

Taxonomic and nomenclatural questions of some coniopterygid species (Neuroptera)

GYÖRGY SZIRÁKI

ABSTRACT: In the present paper confirmation of validity of *Aleuropteryx teleki* Sziráki, 1990, *Aleuropteryx wawrikae* Rausch & Aspöck, 1978, *Coniocompsa arabica* Sziráki, 1992, *Coniocompsa fimbriata* Tjeder, 1957, *Coniocompsa smithersi* Meinander, 1972, *Pamponis uncinatus* Adams, 1973, *Nimboa manselli* Meinander, 1998, *Nimboa natalensis* Tjeder, 1957, *Semidalis intermedia* Monserrat, 1983, *Semidalis tricornis* Johnson, 1980, *Semidalis uncinata* Tjeder, 1957, *Semidalis hidalgoana* Meinander, 1975, *Semidalis problematica* Monserrat, 1985 and *Semidalis sonora* Meinander, 1975 is given. Besides, taxonomic status of *Nimboa transvaalensis* Meinander, 1975, identity of *Nimboa capensis* Tjeder, 1957 and availability of the name *Coniopteryx* (*Xeroconiopteryx*) *martinmeinanderi* Sziráki & van Harten in Sziráki, 2004 are discussed.

According to MAYR (1942) „Species are groups of actually or potentially interbreeding natural populations, which are reproductively isolated from other such groups”. Consequently, a species is a concrete, objective phenomenon of nature, and not an arbitrary, man-made creature. The basic biological meaning of the species that it is a protected gene pool. Furthermore: „The reproductive isolation of a biological species – the protection of its collective gene pool against pollution by genes from other species – results in a discontinuity not only of the genotype of the species but also of its morphology and other aspects of the phenotype produced by the genotype. This is the fact on which taxonomic practice is based.” (MAYR & ASHLOCK, 1991).

In this practice description of a new species is based on the hypothesis that the recognized differences between the newly found form and its closest known relative are results of the reproductive isolation of their populations. (Besides, the identity of a species does not depend on the degree of the recognizableness of the distinctive features for the man.) The direct control of the reproductive isolation – of course – is possible only exceptionally, but when the given differences are larger than the known intraspecific variability of the corresponding characters in the well studied relative species (belonging e.g. to the same genus), supposition of such an isolation is justifiable – especially, if the differences are in direct connection with the reproduction; for example: when there are distinct differences in calling signals, or in the genitalic armature of the insects.

Nevertheless, it is possible that later transitorial forms will be found between the new „species” and its closest relative, i. e. the intraspecific variability of the given species larger than it was suspected before. It is possible also that the differences have been found in the new form were artefacts only. In such cases the junior name should be synonymized. On the other hand, a simple declaration of synonymy, without careful investigation of all possibly distinctive characteristics, and without discussion and demonstration the absence of a discontinuity between the series of variations of the given two species is not adequate. The main concept of

present paper the confirmation of validity of several dusty lacewing species which – in my opinion – were synonymized without sound foundations.

Below the name of the discussed species the original description, the concerning pages of the comprehensive works of MEINANDER (1972, 1990) and ASPÖCK & al. (2001), and the important papers after the last publication with an entire reference list are given.

Discussed species

Aleuropteryx teleki Sziráki, 1990 (confirmation of validity)

SZIRÁKI 1990: 120 (original description), Monserrat 2006: 15 (synonymy).

Geographical distribution: Tanzania.

Remarks: MONSERRAT (2006) determined a single *Aleuropteryx* specimen from Senegal as *A. felix* Meinander, 1977, and simultaneously synonymized *A. teleki* Sziráki, 1990 and *A. transvaalensis* Meinander, 1998 with this species, without any real discussion. Dorsal plate in male genitalia of *A. transvaalensis* is wide, and has two caudal projections (MEINANDER 1998: Fig. 2B) as in *A. felix* (SZIRÁKI 2004: Fig. 7B), the proximal apodeme of penis is wide and short both in *A. felix* (MEINANDER 1977: Fig. 1C) and *A. transvaalensis* (MEINANDER 1998a: Fig. 2C), and the other details of male genitalia are also the same in the two named species. Consequently, *A. transvaalensis* correctly may be regarded as a junior synonyme of *A. felix*. (However, the paratype of *A. transvaalensis* (MEINANDER 1998a: Figs 2E-H) probably represents an other, perhaps undescribed species.) On the other hand, dorsal plate of *A. teleki* narrow, with lateral knobs, and without caudal projections (SZIRÁKI 1990: Fig. 10), and the proximal apodeme of penis rather long and narrow (SZIRÁKI 1990: Fig. 7). Therefore, *A. teleki* clearly is a distinct, valide species. Besides, as MONSERRAT (2006) regards the three different species: *A. felix*, *A. teleki* and *A. wawrikae* Rausch & Aspöck, 1978 (see below) as the same, his record of *A. felix* from Senegal should be regarded as questionable one.

