

III. *Notes on Synonymy and on some Types of Oriental Carabidae in various foreign collections.* By H. E. ANDREWES.

[Read February 2nd, 1921.]

I.

IN May 1920, thanks to the kindness of M. René Oberthür, I had the opportunity of examining a considerable number of the types of Carabidae in his collection; this includes, beside other material, the collections formed by Dejean, Chaudoir, and H. W. Bates, the principal authors in the group. I have to thank M. Oberthür—and I do so very cordially—not only for allowing me to examine his collections, but also for the personal assistance he was kind enough to give me during my visit to him at Rennes. Some of the results of my examination are embodied in the following notes on synonymy, etc., and, as a further result, I am describing a few new species from among those which I found to have been misidentified.

As I shall have to refer rather frequently to my paper published in these Transactions in 1919, I shall, to save space, merely give the date and the page.

*Calosoma scabripenne* Chaud. (Ann. Soc. Ent. Fr. 1869, 371) = *C. indicum* Hope (1919, 171).

When my former paper appeared, I was unaware of Dr. Roeschke's remarks on the genus *Calosoma* in Entomologische Nachrichten 1900. I see that he there treats *C. scabripenne* Chaud., as a variety of *indicum*, and both of these as races of *C. maderae* F.

I also expressed the opinion (p. 202) that *C. orientale* Hope = *C. squamigerum* Chaud. Dr. Roeschke is of opinion that Hope's species is identical with *C. imbricatum* Klug. I have in my collection some examples of this species from the Cape Verde Is., and there are others in the British Museum from the Persian Gulf, together with a solitary very dull specimen from Karachi. It is not unusual to find N.E. African species reappearing in Sind: *Calosoma olivieri* Dej. occurs not only in Baluchistan, but as far up the Indus Valley as Peshawar. The species of Carabidae inhabiting the sandy tract stretching from Egypt to Sind are, however, quite unlikely to extend their habitat so far south, or so high up as Poona, and I cannot



recall any which do so. The size of Hope's specimen ( $10\frac{1}{2}$  lines) does not help us much, for it is about midway between average examples of the two species. Hope's remark about the curvature of the intermediate tibiae seems to me to apply better to *squamigerum* (of which I have before me an example compared with the type) than to *imbriatum*, and I still think the view I took is probably correct.

**Distichus planus** Bon. (Obs. Ent. ii, 1813, 470). In his *Monographie des Scaritides* (Ann. Soc. Ent. Belg. 1880, 53) Chaudoir says that he has an example of this species taken by Capt. Boys in North India. I cannot distinguish any differences between this example, which I examined, and Chaudoir's *D. puncticollis* (Mon. 55), and think that Bonelli's species should for the present be ruled out of the fauna of India, though it occurs in Baluchistan.

**Tachys politus** Motch. (1919, 199). M. Severin, of the Brussels Museum, has been good enough to send me for examination the type of *T. bioculatus* Putz., and in M. Oberthür's collection I have seen an example of *T. ebeninus* Nietn., labelled in Nietner's handwriting. I cannot detect any material difference in these specimens, and I refer both of them to Motchulsky's *T. politus*.

**Tachys mirabilis** Bates (Ann. Mus. Civ. Gen. 1892, 294) = *T. ovatus* Motch. (Bull. Mosc. 1851, iv, 509) (1919, 198).

**Siagona atrata** Bates (not Dej.) (Ann. Mus. Civ. Gen. 1892, 284). Bates misidentified this species when determining the Carabidae taken by Mr. Fea in Burma, and, as the Burmese species is a new one, I give a description of it at the end of this paper. The example from Senegal, mentioned by Dejean (Spec. Gen. v, 1831, 476) must be something different, but unfortunately I have not seen it.

**Siagona subtilis** Bates (Ann. Mus. Civ. Gen. 1892, 284) = *S. obscuripes* Chaud. (Mon. 86).

**Siagona cinctella** Bates (not Chaud.) (Ann. Mus. Civ. Gen. 1892, 285). Here Bates misidentified another of Mr. Fea's Burmese species, a description of which will be found at the end.

**Callistomimus coarctatus** Laf.\* (Ann. Soc. Ent. Fr. 1851, 230). Chaudoir, when describing the genus *Callistomimus* (Bull. Mosc. 1872, ii, 382), identified this species with

\* Since the above was written, a note of mine on all the Oriental species of *Callistomimus* has appeared (P.Z.S., June 1921), in which both *coarctatus* and *littoralis* are referred to, and also figured in the plate.



*C. littoralis* Motch. (Et. Ent. 1859, 33) and *C. westwoodi* Schaum (Berl. Ent. Zeit. 1863, 85); in this he was followed by Bates (Comp. rend. Soc. Ent. Belg. 1891, 327). I find that *C. coarctatus* is a larger species than *C. littoralis* and that it differs considerably in other respects, as is quite clear from the description. *C. westwoodi* appears to be identical with *C. littoralis*.

**Chlaenius javanus** Chaud. As I anticipated in my former paper (1919, 137), this species is indistinguishable from *C. circumdatus* Brullé.

**Chlaenius submarginatus** Bates (not Chaud.) (Comp. rend. Soc. Ent. Belg. 1891, 328). The specimens taken by Père Cardon at Tetara and determined by Bates as belonging to this species are actually examples of *C. fugax* Chaud. (Mon. 266).

**Chlaenius frater** Bates (not Chaud.) (Ann. Mag. Nat. Hist. (5), xvii, 1886, 74) is a misidentification. I have therefore described the species further on.

**Diplochila distinguenda** Laf. I recently identified this species (1919, 193) with *D. retinens* Walk. and *D. rectificata* Bates. I find, to my surprise, that the type specimen is identical with *Eccoptogenius moestus* Chaud. (Bull. Mosc. 1852, i, 74), which must therefore take Laferté's name. The species of *Diplochila* would take the name of *D. retinens* Walk., which is anterior to Bates' *D. rectificata*, were it not that—as will be seen later—a yet older one exists in *D. polita* F. Bates did not apparently know the genus *Eccoptogenius*, the specimens referred by him to that genus (Ann. Soc. Ent. Fr. 1889, 267)—for a knowledge of which I am indebted to M. E. Fleutiaux—belonging to the genus *Diplochila*.

**Gnathaphanus acutipennis** Bates\* (Ann. Mus. Civ. Gen. 1892, 328) = *G. (Selenophorus) orientalis* Dej. (Spec. Gen. iv, 1829, 128).

