Yet a further complication is found in the late Dr. Na’s description of a Statobia from Mendrisio, Switzerland, which he identifies as fasciculata, accompanying his description with an excellent figure. From this it is evident that the insect before him was not the same as the Le Lioran and German examples. On the other hand, it is clearly recognizable as a species which I have taken at Bourg d’Oisans in the Alps, and have considered tentatively as fasciculata, McLeach.. My view being perhaps influenced by the fact that it was certainly distinct from the Le Lioran species described by McLeach as fasciculata; moreover, the author included gratiosa in 1918. Bull. Int. Acad. Sci. Fransais Joseph 6, from Savoy in Savoie. I have failed to reconcile his description and figures with any of the three known species, and it may be that a fourth is here involved.

These are the facts. In the absence of an opportunity of examining either the types or examples from the actual type localities, there seems to be no other course open than to re-describe and figure the species on the assumption that the Le Lioran examples may be fasciculata and those from Bourg d’Oisans, gratiosa.

I am not altogether satisfied that the determinations are correct but, with these figures available, it should be possible, in the future, with fresh material from Savoy and the Alps, to clear up the position beyond all reasonable doubt.

The assembly of three species has led to a better understanding of the genitalia in the genus, and, with more material available of fasciculata from Mr. Rich's collection, I find it advisable to make a further allusion of the figures of this species, those given in Nos. Madrid, 4, and it is necessary to reconcile with the Statobia formation as shown in the remaining species and the additional examples received, to make known the existence of a new species, which may be hardly recognized on the figures. A few words may be added to indicate the general construction of the genitalia in the genus, or, at any rate, in the three European species. The terminal segments are deeply excised both dorsally and ventrally. It is necessary, of course, to clear the material in KOH or in a similar manner to obtain a correct conception of their form. These spines furnish the most easily recognizable character for the separation of the species. A pair of plates with down-growing hooked spines may perhaps be homologous with the superior appendages, and in the antennae also a pair of characterizecally formed inferior appendages. A strong process arises from the antennal segment.

Key to the Species.

1. Black spines three in number
   - entomella, McLeach.
2. Black spines only two in number
   - fasciculata, Schenkler.
3. Black spines unequal in length, asymmetric; the one, half the length of the other, the longer directed downwards, the shorter upwards, fasciculata, Mealy.
realized that very little systematic collecting of dragonflies has been done, with probably half to the feeling that such strong-flying insects would be widespread and well known (see the poverty of Cape localities in B. Monograph of South African Odonata, 1931, Mem. S. Af. Mus., 18).

The genotype, with which I have personal acquaintance, is an extensively handsome insect, and is at once recognizable from all other Cape dragonflies by its bright colours and its sustained flight. It has, however, the habit common to several other allied forms of flying in a definite "best," and by quietly taking up a strategic position at some spot on this "best" the collector has little difficulty in effecting a capture.

Oviposition has not been observed, and no nymph which could belong to these dragonflies has yet been found.

The specific names allude to my friends: Mr. H. G. Wood, a great hunter of insects; and Mr. A. C. Harrison, a disciple of Isaac Walton.

Glossary:
- 
- Presha, gen. n.
- Presha venator, sp. n. (Fig. 1 a-e.)

**Presha venator, sp. n.**

1. Larvum, ephippia and some fulvous-estaminus; vertex dark metallic blue at sides, centre metallic; occiput triangular-estaminus. Thorax estaminus with a narrow mediodorsal pale ochreous stripe, bordered on either side by a metallic greenish-blue stripe, the two outer lateral stripes similarly metallic greenish-blue. Legs black, scutum and trochanters fulvous-estaminus. Abdomen segments 1 and 2 estaminus, segment 3 with black band on hind margin dorsally; segments 4-9 metallic-red with more or less complete black bands, and a submedian median-pale cream-coloured mark anteriorly; segment 10 ochreous with black hind margin. In the uppers appendages black, lower appendages ochreous, with the tip, and sometimes also the margins, black. In the valves and appendages black. Wings hyaline, faintly suffused towards apices in the segment 1, strongly suffused with yellow from base to proximally. Pterostigma and costa black. Mesonotum greyish-white.

