

Sixth series of Notes on Systematics and Synonymy

by

J. B. CORPORAAL, Amsterdam.

(33d Communication on Cleridae)

54

Pic's name *unifasciatus* (Ech. LXV—515, 1949, p. 2) for a variety of *Opilo Nodieri* Pic being preoccupied by ab. *unifasciatus* (Dahl) Spin., Clérites I, 1844, p. 222, 224, of *O. domesticus* Sturm, I propose for the former the name of ab. *unitaeniatus*, nov. nom. Pic's overlooking of Dahl-Spinola's name is very conceivable, as in Gemminger and Harold's and Lohde's catalogues it was only cited as a nomen nudum of Dejean, while in Schenkling's catalogue it was not mentioned at all.

55

Ichnea lycoides Cast. 1836. — Spinola, in Clérites II, 1844, p. 22—25, distinguishes in this species 5 aberrations, A—E, of which var. D, *aequinotialis* (Buq.) Spin., by Chevrolat (Mém. Clér. 1876, p. 7) and subsequent cataloguers has been regarded as a distinct species.

The aberrations A, B and C were united by Spinola under the name of ab. (var.) *Thomasi* (Dej.) Spin. This name has been listed by Gemminger and Harold and by Lohde in their catalogues as *Thomasi* Petit, nomen nudum (under which name Dejean 1837 had already cited it), but it was altogether disregarded in Schenkling's catalogue.

For his ab. E, *lycoides* (Dup.) Spin. (nec Cast. 1836), regarded by Chevrolat (correctly, I think) as a distinct species, I propose the name *Ichnea Spinolai*, nov. nom.

Klug's *Enoplium melanurum* (Clerii 1842, p. 376, t. 2, f. 12) seems to me, to judge by the description and by the figure (all Klug's figures are good), something altogether different from *lycoides* and amply to deserve the status of a distinct species. I cannot understand why Lacordaire (Gen. Col. IV, 1857, p. 477 footnote 1) and subsequently all cataloguers have considered it as a variety of *I. lycoides* Cast.

To my regret, I know of the here discussed species and forms only *I. aequinotialis* Spin. de visu, so that I had to make these conclusions from literature only. It was, however, necessary to arrive at the best possible solution for my forthcoming catalogue.

56

Pelonium piciventre Chevr. (Rev. Mag. Zool. (3) II-7, 1874, p. 325) belongs to the genus *Corinthiscus* Fairm. et Germain, not to *Galeruclerus* Gahan (= *Cregya* Lec. 1861). In the Amsterdam Museum is a specimen, collected by E. A. Schwarz at Cayamas, Cuba, and determined by E. A. Chapin, obtained in exchange from the U. S. Nat. Mus. The species is nearly related to *C. maculicollis* Schaeff., *C. sinaloae* Chapin and *C. nigrosignatus* Pic.

57

Mr. Coldewey brings under my attention three mistakes in my note 43 in Ent. Ber. XII-287, 1949, p. 344:

For $\tilde{\omega}\mu\acute{\alpha}\delta\iota\omicron\varsigma$ in line 6 of that note read: $\tilde{\omega}\mu\acute{\alpha}\delta\iota\omicron\varsigma$.

For shoulder in line 7 read: shoulders.

Line 10, beginning from eye, to line 12, It, read : ;from it derived exists a word *ὀμμαδόν*, which adverb means "with the eyes". *Ommadius*, however, does not exist in Greek.

58

The generic position of many species of Cleridae which have been described as *Pelonium*, *Cregya*, *Enoplium* etc. is far from being definitely established. For many years most of these were listed under *Pelonium* Spin. 1844, until G a h a n (Ann. Mag. Nat. Hist. (8) V, 1910, p. 67 seq.) advocated the splitting up of this genus into *Lasiodera* Gray, *Gale-ruclerus* Gahan (now *Cregya* Lec.) and *Pelonium* Spin. (now *Corinthiscus* Fairm. et Germain). This discrimination was followed by S c h e n k l i n g in his Catalogue 1910, but afterwards L e s n e and others have examined several types, and also otherwise have proved several of those designations to be not well founded. Also many species from the Indo-Australian region have been ranged under *Pelonium* (now to be named *Corinthiscus* Fairm. et Germain). C h a p i n (Phil. Journ. Sc. XXV-2, 1924, p. 255 and 275) has established a genus *Teneropsis*, which apparently fits most of those oriental species. Some others are differing in some details, but not so much, that they could not, at least preliminarily, be included in it. Therefore, for practical reasons, I propose to list all Indo-Australian „*Pelonii*” under *Teneropsis* Chapin. These species are :

<i>atricornis</i> Pic 1926	Sikkim	* <i>Gorhami</i> Lohde 1900	Birma
<i>australicus</i> Lea 1906	Sydney	(= <i>lividus</i> Gorh. 1892)	
<i>bicoloricollis</i> Pic 1929	Tonkin	<i>impressipennis</i> Pic 1929	Tonkin
<i>breveapicalis</i> Pic 1929	Tonkin	<i>inaequalis</i> Pic 1934	Tonkin
* <i>defletus</i> Schklg. 1902	Sumatra	<i>jocosus</i> Schklg. 1908	N.E. Australia
* <i>discrepans</i> Gorh. 1892	Birma	* <i>lividipennis</i> Schklg. 1912	Formosa
(<i>discrepens</i> err. typogr.)		<i>metallicus</i> Pic 1927	Tonkin
* <i>extraneus</i> Gorh. 1877	Laos	<i>mundus</i> Schklg. 1912	Formosa
* <i>formosanus</i> Schklg. 1912	Formosa	* <i>nigroaeneus</i> Gorh. 1893	Assam
<i>fuscus</i> Pic 1933	Pondicherry	<i>notaticollis</i> Pic 1929	Laos
* <i>Gardneri</i> Corp. 1935	India	<i>tonkineus</i> Pic 1936	Tonkin

Most of these species seem to be very rare ; I have only seen those marked with an asterisk ; also there are in the Amsterdam Museum a few apparently undescribed species.

The solution to which I have come, does not altogether satisfy me ; a revision will be needed, and this will probably result in splitting up the genus in a few more, but it will be very difficult for this purpose to obtain the loan of the specimens, many of them being uniques.

59

S c h e n k l i n g's name *quadrinotata* (Stett. Ent. Zeitg. LXIV, 1903, p. 20) for a variety of *Cregya* (*Pelonium*) *sexnotata* Klug being preoccupied by C. (*Pelonium*) *quadrinotata* Chevr. (Rev. Mag. Zool. (3) II-7, 1874, p. 328), I propose for the former *quadristigma* nov. nom.

60

S c h e n k l i n g himself states in the description of his *Pelonium bipartitum* (Ent. Mitt. V-5/8, 1916, p. 153) that it belongs to the group *dilatatum* — *togatum* — *xanthurum*. Therefore it is a *Cregya* and not a *Corinthiscus*.

(to be continued)