

N. xanthosticta (K.) Helenaveen, 13-IV-'46 (♀), vliegend langs een slootkant.

LITERATUUR.

- Alfken, J. D., 1924, *Megachile centuncularis* L. und ihre Verwandten, D.E.Z. (1924) 355.
 Lith, J. P. van, 1947, De collectie der Nederlandsche Hymenoptera Aculeata van wijlen den Heer J. Lindemans, Ent. Ber. 12 (273): 100.
 Niemelä, P., 1936, Mitteilungen über die Apiden (Hym.) Finnlands, 1. Die Gattung *Megachile* Latr., Ann. Ent. Fenn. 2: 86.
 Ritsema Cz., C., 1878, Naamlijst der in Nederland waargenomen bijensoorten (*Anthophila*), T.v.E. 22: 21.
 Vecht, J. van der, 1928, Fauna van Nederland. Afl. IV — Hymenoptera *Anthophila*, A. *Andrena*.
 ———— 1930, Aanteekeningen over de Nederlandsche Hymenopteren (*Mutillidae*, *Psammocharidae* en *Apidae*), Zool. Meded. Rijksmus. Leiden 13: 7.
 Helenaveen, Kamp „Mariaveen”, Dec. 1947.

Further notes on Systematics and Synonymy

by

J. B. CORPORAAL.

(29th Communication on Cleridae).

When, early this year, Mr. W. D. Hincks of Manchester, as Editor-in-Chief, solicited my collaboration in connection with the *Cleridae*, in the Supplements to the great Junk-Schenking Coleopterorum Catalogus which it is proposed to issue, I pointed out that not only since Schenking's compilation (Pars XXIII, 1910) had a very considerable number of new genera and species been described, but also that quite radical changes in the internal subdivision and arrangement of the family have been advocated and introduced. It would have been a very complicated proceeding to summarize these changes and additions in a supplement to be used in conjunction with Schenking's work. Furthermore the result would hardly meet the requirements of future workers in this family for a compact work of reference. To my great satisfaction Mr. Hincks readily gave his approval to my suggestion that I should write the whole catalogue anew.

For this purpose the original Schenking catalogue forms a very sound basis, and in addition I have at hand the accumulated 'rough materials' consisting of inserted references to all publications in the family, which I have always collected and which I continue to collect assiduously. Also there are several older publications of which I am aware, which were either omitted or overlooked by Schenking in 1910.

In preparing this mass of material for publication, however, I find that many points require elucidation, often at the cost of considerable correspondence and the consultation of the relevant literature. In addition there are some personal conclusions in regard to synonymy etc. which occasionally require explanation. Rather than introduce these changes, with or without explanatory footnotes, in the body of the forthcoming catalogue, I feel it would be more satisfactory to record them as a continuation of my series under the above title.

20

Cylidrus sumatranus Kraatz 1899 is no more than a variety of

C. Wallacei J. Thoms. 1860. Kraatz in his description states himself that it only differs from *C. intermedius* Schklg. 1898 (= *Wallacei* J. Thoms.) by its red abdomen. I have myself taken it at Bekassa (Sumatra's East Coast) III. 1912, together with the typical form, in tobacco drying-sheds, where its larva had probably lived at the expense of Bostrichid larvae. Also together with the typical form at Balei Gadjah (Sum. E. C.) 12.VI.1918. I have more specimens from Noesa Kambangan (small island at the South coast of Java; Drescher leg. IX.1910, XI.1913, I.1914, I.1916, XI.1917) and Wangoenredjah (Java; Roepke leg. V.1909), in which localities the typical form also occurs. Further from Sumatra: Tebing tinggi and Indragiri, and Java: Banjoemas (24.III.1932, Kalshoven leg.) and Popoh (E.-Java, Louwerens leg.).

21

To my regret, I made a mistake in my note 3: *Cymatodera hottentotta* Kuw. 1893 is not a synonym of *Tillus senegalensis* Cast. 1832, but of *Tillus pubescens* Cast. 1836. My error was caused by the incorrect entry in Schenking's catalogus 1910, where *T. pubescens* Cast. is placed in synonymy under *T. senegalensis* Cast.

22

The name *apicalis* being in the genus *Lemidia* preoccupied by G o r h a m (Trans. Ent. Soc. Lond. 1877, p. 253) for a variety of *L. maculicollis* Gorh. 1877, I propose for *L. apicalis* Schklg. 1902, considered by Lea (Ann. Soc. Ent. Belg. LI, 1907, p. 336) as a variety of *L. tasmanica* White 1849, the name of ab. *laetipes*, nov. nom.

