

prove that we are in error, and in that case the only species it could be referred to is *abacta*. Dr. Taylor and Mr. Grossbeck were the first to suggest the relationship between *albifasciata* Pack. and *reflata* Grote, as pointed out on page 78 of my paper. Dr. McDunnough, on p. 12 of his "Revision," associates *banavahrata* Strecker with *nubilofasciata* Pack., which is better than Dr. Dyar's reference to *californiata* Pack. A year or so ago I ran across a sketch of the type, made by Mr. Grossbeck, and this showed it to be *nubilofasciata* by the outer terminal bands on the primaries. If this sketch was made from the type, and I have every reason to believe it was, then *banavahrata* will fall under *nubilofasciata*. I shall restrict the type of *nubilofasciata* Pack. to the male in the Packard collection, as the female is badly rubbed and is possibly not the same species. The male type of *nubilofasciata* has a reddish shade to the central or mesial space.

In regard to *H. manzanita* Taylor I think this species, or a form of it, occurs in California, as Dr. McDunnough states, though sparingly. I have recently seen three or four rubbed specimens from there.

I have little to add to Dr. McDunnough's remarks (p. 17) on *H. frigidata* Walker and *transfigurata* Swett, except that I believe the labels, in some unaccountable way, were mixed on a specimen from New Brighton, Pa. I do not remember having seen *transfigurata* from Mr. Merrick, but I had several *frigidata* which I sent to Mr. Prout to be compared with Walker's type. Mr. Prout stated that they were the same as *frigidata*. It must have been one of these females, upon which I accidentally put a wrong label, as I knew both species at the time and would not have confused them. *Hydricmena transfigurata* is a rare species and is of a rather uniform, pale green colour. *H. niveifasciata* Swett seems to be correctly placed as a form of *irata*.

Dr. McDunnough's most startling discovery was concerning the types of *H. chiricahuata* Swett (p. 29); viz., that they were not conspecific. I distinctly remember that they were alike in markings, and the fact that he noted the same, goes to prove the value of genital characters in closely allied species. Future work on this group should be based on very large series from all localities, and on field notes.