**Dicryche (Platymetopus) amoena** Dej. (1919, 155). Having now examined the type of Dejean's species, I find that, though very closely related to *D. torta* MacL., it is not identical with it. Bates' determinations of the species are, I think, correct. Mr. T. G. Sloane has sent me a Javan specimen, exactly agreeing with Macleay's type, and I have seen another example in the collection of the Brussels Museum.

**Gnathaphanus (?Platymetopus) gnathaphanoides** Bates (Ann.

\* Since the above was written, I have published a note on the Oriental species of this genus (Ann. Soc. Ent. Belg., 1920, pp. 106–11).



Mus. Civ. Gen. 1892, 332 (note); Andr., Ann. Mag. Nat. Hist. (9), iii, 1919, 473). I think that Bates has quite deceived himself in regard to this species. In his description he says "♂ tarsi 4 antici anguste dilatati, plantis lateribus longe pilosis, medio transverse squamulatis." Unless I also am the subject of an optical illusion, all the specimens which were in his collection are female examples of *Gnathaphanus punctilabris* MacL.

**Abacetus atratus** Bates (not Dej.) (Ann. Mag. Nat. Hist. (5), xvii, 1886, 143) = *A. cordicollis* Chaud. (Mon. 357). Bates was singularly unsuccessful with the six species of *Abacetus* taken by Mr. George Lewis in Ceylon. Of the four identified with pre-existing species three were wrong, and of the two described one had already been described three times before.

**Abacetus aeneus** Nietn. (Ann. Mag. Nat. Hist. (3), ii, 1858, 177). This species proves to be identical with *A. placidulus* Walk. = *A. infixus* Walk. = *A. carinifrons* Bates (1919, 189). The name of *aeneus* being preoccupied in the genus, Chaudoir changed it to *nietneri*, but the species must retain the older name of *A. placidulus* Walk. *A. nietneri* Bates (not Chaud.) (Ann. Mag. Nat. Hist. (5), xvii, 1886, 145) and *A. maculipes* Bates (not Chaud.) (Ann. Mus. Civ. Gen. 1892, 361) are species which I am not at present in a position to determine.

**Abacetus antiquus** Bates (not Dej.) (Ann. Mag. Nat. Hist. (5), xvii, 1886, 144) = *A. dejeani* Nietn. (Ann. Mag. Nat. Hist. (3), ii, 1858, 178). It follows from this, *A. relinquens* Walk. = *A. dejeani* Nietn. (1919, 189), but Nietner's description appeared a few pages before Walker's in the same journal.

**Abacetus hirmocoelus** Chaud. (Mon. 372). This name has been quoted by Bates, but it is clearly a typographical error for *hirmocoelus*. It is so printed in the index to the Monograph, and also appears in this form on a written label in the Chaudoir collection.

**Pristonychus kashmirensis** Bates (Proc. Zool. Soc. 1889, 214; Andr., Ann. Mag. Nat. Hist. (9), iii, 1919, 475). I identified this species with *P. spinifer* Schauf. (Sitz. Ges. Isis. 1862, 66), but having now compared the two types I have convinced myself that the species are different, and I desire therefore to withdraw this synonymy.

**Colpodes ischioxanthus** Bates (Ann. Mus. Civ. Gen. 1892, 376) = *C. cruralis* Chaud. (Révision des Colpodides 376).

**Pogonoglossus validicornis** Bates (not Chaud.) (Ann. Mus



Civ. Gen. 1892, 388) proves to be another misidentification, and I therefore give a description of Bates' species at the end.

**Pheropsophus marginalis** Dej. (Spec. Gen. i, 1825, 310). This species was said to come from the "Indes Orientales," and a second specimen beside it in M. Oberthür's collection, which I look upon as identical, bears the label "Pondichery." It is difficult to understand how Chaudoir, with Dejean's type before him, came to identify with it a larger and very variable species from Indo-China, which he describes in his Monograph (p. 34), but which to my eyes is altogether different. I think that *P. curtus* Arrow (Trans. Ent. Soc. Lond. 1901, 204, t. 9, f. 3) is identical with *marginalis* Dej., but the examples of this species from Malabar have a black prothorax, and no yellow margin to the elytra. Cotypes of this species from Kanara, however, in my collection have a yellow stripe on each side of the prothorax, and the elytra have a yellow border from the fascia to the apex. I think Chaudoir's species should bear the name of *P. nebulosus* Chaud. (Mon. 27), proposed by its author for what he considered a variety of his (not Dejean's) *P. marginalis*.

**Brachynus timoriensis** Jord. (Nov. Zool. i, 1894, 105) belongs to the genus *Styphlomerus*. It hardly differs from *S. bicolor* Boh. (Eugenies Resa Ins. iv, Col. 1861, 3), but the head is rather wider and also darker in colour.

**Orthogonius parallelus** Bates (not Chaud.) (Ann. Mag. Nat. Hist. (5), xvii, 1886, 201) = *O. acutangulus* Chaud. (Bull. Mosc, 1878, iii, 5).

**Orthogonius collaris** Dohrn (Stett. Ent. Zeit. 1891, 253) = *O. doriae* Putz. (Chaudoir's Mon. 104 [note]). I have seen Putzey's type, but identify Dohrn's species from his description.

**Catascopus costulatus** Chaud. (Rev. et Mag. Zool. 1862, 489). Quite recently (1919, 182) I identified this species with *C. presidens* Thoms., and *C. splendidus* Saund. I have now seen all the types and also that of *C. aeneus* Saund. (Trans. Ent. Soc. Lond. 1863, 467, t. 17, f. 2). I find that *C. presidens* = *C. splendidus*, and that *C. costulatus* = *C. aeneus*; *C. presidens*, in addition to its purple patches, has the elytral carinae more strongly developed than *C. costulatus*, but the species are exceedingly closely allied.

**Catascopus reductus** Chaud. (not Walk.) (Berl. Ent. Zeit. 1861, 117) = *C. cingalensis* Bates (Ann. Mag. Nat. Hist.



(5), xvii, 1886, 203) = *C. severini* Bates (Comp. rend. Soc. Ent. Belg. 1891, 339).\*

*Tetragonoderus cardoni* Bates (Comp. rend. Soc. Ent. Belg. 1891, 338; id. Ann. Mus. Civ. Gen. 1892, 416) = *T. arcuatus* Dej. (Spec. Gen. iv, 1829, 495). I have examined a large number of specimens from N. India, and find that the sericeous patches on the elytra are very variable, being sometimes conspicuous and sometimes altogether wanting: as a rule they are present but not very noticeable. I do not regard Bates' species as differing from Dejean's.