Aleuropteryx wawrikae Rausch & Aspöck, 1978 (confirmation of validity)

RAUSCH & ASPÖCK 1978: 12 (original description), MEINANDER 1990: 9, ASPÖCK et al. 2001: 168, SZIRÁKI 2004: 6, SZIRÁKI & VAN HARTEN 2006: 389 (confirmation of validity).

Geographical distribution: Morocco and Yemen.

Remarks: The validity of this species was considered to be uncertain by MEINANDER (1990), and MONSERRAT (2006) handled this coniopterygid as junior synonyme of *A. felix*, but the examination of the Yemeni specimens supported its validity. Namely, the dorsal plate above the penis of *A. felix* has two caudal projections (SZIRÁKI 2004: Fig. 7B), while this organ of *A. wawrikae* is without caudal projections and has an entirely different shape (SZIRÁKI 2004: Fig. 15B).

Coniocompsa arabica Sziráki, 1992 (confirmation of validity)

SZIRÁKI 1992: 90 (original description), ASPÖCK et al. 2001: 170, SZIRÁKI 2004: 13, MONSERRAT 2006: 15 (synonymy), SZIRÁKI & VAN HARTEN 2006: 390.

Geographical distribution: Yemen.

Remarks: MONSERRAT (2006) regarded *C. arabica* (and *C. smithersi* Meinander, 1972 also – see later) as junior synonymes of *C. silvestriana* Enderlein, 1914. It is true that only rather small differences may be recognized in male genitalia of all species of the genus *Coniocompsa*. However, if there are small, but distinct differences between two described species, no reason to regard them conspecific unless finding transitorial forms. Penis of *C. arabica* differs distinctly from the same organ of *C. silvestriana* and *C. smithersi* (MEINANDER 1972: Figs 51E, F, 1975c: Figs 1D, E, SZIRÁKI 1992: Figs 3–4) without any transitorial forms. Moreover, styli much more longer in the case of *C. arabica* than in *C. silvestriana*. The dusty lacewing species *C. arabica* seems to be closer to *C. smithersi* than to *C. silvestriana*, but the differences do not come from the geographical separation even in this case. I have studied specimens of both species (i. e.: *C. arabica* and *C. smithersi*) from the same locality and from the same year from Yemen, and the identity of all of these examined specimens was entirely clear, because they agreed in every respect with the original description of the corresponding species (SZIRÁKI & VAN HARTEN 2006).

Coniocompsa fimbriata Tjeder, 1957 (confirmation of validity)

TJEDER 1957b: 1 (original description), MEINANDER 1972: 92, MEINANDER 1990: 21, SZIRÁKI 2004: 14, MONSERRAT 2006: 15 (synonymy).

Geographical distribution: Cap Verde Islands.

Remarks: *Coniocompsa fimbriata* was synonymised with *C. silvestriana* by MONSERRAT (2006). However, the perfect identification at species level is possible only on the basis of the examination of male genitalia in the *Coniocompsa* genus also, and the male of *C. fimbriata* is unknown. Consequently, it might be regarded as a species of uncertain identity, but not as a synonyme. Nevertheless, *C. fimbriata* is not conspecific with *C. silvestriana* or with *C. smithersi* with high probability even because of some eidonomic features: the wing patterns of forewing are not the same as in the two other species; in the fore wing there is a crossvein at the knee of Rs in *C. fimbriata*, but not in *C. silvestriana* or *C. smithersi*; the middle part of Cu₁ in forewing straight in *C. fimbriata*, sinuous in the other two species; there is a visible strip of membrane between the parallel parts of veins M and Cu₁ in *C. silvestriana* and *C. smithersi*, but not in *C. fimbriata* (MEINANDER 1972: Figs 45B, 51A, 1975c: Fig. 1A).

