

have been calling *comptaria* (= *perlineata*) is not in the Packard collection at all, and is the one I should have described.

In the Packard collection *perlineata* is represented by two males labelled "type" from "West Virginia, Mead. 4. 9. 72," in good condition, and referred to in description, page 83, Mono. Geom. Moths, 1876. *12-lineata*.—Under this name are four males, labelled "type," all from California. Three of them belong to the genus *Nomenia*, bearing unipectinate antennæ. The fourth is a male without a vestige of antennæ, but is certainly the western form of *Euchœca*, referred by me to *salienta*. It was the custom of Dr. Packard to describe from a group of specimens, calling all of them types, and he so labelled them. In the Monograph Geo. Moths, 1876, *perlineata* was represented by five males and five females; of these, only two males are left. Of *12-lineata* he had three males and five females. Now there are four males left. Three are the males of *Nomenia*. Where did the other ♂ come from? Did he consider the other western species with its simple antennæ to be females of the first? It would appear so. Again, in taking description from a group of specimens involving two species, he makes reference to a certain characteristic which may belong to one species or the other, and where it becomes necessary to separate them, as in the case of *12-lineata*, the description may not wholly fit either of them. After many careful comparisons between my specimens and his description and plates (note its simple antennæ), I find them to agree so well that, as offering the best way out of a complex situation, it would be better to recognize the western *Euchœca* as entitled to the name of *12-lineata*, Pack., and raise it to specific rank. At the close of his remarks under this species he says: "It may be found to intergrade with *E. perlineata* of the Eastern States. It is a little larger, with more acute fore wings than that species or variety (?)" He might have added, by its colour also, which is white, as he describes it, while *perlineata* is decidedly bluish-ashen; nor did he refer to *Nomenia*, for that species is noticeably smaller than *perlineata*. By these points it is easily separable to my eye. This situation leaves *Nomenia* sp. undescribed.

To-day I received a letter from Mr. Prout, in which, after acknowledging receipt of my specimens, he says:

"*Comptaria*, Walk., is not = *perlineata* (that is my Catskill Mt species I had sent him labelled *perlineata*). This is certissime!

"IF it is not exactly = *salienta*, Pears. . . . it is at least so close to it that my eye fails to detect any difference WHATEVER."