

## On the genera *Tarsolepis* and *Dudusa* (Notodontidae)

by

S. G. KIRIAKOFF

Professor ROEPKE pointed out in his paper on the synonymy of Indian *Dudusa* (1953, *Entomol. Ber.*, 14: 364), that *Tarsolepis* should be considered congeneric with *Dudusa*, or at best a subgenus of the latter, because the male genitalic apparatus does not show any appreciable differences in both groups.

It seems, however, that in those groups which possess tympanic organs — as it is the case with the Notodontidae — the study of the latter is of primordial significance for making clear the phylogenetic relations between genera that seem indistinguishable on the ground of their genitalic structures. Now I have had the opportunity to dissect for their tympanic organs representatives of both *Tarsolepis* and *Dudusa* (1950, *Biol. Jaarb.*, 17: 68—69), namely *T. fulgurifera* Walker, *D. sphingiformis* Moore and *D. nobilis* Walker (the latter from Burma and probably conspecific with *D. nobilis* from North China alluded to by Professor ROEPKE in his paper). While very important differences from the other Notodontid genera studied were found in both *Tarsolepis* and *Dudusa* (in fact, so important, that I was led to place them in the new subfamily Tarsolepidinae), there exist, on the other hand, noticeable differences in the tympanic structures of each of the latter. The kettledrum is rounded in *Tarsolepis*; it is depressed, almost hemispheric in *Dudusa*; the anterior supporting rod is placed quite ventrally in *Tarsolepis*, where it is simple, narrow and parallel to the posterior rod; in *Dudusa*, it is dorsal, beginning at the upper angle of the frame, broad and short; the first pocket of the frame is indistinct in *Tarsolepis*, well marked and triangular in *Dudusa*; there are besides a few minor differences. Tympanic structures are, as a rule, very homogenous in the family Notodontidae, and such characters as the supporting rods and the pockets of the frame are of great significance in that family. While *Tarsolepis* and *Dudusa* are undoubtedly closely related, they differ in their tympanic structures in a manner that warrants the generic separation of these two groups.

Laboratorium voor dierkundige systematiek, Rijksuniversiteit Gent (Bestuurder: Prof. dr P. VAN OYE), October 1953.

### Korte Mededelingen

***Boloria aquilonaris* Stichel.** Zo luidt nu de correcte soortnaam voor de vlinder, die een vorige generatie kende als *Argynnis pales* var. *arsilache*. Het is niet vlot gegaan met het vaststellen van het soortrecht, omdat de rupsen een zeer verborgen bestaan leiden.

WARREN publiceerde in 1944 een voortreffelijke studie in *Trans. R. ent. Soc. London* 94 : 1—101 over het genus (Review of the Classification of the Argynnidi with a systematic revision of the genus *Boloria*), waarin hij *Boloria graeca* Stgr. en *Boloria napaea* Hoffmannsegg van *B. pales* afscheidde als goede soorten, doch *pales* en *aquilonaris* bleef hij als subspecies van één soort beschouwen. Zelfs in 1951 nog verdedigde hij dit standpunt (*Entom.* 84 : 169—171). Toch werd de juistheid hiervan door velen sterk betwijfeld.