Coniocompsa smithersi Meinander, 1972 (confirmation of validity)

MEINANDER 1972: 99 (original description), MEINANDER 1990: 22, MONSERRAT 1994: 113, MEINANDER 1998a: 126, MONSERRAT 1998: 7, MONSERRAT 2002: 5 (synonymy), SZIRÁKI 2004: 16, SZIRÁKI & VAN HARTEN 2006: 390 (confirmation of validity).

Geographical distribution: East, Central, and South Africa, Yemen.

Remarks: MONSERRAT (2002) synonymized *C. smithersi* with *C. silvestriana* without discussion of the distinctive features of the two species, without demonstrating the identity, or describing the transitorial forms necessary to a well founded synonymy. He remarks only: „We fully agree with arguments given by MEINANDER (1998b) and consider both species definitively synonymous”. In the cited paper MEINANDER have mentioned only one character as insufficient for distinction, namely, the median tooth on the outer clasper of styli, which „is simply the more sclerotized part which, in MEINANDER’S (1975) figure of *C. silvestriana*, connects the

two claspers”. This statement probably is true, however, the position of this structure is different in the two species. Nevertheless, at least two important distinctive features were not discussed neither by MEINANDER nor by MONSERRAT: the shape of penis and the length of styli. The penis in *C. silvestriana* stout, with widely rounded apex, but in *C. smithersi* narrow, with narrowing apex in dorsal (or ventral) view, while the styli in *C. silvestriana* short, but in *C. smithersi* long (MEINANDER 1972: Figs 51E, F, 1975c: Figs 1D, E).

Pampoconis uncinatus Adams, 1973 (confirmation of validity)

ADAMS in: MEINANDER 1973 (diagnosis), ADAMS 1973: 250 (original description), MEINANDER 1990: 32, MONSERRAT 2005: 424 (synonymy).

Geographical distribution: Chile.

Remarks: MONSERRAT (2005) regards this species as junior synonyme of *Pampoconis latipennis* Meinander, 1972 without discussion of the most important distinctive feature of these two species, namely, the relative measurements of the proximal apodemes of penis. In *P. latipennis* the penis pointed dorso-caudally, and its distal part longer than the proximal apodemes (MEINANDER 1972: Figs 90C, D), while in *P. uncinatus* the penis widely rounded dorso-caudally, and its distal part about as long as the proximal apodemes (ADAMS 1973: Figs 2c, d). Therefore, *P. uncinatus* should be handled as a valid species.

Nimboa capensis Tjeder, 1957 (non Meinander 1972)

TJEDER 1957a: 118 (original description), MEINANDER 1990: 35 (partim), MEINANDER 1996: 190 (partim), MEINANDER 1998a: 128 (partim).

Geographical distribution: East and South Africa.

Remarks: MEINANDER (1972: Figs 110A, B) figured a *Nimboa* specimen determined as *N. capensis*. A similar specimen was illustrated later again, also as *N. capensis* by MEINANDER (1998a: Fig. 11G). However, because of its unforked, evenly narrow, and in median part straight styli, it surely represents an other (hitherto undescribed) species, as – accordig to the figures (TJEDER 1957a: Figs 44–46) and text of the original description – the „entoprocessus” (i. e. stylus) of *N. capensis* basally forked, curved in its whole length, and narrowing apically.

Nimboa manselli Meinander, 1998 (confirmation of validity)

MEINANDER 1998a: 132 (original description), MONSERRAT 2006: 17 (synonymy).

Geographical distribution: South Africa.

Remarks: MONSERRAT (2006) synonymized *N. manselli* with *Nimboa marroquina* Monserrat, 1985 in spite of the fact that the latter species has a very characteristic stylus (MONSERRAT 1985a: Fig. 8), which differs sharply from this organ of all the other described *Nimboa* species (e. g.: MEINANDER 1998a: Figs 12A, B), and in spite of the clear differences in the structure and shape of paramere and penis (MONSERRAT 1985a: Figs 6, 7 versus MEINANDER 1998a: Figs 12E, H). It is worth to mention that all the examined Yemeni *N. marroquina* specimens (SZIRÁKI 1996, SZIRÁKI & VAN HARTEN 2006) agreed exactly in every respect with the original description of the species – in spite of the great geographical distance from the type locality. As MONSERRAT (2006) regards the two different species (*N. manselli* and *N. marroquina*) to be conspecific, his

record – a single male and two females (?) – of *N. marroquina* from Senegal should be regarded as questionable one.