*Lioptera pseudo* Heller (Ann. Soc. Ent. Belg. 1903, 244). Dr. Heller did not know the locality of this species, which has recently been taken by Mr. R. Vitalis de Salvaza in Laos.

*Sarothrocrepis bimaculatus* Jord. (Nov. Zool. i, 1894, 106) belongs to the genus *Lebidia*.

*Callida excelsa* Bates (Ann. Mus. Civ. Gen. 1892, 422) = *C. lativittis* Chaud. (Mon. Callidides, 113).

*Physodera davidis* Fairm. (Ann. Soc. Ent. Belg. 1887, 92) = *P. eschscholtzi* Parry (Trans. Ent. Soc. Lond. 1849, 179, t. 18, f. 2).

## II.

A visit to Copenhagen in September 1920 has enabled me to identify a considerable number of doubtful species, but has also revealed the fact that many of the types of Oriental Carabidae to be found in the University Museum of that city have been misidentified or are quite unknown. Hope seems to have been the first (Col. Man. ii, 1838, pp. 37-45) to publish his views on the Fabrician types and the genera to which the various species should be attributed. The collections at Copenhagen were visited by Erichson, Schaum, and Motchulsky, each of whom has added a little to our knowledge of them. Erichson does not seem to have published his notes, but Schaum (Stett. Ent. Zeit. 1847, pp. 39-57) and Motchulsky (Et. Ent. 1855, pp. 25-71) both wrote memoirs on the Fabrician insects. So far as I can ascertain neither Baron de Chaudoir nor H. W. Bates went to Copenhagen, and it seems to be due chiefly to the writings of the former that a tradition has grown up regarding certain species, which proves upon investigation to be ill-founded. I took with me to Copenhagen a good many

\* I have referred to this quite recently in describing some new species of *Catascopus* (Ann. Soc. Ent. Belg., 1921, 202).



specimens for comparison, but in some cases I had no knowledge whatever of the species described or even the genus to which it belonged. Since my return I have sent specimens of most of these species to Mr. Henriksen, who has very kindly made the comparisons which I was unable to make personally.

The types with which I propose to deal in this section are those of Fabricius and Wiedemann, which I will take separately, giving references where necessary and indicating both the modern and original genera. Unless otherwise specified, the type, where seen, agrees with the traditional identification. I may add that I found the collections in the most excellent condition.

The Fabrician types at Copenhagen came chiefly from the Sehestedt and Tonder Lund collections, the incorporation of which in the general collection was undertaken by Schiödte (1815-1884): this came to a stop at his death, and has not been completed. The Wiedemann types were in the collection of B. W. Westermann (1781-1868), a merchant of Copenhagen, who in early life held appointments in Calcutta and Batavia. He returned to Denmark in 1817, and with the aid of his oversea connections formed a very large collection of insects, which at his death came to the Zoological Museum. By the terms of his will the collection was to remain intact until the beginning of the new century, and its subsequent incorporation, commenced in 1900, is still uncompleted.

I have to thank Dr. Will. Lundbeck for the kind reception which he gave me at the University Museum, and my special thanks are due to Mr. Kai L. Henriksen, who devoted himself to finding and showing me the various types which I desired to see, and also furnished me with the information I have given about the Copenhagen collections, and the various entomologists connected with them.

The private collection of Fabricius, which contains a certain number of types, is now in the Zoological Institute and Museum of Kiel University. I have not seen this collection, but, at my request, the Director of the Department, Dr. Reibisch, has examined it to ascertain whether it contains the types of certain species of which I sent him a list. I have to thank him for doing this and for enabling me to indicate the types that are at Kiel. He informs me that the arrangement of the collection follows that given in the *Systema Eleutheratorum*: the labels are in the hand-



writing of Fabricius, and, although the specimens in question are not of course so marked, there is no reason to doubt that these are in fact the types of the species which he described. It will be noted that very few types are actually lost, and possibly some of these may ultimately be found in other collections.

I have also to thank Mr. P. Lesne for looking up the types in the "Bosc" collection at the Paris Museum, which I hope before very long to see for myself.

#### FABRICIUS.

In my former paper (1919, 120) I gave some notes about Fabricius and the types of the half-dozen species of Oriental Carabidae in the British Museum described by him. There are many more species at Copenhagen, and I propose here to give a complete chronological list of all the species which he described, accompanied by such information as I am able to give about them. At the end of his descriptions Fabricius usually gives the name of the collector of the specimens or of the collection in which they are to be found, sometimes both. The names of BANKS, SEHESTEDT, LUND, VAHL, and BOSC indicate collections, of which the first is in the British Museum, the next three in the Copenhagen Museum, and the last in the Paris Museum. The names of DALDORFF, SMIDT, and SCHOUSBOE indicate collectors only, some of whom gave the insects collected to Fabricius himself, while others gave them to the Copenhagen Museum. Dr. KÖNIG was a physician, who was educated in Copenhagen and subsequently resided in India. His collections found their way to the AMPHITEATRUM OECONOMICO-NATURALE in the Castle of Charlottenborg, and were united with those of the University about 1770, but the insects seem to have perished and no types are to be found. The HYBNER collection was acquired by Germar, whose collection, as I learn from Dr. Walther Horn, is now at Halle. Generally speaking, where no name is given, it appears probable that the type is in the Fabrician collection in the Kiel University Museum.

It will be noted that I have included a few palaearctic species in my list, but this is because they are found as far East as Japan. In the case of each species I give the earliest reference, but many of the descriptions were repeated by Fabricius in works subsequent to that in which they first appeared.



(1) SYSTEMA ENTOMOLOGICA (1775).

1. *Anthia* (*Carabus*) *sexguttata*, p. 236. (Banks.) Type in British Museum (1919, 121 and 200).

2. *Calosoma* (*Carabus*) *maderae*, p. 237. (Banks.) Type in British Museum (1919, 171).

I have included this species in my list because, under one or other of its diverse forms, it is widely spread over the palaearctic, and even reaches the subtropical regions of the Old World.

3. *Pseudophonus* (*Carabus*) *ruficornis*, p. 241. Type in Kiel University Museum.

First described by de Geer (Mém. Ins. iv, 95, 1774). Another well-known palaearctic species, which ranges from Western Europe to Eastern Asia.

4. *Pheropsophus* (*Carabus*) *bimaculatus*, p. 243. Type in Kiel University Museum (1919, 120).

First described by Linnaeus (Mant. Ins. 1771, 532). In my former paper I included this species by inadvertence amongst those of which the type is in the British Museum, although in the text I indicate correctly that it is actually in the Museum of the Linnaean Society.

