

*Atomoscelis* Rt.

*A. signaticornis* Rt. - Cairo, 2 spec., 10. - 19. VI. 1961; Heluan, 1 spec., 9. IX. 1962; Luxor, some, 26. - 28. VII. 1962; Sinai, Wadi Feiran, 2 spec., 25. - 29. IX. 1962. From desert vegetation and at lamps.

*Brachycranella* Rt.

*B. fokkeri* (Rt.) - Alexandria, many, 5. - 6. VIII. 1961; 50 km N. of Ismailia, many, 17. VI. 1961. Swept from halophytes.

*Campylomma* Rt.

*C. nicolasi* P. Rt. - Mersa Matruh, some, Eckerlein; Siwa (HOBERLANDT *op. cit.*, p. 368).

*C. impieta* E. Wgn. - Assiut, many, 30. - 31. VII. 1961; Cairo, many, 10. - 19. VI. 1961, IX. 1962; Cairo - Suez desert road, some, 14. - 15. IX. 1962; Dakhla, some, 20. - 21. IX. 1962; Fayoum, many, 13. - 14. VI. 1961; Heluan, some, 9. IX. 1962; 50 km N. of Ismailia, 17. VI. 1961; Kharga, many, 19. - 22. IX. 1962; Luxor, many, 26. - 28. VII. 1961; Meadi, some, 12. VI. 1961. Common on cultivated fields and in deserts both on herbaceous plants and on bushes and trees. Also at lamps.

*C. annulicornis* (Sgn.) - Siwa (HOBERLANDT *op. cit.*, p. 368).

*C. diversicornis* Rt. - Siwa (HOBERLANDT *op. cit.*, p. 368).

*C. zizyphi* Rt. - Heluan, 1 spec., U. Saalas.

*C. angustula* Rt. - Heliopolis, 1 spec., J. Sahlberg; Siwa (HOBERLANDT *op. cit.*, p. 368).

*Paramixia* Rt.

*P. suturalis* Rt. - 50 km N. of Ismailia, some, 17. VI. 1961; Meadi, 1 spec., 12. VI. 1961; Sokhna, 1 spec., 16. VI. 1961. On *Cyperaceae* in wet places. At lamp.

*Auchenocrepis* Fb.

*A. alboscuteolata* Pt. - Alexandria, 2 spec., 5. - 6. VIII. 1961; Cairo, many, 10. - 19. VI. 1961; 50 km N. of Ismailia, some, 17. VI. 1961; Luxor, many, 26. - 28. VII. 1961; near Suez, some, 16. VI. 1961. On *Tamarix*.

*Tuponia* Rt.

*T. pallida* Rt. - Siwa (HOBERLANDT *op. cit.*, p. 369).

*T. elegans* (Jak.) - Siwa (HOBERLANDT *op. cit.*, p. 369). - The species is common in Turkestan and Iran, but I have not seen it from the western parts of the Middle East. The westernmost find I have seen, probably as a separate subspecies, is from Bulgaria.

*T. lethierryi* Rt. nominate form. - Fayoum, 2 spec., J. Sahlberg.

*T. lethierryi* Rt., ssp. *vulnerata* Lv. - Cairo, some, 10. - 19. VI. 1961; 50 km N. of Ismailia, some, 17. VI. 1961; near Suez, some, 16. VI. 1961. On *Tamarix*.

*T. tamaricicola* Ldb. - Dakhla, some, 20. - 21. IX. 1962; Fayoum, 1 spec., 13. - 14. VI. 1961; Kharga, some, 19. - 22. IX. 1962; Luxor, many, 26. - 28. VII. 1961. On *Tamarix*.

*T. hippophaes* (Fb.) - Siwa (HOBERLANDT *op. cit.*, p. 369).

*T. longipennis* Hv. ssp. *guttata* E. Wgn. - Cairo, many, 10. - 19. VI. 1961; Dakhla, 1 spec., 20. - 21. IX. 1962; Heluan, 2 spec., 9. IX. 1962; 50 km N. of Ismailia, some, 17. VI. 1961. On *Tamarix*.