Nimboa natalensis Tjeder, 1957 (confirmation of validity)

TJEDER 1957a: 119 (original description), MEINANDER 1972: 188, MEINANDER 1990: 36, MONSERRAT 1994: 114, MONSERRAT 1998: 8, MEINANDER 1998a: 131 (partim, synonymy).
Geographical distribution: South Africa, Zimbabwe.

Remarks: *N. natalensis* was regarded by MEINANDER (1998a) as a junior synonyme of *N. capensis*. However, *N. natalensis* was described on the basis of a female specimen, and the illustration of the male genitalia was given later by BO TJEDER in the first modern revision of the family (TJEDER in MEINANDER 1972). Accepting this rendering of the given male to the described female of *N. natalensis*, we can recognize differences in structure of the penis, paramere and hypandrium of *N. capensis* Tjeder, *N. capensis* sensu Meinander 1972, and *N. natalensis*. The penis of *N. capensis* (TJEDER 1957a: Fig. 47), and of *N. capensis* sensu Meinander 1972 (Fig. 110B) ending in three spines in caudal view, while that of *N. natalensis* in one spine (TJEDER in MEINANDER 1972: Fig. 111C). (According to an other interpretation there are two spine-like lateral sclerites on both sides of the median spine of penis in *N. capensis* (MEINANDER 1998a). In this interpretation no spine-like lateral sclerites in the penis of *N. natalensis*.)

According to MEINANDER (1972) *N. natalensis* „Differing from *N. capensis* in higher and narrower distal parametering”, and this distinctive feature seems to be true either in the case of *N. capensis* or *N. capensis* sensu Meinander 1972 (TJEDER in MEINANDER 1972: Fig. 111B versus TJEDER 1957a: Fig. 45, or MEINANDER 1972: Fig. 110B). Besides, dorsal connecting part of the parametering much more wide in *N. natalensis* (Tjeder in Meinander 1972: Fig. 111C), than in *N. capensis* (TJEDER 1957: Fig. 47), or in *N. capensis* sensu Meinander 1972 (MEINANDER 1972: Fig. 110D). As the hypandrium regards, a pair of strong setae are situated ventrally on this organ of *N. natalensis* (TJEDER in MEINANDER 1972: Fig. 111B), and not in *N. capensis* (TJEDER 1957a: Fig. 45) or in *N. capensis* sensu Meinander 1972 (MEINANDER 1972: Figs 110A, B).

The shape of the wings may be somewhat variable within a given species. However, the broad wings of *N. capensis* (TJEDER 1957a: Fig. 43), or *N. capensis* sensu Meinander 1972 (MEINANDER 1972: Fig. 110G) differ strictly from the rather elongated wings of *N. natalensis* (TJEDER 1957a: Fig. 49).

It is worth to mention that though the holotype of *N. natalensis* is a female, the female specimens designed by MEINANDER (1998a) as *N. capensis* were not compared with this, in spite of some remarkable features of female genitalia given in the original description of *N. natalensis*. These are as follows: the setose, dark-pigmented and widened part of subanal plate; the dark-pigmented bursa copulatrix consisting of a horizontal and a vertical cylindrical part; and the paired membraneous sacks connected ventrally to the bursa copulatrix (TJEDER 1957a: Figs 51–53). It is remarkable that this type of bursa copulatrix differs greatly from this organ of *N. adela* Monserrat, 1985, the other species of the genus, where female internal genitalia were studied in details (SZIRÁKI 1996).

Nimboa transvaalensis Meinander, 1975 (species inquirenda)

MEINANDER 1975b: 82 (original description), MEINANDER 1990: 36, MEINANDER 1996: 190, MEINANDER 1998a: 131 (synonymy).
Geographical distribution: South Africa.

