ON SOME RECENTLY DESCRIBED HEMIPTERA, CHIEFLY FROM INDIA

By E. Bergroth.

Coreidæ. — In his Fauna of British India, Rhynch. Het. V, p. 11, DISTANT describes a new genus and species under the name *Consivius collinus*, placing it in the family Lygæidæ near *Arocatus*. In the figure of this insect we meet an old friend — *Corizus hyoscyami* L. of the family Coreidæ, a species common all over the palearctic region and also recorded from Persia and China. With this insect the description — as far as it goes — also entirely agrees. If Mr. DISTANT will compare the type with his English specimens of *C. hyoscyami* I think he will be satisfied as to their identity, although the colour of the species is somewhat variable. The characteristic protruding hind angles of the metasternum and the numerous veins of the membrane are well portrayed by Mr. DISTANT'S artist. Mr. DISTANT does not seem to be aware of the fact that no Lygæid has more than five veins to the membrane. In the Biologia Centr. Americana DISTANT has recorded and figured two species of the common and universally distributed Lygæid genus *Nysius* as belonging to the Coreid genus *Rhopalus* SCHILL. (*Corizus* Auctt.). His way of dealing with the genus *Corizus* FALL. (*Therapha* Am. S.) is not much of an improvement. As *Corizus* is one of the most typical and most easily recognized in the Hemiptera and familiar to every tyro in Hemipterology, the failure of a student of Hemiptera since over thirty years to recognize it can only be explained in one way. With his habitual, now almost proverbial repugnance to structural characters Mr. DISTANT has only had an eye for the bright colour of *Corizus*, reminding of certain Lygæidæ, and this was sufficient reason to him to place it there, and as it naturally did not fit the description of any Lygæid, the « new genus » was ready!

Myodochidæ (Lygæidæ). — In the Records of the Indian Museum V, p. 313, DISTANT describes a « new genus and species » *Abyarus typicus* from Borneo and gives two figures of it, one taken from above, the other from the side. It is said to differ from *Aethalotus* STÄL « by the produced neck behind the ocelli ». From the profile figure it is clear that this « genus » is founded on an *Aethalotus* in which the head had by accident been detached from the body and then glued on to the thorax in such a way that the neck, normally enclosed in the prothorax, barely touches the upper apical margin of it; hence the « produced neck behind the ocelli ». The « genus » is a mere artefact.

The genus *Nerthus* DIST. has nothing to do with the Colobathristidæ, where it is placed by its author (Rhynch. Brit. Ind. V, p. 33). It is closely allied to if not actually identical with *Hyginus* STÅL (Heterogastrinæ). HORVATH has recently placed *Artemidorus* DIST. as a synonym of *Hyginus*, but as *Artemidorus* has clavate hind femora, a more constricted body and a somewhat different *facies*, DISTANT may be right in regarding it as distinct.

The genera *Esmunus* DIST. and *Euhemerus* DIST. (l. c., p. 41-43), placed in the Heterogastrinæ, are so like Blissinæ, that I suppose they will prove to belong to this subfamily even if the membranal nervures are correctly figured.

In 1901 DISTANT described a new genus and species under the name *Heinsius explicatus*. I have seen specimens from the same locality from where the typical specimens came, and I can see no reasons why it should be generically separated from *Ischnodemus* FIEB. Far from being « clavate », as DISTANT says, the antennæ are on the contrary tapering from the base to the apex.

It must be admitted that the descriptions of the Myodochidæ in DISTANT's last Volume of his Indian Rhynchota, though far from complete, are better than the utterly futile « descriptions » in the « Biologia », and I think most of them can be recognized. The genus *Nysius* is an exception. Of this genus DISTANT has described from different parts of the world about 15 new species, not one of which can be recognized from the description even as to the group of the genus where it belongs, and some of them may possibly be Coreidæ. Yet STÅL and HORVATH have clearly indicated what characters should be used in distinguishing species of this genus.

Pyrrhocoridæ. — The genus *Rhodoclia* DIST., originally placed in the Miridæ, is now transferred by DISTANT (l. c., p. 92) to the Pyrrhocoridæ. It may really belong there, but as it is founded on larvæ (a fact not mentioned by DISTANT), it is impossible to determine its place without a careful examination of the type. REUTER (Acta Soc. Sc. Fenn. XXXVII, 3, p. 165) suggested that it may belong to the Alydinæ (Coreidæ) and this is perhaps its true place.

Tingidæ. — DISTANT describes (l. c., p. 103) a new genus *Abdastartus* and says that it is « difficult to locate the genus precisely » because the two last antennal joints are wanting, and that « it is probable that in placing it after *Phatnoma* no considerable error will have been committed ». The two last antennal joints are of no importance in locating the genus and as it has the pronotum posteriorly prolonged in a long acute process reaching for beyond

the scutellum, it is absurd to place it in the Division Cantacaderaria near *Phatnoma*.