*T. concinnoides* Lv. - Alexandria, many, 5. - 6. VIII. 1961; Fayoum, 2 spec., J. Sahlberg; 50 km N. of Ismailia, 1 spec., 17. VI. 1961; near Suez, 1 spec., 16. VI. 1961. On *Tamarix*.

*T. concinna* Rt.

In the Egyptian specimens the vertex ( $\delta$ ) is 1.2-1.44  $\times$  as broad as eye, while 1.6  $\times$  in specimens from Algeria. Possibly the Egyptian specimens belong to a separate subspecies. Additional material from different parts of the Sahara are needed before this can be confirmed. As I have pointed out before, (LINNAVUORI 1962, p. 34), *T. conspersa* Rt. is also closely related to *T. concinna*. If *T. concinna* were to be split into different subspecies in the Sahara, *T. conspersa* could possibly be regarded as the easternmost subspecies of *T. concinna*.

Assiut, 1 spec., 30. - 31. VII. 1961; Dakhla, some, 20. - 21. IX. 1962; Luxor, 1 spec., 26. - 28. VII. 1961; Sinai, Wadi Feiran, some, 25. - 29. IX. 1962; near Suez, many, 16. VI. 1961. On *Tamarix*.

*T. minutissima* Lv. - Sokhna, some, 16. VI. 1961. On *Tamarix*. New for Egypt. Previously known from Israel.

*T. minima* E. Wgn. - Dakhla, 2 spec., 20. - 21. IX. 1962. On *Tamarix*. New to Egypt. Previously known from Iran.

*Aphanophyes* Rt.

E. WAGNER (1964 b, p. 21 - 26) discussed the taxonomic status of the genus *Aphanophyes* Rt. and regarded it as a separate genus, closely related to *Tuponia* Rt. The relationship is very close indeed; it is to be noted that, for instance, a much similar biramose penis type occurs also in the *concinna* group within the genus *Tuponia*. Nevertheless, *Aphanophyes* deserves at any rate a subgeneric rank within *Tuponia*.

E. WAGNER (*op. cit.*) recorded 3 species of the genus: *A. laticeps* Rt. (= *vitticollis* Rt.), *A. richteri* (E. Wgn.) and *A. obscuriceps* (Rt.). These species were synonymized by me (LINNAVUORI 1961, p. 32 - 33) on the base of the similarity in the genitalia. Afterwards I have been able to collect a considerable additional material from North Africa and Arabia. At present I regard *A. laticeps* and *A. richteri* as separate species. Some additions, however, have to be made to WAGNER's recent paper. 1) The size of *A. richteri* is usually smaller than in *A. laticeps*, although both species overlap. The length of *A. laticeps* is 2.6 - 3.25 mm, of *A. richteri* 2.2 - 3.15 mm. There seems to be a certain local variability in the populations of *A. richteri*. I have seen series of unusually large specimens from Libya and Arabia. 2) The vertex in *A. laticeps* is 1.67 - 2.0  $\times$  ( $\delta$ ) or 2.7 - 3.3  $\times$  ( $\varphi$ ) as broad as eye, while in *A. richteri* the corresponding proportions are 1.5 - 2.0  $\times$  ( $\delta$ ) or 2.4 - 3.1  $\times$  ( $\varphi$ ); there is thus a broad overlapping also in this respect. 3) The vesica of *A. richteri* is somewhat robuster, with one of its branches expanded apically. The shape of the last-named is, however, somewhat variable. 4) The other differences mentioned by WAGNER are too small and variable to be of greater taxonomic importance. 5) A good difference is to be found in the colouring. Although *A. laticeps* is very variable in this respect, this species is usually considerably darker and never bright green as *A. richteri* always is. 6) The biology is entirely different in both species: *A. laticeps* lives on *Limoniastrum guyonianum*, while *A. richteri* is strictly monophagous on *Tamarix*. The record of *Ephedra alata* as the host plant is erroneous.

WAGNER also regarded *A. obscuriceps* as a valid species. I have not seen the male type of this species. The female cotype in coll. Reuter has greenish elytra and could belong to *A. richteri*. The male has, according to WAGNER, a somewhat exceptional ocular index, the vertex being 2.2  $\times$  as broad as the eye. Noting, however, the considerable indi-