

the first two united for about $1\frac{1}{2}$ mm. beyond the separation of the lowest ; anal lobe obliterated, but I do not think it was very large.

Lithophotina floccosa, n. sp.

Length of tegmen about $21\frac{1}{2}$ mm., width 7 ; apparently subhyaline, with brown veins, and obscure, irregular brown mottling.

Florissant ; Miocene, Station 14 (*W. P. Cockerell*, 1907).

THE GENUS EUPITHECIA AND ITS ALLIES.

BY RICHARD F. PEARSALL, BROOKLYN, N. Y.

The present paper must necessarily be, in part, of a tentative character, for the active attention which has been accorded the Geometrinae of late has resulted in giving us many new species, and their affiliations are yet to be wrought out. My object is partially to clear the way for future and more mature work. Of the genera allied with *Eupithecia*, Dr. Hulst has placed two in our list, one of which, in the light of recent research, must be excluded therefrom, and the other greatly restricted, viz., *Chloroclystis*, Hubn., and *Gymnocelis*, Mab. The former is represented by a single species, *inconspicua*, Hlst., the female type of which is in the Hulst collection at New Brunswick, N. J. Upon examination, it proves to be the female of *Selidosema Wrightiaria*, Hulst (Dyar, 3829), a species described in 1888 from four males, taken in Southern California. It has vein 8 of hind wings not connected with cell, and vein 5 wanting. *Inconspicua* becomes therefore a synonym, and the genus is left without a known representative in our fauna, and must be dropped. This conclusion was first reached through study of a small series of *Wrightiaria*, taken at Pasadena, Calif., in my own collection, and later confirmed by reference to the type.

Gymnocelis has been the subject of a recent paper by Mr. J. A. Grossbeck (Journ. N. Y. Entom. Society, March, 1908), presenting facts relating to the various species under it, which are in line with my own observations, and show conclusively that *minuta*, Hlst., is the only species which we know at present as fitted to remain in the genus. The others form a group, as he points out, not possible of combination with *Eupithecia*, even if it were desirable to place them in that already overcrowded genus, and although in individuals of one species, *remorata*, Gross., the upper spurs of the hind tibiae may be absent, in other respects it does coincide with the group, nevertheless it appears to me that they should be assembled under a distinct genus. For this genus I propose the name *Nasusina*, the