hedge of Andorra and Sargent's juniper at Harrisburg during April-August, 1974. A few eggs had hatched on April 12, and by the 16th, first-instar nymphs were becoming numerous, although unhatched eggs and a few second instars also were beaten from the plants. Weekly sampling was begun on April 17. The April 24 sample consisted mainly of second instars; the May 1 sample, mainly of fourth instars. Fifth instars were present by May 8, but fourth instars still predominated. Nymphs averaged nearly 30/beating tray in this sample (Fig. 9).

The first adults were seen on May 15 (in 1973 they were observed on May 13). They became more numerous than late instars on May 22 and began to decline in numbers by late May. (Heidemann's (1892) observation that *D. elegans* was less common than *D. repletus* on the same trees probably was a result of his collecting in June and July when populations of *elegans* were declining.) The population used for weekly sampling was nearly a week ahead of nearby populations, possibly because the building offered protection. Populations in Washington Co. and the northern counties lagged behind by as much as two weeks in 1973. A sample taken at Cresson, Cambria Co. (elev. 2400 ft.), illustrated the effect of higher altitudes on development. On May 14, 1975, first and second instars were found when fourth and fifth instars were present at Harrisburg (elev. 365 ft.).

On two occasions we found nymphs of a second generation. Instars III-IV were taken on Pfitzer juniper on August 23, 1973, in Warren Co. and instars IV-V on *J. chinensis* cv. 'Blaauw' on September 5, 1974, in Lycoming Co.

Collections from the Andorra-Sargents juniper hedge during 1973 indicated that small numbers were associated with Andorra juniper. In the 1974 weekly samples, numbers from Andorra were always less than 10% of the total even though 40% of the plants (4 of 10 sample sites) were Andorra juniper.

## Dichrooscytus repletus (Heidemann)

Lygus repletus Heidemann, 1892, Proc. Ent. Soc. Wash. 2:225

This species has been known as D. viridicans Knight, but we have shown that Heidemann's (1892) description was sufficient to recognize the species and to validate Uhler's manuscript name