

3. The narrowing of what Dr. Hagen calls the "second cubital space" is a common feature in Ephemeridae (e.g. species of *Calliareys*, *Choroterpes*, *Blasturus*, *Atalophlebia*, *Rhoenanthus*, *Chloeon*, etc.), though not often to quite such an extent, nor perhaps quite so rapidly, as here; and as this varies in different species of the same genus, it seems to be a very unimportant matter; the approach of the two veins, contrary to Dr. Hagen's statement, is mentioned in my paper.

4. What Dr. Hagen calls the sector subnodalis does not run unbroken to the tip, as in all dragon flies I have examined, but is lost in the reticulation shortly before the margin.

In looking over all the ancient types known, I find none to which this insect may be at all closely compared excepting the Ephemeridae; unless it be *Breyeria*, to which it bears some distant resemblance, and to which it is not impossible that it is allied; but it differs strikingly in every detail from that form, and so much more closely resembles the Ephemeridae of the present day that it would appear to be somewhat of a strain to attempt to bring these two old forms in close proximity, when otherwise the series of forms in the ancient Phasmida is so complete.

I referred in my former memoir (p. 9) to the repetition, in the lower externomedian stem, of the features of the upper stem. If these two are looked upon as distinct externomedian and internomedian stems, we have an additional resemblance in this insect to some of the Protophasmida, though not to *Breyeria*; yet this repetition, "which appears to have no counterpart among living Ephemeridae," is in reality a feature constantly seen in paleozoic wings, and is indicative merely of simplicity and common origin such as we should naturally look for in early insects; and on this ground we may be justified in considering this insect as a representative of a distinct early type of Ephemerideous insects,—which may be called the Palephemeridae.

Lithentomum Harttii.

This insect I placed in a distinct family of Neuroptera proper, which from "having its nearest affinity to Sialina in modern times," I proposed to call *Cronicosialina*. Dr. Hagen also recognizes its Sialidan features and compares the wing to that of *Chauliodes*, adding "the paucity of the offshoots of the scapular branch is by no means exceptional . . . the living *Chauliodes* possesses only one."

Here again is an evident misapprehension of my language, for while the living *Chauliodes* has only one scapular branch, it has four or five offshoots of the scapular branch; a "branch" is not a main stem; and the course of the veins, as I have pointed out, forbids our supposing the ancient wing to have had more than one or two offshoots; only one is preserved.

A comparison of this wing with numerous paleozoic wings now convinces me that it should fall with many others in a group in which this branch may have several offshoots; at least it differs from them so little in general structure and in time that this disposition would seem to be the most rational one, and though Dr. Hagen seems to imply (though he does not explicitly state) that the character above mentioned was the only one laying claim to distinguish the *Cronicosialina* from the modern *Sialina*, I do not discuss this point here, as I shall soon do so to better advantage, in treating of the whole group.