species. "N" means simply, "Nomen in litteris," which Klug himself added to the specific name, to indicate that thus far this name was only used privately and did not yet exist in print. Burmeister adopted this name later for this species and described it for the first time, retaining the manuscript name and cited Klug as the author, though surely wrongly, of which Burmeister, as is universally acknowledged, is the author.

"'As far as I have been able to see, the original label for the genus *Lecanium* has not been preserved in the Berlin Museum.'

"In the hope that this communication will straighten the matter, I remain,

Most sincerely yours,

"THEO. PERGANDE."

Dr. O. G. Costa published his Nuove Osservazioni intorno alle Cocciniglie in the Atti del R. Instit. d'Incorrag., Vol. VI., pp. 31–52. This volume bears the date 1840 on the title page, but as Vol. V. is dated 1834, and as the separatum, which is exactly like the above-named paper except in pagination, bears the date 1835, it is quite certain that the first part of Vol. VI. was also published in 1835. Dr. Hagen was in error in giving 1828 as the date of this paper.

Costa in his Fauna del Regno di Napoli Emitteri divides the Coccidæ into three genera, as follows: Genus *Calypticus* with *hesperidum*, Linn., and *spumosus*, *lævis*, *aterrimus*, *radiatus*, *testudineus* and *fasciatus* of Costa. The first species, *hesperidum*, Linn., may be regarded as the type.

There is some doubt as to the exact date of publication of the Coccidæ in this work, but Hagen gives the date of the entire work 1832–1858. The Coccidæ of the Fauna is referred to in the Nuove Osservazioni, several times in such a way as to lead me to believe that it was published before 1835, and therefore *Lecanium*, which dates only from 1835, is preoccupied by *Calypticus*, Costa.

There is another work by Costa which I have not yet been able to see. This is his Prospetti di una nuova descrizione metodica del genera Coccus L., published in Naples in 1828. From a reference to this in the Fauna del Regno di Napoli, I infer that he proposed generic names which he changed in his later works. Whether these names were established in such a way that they may be used to the exclusion of the later ones, I have not yet been able to learn.