squamae forming conspicuous red spots on sides of pronotum in front, on elytral disc (produced sub-basally to humeri and posteriorly to beyond middle of elytra occupying median third in width) a conspicuous small red area nearly surrounded by a denuded area near apices of elytra and a red patch on femora at apical fourth, vestiture absent in small basal area below humeri and at sides of elytra in median half of length below humeral costa, the white scales narrower and less densely placed in median third of pronotum. Pronotum widest at middle, sides strongly arcuate, posteriorly parallel (♂) or slightly convergent (♀), anteriorly strongly convergent; median carina shining and conspicuous in anterior two-thirds. Elytra widest at humeri which are not prominent but only obtuse-angulate, sides parallel in basal third, evenly rounded posteriorly; striae very feebly impressed, the 2d, 4th and 6th insterstices obsoletely tuberculate. Mesosternum very prominent, produced anteriorly into a transverse subconical lobe and clothed with numerous white hairs. Metasternum not impressed at middle, posteriorly prominent before hind trochanters, sparsely foveolate, with short white scale-like hairs, abdominal segments finely, shallowly punctate with fine sparse white scales. Tarsal claws small, simple.

♂; Rostrum passing middle coxae, strongly punctate, the punctures forming striae on each side of basal median carina and supporting fine white hairs to beyond middle; antennae inserted two-fifths from apex; basal abdominal segments shorter and more deeply impressed at joints.

♀; Rostrum moderately curved, reaching 1st abdominal segment, round, shining, sparsely punctulate, without hairs at base; antennae inserted at middle.

Length ♂ 5.7, ♀ 5.5–6.1 mm.; width ♂ 2.9, ♀ 2.7–3.1 mm.; rostrum ♂ 2.4, ♀ 2.4–2.8 mm.

Type and allotype and one ♀ paratype no. 26584 U. S. N. M. Two female paratypes returned to S. C. Brunner.

Described from five specimens reared by Mr. S. C. Brunner at Santiago de las Vegas, Cuba, from larvae boring tunnels through the flesh of *Achras sapota* Linn., on a farm near San Miguel del Padrón, Habana Province. In the largest female irregular small areas of red scales are scattered in the white scale area in basal three-fifths of elytra.

TYPES OF TWO CHALCID-FLIES MISIDENTIFIED.

By A. B. Gahan, *Bureau of Entomology.*

It is desired herewith to correct two unfortunate instances of erroneous synonymy published by the writer. In both instances the errors were directly due to misidentification of type specimens.

I. In Proc. Ent. Soc. Wash., vol. 20, 1918, p. 66, a note regarding the genus *Propachyneuronia* Girault was published in which the statement was made that the genotype species, *Encyrtus siphonophorae* Ashmead, was a composite species and that the true type was an Encyrtid belonging to the genus

Aphidencyrtus where Ashmead had later placed it, instead of a Pachyneurine as Girault had stated.

This conclusion was based on specimens in the national collection bearing the type number 4860 which is the number assigned to the species in the type book, (not 4761 as recorded by Ashmead, Proc. U. S. Nat. Mus., vol. XII, 1900, p. 399). These specimens were naturally taken to be the actual types without further verification and since they certainly belonged to *Aphidencyrtus* the conclusion was drawn that Girault had been mistaken in the identity of the type specimens. Unfortunately I failed to take account of the fact that the specimens bearing the type number also bore a folded label stating that they had been reared at "Washington, D. C., Aug. 15 and 22, 1894, from *Siphonophora liriodendri*," and thus were shown to have been reared eight years subsequent to publication of the description and were from a different host and locality from that stated for the types in the original description. In the light of this label it is obvious that these specimens can not be the types. Girault in 1915 (Ann. Ent. Soc. Amer., vol. VIII, p. 283) where he synonymized *Aphidencyrtus aphidiphagus* Ashmead and *A. siphonophorae* Ashmead, evidently fell into the same error of accepting these specimens as types, a fact which he does not mention in his later treatment of the species.

The specimens upon which Girault based his later (1917) identification of the species and which formed the basis for his genus *Propachyneuronia* are labelled "*Pachyneuron siphonophorae* Ashmead" in Ashmead's handwriting with the name "*Encyrtus*," also in Ashmead's hand, written in one corner of the label and are from Jacksonville, Fla. The collection apparently contains no other specimens which could be the types and since these specimens fit Ashmead's description it seems certain that they are the actual types of *Encyrtus siphonophorae* and they have been so labelled.

In view of the foregoing the synonymy indicated in my previous note requires correction. Also it becomes necessary to amend to some extent the synonymy as given in the recently published list of type species of the genera of Chalcidoidea by Gahan and Fagan (U. S. Nat. Mus. Bul. 124, 1923, pp. 14 and 121). *Encyrtus aphidiphagus* Ashmead and *Encyrtus siphonophorae* Ashmead are not the same species and therefore *Aphidencyrtus* Ashmead and *Propachyneuronia* Girault are not isogenotypic, the latter genus being instead a synonym of *Pachyneuron* Walker in the opinion of the writer.

The corrected synonymy is as follows:

Pachyneuron Walker.

Pachyneuron Walker, Ent. Mag., vol. I, 1833, pp. 371 and 380.
Propachyneuronia Girault, Psyche, vol. XXIV, 1917, p. 102.

Propachyneuronia (Girault) Gahan and Fagan, U. S. Nat. Mus. Bul. 124, p. 121.

Pachyneuron siphonophorae (Ashmead).

(*Eupelmus*) *Encyrtus siphonophorae* Ashmead, Trans. Amer. Ent. Soc., vol. XIII, 1886, p. 131.

Pachyneuron aphidivora Ashmead, U. S. Dept. Agr. Div. Ent., Bul. 14, 1887, p. 14.

