

The spine-like, subulate spur is the most primitive and some of its possessors show the more generalized form of tegmina. The solid cultrate spur with both surfaces convex (Delphacini, Section A) appears to be the next stage, which is followed by the inner surface becoming concave (Section B) and eventually laminate (Section C). Section A is of interest as, with the exception of *Proterosydne** with one Australian and one American species, all the genera at present known are Hawaiian. With the exception of three species of grasses and sedges which are placed in Kelesia, all the native Hawaiian Delphacidae belong to this section and are not attached to grasses. Swezey† has shown that *Nesodryas freycinetiae* has but an apical tooth on the spur in first instar, those on the hind edge appearing at later instars. Section B contains six genera; of these, five, of which the habits are known, are attached to grasses. It is highly probable that further study will add several more to this section.

The antennæ. These organs come next to the spur for usefulness in taxonomic work; there appears to be but little specific variation and an absence of the sexual differences found in some of the other families of Fulgoroidea. The terete form is probably the more primitive, and the short basal joint more primitive than the longer basal joint.

The mesonotal carinæ. These are of great utility as they are always mentioned by describers and of their presence or absence there is little dispute.

The pronotal carinæ. Among some of the more difficult genera of section C of the Delphacini it is necessary not only to recognize the presence of these carinæ but also their shape and extension. Unless this is done it will be difficult to keep apart several genera containing different forms, and it will lead to the formation of one or more unwieldy genera of polymorphic character, whose species it will be more difficult to locate than are the present genera. This has been the case with Crawford's work on the north American forms and it will be still worse if the same methods are applied to the genera of the world.

It is generally possible to recognize two forms, those divergingly

*Crawford wrongly states this genus to be Hawaiian.

†Proc. Haw. Ent. Soc., 11., 13.