Seventh series of Notes on Systematics and Synonymy

by
J. B. CORPORAAL, Amsterdam
(36th Communication on Cleridae)

61

Gorham, in Trans. Ent. Soc. Lond. 1877, p. 417, was right in renaming Klug's *Enoplium* (*Pelonium*) *pilosum* Kl. (Clerii 1842, p. 369) and giving it the name of *Pelonium Klugi,* nov. nom., because it made collision with *P. pilosum* Forster 1781, which species, though now it is considered a *Chariessa,* at that period was included in *Pelonium.* And since the first sentence of Article 36 of the International Code reads "Rejected homonyms can never be used again", Gorham's name must stand for this species. It is not, however, a *Corinthiscus* (or a *Pelonium,* as Schenkling, Col. Cat. XXIII, 1910, p. 132, would have it), but a *Cregya.*

62

Pic's *Pelonium lateapicalis* (Rev. Soc. Ent. Argent. VII, 1935, p. 100) agrees, after the description, and as Pic himself already presumed, with *Pelonium geniculatum* Kl. 1842 (now to be listed under *Corinthiscus*), and more especially with the aberration, described by Chevrolat (Ann. Soc. Ent. Fr. (2) I, 1843, p. 34) and figured by Lacordaire (Gen. Col. IV, 1857, t. 46, f. 1) under the name of *Pelonium* (*Enoplium*) *seminigrum* Chevr.

63

I cannot see why the authorship of *Enoplium serraticorne,* from Southern Europe, should be attributed to Villers (Car. Linn. Entomologia I, 1789, p. 222 [*Attelabus*]). Villers's description is quite sufficient to prove his name a synonym of *Tillus unifasciatus* Fabr. (Mant. Ins. I, 1787, p. 125 [*Clerus*]). On the other hand, G. A. Olivier's description of *Tillus serraticornis* (Ent. II, nr. 22, 1790, p. 4, t. 1., f. 2 a-d [*Tillus*]), with the very distinct, coloured figure, applies without any doubt to this *Enoplium.* The error was started, I think, by Gemminger and Harold in Cat. Col. VI, 1869, p. 1756, who, however, with the same quotation, in the same work, on p. 1725, place *serraticornis* Villers as a synonym under *Tillus unifasciatus* Fabr. This error was continued by Lohde 1900 and Schenkling 1903 and 1910, and also by Winkler 1925 in his palaearctic catalogue (pars 5, p. 572). In the earlier European catalogues the authorship of *Enoplium serraticorne* is often ascribed to Fabricius (Ent. Syst. 1—2, 1793, p. 78), but Olivier undoubtedly has priority.

64

For *Tillus unifasciatus* ab. *tricolor* Spin. (Clérites I, 1844, p. 97, t. 2, f. 5) from France, which name is preoccupied by *T. tricolor* Fabr. (Spec. Ins. I, 1781, p. 202 [*Clerus*] = *elegans* Roth 1851 = *elegantulus* Gemm. et Har. 1869) from Africa, I propose the name of ab. **laterufus,** nov. nom.

65

The perusal of W. Macleay's description of *Tarsostenus* (*Tarsosternus* err. typogr.) *Mastersi,* in Trans. Ent. Soc. New South Wales

II,1869—73 (1872), p. 273 (to my regret I do not know this species de visu), gave me the certainty that it rather belongs to the genus *Tarsostenodes* Blackb. than to *Tarsostenus* Spin. The same has already been pronounced by Blackburn (Trans. Roy. Soc. South Austral. XXIV, 1900, p. 118) regarding *Tarsosternus pulcher* W. Macleay. Another argument is that W. Macleay's *Opilo incertus,* (l.c. p. 315), which has been shown by Elston (Trans. Roy. Soc. South Austral. XLVI, 1922, p. 315) to be a simple synonym of *Tarsostenus univittatus* Rossi, evidently by its author was not considered to be congeneric with his *Tarsosternus Mastersi.*

66

Gemminger (Coleopt. Hefte VI, 1870, p. 121) was right in substituting the name *Hydnocera scabripennis* nov. nom. for *H. scabra* Motsch. 1861 from Ceylon, on account of homonymy with *Hydnocera scabra* Lec. 1851 from North America. This mutation remains valid, though later the Ceylon species has been incorporated by Gorham with *Neohydnus* Gorh. Schenkling (1903 and 1910) was wrong in reinstating the name *scaber* Motsch.

