

1841. Guen., Noct. Eur. Index Meth. Ann. Soc. Ent., Fr., I. Ser., Tom. 10: ophiogramma, didyma, unanimis, gemina. Except the first, which goes to *Oligia*, Lederer's section C, this restriction gives us species belonging to Lederer's section B of *Hadena*, Led., nec Schrank. Hübn. does not use *Apamea*. Further citations have no bearing on the subject of the type, which may be accordingly taken as *didyma*.

The species heretofore classed under *Hadena*, Led., fall to *Xylota* (= *Xylophasia*), *Helioscota*, *Apamea* and *Oligia*. The European type *Ilarus ochroleuca* is not recognized as American.

*Luperina*.

1829. Boisd., Europ. Lep. Index Meth., 77: Dumerilii, argillacea, testacea, contribulis, cespitis. One of the above must be type. The use of this term for *virens*, etc., by Lederer is therefore erroneous. For *Luperina*, Led., nec Boisd., type *virens*, the term *Ledereria*, Grote, 1874, should be used. *Testacea* may be taken as type, taking with it *Dumerilii*. *Argillacea* is a var. of *Hadena* (*Dianthæcia*) *luteago*. *Cespitis* is apparently type of *Tholera*; *contribulis* is apocryphal. This generic term, as previously suspected by me, must be used instead of *Apamea*, Led., nec Ochs. The subsequent enlargements of *Luperina* by Boisduval (1840) and Guenée (1841) have no bearing on the question of type. In literature of the North American Noctuid Fauna this name has been seemingly wrongly applied. The existence in our North American fauna of species congeneric with *Luperina testacea* or *Ledereria virens* has not been made out as yet satisfactorily. In all cases, to insure the "scientific" application of the generic name, the type species as here given must be studied and compared with American material. It is very necessary at the moment that this should be done before the issue of a new Catalogue. For this reason I publish the literary evidence so that it may be looked into and, if possible, contradicted or corrected. I had brought the classification of the North American Noctuids into general harmony with Lederer's, so far as structure was concerned. I could not always adopt his generic names, because he had made no literary study of the subject, had taken at times the first name which came to hand in fact, and had repudiated the authority of the Verzeichniss, now acknowledged by almost all writers in England