Remarks: This species was described on the basis of a male (holotype) and 5 females (paratypes). However, later (MEINANDER 1998a) it was regarded (together with *N. natalensis*) as a junior synonyme of *N. capensis*. Because the *N. capensis* and *N. natalensis* are two different species (see above), and as the figured male genitalia of *N. transvaalensis* agrees entirely with the same organs of *N. natalensis*, *N. transvaalensis* is not conspecific with *N. capensis*, but may be a synonyme of *N. natalensis*. On the other hand, the widely rounded wings of *N. transvaalensis* (MEINANDER 1975b: Fig 2F), differ distinctly from the elongated wings of *N. natalensis* (TJEDER 1957a: Fig. 49). This fact was not discussed in the original description of the former species, however, *N. natalensis* was regarded as the closest relative of it. (It is uncertain that the wings of *N. transvaalensis* were drawn on the basis of the male holotype, or of a female paratype, but the sequence of the figures in the original description suggests the second possibility.) The female terminalia of the two species seems to be different ones (TJEDER 1957a: Fig. 50 vs. MEINANDER 1975b: Fig. 2E) according to the original descriptions. Consequently, it seems to be highly probable that the female paratypes of *N. transvaalensis* are not conspecific with *N. natalensis*, however, the holotype of the former species may be. The correct answer to this question would be possible after the reexamination of the type material of *N. transvaalensis*.

Coniopteryx (Xeroconiopteryx) martinmeinanderi Sziráki & van Harten in Sziráki, 2004 (available name)

(= *Coniopteryx furcata* Meinander, 1998; non *Coniopteryx furcata* Meinander, 1983)

(= *Coniopteryx convivientibus* Monserrat, 2006)

MEINANDER, 1998b: 25 (as *Coniopteryx furcata*, original description), ASPÖCK & al. 2001: 183 (as *Coniopteryx furcata* Meinander, 1998), SZIRÁKI & VAN HARTEN in SZIRÁKI 2004: 36 (replacement name because of homonymy), MONSERRAT 2006: 19 (as *Coniopteryx convivientibus*, a second replacement name), SZIRÁKI & VAN HARTEN 2006: 407.

Geographical distribution: Israel, Yemen.

Remarks: *Coniopteryx (Xeroconiopteryx) furcata* Meinander, 1998 is junior homonym of *Coniopteryx (Scotoconiopteryx) furcata* Meinander, 1983. The first replacement name was published in a work of present author (SZIRÁKI 2004), but as „*Coniopteryx (Xeroconiopteryx) martinmeinanderi* SZIRÁKI & VAN HARTEN, 2004”, because it was suspected that the cited paper will be published earlier than the given work. The only reason why the name is not cited as a „nom. nov.” in my paper of 2004 that I did not wish to explicitly cite the name as a „nom. nov.” in two papers. However, the mentioned paper of Sziráki and van Harten was published only in December of 2006, and meantime, in June 2006, V. MONSERRAT published *Coniopteryx (Xeroconiopteryx) convivientibus* as a second replacement name for *C. (X.) furcata* (MONSERRAT 2006). Nevertheless, in the paper with the first replacement name for this coniopterygid (SZIRÁKI 2004) it was indicated explicitly that the name *Coniopteryx (Xeroconiopteryx) martinmeinanderi* was given as a replacement name, owing to homonymy. (The term „replacement name” obviously means – even without any farther specification – a kind of new name.) Therefore, the corresponding regulation of Article 16.1 of ICZN Code that „Every new name published after 1999, including new replacement names (nomina nova) must be explicitly indicated as intentionally new.” was fulfilled already in this occasion.

Semidalis intermedia Monserrat, 1983 (confirmation of validity)

MONSERRAT 1983: 149 (original description), MEINANDER 1990: 82, MEINANDER 1995: 66 (synonymy).

Geographical distribution: Columbia, Peru, Venezuela.

Remarks: MEINANDER (1995: Figs 5A-D) figured male terminalia and genitalia of two *Semidalis* specimens from Costa Rica determined by him as *S. rondoniensis* Meinander, 1982, and – simultaneously – he regarded those to be conspecific with *S. intermedia* described by Monserrat from Venezuela. Accordingly, *S. intermedia* was regarded by Meinander as a junior synonyme of *S. rondoniensis*. However, the given *Semidalis* specimens – in my opinion – have an uncertain identity, but – because of the great differences in structure of paramere – differ clearly from both species mentioned above. Besides, the internal genitalia of *S. intermedia* and those of *S. rondoniensis* are clearly different ones; the distal part of paramere wide, and uncini present ventrally in *S. intermedia* (MONSERRAT 1983: Fig. 29), while distal part of paramere fairly slender and uncini absent in *S. rondoniensis* (MEINANDER 1982: Fig. 24C).

