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Among the Ephemeridae which the senior author reared at Ithaca, N.Y., from 1913-1915, there were two very common species of the genus Heptagenia. The nymphs of both of these species are described by Needham in Bulletin 86, N. Y. State Museum, and figured in plate 9. Extensive rearings, about 50 in all, show, however, that the nymph described as Heptagenia sp. 3 and illustrated in Fig. 4 of plate 9, is that of Heptagenia interpunctata, while the nymph described for that species and illustrated in Fig. 3 of plate 9 appears to belong to a new species which we here describe.

**Heptagenia ithaca** sp. nov.

*Nymph.* The description by Needham (loc. cit.) is quite complete. The markings on the ventral surface of the abdomen are very distinctive. *Imago.* Male (dried specimen). Body length 9 mm. Rather uniformly brown in colour. Brownish area on face extending from antenna to ventral margin of carina. Abdomen brownish with posterior margins of the segments very dark dorsally. Stigmatal spots not marked. Petioles L-shaped as in *H. ripunctata.* Wings hyaline, slightly clouded in the pterostigmatic space. Femora banded at middle and at distal ends; tibia-tarsal joints dark. *Female.* Similar to male.

*Holotype*—1, Ithaca, N.Y., June 24, 1913. (W. A. Clemens), in the collection of the senior author.

*Allotype*—1, Ithaca, N.Y., June 26, 1923. (W. A. Clemens), in the collection of the senior author.

Paratypes in the collection of the senior author.

**Heptagenia interpunctata** Say.

*Nymph.* The nymph is fully described (as species number 3) by Needham (1905). It is very similar to the nymphs of *H. condensata* and *H. frontalis.* In all three species there is more or less of a dorsal longitudinal striping on the abdomen and all possess oval pointed gills and certain characteristic features in the mouth parts (Clemens, 1913).

*Imago.* The imago is described in detail by Eaton (1888) and by Needham (loc. cit.).

This species is very close to *H. condensata* and it is not unlikely that the two species should be considered as varieties rather than as distinct species. *H. condensata,* as pointed out by Banks (1910), is typically a dark northern form while *H. interpunctata* is a lighter form of more southern distribution. We have specimens of the former from Lake Nipigon and a few from Ithaca, N. Y. The undetermined nymph described by Cleverton (1913) and there illustrated in Fig. 4, plate V, is undoubtedly that of *H. interpunctata.* The present known range of this species then is from Georgian Bay and Sherbrooke, Que., in the north, to Virginia and North Carolina in the south.
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