5. *Plocionus* (*Carabus*) *pallens*, p. 244. This type cannot at present be traced.

This species, which is cosmopolitan, was redescribed by Dejean (Spec. Gen. i, 1825, 251) as *P. bonfilsii*; it is also mentioned and figured both by Brullé (Hist. Nat. des Ins. iv, 1834, 224, t. 7, f. 6) and Hope (Col. Man. ii, 1838, t. 1, f. 6). Gory also described it (Ann. Soc. Ent. Fr. 1833, 189) as *P. boisduvali*. See also Chaudoir (Mon. des Callidides, Ann. Soc. Ent. Belg. xv, 1872, 168), Fauvel (Revue d'Ent. 1889, 100), and Bedel (Faune Seine, i, 1879, 114).

The type came from Dresden, Dejean's specimen from Bordeaux, and Gory's from Senegal. Chaudoir gives as localities the South of France, Senegal, Mauritius, Java, Polynesia, California, Mexico, Amazon, and Cartagena (New Granada): to these I may add China. I have several records from Java, the insects in one instance having been taken "in stored rice" (*Dr. Roepke*).

6. *Cyclosomus* (*Scolytus*) *flexuosus*, p. 246. (König.) There is a specimen at Kiel, which is the equivalent of the type.

As already mentioned, the types in the König collection have perished, but the specimens in the Copenhagen Museum quite accord with the description, and I have no doubt that



the traditional identification is correct. The species was redescribed by Nietner (Journ. As. Soc. Beng. 1857, ii, 132; id. Ann. Mag. Nat. Hist. (2), xx, 1857, 272) under the name of *C. dyti(s)coides*: Chaudoir considered this a distinct species (Etude monographique des Tetragonodérides, etc., Bull. Mosc. 1876, iii, 31). Other references are numerous. I have various records from India and Ceylon, and the species apparently occurs also in Indo-China, and at Hong-Kong, though I feel some doubt about the identity of the specimens from this last locality.

(2) SPECIES INSECTORUM, i (1781).

7. *Craspedophorus* (*Carabus*) *angulatus*, p. 302. (Banks.) Type in British Museum (1919, 125).

8. *Luperca* (*Carabus*) *laevigata*, p. 304. (Banks.) Type in British Museum (1919, 122).

9. *Chlaenius* (*Carabus*) *cinctus*, p. 310. (Banks.) Type in British Museum (1919, 122).

10. *Craspedophorus* (*Pimelia*) *fasciatus*, p. 318. (Lund.) Type at Copenhagen (1919, 125).

I find that Schaum was quite right in identifying this species with No. 7 *C. angulatus* F.

(3) MANTISSA INSECTORUM, i (1787).

11. *Calosoma* (*Carabus*) *indagator*, p. 127. (Vahl.) Type at Copenhagen.

I have not of course been able to compare this type with that of *C. maderae* F. (see above No. 2), which is in the British Museum, but I have no doubt that they belong to the same species.

12. *Dolichus* (*Carabus*) *flavicornis*, p. 199. (Hybner.) Type probably at Halle, but there are two specimens at Kiel.

A well-known European species, which I have included, because its habitat extends from Europe to China and Japan.

The species was first described by Schaller (Naturf. Ges. Halle, i, 1783, 317) under the name of *Carabus halensis*.

13. *Pterostichus* (*Carabus*) *oblongopunctatus*, p. 202. (Lund.) The type is lost.

Another palaearctic species ranging from Europe to Japan.

14. *Acupalpus* (*Carabus*) *dorsalis*, p. 205. (Daldorff.) Type in Kiel University Museum.

Like the two last this is a widely distributed palaearctic species. See Bedel (Cat. rais. des Col. du N. de l'Afrique,



1899, 158, note (2)) and Andrewes (Ann. Mag. Nat. Hist. (9), iii, 1919, 475).

(4) ENTOMOLOGIA SYSTEMATICA, i (1792).

15. *Scapterus* (*Scarites*) *crenatus*, p. 95. (Lund.) Type at Copenhagen.

No one, so far as I know, has commented on this species since it was first described. I had no suspicion that the genus would prove to be *Scapterus*, and did not therefore take any specimens for comparison. I have, however, since sent to Copenhagen a specimen of the genus, which I identify with *S. sulcatus* Putz., but Mr. Henriksen informs me that, as I expected, it does not quite agree with the Fabrician type. This latter is 13 mm. in length; the tubercle on the head is short and distinct, the vertex being smooth behind it, the sides moderately and rather vaguely striate; the prothorax is quite smooth, with parallel sides, the front angles porrect and a faint round fovea on each side at base; the elytra are short, nearly parallel, hardly sulcate, but with strongly punctured striae. The species is evidently near *S. guerini* Dej. (Spec. Gen. ii, 1826, 472), of which I have seen the type, but differs in several particulars. I do not know *S. riparius* Gestro, or *S. figuloides* Gestro (Ann. Mus. Civ. Gen. 1882, 299 and 301), but from the descriptions I do not think either of them conforms to Fabricius' species. It is to be hoped that further material will come to hand of this curious and scarce genus.

16. *Nebria* (*Carabus*) *lateralis*, p. 134. (Daldorff.) Type in Kiel University Museum.

A race of the common *N. livida* L., which extends as far East as Japan.

17. *Zuphium* (*Carabus*) *olens*, p. 139. (Bosc.) The type appears to be lost.

Originally described by Rossi (Faun. Etrusc. i, 1790, 217, t. 5, f. 2) from Italy. The specimen which served Fabricius for his description should be in the Paris Museum, but Mr. Lesne tells me that it cannot be found. The species is widely spread over the Mediterranean basin and in Southern Asia, and references to it are numerous in entomological literature.

18. *Pheropsophus* (*Brachinus*) *tripustulatus*, p. 145. (Banks.) Type in the British Museum (1919, 124).

19. *Diplochila* (*Carabus*) *polita*, p. 146. (Lund.) Type at Copenhagen (1919, 144).

In my former paper I gave some notes on this species on



the assumption, which turns out to be erroneous, that the traditional identification was accurate. In the genus *Diplochila* there are two very closely allied species, in one of which the labrum is very deeply and the clypeus moderately excised—enough to show the basal membrane of the labrum; in the other the labrum is deeply excised and the front margin of the clypeus nearly straight. When Dejean described his *D. polita*, he did so on specimens sent to him by Westermann and Gyllenhal as the true *Carabus politus* of Fabricius. Actually they belonged to the first of the species mentioned above, which I have verified by an examination of Dejean's type, whereas Fabricius' insect belongs to the second.