Abdominal segments 6-8 strongly banded in both sexes. Dorsal lobe ceasing about middle of segment 9. Post-terginal cells in hind-wing in 2 rows, except for the proximal 2 cells in the segment 9. In the segment 9 and 10, parallel throughout. Genitalia, segment 1 with a pair of strong siphoniform processes on the sternite, projecting backwards; anterior hamus (segment 2) broad, thinly elavated; base of the siphoniform processes on the margin curved outwards; genitalia elongate; penis spumber with a single siphon, strongly chitinized, red. Valves prominent, lobate, articulation processes very small, knob-like, hidden under the valves.

Fore and hind-wing: 1. 37-38 mm.; 2. 39-40 mm. Abdomen: 3. 37-38 mm. (including appendages). 4. 36-38 mm. 5. 37-38 mm. 6. 36-38 mm. 7. 37-38 mm. 8. 36-38 mm.

**NOTES ON THEOBALDI’S “THE PLANTLICE OR APHIDIDAE OF GREAT BRITAIN”**

By D. Hille Ris Lambers.

(From the Entomological Laboratory, Wageningen, Holland.)

**Introduction.** In February 1933, through the kindness of the Trustees of the British Museum (Natural History), I had the opportunity of going through part of the Theobaldi collection of Aphids, and of examining some of his types, the results of which are given in the following paper.

There is no doubt that the study of the Aphids is still in a rather primitive stage and that a genus is a more or less vague conception to most workers, not so much in the generic diagnosis, as in the arrangement of border-line species. Theobaldi accepted Baker’s system, at least in name, but judging by the way in which his species are distributed over the genera, he followed a very indefinite rule in the estimation of generic characters.

Nobody will doubt that the summer and winter forms of a migrating Aphid belong to one species. Every author has made the mistake of describing them as distinct species when the life-cycle was unknown. This is more or less to be expected, as the morphological characters of an Aphid on primary and secondary hosts may be rather different. But Theobaldi placed them in different genera, even though he knew the biology. As an example illustrating this point, I give the following: *Elphesporaphus syrphus*, L., (Theo., 2 : 60-66), is the summer form of *Aphis tuberariae* Koch, (Theo., 2 : 204-208), and is described also under the name *Hydropaphus syrphus*, Theo., (2 : 96-100). Again, *Anaphus rugosus*, Baker, (Theo., 2 : 294-295), is described also as *Myzus plantagineus*, Pan., (Theo., 2 : 327). The latter migrates from apple to plantain.

The same species is often described many times under various names (*Microaphus Tuberae*, Asim., was described as *M. pisi*, Koch, *M. syrphus*, Theo., *M. rugosus*, Theo., *M. tuberae*, Theo., *M. ginsengi*, Theo., *M. emetabolitum*, Theo., and *M. helicani*, Theo. & Walton; the same is the case with *Anaphus rugosus*, Kalt., see below).

The keys are almost useless as in some instances the characters and differences do not agree with his own material, e.g. in the key to *Macrosiphum continuitum* (1 : 65) is characterised by having “5 hairs each side” on the coxae, whereas the coxae of his type specimen has at least 11 hairs.

In the following paper, an attempt is made to correct some of the errors in Vol. 1. It is quite possible that new mistakes have been made in doing so, but some errors by “trial and error.” I have not yet completely examined the material in Vols. 2 and 3, but I hope to publish later the notes that I have made on some of the types. The systematics of Hine are followed for practical reasons, although I cannot agree in every detail with his ideas or with the characters given for some of his genera.


The Jackson slide in Theobaldi’s collection is only *Macrosiphum (Kulbovsky) orae*, Fair., so that I place Jackson’s species as a synonym.


As Theobaldi says, Buckton’s slide in the B.M. collection is *rubrofusus*, Theo.