Semidalis tricornis Johnson, 1980 (confirmation of validity)

JOHNSON 1980: 191 (original description), MEINANDER 1990: 78, MEINANDER 1995: 66 (synonymy), PENNY & al. 1997: 62.

Geographical distribution: Mexico, USA: Arizona.

Remarks: According to MEINANDER (1995) *S. tricornis* is a junior synonyme of *Semidalis arnaudi* Meinander, 1972. On the basis of the original descriptions – because of the figured differences existing in parameres and uncini – it seems to be uncertain. In the case of *S. arnaudi* distal part of paramere moderately wide, with a hook-like anterior and a similar posterior spine, and the fused uncini with a deep dorsal incision (MEINANDER 1972: Figs 210B, C). On the other hand, in *S. tricornis* the distal part of paramere very wide, with a small lateral projection, a large median and a slender caudal spine, while the fused uncini with a very shallow dorsal incision (JOHNSON 1980: Figs 7D, F). Therefore, without the comparison of the type material of the two species the synonymisation is not founded correctly.

Semidalis uncinata Tjeder, 1957 (confirmation of validity)

TJEDER 1957: 139 (original description), MEINANDER 1972: 326, Meinander 1990: 77, MEINANDER 1996: 190, MEINANDER 1998a: 142.

Geographical distribution: South Africa

Remarks: *S. uncinata* was regarded by MEINANDER (1983) as a junior synonyme of *S. meridionalis* Kimmins, 1935. The intraspecific variability of the latter species was detailed and illustrated in this paper. However, the structure of hypandrium of the figured specimens seems to be the same (MEINANDER 1983: Figs 64, 67, 70, 71), and differs clearly from this organ of *S. uncinata* showed in the original description of the latter species (TJEDER 1957a: Figs 107, 109). Moreover, there are some differences also in the structure of paramere and uncini of the two species (MEINANDER 1983: Figs 65, 66, 68, 69, 72, 73 vs. TJEDER 1957a: Figs 111, 112).

Semidalis hidalgoana Meinander, 1975 (confirmation of validity)

MEINANDER 1975a: 31 (original description), MEINANDER 1990: 82, MEINANDER 1995: 66 (synonymy).

Geographical distribution: Columbia, Mexico.

Remarks: *S. hidalgoana* and *S. sonorana* Meinander, 1975 were regarded by MEINANDER (1995) as junior synonyms of *S. mexicana* MEINANDER, 1972, without any explanation. However, all the three species were described (by himself) on the basis of examination of more than one specimens, and the differences mentioned in the original descriptions (first of all the differences in the shape of the hypandrium) seems to be very characteristic ones. Namely: processus terminalis of hypandrium is rounded conic and snouted, with a minute median incision (MEINANDER 1972: Fig. 216D) in *S. mexicana*, very long and tapering tongue-like, with a deep, V-shaped median incision (MEINANDER 1975a: Fig. 3D) in *S. hidalgoana*, and moderately long, slightly tongue-like, with shallow median incision (MEINANDER 1975a: Fig. 3E) in *S. sonorana*. Besides, it is worth to mention that ectoproct and hypandrium on the figure of the original description of *S. mexicana* (MEINANDER 1972: Fig. 216A) differs distinctly from these organs of specimen figured by MEINANDER in the occasion of the description of the two above mentioned species (MEINANDER 1975a: Fig. 3C).

Semidalis problematica Monserrat, 1985 (confirmation of validity)

MONSERRAT 1985b: 219 (original description), MEINANDER 1990: 83, MEINANDER 1995: 66 (synonymy), MEINANDER 2002: Fig. 411 (as *S. manausensis*).

Geographical distribution: Mexico.

