

species which Mr. Pearsall named *exhumata*, but now tells us should be called *inornata*, Hulst (the *perlineata*, of the figures in Packard's Monograph), belong to the *other* group (discocellulars simple), as typified by the European *testacea*—to which, moreover, the said "*exhumata*" bears an extremely close superficial resemblance. Would it not be better to group the species after this stable character than after the secondary sexual one of the male antennæ?

I may add here that I think Meyrick was wrong in sinking *Hydrelia* to *Euchæca*, the whole *habitus* of the latter (unrepresented in America) suggests that it is *sui generis*, though I have not leisure to work out its character exhaustively, and only mention that vein 5 of hind wings is usually much nearer to 6 than to 4, cell very short, etc.

The species 3329 to 3336 in Dyar's List should, it seems to me, be distributed as follows:

VENUSIA, Curtis.

Section I.—♂ antennæ bipectinate.

3329. *cambrica*, Curtis.

Section II.—♂ antennæ unipectinate.

3330. *duodecimlineata*, Packard.

Section III.—♂ antennæ shortly ciliated.

3331. *comptaria*, Walker (not of Hulst?).

3331. (1) *Pearsalli*, Dyar (præc. var.?).

TRICHODEZIA, Warren.

3332. *albovittata*, Guenée.

3333. *Californiata*, Packard.

(3334 goes to *Eupithecia*.)

HYDRELIA, Hubner.

3335. *lucata*, Guenée.

3335. (1) *perlineata*, Auct. (Packard pro parte), = *inornata*, Hulst,  
(fide Pearsall) = *exhumata*, Pearsall.

3336. *albifera*, Walker.

The value of this character lies largely in the ease with which it can be observed, even by those who are not well accustomed to close study of structure; and I would point out that if, as has been suggested (though to me it seems well-nigh unthinkable), confusion ever really arises between worn specimens of *comptaria* and "*inornata*," it can instantly be set at rest in this way.