

information from Mr. Moschler, unites *A. quenselii* Geyer and *A. gelida* Moschler, cited separate in our "List." This correction, coming from the author of the synonym, is doubtless of value, but we have no responsibility in the matter nor did we "fall into any error." If Mr. Strecker will refer to the two names in the List, he will find them followed by a dash (—), and from our preface he may gather the information that this dash indicates that we do not know the species and are not to be held accountable for their value. Next, Mr. Strecker (undoubtedly on the strength of Mr. Moschler's letters) says we fell into the same error with regard to *Arctia parthenos* Harris, and *Arctia borealis* Moschler. Mr. Strecker should have read my statement that the two were probably identical, published in the Proc. Ent. Soc. Phila., pp. 74 and 537 (1864). The species were, however, described as distinct by Professor Packard and the names are kept separate on this authority in the List; *borealis* being followed by a dash, since we do not know it as distinct from *parthenos*. At the time of describing *borealis*, Mr. Moschler did not know that Harris had described an allied species, nor in describing *speciosa*, that Kirby had described *virguncula*, since he does not allude to them; but perhaps, after all, the species described by Moschler from Labrador, may be distinct; at least it is yet an open question whether they are so or not. Where is our "error," then, with respect to these species of *Arctia*?

With only partial quotation of our remarks, Mr. Strecker unites our *luteola* from Quebec with *cordigera* from Lapland. We had only *mystilli* in nature for comparison, and judged of *cordigera* by description when we described *luteola*. That we judged the American to be a near ally of the European species is evident from our remark that it "appears to represent the European *cordigera* in our fauna." Now, that Mr. Strecker has received from Europe specimens of *cordigera* and compared them with *luteola*, and finds no difference, it becomes probable that they are the same species. This information is very interesting in a distributional point of view.

To conclude this notice I will draw attention to Mr. Strecker's repeated remarks that "great confusion exists with regard to the species of *Catocala*." These are not true of the most prominent collections of that genus. There is but little uncertainty about our species, and that with regard to the limits of a very few of them. I have determined during the last ten years nearly all material in this genus, sent to me from Canada, to Georgia, and all of Mr. Strecker's determinations have