-Mr. Caudell presented for publication the following paper:

THE SYNONYMY OF ŒDIPODA CINCTA THOMAS.

By A. N. CAUDELL.

In 1870,* Thomas described his *Œdipoda cincta*, and a curious condition has followed, for we now have two species based on that one description—*Mestobregma cinctum* and *Trimerotropis cincta*. It is obvious that one must be changed, as two specific

names cannot properly be based on one description.

Six years after making the original description Thomas referred his species with doubt to the genus Mestobregma,† and four years later treated of it under that genus ! But at that time the genera were not clearly defined and the characters used by Thomas as of generic value were inadequate for the separation of the two insects under discussion. In 1884, Saussure located Thomas' species, from his description, in the genus Trimerotropis | A careful study of Thomas' descriptions shows that they apply much better to a species of Trimerotropis than to a member of the genus Mestobregma. While many of the characters given apply equally well to either, certain ones apply only to Trimerotropis. Such are the following: Disk of the posterior lobe of the pronotum nearly flat and with the posterior angle greater than a right angle; median carina of the thorax only a raised line; posterior femora not reaching the tip of the abdomen in the female. No character mentioned in the description is inapplicable to a member of the genus Trimerotropis, and the type mentioned by McNeill¶ belongs to that genus. Taken all together, it seems well to consider Trimerotropis cincta to be the species eligibly based on Thomas' original description. This being accepted, it leaves the insect now known as Mestobregma cinctum to be dealt with. As a new specific name seems inevitable, I propose the name thomasi. The synonymy of the two species will thus stand as follows:

1. Trimerotropis cincta Thomas.

Œdipoda cincta Thomas.

Mestobregma cinctum Thomas (not Bruner, Scudder, etc.).

2. Mestobregma thomasi Caudell.

Mestobregma cinctum Bruner, Scudder, etc. (not Thomas).

^{*} Proc. Acad. Nat. Sci., Phila., pp 80-81, 1870.

[†] Bull. Ill. Mus. Nat. Hist., 1, p. 65, 1876.

[‡]Rept. Ent. Ill., 1x. pp. 90, 95, 113-114, 1880.

[§] Prodr. Œdip., pp. 171-172, 1884.

^{||} The insect Saussure had before him, however, was not Thomas' species, but one described some years previous by Scudder as *Trimerotropis vin-* culata.

[¶] Proc. U. S. Nat: Mus., xxIII, pp. 414-415, 1901.