The synopsis shows plainly the close relation of some of the genera, though the series is arbitrary in its arrangement. Excluding the Cydosiina, which perhaps indicate a tendency to the Noctuidae, we have two fairly distinct series. In the one we find a usually small head, somewhat retracted, and more or less obsolete tongue. The antennae are moderate in length or short. In the other series, the head is larger, more free, the tongue stronger and longer, and the antennae are usually longer and more prominent. The position and origin of vein 10 serves as a good basis of division, and this corresponds to some extent with the other characters. The entire family needs further revision. The genera allied to Arctia are scarcely sufficiently distinguished, and so Euhalisidota seems scarcely distinct from Halisidota.

Melanchroia, Daritis and Kodiosoma are not included in the synopsis. Ectypia and Nelphe are placed partly by guess, from lack of types for examination.

Eupseudosoma has been sent me by Mr. Conradi, and is a close ally of Halisidota, differing in the broader primaries, and very long oblique outer margin.

Finally, the present paper consists rather of a series of notes preparatory to a study of the family, than a critical study. With a good collection at hand, there should be no difficulty anywhere in the family, except perhaps in *Halisidota*.

## EXPLANATION OF PLATE.

ı.	Venation	of	Gnophæla hoppferi.	8.	Venation	of	Phragmatobia rubricosa.
2.	"	* 6	Crocota ferruginosa.	9.	"	"	Antarctia vagans.
3.	"	"	Utethesia bella.	10.	"	"	Spilosoma virginica.
4.	"	"	Epicallia virginalis.	II.	44	* 4	Hyphantria textor.
5.	**	"	Euprepia caja. Arctia	12.	**	"	Euchætes egle.
			does not differ.	13.	• 6		
6.	"	"	Nemeophila.	14.	44	44	Ecpantheria scribonia.
7.	"	"	Scirarctia echo. Leucaretia and Pyrrharctia do not differ.	15.	4.6	""	Halisidota caryæ,

Cydesia and Cerathosia were figured in the Proc. U. S. Nat. Mus. for 1888; Callimorpha and Eucrythra were figured in the same publication the year previous.