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ABSTRACT. Reid (1968) wrongly designated a syntype of $A$. pampanai as the holotype instead of the lectotype. This error is here corrected.

## Introduction

Büttiker and Beales (1959) described A. (C.)pampanai from specimens collected near Snoul, Kratié Province, Cambodia. The species had previously been confused with $A$. minimus Theobald, and it was collected with minimus in Burma by Büttiker and in Cambodia by Büttiker and Beales. The authors presented some of the specimens on which their description was based to the British Museum (Nat. Hist.), and in their paper (p. 67) listed these as Type specimens, but did not designate a holotype.

These specimens, which were syntypes, were received at the Museum in 1965, when I labelled a female with matching skins as the holotype (correspondence with Dr. Buittiker in 1965). Later (Reid, 1968, footnote p. 313) this erroneous labelling of a holotype was published.

Recently I found a note by B. A. Harrison, pinned in the collection beside the specimens of $A$. pampanai, pointing out the mistake. The purpose of this paper is to correct the mistake by designating a lectotype and paralectotypes, and to give the relevant information about each specimen.

## Specimens

The principal details of the specimens listed by Büttiker and Beales and now in the British Museum are as follows.

Four adults (39, 18) bearing individual code letters and having corresponding last larval and pupal skins, each skin mounted on a separate slide bearing the same code letter as the adult; also a pair of slides bearing the last larval and pupal skins of a male (code letter $K$ ) without the corresponding adult (Büttiker, letter of 28 July, 1965). These four adults are labelled in black ink (except on the third label), mainly in block letters, as follows. The first label beneath each pin gives the place and date of collection and the collectors, "Leg. W. Büttiker, P. F. Beales". The place is the same for all - Preke Chi Meang, Cambodia, Snoul region (or locality, or district), Kratié Province. The date for all is $v .58$, but the day of the month differs, thus: specimen $A, 4$. v. 58; CC, 17; X, 17; Z, 22. The second label gives the species-name, Anopheles (C) pampanai Büttiker Beales 1959, plus the sex, the word Type and the code letter, as follows: $\circ$ Type (A), ó Type (CC), Type $\circ$ ( X ) X repeated in pencil, $\$$ Type (Z). The third label bears the code letters in pencil, thus: A; CC;
A. species Büttiker \& Beales (X); Z. Specimens CC and X bear a small printed fourth label reading SEAMP Acc. No. 124 (the number hand-written in black ink).

Five more pinned adults (29, 30) do not have corresponding larval and pupal skins, nor code letters on an original third label. Otherwise they are similarly labelled to the four specimens above, except that the first label is dated v. 58 without the day of the month, and on the second, or species-name label is the word Syntype instead of Type and a number instead of a code letter, thus: ó Syntype 1, Syntype $\circ$ 2, 9 Syntype 3, ơ Syntype 4, ó Syntype 5. Specimens 3 and 4 bear a third label reading SEAMP Acc. No. 124, as described above.

At the time of writing the condition of the adult specimens was briefly as follows: $\% \mathrm{~A}$, no head, left fore- and right mid-leg present, other legs missing, apical wing-fringe rubbed; o CC, no head or abdomen, right fore- and right mid-leg missing, left hind leg broken off near middle of tarsomere 1 , wings good though right one somewhat folded; $\% \mathrm{X}$, good, complete except for last three segments of right palp and tip of right antenna, abdomen somewhat shrivel1ed as if the specimen was partly teneral when killed; $i \mathrm{Z}$, good; $\delta \mathrm{l}$, gummed onto pin, no abdomen, all legs present, right wing missing except for the base, left wing good; $\% 2$, complete with good wings, but teneral with shrunken abdomen and partly distorted palps and legs; $\%$ 3, no abdomen, left mid- and hind legs missing, wings good; 04 , no abdomen, palps or antennae, proboscis present, right fore- mid- and hind legs missing, tarsomeres $3-5$ of left mid-leg missing, wings slightly rubbed; of 5, head complete but detached and gummed to pin, as is damaged left fore-leg, left hind leg missing, right hind leg lacks last four tarsomeres, left wing good, right wing damaged.

## Designation of Lectotype

In accordance with Article 74 of the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature (1964, 1972), the female syntype labelled $X$ is hereby designated as the lectotype of Anopheles (C.) pampanai Büttiker \& Beales, 1959. This specimen, which can be recognised from its labels and condition described above (Recommendation 74C), is selected because its wing is figured (Recommendation $74 B$ ) by the authors (their fig. la). No part of specimen $Z$, which $I$ had previously selected and wrongly labelled as the holotype, is figured by them.

In addition to the data on the labels and notes on the condition ("individual characteristics") of the lectotype, its size should be given (Recommendation 74C). For this purpose the wing-length of 2.8 mm recorded by the authors in their description seems adequate.

This specimen $X$ and the two slides bearing its last larval and its pupal skin have been labelled lectotype. The other syntypes listed have been labelled paralectotypes (Recommendation 74E).
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