The stationary veins
in the lepidopterous wing are, then, the subcostal, the main stem of the radius, the cubitus with its two invariable branches (cases occur in which a fourth median branch is noted), and the second anal vein.

It remains to state that accessory or secondarily developed veins always seem to be joined on to other veins, their object being to strengthen the tegument in some particular part of the wing which the changes above detailed have left weak. A curious way in which veins have become bent, in order to support the peculiar shape of the wing, has been detailed in my papers on the "Round-wing," *Pseudopontia paradoxa*. Another curious case is that of the fusion of the first and second radial branches, just before tip of fore wing, in *Perente callinice*. The first radial here fails to reach the outer margin, and the object seems to be to strengthen the apical field, left weak by the reduction of the radial branches.

If this localization of the secondary veins, which I assume, be correct, it follows that all veins issuing from base of wing are, *ipso facto*, primary, carried over from primitive types of insects. The short, downwardly curved internal vein, which I have taken as the visible sign of the Papilionides, is, then, a true third anal vein, or what remains of one, and is not to be considered as of secondary origin and value.

TYPES OF NOCTUID GENERA.

BY A. RADCLIFFE GROTE, A. M.

In reference to my previous paper (page 209), Mr. Louis B. Prout kindly draws my attention to the fact that Duponchel, Lep. Ent., March, 1829, also selects *didyma* as type of *Apamea*, Ochs., 1816. While it is gratifying that I had come independently to the same conclusion with regard to this type, I cannot follow Duponchel's selection in other cases. I merely state the fact here, reserving details for a later occasion.

It further appears from Mr. Prout's researches that Curtis, who publishes later than Duponchel, viz., in May, 1829, "chooses *chrysographa*" as type of *Apamea*. Independent of the fact that this choice is rendered nugatory from Duponchel's prior action, I do not identify this name with certainty as referring to one of Ochsenheimer's original species of *Apamea*. Great confusion has been caused by the double employment of *nictitans* for two distinct forms. It was owing to the fact that I incorrectly supposed Ochsenheimer's *nictitans* (=oculea) was Linne's