Fourth series of Notes on Systematics and Synonymy

by
J. B. CORPORAAL, Amsterdam.
(31st Communication on Cleridae)

37

To the species, transferred by Wolcott (Coleopt. Contrib. I-1, 1927, p. 73) to Adelphoclerus Wolc., should be added Clerus leuconelas Chevr. 1874, of which two specimens, both from Mexico, are in the Amsterdam Museum; also perhaps a few more species which I do not know de visu.

38

My Clerus araneipes (Ent. Mitt. XIV-5/6, 1925, p. 394) is a synonym of Enoclerus insidiosus Gorh. 1882.

39

Enoclerus scenicus Kl. — Klug, in his "Versuch einer systematischen Bestimmung und Auseinandersetzung der Gattungen und Arten der Clerii," in Abh. Königl. Akad. Wissensch. Berlin 1840—42 (usually cited as Clerii 1842), describes twice a Clerus scenicus, once (his number 17) on p. 295, and again (his number 46) on p. 305. The first one, which fortunately has priority of pagination, is universally known by that name, and apparently a common species. The second one, which according to the description, must be something quite different, has apparently always been overlooked. The types of both should be in the Zoological Museum of the University of Berlin. For the second species I propose the name Klugi, nov. nom. Both were from Brasil, the first through v. Olfers and Sellow, the second through Virmond. It is a curious thing, that this homonymy has not been noticed for so many years. In Gemminger and Harold's Cat. Col. IV, 1869, neither of the two is listed, and in the catalogues of Lohde (1900) and Schenkling (1903 and 1910) only the first one is mentioned. I have found a reference to the second one only in Blanchard, Voy. d'Orbigny, 1844, p. 90.

40

In my description of *Trichodes pseudaulicus*, Ann. Mag. Nat. Hist. (11) XIV, 1947 (1948), p. 651, I did not mention the length: 7,2 millim.

41

Gorham's citation in Biol. Centr.-Amer. Col. III-2, 1882, p. 150, of a "Clerus rufiventris Chevr., Rev. Mag. Zool. 1874, p. 11" as a synonym of C. viduus Kl. cannot be anything but a mistake, which later was copied by Lohde in his catalogue (1900) on p. 48, and by Schenkling, and lastly by Wolcott in Fieldiana: Zool. XXXII-2,

1947, p. 81 (here with "nomen nudum" added). Lohde (1900) and Schenkling (1910) changed the year to 1843, but this is also wrong. Rev. Mag. Zool. does not begin until 1849, and neither in Rev. Zool. 1843 (Vol. VI) nor in Mag. Zool. 1843 (série 2, Vol. V) is on p. 11 a Clerus rufiventris mentioned. The explanation seems to me, that Gorham has cited from an offprint of Chevrolat's paper in Rev. et Mag. de Zool. (3) II, 1874, p. 252-330. Here indeed is listed on the 11th page (p. 262) a Clerus rufiventris. not however of Chevrolut of Spin., Clérites I, 1844, p. 264, t. 23, f. 3. Spinola, while recognising it as a variety of Clerus nigripes Say, had used a nomen nudum of Dejean (Cat. Col. ed. 3, 1837, p. 127), and quite correctly was followed by Leconte (Ann. Lyc. Nat. Hist. N. York V, 1849, p. 24; Sep. p. 16), and by all successive authors. Therefore the citations under C. viduus are erroneous and have to disappear from the catalogues.

42

Chevrolat's name Stigmatium bifasciatum (Mém. Clér. 1876, p. 23) being preoccupied by Hope (Trans. Ent. Soc. Lond. II, 1837, p. 54, t. 7, f. 7), I propose for the former Stigmatium Chevrolati, nov. nom.

43

The generic name Omadius, as Laporte de Castelnau wrote it (Rev. Silberm. IV, 1836, p. 48), is valid and should stand. Later authors wrote Ommadius, among them Gorham, who advocated this spelling in Ann. Soc. Ent. Belg. XXXIX, 1895, p. 296 footnote, but this intended emendation is unnecessary and not valid. Gemminger and Harold retain Omadius, explaining its meaning as $\tilde{\omega}\mu\acute{a}\delta\iota\sigma s$, adhumeros, at the shoulder, which, according to my friend H. Coldewey, classicist, is grammatically perfectly correct. Gorham would have preferred a name in connection with $\check{o}\mu\mu a$, eye, but, as Mr. Coldewey informs me, the word derived from it should be $\check{o}\mu\mu a\delta\acute{o}v$, ommadus, which adverb means "with the eyes". Ommadius does not exist in Greek. It may be true that the large eyes in this genus are a more striking character than the shoulders, and that a name derived from $\check{o}\mu\mu a$ would have been more fitting, but this does not affect the validity and priority of Laporte's Omadius.

(to be continued.)

Korte mededelingen.

Bibliotheek N.E.V. Recente aanwinsten zijn o.a.: 1. Norsk Entomologisk Tidskrift, vanaf vol. 5 heft 1 (1937) tot heden. 2. G. W. Pierce, The songs of insects (1948).

De Bibliothecaris.

Verzoek. Insektenbörse 46 (1929) is in de Bibliotheek der N.E.V. niet volledig; wie kan het mij ter inzage verschaffen?
J. B. Corporaal, Zeeburgerdijk 21, Amsterdam-O.