

appearance of a series of brownish spots. The hind margin, which is somewhat dentated and enlarged at anal angle, has a very irregular and jagged line of light brown, forming a series of interspatial light brown spots, extending from anal angle to upper angle.

Under side of fore wing brown, somewhat lighter than upper surface, and with less lustre. The white spots are repeated, showing more transparency. The lower submedian interspace and the inner marginal area are lighter than the ground colour.

Under side of hind wing brown, a shade darker than fore wing. The white and brown markings of upper surface are repeated, but are all white. The hind margin has a slight whitish line.

Variations.—In some specimens the light brown marginal border or series of interspatial spots noted on upper surface of hind wing is continued upwards across marginal area of fore wing, but it is so variable in its definiteness that it may be considered a distinct band in some specimens, or a mere suffusion in others. The small discoidal spot of fore wing is often joined to the larger one in the discoidal space.

Taken in January, 1900.

SELIDOSEMA UMBROSARIUM, HUBNER.

BY RICHARD F. PEARSALL, BROOKLYN, N. Y.

In a recent paper on the "Lepidoptera of the Kootenai District" (page 910), Dr. H. G. Dyar remarks of this species: "No specimens; one from Mr. Cockle's collection. The specimen agrees with two in the National Museum, bearing Dr. Packard's original labels, '*Boarmia indicataria*, Comp., Walker's type,' and '*Boarmia umbrosaria*, Hbn., *B. gnophosaria*, Gn,' the specimens originally coming from the Meske and Riley collections. They are males, and show a hair pencil on the hind tibiæ, so I transfer *umbrosaria* to *Cleora*, following Hulst's separation of *Cleora* and *Selidosema*."

In this conclusion I cannot concur, having raised from larvæ, when in Florida, one male and three females of this species, the male having *no* hair pencil, and an exact counterpart of Packard's figure of the type (Mono. Geom., Plate XI, fig. 23), which came from Demopolis, Ala. When at Cambridge I examined this type, which proved that it was correctly placed in *Selidosema*. With it under this name were perhaps twenty specimens, six of which were the true *umbrosarium*, the rest being a species I take frequently in the Catskill Mts., belonging in the genus *Cleora*, and at that time without name in my collection. On my return home I sent one of

May, 1906.

these to Mr. L. B. Prout, thinking it might be one of Walker's species. He writes me that it is the *indicataria*, Walk., the type of which is in the British Museum, comparison having been made with it. Here, I think we have the explanation of Dr. Dyar's reference of *umbrosarium* to *Cleora*, but why he should ignore the name *indicataria*, since one was so labelled, I cannot explain. The Nat. Mus. specimens bear Dr. Packard's labels, and as he mingled the two species in his collection, it is quite probable that he distributed them also under one name. *Umbrosarium* is more heavily powdered with black, while *indicataria* is gray, but rubbed specimens of the former might be taken for the latter. Probably they are mingled in most collections, but I find *umbrosarium* rather rare. Recently I have obtained three males and two females from Atlanta, Ga., and am inclined to the belief that its habitat is more strictly southern than is generally supposed, while *indicataria* is found throughout the temperate zone. The localities given by Dr. Packard (Mono., page 441) refer mostly to *indicataria*, and his remarks partly to one and partly to the other species.

Dr. Hulst places *Polygrammaria*, Pack., as a synonym of *Cleora indicataria*, Walk. This is an error. The type in the Packard collection is a male having *no* hair pencil, and belongs to *Selidosema*.

Before me is a male taken in Arizona, which I conclude is this species. It agrees exactly with Packard's description and plate, and in the points to which he calls attention in his remarks. Many of the species of *Alcis*, *Cleora* and *Selidosema* are incorrectly placed, as evidenced by their structure. For instance, *Haydenata* is not an *Alcis*, having *no* hair pencil; Dr. Hulst created the genus *Somatolophia*, which he states is without hair pencil, and places as its type what I believe to be this species. I cannot account for the "tufts on first and third segments" of abdomen, which certainly are present in that specimen, and not in any other which I have examined, except that it is or was freshly emerged, and the tufts had not been rubbed off. I know by experience in raising Geometrids that these tufts are detached by a slight wind or touch. Dr. Dyar some time ago called attention to this genus, and says "both genus and species must fall." Perhaps if *Haydenata* is not an *Alcis*, it may remain as a *Somatolophia*. Until these groups can be studied and rearranged, this had better stand, however, until a decision can be reached by a study of *all*. Again, Dr. Hulst places in the genus *Epimecis*, Hub., our large Geometrid *Virginaria*, Cram. He characterizes the genus as *without* hair pencil in male. If that be correct, then our species is *not* an *Epimecis*, since it *has* a hair pencil.