

Studies on Cynipidae Alloxystinae

3. The identity of *Phaenoglyphis ruficornis* (Förster, 1869) comb. nov.

by

H. H. EVENHUIS

Institute of Phytopathological Research (IPO), Wageningen

Among Cynipidae Alloxystinae there are two described species with a densely pubescent mesoscutum, namely *Hemicrisis ruficornis* Förster, 1869, and *Allotria (Auloxysta) pubicollis* Thomson, 1877. Obviously, neither the original authors nor later workers paid much attention to this striking character. Since FÖRSTER and THOMSON neither of the two species seems to have been found again.

FÖRSTER (1869) characterized the genus *Hemicrisis* by the presence of two parapsidal furrows on the hind part of the mesoscutum. Species with complete parapsidal furrows he placed in the genus *Phaenoglyphis*, described in the same publication. As another important character he mentioned one or two grooves at the base of the scutellum, present in *Phaenoglyphus*, but absent in *Hemicrisis*.

Since FÖRSTER, however, a number of Alloxystinae species have been described, which have incomplete parapsidal furrows, and grooves at the base of the scutellum. CAMERON (1883) described *Allotria salicis* with two incomplete parapsidal furrows. Later (CAMERON, 1890) he transferred the species to *Phaenoglyphis* with the remark: "In *P. salicis* the fovea at the base of the scutellum is obscure, so that it may be said to be intermediate between *Phaenoglyphis* and *Hemicrisis*". KIEFFER (1902) retained the genus *Hemicrisis* and separated it from *Phaenoglyphis* only by the absence of grooves at the base of the scutellum. In their work on world Cynipidae, DALLA TORRE and KIEFFER (1910) added in their key to the genera that in *Hemicrisis* the mesoscutum is finely punctuated, but in their discussion of the only species, *H. ruficornis*, they classify this as a specific character and not as a generic character. Thus it is clear that in taxonomic literature much doubt exists about the status of the genus *Hemicrisis*.

In comparing the original descriptions of *Hemicrisis ruficornis* and *Allotria pubicollis* these species seem very similar. The only serious contradiction obviously consists in the fact that THOMSON placed the latter species in his subgenus *Auloxysta*, stating that it has two grooves at the base of the scutellum which, according to FÖRSTER, *Hemicrisis* does not have.

I had the opportunity to compare the original types of *Hemicrisis ruficornis* and *Allotria pubicollis*, which I got on loan from the "Naturhistorisches Museum" at Vienna, Austria, and from the Zoological Institute of the University of Lund, Sweden, respectively. The material from Vienna consists of one male and one female specimen, that from Lund of one female only; they are obviously the only known specimens of the two species. In comparing the two female specimens I can only conclude that they belong to the same species. The male specimen agrees in essential features with the females and thus I accept that it also belongs to the same species.

The FÖRSTER specimens show a shallow groove at the base of the scutellum; at a magnification of $\times 70$ and a favourable illumination its front edge seems marked by a narrow, raised border. In the THOMSON specimen the left side of the

thorax is partly perforated by the pin. However, the right hand part of the groove seems to show the same structure as in the FÖRSTER specimens.

The species has three important characters in common with *Phaenoglyphis* Förster sensu HELLÉN, 1959, namely the longitudinal suture at both sides of the mesothorax, the curved and excavated third antennal segment in the male and the large radial cell with the distal part of the radius straight or almost straight. However, the first segment of the gaster is dorsally only a little longer than the second, unlike most *Phaenoglyphis* species in which it is much longer. As the relative lengths of these segments can vary considerably between the several species, I do not value this too much as a generic character.

Though the species is in some respects somewhat aberrant, I think there is reason enough to place it in *Phaenoglyphis* Förster sensu HELLÉN. The valid name should then be *Phaenoglyphis ruficornis* (Förster, 1869). I designate the female specimen of FÖRSTER's material as the lectotype of *Hemicrisis ruficornis* Förster. It bears three labels: 1. 16/7 62 and some illegible sign (handwritten), 2. Collect. G. Mayr (printed; it means that the specimen did belong to the collection of Mayr), 3. Hem. ruficornis (handwritten) Förster, Type (printed). The male specimen is the paratype and bears four labels: 1. Först. (printed), 2. Collect. G. Mayr (printed), 3. Hem. ruficornis (handwritten) Förster, Type (printed), 4. Hemicrisis ruficornis Frst. ♂ ♀ (handwritten). The only THOMSON specimen should be the holotype of *Allotria pubicollis* Thomson; it bears three labels: 1. Lund Åroskut 31/7 1840 (handwritten), 2. pubicollis (handwritten), 3. 1972 48 (printed on a blue, rectangular card). A more complete redescription can better be given after the species has been found again in sufficient numbers, or, even better, after it has been reared as a hyperparasite from some aphid species.

Thanks are due to Dr. J. QUINLAN, London, England, and Prof. Dr. J. T. WIEBES, Leyden, Netherlands, for reading the manuscript critically and to Mr. R. DANIELSSON, Lund, Sweden, and Dr. M. FISCHER, Vienna, Austria for furnishing the THOMSON and FÖRSTER types respectively.

SUMMARY

After studying the original type material, it is concluded that *Hemicrisis ruficornis* Förster, 1869, and *Allotria (Auloxysta) pubicollis* Thomson, 1877, are synonyms (syn. nov.). It is proposed to transfer the species to the genus *Phaenoglyphis*, so that the valid name should be *Phaenoglyphis ruficornis* (Förster, 1869) (comb. nov.). The types were designated.

References

- CAMERON, P., 1883. Descriptions of sixteen new species of parasitic Cynipidae, chiefly from Scotland. *Trans. ent. Soc. Lond.*: 365—374.
- , 1890. A monograph of British phytohagous Hymenoptera 3. Ray Society, London.
- DALLA TORRE, C. W. VON und J. J. KIEFFER, 1910. Cynipidae. *Das Tierreich* 24.
- FÖRSTER, A. A., 1869. Ueber die Gallwespen. *Verh. zool.-bot. Ges. Wien* 19: 327—370.
- HELLÉN, W., 1959. Die in Finnland vorkommenden Arten der Gattung *Phaenoglyphis* Först. (Hym., Cyn.). *Notul. ent.* 38: 65—67.
- KIEFFER, J. J., 1902. Les Cynipides (suite), in André: *Spécies des Hyménoptères d'Europe et d'Algérie*. Tome 7 bis.
- THOMSON, C. G., 1877. *Opuscula Entomologia*, Fasciculus octavus, Trelleborg.