THE TYPE OF DELPHAX FABR. AND LIBURNIA STAL.

BY E. BERGROTH, TURTOLE, FINLAND.

In his recently published "Contribution Toward a Monograph of the Delphacidæ of North and South America," Mr. D. L. Crawford discusses the use of the name Delphax by different authors, and correctly states that Delphax crassicornis Fabr. is the type of both Delphax Fabr. and Araeopus Spin., and that Araeopus consequently is a synonym of Delphax. He then proceeds to say: "In 1866 Stal (Hemipt. Africana, Vol. IV, p. 178) further complicated matters by restricting the name Delphax to D. clavicornis, which he erroneously supposed to be the type." In the cited place Stal does not at all speak of Delphax, but in the cited work and volume, p. 175, he expressly states: "Delphax Fabr., Stal = Araeopus Spin."
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As *crassicornis* is the type of *Arceopus*, it is according to Stal clearly also the type of *Delphax*. *D. clavicornis* Fabr. is the type of *Asiraca* Latr., which Stal always called by its correct name; nowhere has he called this genus *Delphax*. Far from having "complicated matters," Stal was the first author who set down the correct type of *Delphax*. Crawford has apparently not seen Stal's Hem. Afr., and what he says seems to be based on wrong second-hand quotations in some obscure paper. He further states, probably relying on the wrong statements of Kirkaldy and Distant, that Stal used *Embolophora monoceros* Stal as the type of *Liburnia*. Had he known Stal's Hem. Afr., he would have seen that Stal maintained *Embolophora* as subgenerically or sectionally distinct from *Liburnia* proper. This fact is sufficient to preclude *monoceros* from the possibility of being considered the type of *Liburnia*. The type of the latter genus is *pellucida* Fabr., as pointed out by Van Duzee.

Crawford gives good descriptions, and in many cases detail-figures, of the American Delphacids known to him, citing only the the names (with bibliographical references) of the other species, but reproducing the descriptions of the genera which he had not seen. He has, however, overlooked Stal's important work, "Rio Janeiro Hemiptera, II: Homoptera." Of the new genera and species of Delphacidae described by Stal in this work not even the names are mentioned. *Delphax cylindricornis* Fabr., redescribed from the type by Stal in his "Hemiptera Fabriciana" as *Canyra cylindricornis*, has also been omitted. From the facts that Crawford says this work was published in 1858, and that *Delphax seminigra* Stal (not "seminegra!") is described on p. 275 of it (whereas the work is from 1869, has only 130 pages, and contains nothing about that species) it is clear that the work is unknown to him. *Hygropyx pictifrons* Stal from the Philippine Islands is cited as a synonym of *Delphax pictifrons* Stal from Mexico, a synonymy which had been impossible if the author had known the cited papers where these generically distinct species are described. In all Crawford enumerates seven of Stal's publications in his bibliographic list, but it seems dubious whether he has seen any of them.

Stal is the founder of modern hemipterology, and it is not advisable to begin the study of any group of the Homoptera Auchenorhyncha without knowing his works.