67

Colyphus biplagiatus Klug, Clerii 1842, p. 379 nota 3. — Klug was right in proposing the new name of *biplagiatus* for his own *bimaculatus* (in the same work, p. 282), because he had described this as a *Tillus* and at that time it was in homonymy with *Tillus bimaculatus* Donovan 1807. As rejected homonyms can never be used again (first sentence of Article 36 of the International Code) the name *biplagiatus* remains valid, even though afterwards the species has been removed to the genus *Cleronomus* Kl., later to *Colyphus* Spin.

68

In my opinion, Schenkling (Ent. Mitt. I—11, 1912, p. 326) was wrong in subordining his own *Xenorthrius simplex* 1903, from Hongkong, as a variety under his *X. umbratus* 1912, from Formosa. Even if the two forms should be cospecific, the name *simplex* would have priority, and at best *X. umbratus* could be conceived as a variety of *X. simplex.* There are, however, in the Amsterdam Museum, specimens of *X. simplex* Schklg. from Kiautschau, China, of *X. umbratus* Schklg. from Formosa, and of the so-called *X. umbratus* var. *simplex* Schklg. from Formosa, all metatypes, identified by the author himself. The two forms from Formosa appear to be cospecific indeed, but the form from China is certainly different : its elytra are comparatively longer, there is on the elytra, near the base, a slightly elevated hump half way between the shoulders and the scutellum, and the interstices between the rows of punctures on the elytra are all flat, whereas in both the Formosa forms, the lateral interstices, from the fifth on, are distinctly and sharply carinate. Therefore, the name *simplex* should be retained for the form from China, while for the similar form from Formosa I propose the name *X. umbratus* Schklg., var. **simplicipennis,** nov. nom.

69

Genera *Korynetes* and *Necrobia*. — Herbst, in Naturgesch. aller bekannten in- und ausländischen Insekten, Käfer IV, 1792, p. 148, tab. H, f. 1—5, who was the first to publish the generic name *Korynetes*, wrote it with an initial K (on each of the seven times he mentions it; only once, on pl. H, the spelling *Korinetes* occurs, which is evidently a printing error). The name is derived from the Greek: κορυνήτης = not *claviger*, as Gemminger and Harold, Cat. Col. IV, 1869, p. 1757, would have it, but *clavator* (fide Coldewey in litt.). There is no orthographical objection whatever against the use of the K, so this spelling should be maintained. Paykull (Fauna Suecica I, 1798, p. 274) was the first to substitute for it the spelling *Corynetes*, without stating any reason. Probably he intended it as an emendation, but such an emendation was unnecessary and is not valid under the International Code.

Paykull was followed by the vast majority of subsequent authors; Chapin (Phil. Journ. Sci. XXV—2, 1924, p. 277) was the first to return to Herbst's original spelling. I do not think it necessary to indicate in my forthcoming catalogue the spelling used by all the other authors at each occasion; that would only be a waste of space.

The first species of the genus mentioned by Herbst was *Dermestes violaceus* L., but in his subsequent description he recorded and figured two different forms of antennae (tab. H, f. 2 and 3) and mentioned the habitat as on flowers and in wood, contrary to his subsequent statement that development occurred in carrion. It is evident therefore that he confounded the species which is now universally known as *Corynetes coeruleus* de G. with what is now known as *Necrobia violacea* L. Strict application of the rules of nomenclature should perhaps demand that the names of the genera now known as *Corynetes* and *Necrobia* be interchanged, which indeed has been advocated by Jacq. du Val (Gen. Col. d'Eur. III, p. 201 footnote 1), by Crotch (Trans. Ent. Soc. Lond. 1870, p. 48) and by Bergroth (Berl. Ent. Zeitschr. XXVIII, 1884, p. 229). Nobody, however, has followed them, and, in stead of being of value, the introduction of such a change now would lead to a very regrettable confusion. This would be all the more awkward, because both *Corynetes* and *Necrobia* are mentioned very often in the literature on Applied Entomology, and species of the latter genus especially are of considerable economic importance. Moreover the name *Necrobia* is very fitting for the species so far understood under it, but would be rather misleading for coleoptera hunting woodboring insects. Therefore, I feel justified in proposing that both genera, in the meaning in which they generally have been used up to the present, be placed on the Official List of Generic Names (Nomina Conservanda), at the same time designating *Clerus coeruleus* de G. as type of *Korynetes* Herbst and *Dermestes violaceus* L. as type of *Necrobia* Ol. I hope that such a proposal will meet with the approval of the Internationaal Commission on Zoological Nomenclature. In my forthcoming catalogue I intend to anticipate a favorable decision and to continue the use of both generic names in the universally familiar way, in order to prevent any possible confusion.