Whether Herbst's *Carabus indicus* is identical with the first, or with the second, or with either of them, we shall probably never know, as Gemminger and Harold inform us in the preface to their Catalogue that this author's collection has perished.\* In these circumstances I think it best to give Dejean's species a new name, and accordingly I suggest *D. perscissa*. The synonymy will then be (1) *D. polita* F. = *retinens* Walk. = *rectificata* Bates, (2) *D. polita* Dej. = *perscissa* nom. nov. I have already given a number of references (1919, 144 and 192), and among them one to *Rhembus distinguendus* Laf., which must now be withdrawn. (See note in Section I.)

20. *Calosoma* (*Carabus*) *sericeum*, p. 147. (Smidt.) Type in Kiel University Museum.

This species appears to be identical with the widely spread *C. auropunctatum* Herbst (Fuessly's Archiv, 1784, 131). Bates (Entom. 1891, Suppl. 8) considered that specimens taken by Capt. Graham Young in Kulu, N.W. India, belonged to it.

21. *Chlaenius* (*Carabus*) *micans*, p. 151. (Bosc.) Type in Paris Museum (1919, 139).

A specimen in the Copenhagen collection, coming from Paykull, and bearing the name of *C. micans* F., is identical with *C. pictus* Chaud. I think it must be wrongly named, for Mr. Lesne has found at Paris what he considers to be Fabricius' type, and he tells me that the apical spot is not virguliform. I hope later on to examine it and settle the point.

\* I now learn from Dr. W. Horn that Herbst's types are in the Zoological Museum of the Berlin University.



22. *Amara* (*Carabus*) *ovata*, p. 154. (Smidt.) Type in Kiel University Museum.

Another common palaearctic species, the range of which extends from Europe to Japan.

23. *Somotrichus* (*Carabus*) *elevatus*, p. 162. (Bosc.) Type probably in Paris Museum, but there is also a specimen at Kiel (1919, 178).

Mr. Lesne tells me that he believes the type is at Paris, but at the time he could not find it. I dealt fully with this species in my former paper.

24. *Trechus* (*Carabus*) *discus*, p. 164. (Smidt.) Type in Kiel University Museum.

Bates records this European species as being found as far East as Japan.

25. *Bembidium* (*Elaphrus*) *striatum*, p. 179. (Smidt.) Type in Kiel University Museum.

Also recorded by Bates from Japan.

(5) SUPPLEMENTUM ENTOMOLOGIAE SYSTEMATICAE (1798).

26. *Oxylobus* (*Scarites*) *porcatus*, p. 43. (Sehestedt.) Type at Copenhagen.

I do not think any one has yet identified this species, which I find to be the same as Chaudoir's *O. costatus* (Mon. des Scaritides, Ann. Soc. Ent. Belg. 1879, 134). I have numerous records from South India, but the species extends northwards through the Central Provinces and Orissa to Bengal.

27. *Chlaenius* (*Carabus*) *spoliatus*, p. 54. (Schousboe.) Type at Copenhagen.

Originally described by Rossi (Faun. Etrusc. Mant. 1792, 79). The species is widely distributed over the Mediterranean basin and Central Asia. I have recently seen specimens taken by the Indian Zoological Survey at Seistan.

28. *Tetragonoderus* (*Carabus*) *quadrinotatus*, p. 55. (Dallhoff.) Type at Copenhagen.

A well-known Indian species, redescribed by Dejean (Spec. Gen. iv, 1829, 491), and also by Chaudoir in his *Étude monographique des Tetragonodérideres*, etc. (Bull. Mosc. 1876, iii, 41). It occurs all over India and in Ceylon, but apparently not elsewhere.

29. *Siagona* (*Carabus*) *depressa*, p. 56. Types at Copenhagen and Kiel.

Some discussion has centred round this species (see Bedel, Ann. Soc. Ent. Fr. 1887, 195; id. Cat. rais. des Col. du Nord de l'Afrique, 1897, 108; Andr., Ann. Mag.



Nat. Hist. (9), iii, 1919, 470), and, as not infrequently happens when the type of a species is a matter of conjecture, there has been a waste of paper and ink.

The species was described from specimens taken by Schousboe in Mauretania and by Daldorff in "India Orientali" (Coll. Sehestedt). I found at Copenhagen two "Mauretanian" specimens, one of them indicated (though not by Fabricius) as the type, but there was no Indian specimen. At Kiel, on the other hand, Dr. Reibisch found, under the genus *Galerita*, a single specimen of a *Siagona*, bearing the name *depressa* in Fabricius' handwriting, but without indication either of the locality from which it came, or of the name of the collector. The Copenhagen specimens I recognised as being identical with *S. dejeani* Ramb. (or what passes as that species, for I have not seen the type), an insect nearly twice as long as, and quite different in shape from *S. europea* Dej. Mr. Henriksen has kindly compared with the "type" a specimen which I sent to him, and finds it to agree exactly. Dr. Reibisch kindly sent me the Kiel example to examine, and I find it to be the same species as Chaudoir's *S. germana*: I have in my collection a defective example of this species, which I compared with Chaudoir's type, and, although this does not entirely agree with the Kiel specimen, the resemblance is so close as to leave no doubt in my mind that they belong to the same species. I think Chaudoir's *S. punctatissima* is also identical with them.

It is not clear from the Fabrician description whether or not both the "Mauretanian" and Indian specimens were in Sehestedt's collection, but, judging by the above facts, it seems almost certain that the former only belonged to him, the Indian example being in Fabricius' own collection. Two further observations may be made, one that in his descriptions—at least in such as I have studied—Fabricius does not mention his own collection, and the other, that three years later in Syst. Eleuth. (i, 1801, 215) no mention is made under *Galerita depressa* of the "Mauretanian" specimens, and the only reference is "India Orientali, Daldorff."

In these circumstances the small Mediterranean species will retain Dejean's name of *S. europea*, and for the small Indian one, now known as *S. depressa*, I propose the new name of *S. fabricii*. As Rambur's *S. dejeani* (1838) was described long before Chaudoir's *S. germana* (1876), Ram-



bur's name should stand for the African species, and *S. germana* should in future be known as *S. depressa* F., the specimen at Kiel being regarded as its type.

30. *Pheropsophus* (*Carabus*) *hilaris*, p. 56. (Lund-Daldorff.) Type at Copenhagen.

