

Remarks.—*Ceratocapsus knighti* can be separated from other *Ceratocapsus* by its small size, by the dark brown dorsum clothed with recumbent brown setae, by the testaceous legs, and by the male genitalia.

I have named this species in honor of the late H. H. Knight, a man who had a remarkable perception of mirid taxonomy and whose many fine contributions to miridology clearly made him North America's greatest mirid specialist.

*Ceratocapsus lutescens* Reuter, 1876:87

Fig. 14

*Ceratocapsus lutescens* was originally described from Texas. Since then it has been recorded from Florida to Kansas and north to New York and Wisconsin, but these records may be based on misidentifications of *C. bifurcus* and *C. rubricornis*. All the specimens I have examined from the east are *C. rubricornis* and those from Florida are *C. bifurcus*.

I have examined the holotypes of *C. bifurcus* and *C. rubricornis* and 2 specimens of *C. lutescens* from Texas (determined as *C. lutescens* by Knight). *Ceratocapsus lutescens* can be separated from *C. rubricornis* by the partially (rather than totally) red antennae and from *C. bifurcus* by the short, semierect (rather than pilose) setae on the dorsum. The male genitalia are distinct for each species.

*Ceratocapsus luteus* Knight, 1923:527

Fig. 17

*Ceratocapsus luteus* was originally described from New York and West Virginia and later reported from Ohio (Watson, 1928) and Illinois (Knight, 1941). This species is common throughout Pennsylvania on both *Pinus* spp. (mostly *sylvestris*) and *Picea* spp. (mostly *abies*).

Although Knight (1923) suggested *C. luteus* resembled *C. lutescens*, it now can be more closely associated with *C. cecilsmithi*. It can be separated from both species by the smaller, more slender form, uniform yellow-brown color, tomentose pubescence, and distinctive male genitalia.

*Ceratocapsus modestus* (Uhler), 1887:69

Fig. 1

There has been considerable confusion over the identify of *C. modestus*. Uhler clearly noted that the species he was describing was common on pine trees. Blatchley (1926) noticed a problem when he noted that Uhler's description of the pronotum as being "coarsely unevenly punctate" did not agree with specimens Knight had determined as *C. modestus*. Knight, possibly not aware of the *C. modestus* problem, apparently based his concept of *C. modestus* on the single female in the USNM type collection and not on Uhler's description. Wheeler and Henry (1975) have shown that Uhler's