Remarks: MEINANDER (1995) synonymized *S. problematica* with *S. manausensis* Meinander, 1980, although – according to the original description of the latter species – there is a short dorso-lateral branch anteriorly of the forked main branch of distal part of paramere (MEINANDER 1980: Fig. 11D), while in *S. problematica* not (MONSERRAT 1985b: Fig. 18). Such a distinct difference may not be regarded as intraspecific variation. Besides, the specimens from Costa Rica determined and figured by MEINANDER (1995: Figs 4A-K) as *S. manausensis* surely belong to (probably two) other species – partly perhaps to *S. problematica*. Moreover, it is interesting that in an other publication (MEINANDER 2002) again the above cited figures of these questionable specimens together with a drawing (Fig. 411) taken from the original description of *S. problematica* (!!) are showing the variability of *S. manausensis*, without demonstration or discussion of the rather different figures of the original description of the concerning species.

Semidalis sonorana Meinander, 1975 (confirmation of validity)

(MEINANDER 1975a: 32 (original description), MEINANDER 1990: 83, MEINANDER 1995: 66 (synonymy).

Geographical distribution: Mexico.

(The concerning remark see above, at the species *S. hidalgoana*.)

References

- ADAMS, P. A. (1973): Coniopterygidae from Chile, with three new species (Neuroptera). – *Pan Pacific Entomologist* 49: 250–254.
- ASPÖCK, H., HÖLZEL, H. & ASPÖCK, U. (2001): Kommentierter Katalog der Neuropterida (Insecta: Raphidioptera, Megaloptera, Neuroptera) der Westpaläarktis. – *Denisia* 2: 1–606.
- JOHNSON, V. (1980): New species of Coniopterygidae (Neuroptera) from North America. – *Psyche* 87: 181–192.
- MAYR, E. (1942): Systematics and the origin of species. Columbia University Press, New York
- MAYR, E. & ASHLOCK, P. D. (1991): Principles of Systematic Zoology. 2nd edition – McGraw-Hill, INC, New York: 475 pp.
- MEINANDER, M. (1972): A revision of the family Coniopterygidae (Planipennia). – *Acta Zoologica Fennica* 136: 1–357.
- MEINANDER, M. (1973): Notes on some types of Enderlein's species of Coniopterygidae, with description of a new species of Pampoconis (Neuroptera). – *Notulae Entomologicae* 53: 23–25.
- MEINANDER, M. (1975a): Coniopterygidae from North America (Neuroptera). – *Notulae Entomologicae* 55: 28–32.
- MEINANDER, M. (1975b): Coniopterygidae from South Africa (Neuroptera). – *Notulae Entomologicae* 55: 81–85.
- MEINANDER, M. (1975c): Coniopterygidae from West Africa (Insecta: Neuroptera). – *Entomologica Scandinavica* 6: 247–252.
- MEINANDER, M. (1977): Coniopterygidae from the Arabian Peninsula (Neuroptera). – *Entomologica Scandinavica* 8: 81–85.
- MEINANDER, M. (1980): Coniopterygidae from Brazil (Neuroptera). – *Entomologica Scandinavica* 11: 129–144.
- MEINANDER, M. (1982): The Coniopterygidae of Ceylon (Neuroptera). – *Entomologica Scandinavica* 13: 49–55.
- MEINANDER, M. (1983): The Coniopterygidae (Neuroptera) of southern Africa and adjacent Indian Ocean Islands. – *Annals of the Natal Museum* 25: 475–499.
- MEINANDER, M. (1990): The Coniopterygidae (Neuroptera, Planipennia). A check-list of the species of the world, descriptions of new species and other new data. – *Acta Zoologica Fennica* 189: 1–95.
- MEINANDER, M. (1995): Coniopterygidae (Neuroptera, Planipennia) from Costa Rica and Nicaragua. – *Brenesia* 43–44: 61–70.
- MEINANDER, M. (1996): – Coniopterygidae from sub-Saharan Africa (Insecta: Neuroptera). – in: CANARD, M., ASPÖCK, H. & MANSELL, M. W. (eds): Pure and applied research in neuropterology. Proceedings of the Fifth International Symposium on Neuropterology, Cairo, Egypt, 2–6 May 1994, Toulouse: 187–192.
- MEINANDER, M. (1998a): Coniopterygidae (Neuroptera) from southern and eastern Africa. – *African Entomology* 6: 117–146.
- MEINANDER, M. (1998b): Coniopterygidae from the Mediterranean Region and Iran. – *Journal of Neuropterology* 1: 23–31.
- MEINANDER, M. (2002): Family Coniopterygidae. – In: PENNY, N. (ed.): A guide for the lacewings (Neuroptera) of Costa Rica. – *Proceedings of the Californian Academy of Sciences* 55: 227–237.
- MONSERRAT, V. (1983): Contribución al conocimiento de los Coniopterígidos de Venezuela (Neuroptera, Planipennia, Coniopterygidae). – *Boletín de Entomología Venezolana (N.S.)* 2: 137–156.
- MONSERRAT, V. (1985a): Contribution al conocimiento de los Neuropteros de Marruecos (Insecta, Neuroptera, Planipennia). – *Mediterranea* 8: 73–82.
- MONSERRAT, V. (1985b): Contribución al conocimiento de los coniopterígidos de México (Neuroptera, Planipennia, Coniopterygidae). – *Eos* 60: 211–222.
- MONSERRAT, V. (1994): Nuevos datos sobre los Coniopterígidos de las regiones Palearctica y Afrotropical (Neuroptera: Coniopterygidae). – *Graellsia* 50: 109–127.
- MONSERRAT, V. (1998): Nuevos datos sobre los Coniopterígidos de Zimbabwe y Zambia (Neuroptera: Coniopterygidae). – *Journal of Neuropterology* 1: 5–15.
- MONSERRAT, V. (2002): New data on the dusty wings from Africa and Europe (Insecta, Neuroptera, Coniopterygidae). – *Graellsia* 58: 3–19.
- MONSERRAT, V. (2005): New data on the dusty wings from Coquimbo, Patagonia and Tierra del Fuego (Neuroptera, Coniopterygidae). – *Entomofauna* 26: 421–436.
- MONSERRAT, V. (2006): New taxonomic and faunistic data on the dusty wings from Senegal (Insecta, Neuroptera, Coniopterygidae). – *Graellsia* 62: 13–24.
- PENNY, N., ADAMS, P. A. & STANGE, L. A. (1997): Species catalog of the Neuroptera, Megaloptera, and Raphidioptera of America North of Mexico. – *Proceedings of the Californian Academy of Sciences* 50: 39–114.