The description of this species hardly leaves room for doubt that Fabricius had before him a specimen of the traditional *P. hilaris* (= *P. sobrinus* Dej., with a black band of varying width at the base and apex of the prothorax). Actually the type does not conform with the description, but agrees—as does a second specimen—with *P. tripustulatus* F. (see No. 18). I cannot but think that there has been in the past some transposition of labels: if the type is accepted, the name of *hilaris* will fall into synonymy with *tripustulatus*, but if in the special circumstances the type is ignored and the description accepted, the species now known as *P. hilaris* will retain its name. I propose to accept the description and make no change.

The species (as described) is well known and has been referred to by many authors: Chaudoir deals with it in his *Mon. des Brachynides* (*Ann. Soc. Ent. Belg.* 1876, 25). It occurs all over India and in Burma, but I have not seen specimens from Ceylon: there are examples from Baluchistan in the Indian Museum, Calcutta, and in the Chevrolat collection (Oxford University Museum) is one labelled Java—probably in error.

31. *Diplochila* (*Carabus*) *impressa*, p. 57. (Daldorff.) Type at Copenhagen.

The species was redescribed by Dejean (*Spec. Gen.* ii, 1826, 383), and has been mentioned by various other writers. Nearly all the specimens I have seen came from Bengal or Burma, but the range is probably a wider one: Redtenbacher (*Reis. Novar. Zool.* ii, Col. 1867, 10) mentions the Philippine Is., examples in the Indian Museum are labelled China, and in the Hope Dept. of the Oxford University Museum are others labelled Madras and Singapore. I think these indications should be viewed with caution.

32. *Chlaenius* (*Carabus*) *posticus*, p. 57. (Daldorff.) Type at Copenhagen.

This species is mentioned by Chaudoir in his *Mon. des Chlénieniens* (*Ann. Mus. Civ. Gen.* 1876, 55) as being probably allied to *C. neelgheriensis* Guér., but the identification, based on the comparison of an example from Zanzibar



with an assumed typical specimen of Fabricius' species in the Berlin Museum, was due to Gerstaecker, and the question is left an open one. I find that the two species are in fact identical. A full description, along with the synonymy, will be found in Chaudoir's Monograph. It is a common insect throughout India and Ceylon, but does not apparently occur elsewhere, though there are two examples labelled China in the British Museum. The Zanzibar insect probably belongs to an allied species.

33. *Platymetopus* (*Carabus*) *flavilabris*, p. 59. (Daldorff.) Type at Copenhagen.

Schaum indicated the genus, but no one seems to have ventured on identifying the species. For years past I have endeavoured to persuade myself that the various described species in this genus were really distinct, and I myself (1919, 151) gave a detailed description of *P. punctulatus* Macl., comparing it with *P. senilis* Nietn.

I have seen in various collections a very large number of examples from India, Ceylon, Burma, Java, Sumatra, Siam, Indo-China, S. China, and Japan. I note considerable variation in specimens from the same locality, chiefly in the size, colour of the legs, amount of puncturation on the prothorax, and the extent to which the odd intervals of the elytra are raised. The conclusion is forced upon me that the following all belong to the same species: *flavilabris* F., *thunbergi* Quens., *punctulatus* Macl., *senilis* Nietn., *corrosus* Bates, and *punctulicollis* Bates. I have seen all the types, with the single exception of *P. senilis*. The species should be known as *P. flavilabris* F. The type has flavous legs (as in *senilis*), the head is very wide and minutely punctate, the prothorax only strongly punctate in the basal foveae and marginal channels, which are faintly blue in front, elytral intervals all flat.

34. *Barysomus* (*Carabus*) *semivittatus*, p. 59. (Daldorff.) Type at Copenhagen.

Redescribed by Dejean (Spec. Gen. iv, 1829, 60). Nietner also described the species under the name of *Oosoma gerstaeckeri* (Journ. As. Soc. Beng. 1857, ii, 147; id. Ann. Mag. Nat. Hist. (2), xx, 1857, 370). It is recorded from India, Ceylon, Indo-China, and Hong-Kong, but does not appear to be common in any of these localities.

35. *Stenolophus* (*Carabus*) *smaragdulus*, p. 60. (Daldorff.) Type at Copenhagen (1919, 178 and 189).

Both Schaum and Erichson (Käf. Mark Brand. i, 1837,



59) were at fault here. Motchulsky proposed a new genus *Egadroma* for the species. I have already commented on it and have only to add that, having now seen the types both of this species and *5-pustulatus* Wied., my impression that these were only different forms of one species is confirmed. In the Fabrician type the interval between the two yellow apical spots is itself faintly yellow.

36. *Ophionea* (*Cicindela*) *cyanocephala*, p. 60. (Daldorff.) Type at Copenhagen.

A very well-known and widely-spread Eastern species, which seems to have been previously described by Thunberg (Nov. Ins. Spec. part 3, 1784, 68, f. 81). It has been redescribed by Dejean (Spec. Gen. i, 1825, 173), Brullé (Hist. Nat. des Ins. iv, 1834, 139, t. 4, f. 3), and Schmidt-Goebel (Faun. Col. Birm. 1846, 20). The figure given by Lacordaire (Gen. des Col. Atl. t. 3, f. 2) does not represent this species, as alleged, but *O. nigrofasciata* Schm.-Goeb.

(6) SYSTEMA ELEUTHERATORUM, i (1801).

37. *Chlaenius* (*Carabus*) *quadricolor*, p. 180. (Lund-Daldorff.) Type at Copenhagen (1919, 139).

The specimen from which Fabricius drew up his description agrees with the traditional *C. quadricolor* Oliv.: Mr. Henriksen has kindly compared with it an example which I sent him.

38. *Catascopus* (*Carabus*) *elegans*, p. 184. (Daldorff.) Type at Copenhagen (1919, 141 and 182).

Schaum was wrong in supposing the species identical with *C. smaragdulus* Dej. Weber (Obs. Ent. 1801, 45) had described the species a few months, apparently, before Fabricius' volume appeared. I need only add to my previous notes that Chaudoir has given a very detailed description (Bull. Mosc. 1850, ii, 354).

39. *Callida* (*Carabus*) *splendidula*, p. 184. (Sehestedt.) (1919, 165).

The specimen at Copenhagen was taken by Daldorff, and may be the type, but for some reason not now ascertainable it is not so marked; there is no example at Kiel.

40. *Strigia* (*Carabus*) *stigma*, p. 192. (Daldorff.) Type at Copenhagen.

It was a long time before this species was put into its present genus, and Motchulsky proposed for it (Et. Ent. 1855, 45) the new genus *Selenidia*. Chaudoir saw that it was a true *Strigia* (Rev. et Mag. Zool. 1872, 140), and



later on redescribed it (Bull. Mosc. 1878, iii, 9). His specimen came from Dacca, but the few examples I have seen all came from South India.