Pachyneuron maidaphidis Ashmead, Fla. Agr. College Bul. 2, 1888, p. 23.

Pachyneuron micans Howard, Insect Life, vol. II, 1890, p. 247; fig. 51.

Aphidencyrtus siphonophorae Ashmead, Proc. U. S. Nat. Mus., vol. XII, 1900, p. 399.

Propachyneuronia siphonophorae Girault, Psyche, vol. XXIV, 1917, p. 102.

Genus **Aphidencyrtus** Ashmead.

Aphidencyrtus Ashmead, Proc. U. S. Nat. Mus., vol. XII, 1900, pp. 340 and 398.

Propachyneuron Gahan, Proc. Ent. Soc. Wash., vol. 20, 1918, p. 66; Gahan and Fagan, U. S. Nat. Mus. Bul. 124, 1923, pp. 14, 120 and 121. (Misidentification of Propachyneuronia Girault.)

Aphidencyrtus aphidiphagus Ashmead.

Encyrtus aphidiphagus Ashmead, U. S. Dept. Agri. Div. Ent., Bul. 14, 1887, p. 14.

Aphidencyrtus aphidiphagus Ashmead, Proc. U. S. Nat. Mus., vol. XII, 1900, p. 399.

Aphidencyrtus siphonophorae Girault (not Ashmead), Ann. Ent. Soc. Amer., vol. VIII, 1915, p. 283.

Aphidencyrtus siphonophorae Gahan (not Ashmead), Proc. Ent. Soc. Wash., vol. XX, 1918, p. 66.

(*Encyrtus*) *Aphidencyrtus siphonophorae* Gahan and Fagan (not Ashmead), U. S. Nat. Mus. Bul. 124, 1923, p. 14.

II. In 1920 (Proc. Ent. Soc. Wash., vol. 22, p. 239) (*Pteromalus*) *Meraporus calandrae* Howard was listed by me as a synonym of *Lariophagus distinguendus* (Foerster) the conclusion being based upon specimens in the national collection bearing the name label and at that time supposed to be the types. Following this publication Mr. James Waterston of the British Museum in correspondence and later in his "Report on Parasitic Hymenoptera Bred from Pests of Stored Grain" called attention to certain particulars in which Howard's original description of *calandrae* failed to agree with *distinguendus*. A careful checking up of the type was accordingly undertaken with the result that a pin from which the specimen had disappeared but which bore the label "*Pteromalus calandrae* Howard, MS, from *Calandra orizae*, Aug. 11, 1880," and the type label No. 2743 was discovered misplaced in the collection. There can be no doubt that this pin originally carried the type specimen of *Pteromalus calandrae* Howard which was described from a single male and that the specimen which I previously considered to be

the type was not that. The actual type specimen has completely disappeared as already indicated. The original description must, therefore, be depended upon to fix the identity of *calandrae* Howard.

This description agrees in every detail with certain male specimens of *Aplastomorpha vandinei* Tucker, a species which, like *calandrae*, was originally recorded from Texas as a parasite of *Calandra oryzae*. There appears no reason to doubt that *calandrae* Howard and *vandinei* Tucker are the same species. The former name is the older and should have precedence. The corrected synonymy is as follows:

Aplastomorpha calandrae (Howard).

Pteromalus calandrae Howard, Rept. U. S. Dept. Agri., 1880–1881, p. 273.
Meraporus calandrae Ashmead, in Smith's Ins. N. J., 1900, p. 558.
Meraporus calandrae Pierce, Jr. Econ. Ent., vol. I, 1908, p. 384.
Meraporus vandinei Tucker, Can. Ent., vol. 42, 1910, p. 343.
Aplastomorpha pratti Crawford, Proc. U. S. Nat. Mus., vol. 47, 1913, p. 252.
Neocatolaccus australiensis Girault, Mem. Queensl. Mus., vol. II, 1913, p. 306.
Aplastomorpha australiensis Girault, Mem. Queensl. Mus., vol. III, 1915, p. 313.
Neocatolaccus vandinei Girault, Ins. Ins. Mens., vol. 5, 1917, p. 152.
?Pteromalus calandrae Bridwell, Proc. Haw. Ent. Soc., vol. III, 1917, p. 488.
Neocatolaccus vandinei Girault, Treubia, vol. I, 1919, p. 59.
?Pteromalus calandrae Bridwell, Proc. Haw. Ent. Soc., vol. IV, 1919, p. 19.
Meraporus vandinei Gahan, Proc. U. S. Nat. Mus., vol. 56, 1919, p. 523.
Meraporus calandrae Doane, Jr. Econ. Ent., vol. 12, 1919, p. 312.
Aplastomorpha vandinei Gahan, Proc. Ent. Soc. Wash., vol. 22, 1920, p. 239.
Aplastomorpha vandinei Waterston, 9th Rept. Grain Pests Com., 1921, p. 17 (Royal Soc. Lond.)

THE RASPBERRY CANE APHID (HOM.).

By P. W. Mason, *U. S. Bureau of Entomology.*

This description was first prepared for a monograph of the Genus *Amphorophora*, and tables of measurements and drawings will appear in that monograph. In view of the increasing interest in the raspberry aphids and their possible relation to the transmission of mosaic, it is thought advisable to publish an account of this species in advance of the monograph.

The species is commonly known as the cane aphid, in distinction to *Amphorophora rubi* Kalt. which is found on the leaves. It seems to be rather common on this continent and has no doubt often been confused with *rubi* Kalt. As far as is known it is not found in Europe, the type continent of *rubi* Kalt.

It is distinguished from *rubi* Kalt., by the sensoria on antennal segments IV and V of the alate, by the larger number of sensoria on segment III in both the alate and apterous forms,