

errors as to *pittula* and *dodgei* are repeated. I do not find in the list my *M. mimula* (also omitted in my late Check List) nor Dr. Harvey's *D. pallilis*. Hübner's *confusa* and *mucens* are much like *Hylomiges*, and I so referred them in my Check List, 1875-6. Otherwise the species of North American *Mamestra* and *Dianthoecia* known to me seem to be all included in the Revision, which credits me with thirty-three species and two varieties. I would correct this so far that *lubens* should be restored and that *oregonica* should be added as a variety of *trifolii*. Three well-marked species, *sutrina*, *ferrealis* and *Dimmocki*, are unknown to the author of the Revision. The latter should be recognizable since it is a peculiar form, and the type was in my collection, which latter ought rather to have been preserved as I left it, intact, in the true interests of science. What I must have suffered at having my Noctuidæ overhauled by Mr. Butler may be imagined.

#### MR. WALKER'S TYPES.

BY A. R. GROTE, A. M., BREMEN, GERMANY.

In the CAN. ENT., p. 136, Prof. Smith says that our reference of *Edema? transversata*, Walk., in 1868, to *lignicolor* is an error. In other cases e. g. *Apantesis radians*, etc., our testimony is borne out, and now comes up the question of a changing in specimens since 1868. Mr. Walker's specimens are not marked type, but placed merely above the label. They can have been changed, and the question is, whether a name of Walker's can be employed which in any way contradicts in its description the supposed species. In my Revised Check List 4, I say: "Clearly there is room for misapprehension of what specimens are really types had we not a check for the reference. This is the criterion for types, that they do not contradict the original description," CAN. ENT., XX., 75. If the description of *Edema? transversata* contradicts *Ellida gelida* in any particular it should not be accepted. If it agrees well with *lignicolor*, our original reference is probably correct. I do not now recall this particular reference, and a possible error in our notes, or their transcriptions, might have occurred. But we knew *lignicolor* very well, and I am the first to restore and interpret this name, reducing *virgata* to a synonym and giving the correct synonymy of the species. I do not object to as rigorous a use of Mr. Walker's names as is consistent with the law of priority. But I object to the putting forward of this or that supposed type of Mr. Walker's without reference to the description. The proposal by Stal and others to