

1900. Leonardi, *Ibid.*, 8: 344.

1903. Fernald, Catalogue Coccidæ, 299.

This genus was named by Leonardi in 1898 and its type was definitely stated to be *Mytilaspis metrosideri* Maskell. Later (1900) Leonardi stated that he found *metrosideri* to be a species of *Aspidiotus* and he transferred the generic name *Anoplaspis* to the species earlier named by Cockerell as *Aspidiotus bambusarum*, designating this as the type. This procedure is followed in the Fernald Catalogue and *Anoplaspis* is placed as a synonym of *Odonaspis* in which the species *bambusarum* is included. The species *Mytilaspis metrosideri* Maskell is placed under *Lepidosaphes* in the catalogue and no reference is given under it to Leonardi's first paper.

It is obvious that the first type fixation must stand and that the status of the genus *Anoplaspis* depends upon that of *Mytilaspis metrosideri*, its type species.

A revision of the genera of Diaspinæ must soon come for the group is falling into confusion because of the many genera and subgenera that have been named usually upon characters of no particular significance. Many of these names, however, must be used, and it is desirable that such points as those discussed above be straightened out.

SYNONYMY OF SOME SPECIES.

***Targionia yuccarum* Ckll.**

1898. *Aspidiotus yuccarum* Ckll., Ann. Mag. Nat. Hist., (7), 2: 25.

1900. *Chrysomphalus* (*Melanaspis*) *tonilensis* Ckll., *Ibid.*, (7), 10: 470.

1919. *Targionia covilleæ* (Ferris), Contrib. Knowl. Coccidæ Sw. U. S., Stanford Univ. Publ., 67-8.

Mr. Morrison has called my attention to the fact that my *Targionia covilleæ* is identical with *T. yuccarum* (Ckll.), and has sent me a specimen of the latter species. There is no doubt that the two are the same. Also, through the kindness of Professor Cockerell, I have been enabled to examine a slide of *Chrysomphalus tonilensis* Ckll. from the type material, and this too proves to be the same. The species is a true *Targionia* as I have pointed out in the description of my *T. covilleæ*.

***Aspidiotus herculeanus* Doane and Hadden.**

1909. *Aspidiotus herculeanus* Doane and Hadden, Can. Ent., 41: 298.

1918. *Aspidiotus subsimilis* var. *anonæ* Houser, Ann. Ent. Soc. Am., 11 m.: 163; pl. 18, f. 1.

The figure given by Houser indicates clearly that his *A. subsimilis* var. *anonæ* is identical with *A. herculeanus*, and Mr. Morrison, to whose attention I have called this and who has examined specimens, agrees that this is the case. I have had the privilege of examining a "type" slide of *A. subsimilis* Ckll., and unless intergrading forms exist there is no reason for placing *herculeanus* as a "variety" of this species.

***Pseudodiaspis yuccæ* Ckll.**

1896. *Aspidiotus yuccæ* Ckll., Psyche, 7; Suppl. 1, p. 20.

1898. *Aspidiotus yuccæ* var. *neomexicana* Ckll., Ann. Mag. Nat. Hist., (7), 2 m.: 25.

1899. *Xerophilaspis parkinsoniæ* Ckll., Ariz. Exper. Sta., Bull. 32 m.: 282.