

I think I may have confused Dr. McDunnough on *bistriolata* Zeller, as I was mistaken in supposing the Cambridge specimen to be a paratype. I have made a careful study of Zeller's descriptions and Dr. Hagen's methods, and find that the error may be laid to Packard's door, where he states in the Monograph that he has Zeller's types. Unless Zeller states that the specimens are in the museum at Cambridge they cannot be considered as types, as his descriptions indicate. Hagen appears to have sent specimens to Zeller and placed a yellow label on the specimen agreeing with those he sent; hence they may be considered as having been merely compared with the type. This does not alter our conception of the species as both Dr. McDunnough and I knew it, but changes the fixation of types.

I have positively identified the type of *glaucata* Pack. as the specimen in the Henry Edwards' collection, so labeled. I find in the older plates of the Boston Society of Natural History the wings are reversed, so by a careful comparison of holes and tears in the wing I was able definitely to place it. Mr. Frank Watson has again checked my notes and made comparisons verifying my conclusions. In the original Henry Edwards' catalogue, for No. 1375, he gives "Santa Clara Co., California, taken at rest in forest, on a pine tree, in June." The specimen was originally mounted on a headless brass pin, but was repaired and remounted on May 2, 1917, and stands as No. 13197, Henry Edwards' collection.

*Hydriomeva edenata* Swett has more elongated primaries than *glaucata* Pack. Apparently Dr. McDunnough has a closely related form, shown on pl. VI, fig. 4, but the basal and mesial lines do not exactly match the type of *glaucata*.

*H. regulata* looks superficially like a suffused form of some of the *speciosata* group.

*H. periclata* Swett should be placed as a form of *H. quinquefasciata* Pack., rather than *furcata*, the type having a broken uncus, and a recent second specimen showing the correct location of the form. I am to blame for this, rather than Dr. McDunnough, as in my notes to him on the species I so placed it incorrectly owing to this defect in the type and the lack of other material. The receipt of two males recently from the same locality enabled me to place it correctly.

I have still another new species of *Hydriomena*, which I