41. *Chlaenius* (*Carabus*) *pudicus*, p. 193. (Sehestedt.) Type at Copenhagen.

Chaudoir did not know the type and in his *Mon. des Chlénien*s (p. 280) he unwisely assumed that it was identical with Motchulsky's *Callistoides malachinus* (Bull. Mosc. 1864, iv, 335), which is not the case. It is in fact the same species as Bates' *C. caeruleiceps* (Ann. Mus. Civ. Gen. 1892, 320), a cotype of which I took with me for comparison. Fabricius' type came from Bengal, Bates' specimens from Karin Cheba: I have seen no other examples.

42. *Dischissus* (*Carabus*) *notulatus*, p. 201. (Sehestedt.) Type at Copenhagen.

We are indebted to Schaum for the identification of this species with *Craspedophorus elegans* Dej. (Spec. Gen. ii, 1826, 290). Chaudoir accepted Schaum's statement, as appears both in his Revision of the genus *Panagaeus* (Bull. Mosc. 1861, iv, 335) and his *Mon. sur les Panagéides* (Ann. Soc. Ent. Belg. 1878, 104). I took with me to Copenhagen a specimen already compared with Dejean's type, only to find that the Fabrician species was quite a different one and, having a cleft fourth tarsal, did not even belong to the genus *Craspedophorus*. On my return I sent to Copenhagen three examples of the genus *Dischissus*, and as a result of Mr. Henriksen's comparisons with the type and my own notes I feel little doubt that the species is identical with *D. longicornis* Schaum (Berl. Ent. Zeit. 1863, 84). I have not, however, seen the type of this species, which is presumably in Berlin.

As a result of the above, my former note on this species (1919, 163), to the effect that it should be included in *Craspedophorus*, must be withdrawn.

43. *Pachytrachelus* (*Carabus*) *angulatus*, p. 203. (Daldorff.) Type at Copenhagen (1919, 125).

I have already pointed out that Fabricius described two quite different species under the same name of *Carabus angulatus*, this being the later one. I anticipated that it was the same thing as Dejean's *P. oblongus* (Spec. Gen. v, 1831, 813), a specimen of which, already compared with the type, I took with me for comparison. This proves to be the case, and the species should bear Dejean's name.



It is very variable in regard to colour, being sometimes of a uniform light brown, sometimes almost black: the usual coloration is dark brown or black, with a light border, a little interrupted in the middle, on the elytra. This is the coloration in the type, which is 5.5 mm. in length. The sculpture of the head and prothorax is a little variable, the head being often flattened in front and subrugose; in the type the head is convex and nearly smooth, while the prothorax is rather more finely punctate than is usual. The species occurs all over S.E. Asia, including the Philippine Is. and the Malay Archipelago.

44. *Omphra* (*Galerita*) *attelaboides*, p. 214. Type in Kiel University Museum.

In the Banks collection in the British Museum there is a specimen of an American insect described by Fabricius (Ent. Syst. i, 1792, 132) as *Galerita attelaboides*, and it belongs to the genus in which he placed it. In Syst. Eleuth. the same name reappears, followed by "Mus. Dom. Banks," but the description is of a different insect. Schaum fell into this trap (Stett. Ent. Zeit. 1847, 49), but was corrected by Erichson (l. c. 141), who informs us that the insect in question is *Omphra* (*Helluo*) *pilosa* Klug (Jahrb. Ins. 1834, 71). I do not know Klug's types in this genus, and am unable to express any opinion. I have not seen the Kiel specimen, and Mr. Henriksen informs me that he is unable to find any species of *Omphra* at Copenhagen bearing the name *attelaboides* F.

45. *Omphra* (*Galerita*) *hirta*, p. 214. (Lund-Dalldorff.) Type at Copenhagen.

Redescribed by Dejean (Spec. Gen. i, 1825, 284), and by Klug (Jahrb. Ins. 1834, 71); Chaudoir has also made some remarks on the species (Rev. et Mag. Zool. 1872, 140). It is curious that Fabricius himself, Klug, and Chaudoir all say that the colour of the pubescence is grey; Dejean says it is brown, and I find that it is in fact quite light brown.

I believe the species to be confined to the South of India and Ceylon. There is an example in the British Museum labelled Burma, and two examples at Oxford are labelled Bengal and Penang respectively: I think these indications are erroneous, though the range of the species may possibly extend to Bengal.

46. *Siagona* (*Galerita*) *plana*, p. 216. (Sehestedt-Dalldorff.) Type at Copenhagen.



This species is the same as *S. plagiata* Chaud. (Mon. des Siagonides, Bull. Mosc. 1876, i, 93). This comparatively scarce species is found chiefly in South India and Ceylon, though I have seen one example from Orissa. Chaudoir's type was said to come from Dacca.

The name of *S. plana* Bonelli (Obs. Ent. ii, 1813, 458) being thus preoccupied, I propose for it the new name of *S. pumilus*.

47. **Siagona** (**Galerita**) **flesus**, p. 216. (Lund-Daldorff.) Type at Copenhagen.

Redescribed by Dejean (Spec. Gen. i, 1825, 363) and by Chaudoir (Mon. des Siagonides, p. 94). It is a common species, spread over India, Burma, the F.M.S., Siam, and Indo-China.

48. **Pheropsophus** (**Brachinus**) **annulus**, p. 217. (Lund.) Type at Copenhagen.

Chaudoir could make nothing of this species (Mon. des Brachynides, Ann. Soc. Ent. Belg. 1876, 47), nor has any other author attempted to identify it. I find it to be a curious aberration, such as I have seen in no other example of the genus, the shoulder and median spots being united on each side by a line down the middle of the elytron, thus forming a ring on each shoulder. The vertex is black, but not the front; there is a little yellow on the sides of the prothorax, and the sides and apex of the elytra are bordered with yellow, the latter rather narrowly. The head beneath, sides of proepisterna, metasternum, and metepisterna, pygidium, propygidium, and hind coxae are yellowish, the knees faintly fuscous. In structure the specimen agrees with *P. tripustulatus* F., of which I consider it to be an aberration.

49. **Melaenus** (**Brachinus**) **piger**, p. 219. (Sehestedt-Daldorff.) Type at Copenhagen.

Erichson (Stett. Ent. Zeit. 1847, 142) pointed out quite correctly that this species was closely allied to *Melaenus elegans* Dej. (Spec. Gen. v, 1831, 482), but no other description has appeared, and I therefore give one at the end, together with some further account of the genus.