As shown by HORVATH *Ayrerus* DIST. is identical with *Urentius* DIST. DISTANT keeps it still as distinct because it has no pronotal hood. The hood is, however, absent also in the palearctic *Urentius Chobauti* HORV. and is evidently only of specific importance in this genus.

HORVATH has shown that *Belenus* DIST. = *Sakuntala* Kirk. As, however, the name *Sakuntala* is preoccupied (LAMEERE, Coleoptera, 1890), the name *Belenus* DIST. must be maintained.

Elasmognathus nepalensis DIST. (l. c., p. 122) belongs to *Diplogomphus* HORV., Bull. Soc. Ent. Fr. 1906, p. 296, a genus not even mentioned in DISTANT'S book, although HORVATH stated that the Ceylonese *Elasmognathus Greeni* KIRBY appertains to it.

Aradidæ. — *Acantharadus giganteus* BANKS, Philipp. Journ. Sc. IV, 580, pl. II, fig. 8 (1909) is identical with *Dysodius quaternarius* BERGR., Verh. zool. bot. Ges. Wien XXXVI, 54, pl. II, fig. 3 (1886). It is not allied to *Phyllotingis* WALK. (*Alyattes* STÅL), as BANKS says, but very closely so to the neotropical genus *Dysodius* Lep. Serv. As the hind lobe of the pronotum is broader than the fore lobe, not narrower than it as in *Dysodius*, I now think that this species can be generically separated from *Dysodius* and it has to bear the name *Acantharadus quaternarius* BERGR.

Gerridæ. — The genus *Ures* DIST. (Rhynch. Brit. Ind., V, 149) is founded on a larval stage, of what genus is impossible to say. Some other new Gerrid genera described in the same book are possibly also founded on larvæ, but as DISTANT carefully avoids to describe the tarsi and the genital segments, it is impossible to know with certainty. In several families he has founded new genera and species on larvæ, taking them for imagines, and on the other hand he has described apterous imagines as larvæ (« immature » specimens) without naming them. It is obvious that he does not know how to tell a larva from an imago, although in most cases a glance at the tarsi is sufficient for this purpose. There is no reason to name larvæ and I quite agree with MICHAEL and other authors, that such names cannot take priority if the imago is described later under an other name.

The genus *Ventidius* DISTANT (l. c., p. 156) is identical with *Metrocoris* MAYR. The differential characters given by DISTANT, « body shorter and broader, and with hirsute antennæ », are only specific. I have an undescribed species from Burma which is fully as short and broad as *Ventidius aquarius* DIST., but it cannot be generically separated from *Metrocoris*.

Reduviidæ. — For *Tribelocephala orientalis* DIST. (l. c., p. 182) I propose the name *T. comparanda*, the name *orientalis* being preoccupied by SCHOUTEDEN for an East-african species.

Physorhynchus coprologus Ann. has been correctly transferred to the Acanthaspidinæ by DISTANT (l. c., p. 195), but I do not think it is an *Acanthaspis* as DISTANT suggests. The type is an apterous imago, not an « immature » specimen as DISTANT says.

In 1902 DISTANT described the new genus *Khafra* and says of it : « anterior tibiæ not provided with a distinct apical spongy furrow ». As type of the genus is given *Platymeris prædo* STÅL, of which DISTANT had STÅL's type before himself. Of this species STÅL correctly says : « fossa spongiosa tibiarum anteriorum circiter dimidium tibiarum occupans ». In *Kh. elegans* BREDD. and *ugandica* SCHOUT., which I know, the spongy furrow is of the same length as in *prædo*, and there can be no doubt that this is the case in all other species of the genus. Far from being absent, as DISTANT says, the spongy furrow is thus exceptionally long and well developed in *Khafra*.

Nabidæ. — For *Arbela* DISTANT (Rh. Br. Ind. V, 219) uses the name *Acanthobrachys* FIEB. and says that « REUTER has advocated the substitution of the later name *Arbela* STÅL, because FIEBER had neither given nor described a representative species ». REUTER has said nothing of the kind and has nowhere advocated such a principle. On the contrary he states expressly (Mém. Soc. Ent. Belg. XV, 126) that he discorded the name *Acanthobrachys* simply because it is preoccupied (JEKEL, Coleoptera, 1857).

Miridæ (Capsidæ). — In this family DISTANT has described 60 new genera from India. REUTER has shown that 43 of these genera are impossible to locate from the utterly useless descriptions, and in this family DISTANT's figures are of little avail. Developing the excellent fundamental principles for the classification of this family laid down by FIEBER and C. G. THOMSON and adding new ones REUTER has during many years' studies established a system of the Miridæ in which all characters have been properly considered and which beyond question is the greatest achievement of modern systematic Hemipterology. Of this system DISTANT seems to have understood practically nothing and has substituted for it a preposterous jumble of his own fabrication, impossible to unravel without examination of his types. To cap the climax he does not scruple (Rhynch. Brit. Ind. IV, p. 157) to speak of REUTER's disastrous results in retarding a knowledge of that family » !

