northern Finland which differs very slightly from some *Calgary* specimens in being smaller and browner, and having duller secondaries. They were received from Mr. Prout as "*festiva*, var. *conflua* Treit.," but do not agree very well with Treitshke's description as copied by Tutt (Brit. Noct., II, 122), or Barrett (Lep. Brit. Isles, IV, 76). Hampson lists *conflua* as an aberration of *festiva*, "smaller, grayer, duller,