23

Callimerus bimaculatus Pic (Ent. Ber. X-217, 1937, p. 345) is a synonym of *C. fuscitarsis* Chapin (Proc. Biol. Soc. Wash. XXXII, 1919, p. 230). We possess specimens of his rather common species, named by both authors. Schenking has repeatedly determined individuals of this species as *C. nigromarginatus* Kuw. 1893.

24

Brachycallimerus (*Callimerus*) *flavofasciatus* Schklg. 1902 can better be considered not as a variety of *Br. (C.) latifrons* Gorh. 1876, but as a distinct species.

We have only one specimen of *Br. latifrons*, from Laos, which agrees very well with G o r h a m's description; only the two yellow kidney-shaped maculae in the middle of the elytra are confluent, and form an uninterrupted, nearly parallel undulate transverse fascia.

Br. flavofasciatus Schklg. not only differs from *Br. latifrons* by the presence of a subapical yellow spot on each elytron, but also by being more slender in shape, by its constantly smaller size (in our large series 6,1—8,5 versus 9,1 millim.), by the elytra tapering more towards the apex, and by the punctuation on the elytra, which is coarser. I can find no differences between specimens from Sumatra and from the Philippines. I have seen one specimen from East Java, taken by Mr. H. L u c h t at Bajukidul in 1931.

25

Lasiocallimerus vestitus Corp., Tijdschr. v. Ent. LXXXII, 1939, p. 194, t. 1, f. 12 a, b. — In a consignment from the Copenhagen Museum I found, to my astonishment, a specimen of his obviously very rare species from Siam (Prae. Siam, Poul Fogh).

26

Notoxus Illigeri Gyll. (in Schönh., Syn. Ins. I—1, 1808, p. 53 footnote) from "India orientali" (recte Mauritius), though the author compares it to *N. chinensis* F. 1794 (= *Gyponyx chinensis* F.), has already been recognized by Laporte de Castelnau (Hist. Nat. Ins. Col. I, 1840, p. 283) as belonging to the *Dasytidae*. It is the type of the genus *Pelecophora* Lepeletier 1825.

27

Opilo mollis F. var. A, *subfasciatus* (Dej.) Spin., Clérites I, 1844, p. 222, 224 (figured on t.19, f. 5, a, b under the name of *unifasciatus*) is a synonym of *O. domesticus* Sturm 1837, hitherto not mentioned in the catalogues.

O. mollis F. var. B, *unifasciatus* (Dahl) Spin., l.c., is an aberration of *O. domesticus* Sturm, which likewise has been overlooked. It is characterized by the absence of the dark brown colour in the anterior $\frac{2}{3}$ of the elytra. Dejean (Cat. Col. éd. 3, 1837, p. 126) cites it from Sicily. In the collection of H. du Buysson (Cleridae now in the Amsterdam Museum) was a specimen from Broût-Vernet (France: Allier).

28

I cannot agree with Schenkling's contention (Ent. Mitt. IV, 1915, p. 248) that *Opilo impressus* Fairm. 1902 (1903) should not enter into the genus *Homalopilo* Schklg. l.c. p. 247. We have a specimen (Homotype; Lesne comp.) from the Amber Mts., Madagascar (Sicard leg. 1930), obtained in exchange from the Paris Museum. The antennae hardly show any difference to those of *Homalopilo tristis* Kl. 1942, to which species *impressus* is closely related.

29

The description of *Trichodes trifasciatus* Sturm (Catalog meiner Insecten-Sammlung I, Käf. 1826, p. 59, t. 1, f. 6 a—d) is undoubtedly valid. I saw in Sturm's collection (Munich Museum) a specimen which probably is the type. It bears a very much faded label, with an indication which might be read as "Georgia", as cited in the description. The figure is in so far misleading as the red colour, both of prothorax and head, and of the first 8 antennal segments, is rendered much too vivid and too bright. As stated in the description, the first 8 antennal segments are brownish red, and the prothorax is of a brownish bronze-colour, the latter being thickly covered with hairs of a brownish red. It is a synonym of *Trichodes apivorus* Germ. 1824, and cited as such in the catalogues of Gemminger and Harold (1869) and Lohde (1900), but not in Schenkling's (1910), nor in those of Leng (1920 and supplements 1927, 1933 and 1939) and Wolcott (1947).

(to be continued)