The insect described by Dyar in 1904 as *Thorybes mysie* has been referred to in the literature a number of times, but very little is known about it due to lack of material. Very few specimens are known.

Tilden (1949) reviewed much of the literature and illustrated a male topotype and the genitalia.

Lindsey (1921) and Lindsey, Bell & Williams (1931) said of *mysic*, that they did not know this species. It is interesting that Hoffmann (1941) stated (free translation of the Spanish) that *mysie* is found “From Sonora to the mountains of the Central Valley of Mexico. It ranges up to elevations of about 2500 meters or somewhat more.” But on the next page he says of *Thorybes valeriana* Ploetz, “I do not know this species.”

Evans (1952) synonymized *mysie* Dyar 1904 with *Thorybes valeriana* (Ploetz) 1882, on the basis of a copy of a manuscript figure in the British Museum, and three female specimens in that collection. I have not seen these specimens, but they can scarcely be the insect described by Dyar as *mysie*. Evans was a very careful worker, and he would have noted at once that *mysie* does not fall structurally into *Thorybes* as placed by him in Section 2 of the Pyrginae, which has the palpi upturned, the third segment appressed to the face. *Mysie* falls into Section 3, the palpi more or less porrect, the third segment protruding beyond the second. Moreover, the antennae of *Thorybes* are arcuate or hooked. Those of *mysie* have the apiculus bent at right angles to the club. *Mysie* is structurally similar to *caicus* Herrich-Schaeffer 1869, which Evans placed in the genus *Cogia*. *Caicus* and *mysie* share with members of the genus *Cogia*, the form of the antennal apiculus, and the out-of-line position of the apical hyaline spot in space 6 (the lower, or 4th, apical spot).

However, both *caicus* and *mysie* have the palpi longer than the head as seen from above, and the males lack the hair pencil at the base of the hind wings which is present in *Cogia* and is a distinctive feature of that genus. On the basis of these differences, it seems desirable to retain *caicus* and *mysie* in another genus than *Cogia*.

Godman & Salvin (1894) proposed *Phoedinus* and included *caicus* and *aventinus* (G. & S.). Skinner (1911) included *mysie*, treating *Phoedinus* as a subgenus under *Eudamus*. Lindsey (1921) selected *caicus* as the type-species of *Phoedinus*. 
Mabille & Boullet (1919) proposed *Anaperus* to replace *Phoedinus* Godman & Salvin 1894, considered to be a homonym of *Phaedinus* Duponchel 1834, which was used by Guérin-Méneville (1838), but misspelled *Phoedinus*. See Cowan (1970) for a more complete discussion. *Anaperus* is itself a homonym. It was replaced by *Caicella* Hemming in 1934.

But as pointed out by Cowan (loc. cit.), under present rules *Phoedinus* Godman & Salvin 1894 is not a homonym of *Phaedinus* Duponchel 1834, but is a valid genus, and the replacement name *Caicella* Hemming 1934 is not needed, and is junior synonym of *Phoedinus* Godman & Salvin.

It appears that the binomen *Phoedinus mysie* (Dyar) 1904 is valid and should be returned to prior usage.

Lindsey (1921), Skinner & Williams (1924), Lindsey, Bell, & Williams (1931), and Bell (1938), in dealing with the American members of the genus *Ochloides* Scudder 1872 (*Augiades* auct., nec Hübner 1819), all place both *agricola* Boisduval 1852, and *sylvanoides* 1852 correctly. All, however, fail to associate *nemorum* Boisduval 1852 with *agricola*, but associate it either with *sylvanoides*, or regard it as a distinct species.

Skinner & Williams (op. cit.) note that *agricola* has hyaline spots below the stigma, and a white central line in the stigma, associating *agricola*, *milo* and *verus* correctly. However, they consider *nemorum* a light form of *sylvanoides*.

Lindsey and Lindsey, Bell & Williams, have the same concept of *nemorum* as a light *sylvanoides*-type insect, but both raise *nemorum* to the species level, and this position is taken by Bell (1938). As will appear below, they are correct in realizing the existence of a small, pale *sylvanoides*-like insect in California, but are mistaken in the name they apply to it.

Evans (1955) seems to have been the first to associate *nemorum* with *agricola*, placing it as a subspecies of *agricola*.

In the early 1950's I sent some specimens to Evans for comparison with the Boisduval specimens in the British Museum. The ones I had considered to be *agricola* and *sylvanoides* agreed with the Boisduval type material. The one that was *nemorum* by the Skinner-Williams-Lindsey-Bell concept, proved to agree entirely with the insect named *pratincola* by Boisduval.

Thus it appears that the insect previously considered by most American workers to be *nemorum*, actually is *pratincola* Boisduval 1852. Evans (op. cit.) placed it as a subspecies of *sylvanoides*. Lindsey (1921) placed it as a subspecies of *nemorum*, his concept of *nemorum* being of the insect that is actually *pratincola*. 
Pratincola looks like a small pale sylvanoides, flying in June. It appears just as Ochlodes agricola is becoming worn, and is gone by the time the late-flying sylvanoides appears. It is a rather uncommon species, and is likely to be undetected among the numbers of the much more common agricola.

Ochlodes pratincola Boisduval 1852 should be restored to rightful position as a valid species. It should be listed after sylvanoides and before agricola, as No. 79.1 in the dos Passos List.
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