Lasiomiris lineaticollis REUT. is correctly placed as a synonym of *albopilosus* LETH. by DISTANT; I have seen LETHIERRY's type.

Seveval years ago ATKINSON placed *Helopeltis febriculosa* BERGR. as a doubtful synonym of *H. theivora* WAT., and MANN has recently expressed the opinion that they should be united There can in fact be no doubt that *febriculosa* was founded on a casual, not definite, variety of *theivora*.

POPPIUS has recently described a new Ceylonese genus of this family under the name *Uzeliella*. This name being preoccupied by BAGNALL for a genus of Thysanoptera, I propose the name *Poppiella* for the Mirid genus.

Anthocoridæ. — The five new genera of this family described by DISTANT in a former volume (1906) of his « Fauna » have been placed as synonyms of other genera by POPPIUS. DISTANT maintains them all in his new volume. As to the identity of *Amphiareus* DIST. and *Lippomanus* DIST. with *Cardiostethus* FIEB. there can, however, be no doubt, but if DISTANT's figure of *Armulphus* is correct, he may be right in keeping this genus as distinct from *Anthocoris*, as it has a much larger cuneus beginning before the tip of the clavus. As stated by POPPIUS there seem to be no reasons to separate *Seseliius* DIST. and *Ostorodias* DIST from *Scoloposcelis* FIEB., although DISTANT gives a key to keep them apart. This key looks good on the paper, but breaks down on closer examination, as *Scoloposcelis* contains species with only the fore femora spined, others with the fore and hind femora spined, and still others with all femora spined, all species, however, exhibiting the same generic characters. On *Cardiostethus pilosus* POPP. DISTANT founds the new genus *Almeida*, but does not mention that POPPIUS himself suggested the foundation of a new genus for it. The cosmopolite *Lyctocoris campestris* FABR. has been recorded from Bombay by POPPIUS; it is not described in DISTANT's book.

Naucoridæ. — The genus *Thurselinus* DIST. (Rhynch. Brit. Ind., III, 33 and V, 327) is identical with *Naucoris* GEOFFR.

Cicadidæ. — GODING and FROGGATT have — « very properly » according to DISTANT — separated the species of *Cicadetta* KOL. (*Melampsalta* KOL.) with five apical areas to the wings as a distinct genus, *Pauropsalta*. Yet this character cannot even be regarded as of specific value, as in some species, for instance the African *C. variegata* OL., the number of apical areas is six in some specimens and five in others. Sometimes there are five areas in one wing and six in the other. The number is variable also in other allied genera. Specimens of *Abroma nubifurca* WALK. with five (instead of six) apical areas have been described by DISTANT as a « new genus and species » under the name *Panka simulata*.

Mr. DISTANT seems to greatly resent every criticism of his works, forgetting that science can make no progress without criticism, and he apparently wants to be undisturbed in filling the hemipterological literature with systematic enigmas. In one of Mr. DISTANT's latest papers there is a passage too characteristic of his attitude towards criticism to be left unmentioned. Many years ago G. FALLOU described as new, without consulting the literature, all such Hemiptera in his collection that he did not find named in SIGNORET's collection. His descriptions are very short and quite inadequate, but he sent me his types and I published the synonymy of his species. I did so without further comment, for FALLOU did not pretend to be a specialist and *he* did not try to gloss over his dilettantism with a veneer of erudition. Yet this short synonymic notice of mine is sufficient reason for Mr. DISTANT to depict FALLOU as my « critical target »! It is true that DISTANT's works have been severely censured by his colleagues in Hemipterology, but there has been too sufficient reason for this criticism and I cannot but agree with the late BREDDIN when he spoke of DISTANT's « disastrous activity ». Mr. DISTANT speaks of my « constant animadversions ». *Errare humanum est* and anybody can make occasional mistakes, but when DISTANT describes Myodochidæ as Coreidæ, Coreidæ as Myodochidæ, Pyrrhocoridæ as Pentatomidæ, Acanthiadæ as Reduviidæ and Reduviidæ as Nabidæ, when he describes parts of the abdomen as belonging to the sternum, larvæ as imagines and imagines as larvæ, when his descriptions are not only insufficient but often positively wrong, when he in his papers shows a constant incapacity to grasp what characters should be used in separating genera and species in the group he happens to be dealing with, and when he constantly tries to defend or deny unquestionable errors, — then I fail to see why all this should be passed by in silence. STÅL (Öfv. Vet. Ak. Förh. 1870, p. 607) said of F. WALKER : « this author's notions of systematic characters are so hazy that one does not venture to assume that he has correctly understood even the most distinct forms ». These very words are applicable also to Mr. DISTANT. It is indeed a pity that so great a part of all known Hemiptera has passed through the hands of WALKER and DISTANT, and it is at least fortunate that a good deal of the Central-American Heteroptera was worked out by the coleopterist Mr. CHAMPION whose masterly treatise on the families belonging to *his* part of the Rhynchotal division of the « Biologia » is an adornment of the hemipterological literature.