

*Plagiolepis flavidula* Roger, 1863. Berlin Ent. Ztschr. 7: 162, *worker*. Type locality, "Cuba."

Dr. Bischoff found Roger's type of *Plagiolepis flavidula* to be a *Brachymyrmex*, but he was not able to determine the species. This information, while new, is not very surprising as no *Plagiolepis* is known to be native to the New World, although it is of course possible that Roger might have applied a valid name to an introduced species. So far as I am aware the name *flavidula* is not a homonym; therefore it should now stand as *Brachymyrmex flavidula* (Roger), new combination. It is possible, though, that some of the species described later in *Brachymyrmex* may prove to be a synonym of *flavidula*.

*Acanthostichus texanus* Forel, 1904. Soc. Ent. Belg. Ann. 48: 168, *dealate female*. Type locality, "Brownsville, Texas."

Although the holotype of *texanus* has apparently been lost, the description of the species is complete enough so that W. S. Creighton, Wm. F. Buren, and I have had no difficulty in placing female individuals from several localities in Texas not too distant from the type locality. In a paper to be published in the Bulletin of the Brooklyn Entomological Society I am synonymizing *Ctenopyga townsendi* Ashmead (1906. Ent. Soc. Wash. Proc. 8: 29, *male* and *alate female*. Type locality, La Puerta (probably Chihuahua). Mexico) with *A. texanus*.

*Tetramorium (Cephalomorium) bahai* Forel, 1922. Rev. Suisse de Zool. 30: 91, *worker*. Type locality, "Faisons, North Carolina, United States."

North American myrmecologists have never been able to place the ant described by Forel as *Tetramorium (Cephalomorium) bahai* from Faisons, North Carolina. As no *Tetramorium* is known to be native to North America, it is assumed that either Forel was incorrect in his generic placement of the ant or he had described an introduced *Tetramorium*, or else his locality labels were incorrect. When Santschi (1925. Soc. Ent. Belg. Bul. et Ann. 65: 228) stated that he had examined Forel's type and found the ant to be a *Pheidole (Hendecapheidole)*, it was only natural to assume that Santschi was correct in his generic and subgeneric placement. I was therefore greatly surprised when Charles Ferriere examined the type and found that, although it was a *Pheidole*, it could not possibly be a *Hendecapheidole* since it had 12 instead of 11 antennal segments. As Dr. Ferriere could not send me the holotype for examination and he did not have the time to determine it specifically, we do not yet know what the species is. Perhaps this can be settled at a future date when some North American myrmecologist is visiting the museum in Geneva.