- RAUSCH, H. & ASPÖCK, H. (1978): Zweie neue species des Genus *Aleuropteryx* Löw aus dem westlichen Mittelmeergebiet (Neuroptera, Coniopterygidae). – *Nachrichtenbl. Bayer. Entomol.* 27: 9–13.
- SZIRÁKI, GY. (1990): Two aleuropteryx species from Tanzania (Planipennia: Coniopterygidae). – *Folia Entomologica Hungarica* 51: 117–121.
- SZIRÁKI, GY. (1992): Coniopterygidae from Yemen (Neuroptera). – *Acta Zoologica Hungarica* 38: 89–94.
- SZIRÁKI, GY. (1996): The internal genitalia of females of some coniopterygid genera, compared with other neuropteroid taxa (Insecta: Neuroptera: Coniopterygidae). – in: CANARD, M., ASPÖCK, H. & MANSELL, M.W. (eds): *Pure and applied research in neuropterology. Proceedings of the Fifth International Symposium on Neuropterology, Cairo, Egypt, 2-6 May 1994*, Toulouse: 217–228.
- SZIRÁKI, GY. (2004): Coniopterygidae of Eurasia, New Guinea and North Africa. – *Folia Entomologica Hungarica* 65 (Suppl.): 1–166.
- SZIRÁKI, GY. & VAN HARTEN, A. (2006): The dusty lacewings (Neuroptera: Coniopterygidae) of the Arabian Peninsula. – *Fauna of Arabia* 22: 381–434.
- TJEDER, B. (1957a): Neuroptera-Planipennia. The lace-wings of southern Africa 1. Introduction and families Coniopterygidae, Sisyridae, and Osmylidae. – *South African Animal Life* 4: 95–188.
- TJEDER, B. (1957b): Neuroptera from the Cape Verde Islands 1. Fam. Coniopterygidae. – *Societas Scientiarum Fennica Commentationes Biologicae* 16 (8): 1–11.

György SZIRÁKI
Hungarian Natural History Museum
H-1088 BUDAPEST
Baross utca 13.
E-mail: sziraki@zoo.nhmus.hu