

wanting. The description is thus additionally useless for identification, and the name so founded should be dropped.

*A. hamamelis*, Guen.

This identification was given us by Guenée. It now seems probable that Guenée had "mixed up" the species, and that "a very dark form of what we call *hamamelis* being easily confounded with *afflicta*," Guenée sent an *afflicta* to Doubleday and kept his other type, a dark *hamamelis*. The rule would then in any event validate *afflicta* as being properly differentiated. The two species would stand:

1. *A. afflicta*, Grote.

= *A. hamamelis*, Guen., in pars (spec. as type in Coll. B. Mus.).

2. *A. hamamelis*, Guen., in pars (spec. in Coll. Guen.).

= *A. inclaræ*, Sm.

It would prevent much confusion if the names as above were retained.

*A. haesitata*, Grote.

This name is now validated. It was evidently owing to my remark in *Psyche* that Sm. and Dyar positively made the name a synonym of *clarescens*. I then admitted the possibility, referring to Mr. Butler's identifications, that *clarescens* might have been founded on a large pale *hamamelis* (= *inclaræ*). This brief characterization covers very well and suggests my *haesitata*.

*A. clarescens*, Guen.

The identification of this species by me in American collections is now validated. Guenée, at the time, in comparing his type with my material, was a little doubtful. But I thought, on the whole, that he was satisfied with the determination, so I adopted it and labeled my example.

*A. increta*, Morr.

I wish to say here that any jumbling of the species in Coll. B. Mus. is not my work. The rearrangement of Mr. Walker's material is the work of Mr. Butler, whom Mr. Tutt, and, indeed, Prof. Smith as well, has criticised for his want of familiarity with the Noctuidæ. Mr. Walker had no type labels. The sorting out of specimens as his "types" is therefore uncertain at Mr. Butler's hands, especially in the cases which occurred where more than one species was placed by Mr. Walker over one printed label. The