The species is spread all over India, and Mr. E. A. D'Abreu has taken many specimens at Nagpur. I found it commonly at Belgaum many years ago during the rains, along with various species of *Siagona*, in the rubbish along the sides of the paddy-fields.

50. **Mastax** (**Brachinus**) **histrion**, p. 219. (Lund-Daldorff.) Type at Copenhagen.



Redescribed by Chaudoir in his *Mon. des Brachynides* (Ann. Soc. Ent. Belg. 1876, 101). Confined apparently to India and Ceylon, and not very common.

WIEDEMANN.

All the types of Wiedemann were in the Westermann collection and are at Copenhagen; more than half of them have been correctly identified, so that on these my notes will be brief. All the specimens came either from Bengal or from Java. The descriptions, which are in German, were drawn up between 1819 and 1824, and, considering when they were written, they are reasonably good: as a rule I have found it possible to recognise the species without any great difficulty. I give a list below, taking the species—as in the case of the Fabrician types—in chronological order. There are but few species to redescribe, partly because the original descriptions are sufficiently accurate, but much more because Westermann sent so many examples to Dejean, who redescribed them in his well-known *Species Général des Coléoptères*.

(1) ZOOLOGISCHES MAGAZIN, i, 3 (1819).

1. *Catascopus* (*Carabus*) *facialis*, p. 165. Bengal (1819, 130, 132, 141, and 202).

Redescribed by Dejean (*Spec. Gen.* i, 1825, 329), Brullé (*Hist. Nat. des Ins.* iv, 1834, 232), and Chaudoir (*Bull. Mosc.* 1850, ii, 352). A very common species throughout S.E. Asia.

2. *Chlaenius* (*Carabus*) *apicalis*, p. 166. Probably Bengal, though in this instance no locality is given.

Redescribed by Dejean (*Spec. Gen.* ii, 1826, 324) and Chaudoir (*Mon. des Chlénienis*, p. 89). Confined to Northern India and Burma. Bouchard (*Ann. Soc. Ent. Fr.* 1903, 171) mentions Java as a locality, but probably he had before him *C. apicalis* Macl. (= *mutatus* Mun. Cat.).

3. *Orthogonius* (*Carabus*) *duplicatus*, p. 166. Java.

This species has been misunderstood by all the authors who have dealt with it, excepting only Dejean (*Spec. Gen.* i, 1825, 279), and his specimen came direct from Westermann. Wiedemann's description is certainly in this case misleading, which no doubt accounts for the existing confusion. After Dejean, Schmidt-Goebel next considered the species, and decided on making a new genus *Apsectra* (*Faun. Col. Birm.* 1846, 61) for the insect which he erroneously identified with it. Just before (p. 57) he had described



his *O. puncticollis*, which (if the traditional identification of his species is accurate) he quite correctly supposed to be the *duplicatus* of Dejean. Chaudoir in his *Essai monographique sur les Orthogoniens* (Ann. Soc. Ent. Belg. xiv, 1871, 99) rightly changed the name of Schmidt-Goebel's *Apsectra duplicata* to *Orthogonius schmidt-goebeli*, but made the mistake (p. 102) of identifying Wiedemann's *duplicatus* with the same author's *alternans*. Bates thought all these authors were wrong (Ann. Mus. Civ. Gen. 1892, 399), but it is difficult to know what he had in his mind: I have in my collection two examples (♂♀) from the Fea collection, presumably identified by him (though the labels are not in his handwriting), of which the ♂ is *O. mellyi* Chaud. and the ♀ *O. alternans* Wied.

The species is known at present as *O. puncticollis* Schm. Goeb., an example of which has been compared by Mr. Henriksen with the type of *duplicatus*: Wiedemann's name should in future be substituted for Schmidt-Goebel's. It is a common insect in North India, but I have not seen examples from further south than the Central Provinces. It occurs also in Burma, the F.M.S., and Indo-China. The type was said to come from Java, but I have seen only one other specimen (in the Chevrolat collection at Oxford) alleged to come from that locality, and I think it quite possible that it really came from Bengal.

4. *Orthogonius* (*Carabus*) *acrogonus*, p. 167. Java (1919, 165).

I need not repeat here the references given in my former paper.

5. *Cyclosomus* (*Scolytus*) *suturalis*, p. 169. Bengal.

This species has previously been identified with *C. flexuosus* F. (see above Fabricius, No. 6), but it is actually the same species as Motchulsky's *C. marginatus* (Bull. Mosc. 1864, iii, 200), redescribed by Chaudoir in his *Étude monographique des Tetrasonodérides*, etc. (Bull. Mosc. 1876, iii, 32). Wiedemann's name must now displace Motchulsky's. In the type the median black fascia on the elytra is exceptionally narrow. The species is spread over North India and Indo-China.

(2) *MAGAZIN DER ENTOMOLOGIE* (Germar) iv (1821).

6. *Chlaenius nigricans*, p. 110. Bengal.

Redescribed by Dejean (Spec. Gen. ii, 1826, 371), and by Chaudoir (Mon. des Chlénien, 126).

One of the best known Eastern *Chlaenius*, which extends



all over S.E. Asia. Bates' *C. culminatus* (Trans. Ent. Soc. Lond. 1873, 251) is not more than a local race.

7. **Chlaenius rufithorax**, p. 112. Bengal.

Also redescribed by Dejean (Spec. Gen. ii, 1826, 322), and by Chaudoir (Mon. 259). I am indebted to M. René Oberthür for the only other example I know of this species, which came from Assam (Noa Dehing Valley), and which I compared with the type.

8. **Systolocranius (Oodes) linea**, p. 113. Bengal.

Described by Dejean (Spec. Gen. ii, 1826, 376) as *Oodes grandis*: I have compared the same specimen with both types. Chaudoir redescribed it in his Mon. des Oodides (Ann. Soc. Ent. Fr. 1882, 331). Confined to North and Central India.

9. **Simous (Oodes) nigriceps**, p. 114. Bengal.

Described by Dejean as *Oodes pulcher* (Spec. Gen. ii, 1826, 375). Here again I was able to compare the same specimen with both types. See also Chaudoir (Mon. 375). Confined to North India, but there is a specimen labelled "Pegu" in the Indian Museum apparently belonging to this species.

10. **Chlaenius (Carabus) xanthospilus**, p. 115. Bengal.

Redescribed by Nietner as *C. quinquemaculatus* (Journ. As. Soc. Beng. v, 1856, 386; id. Ann. Mag. Nat. Hist. (2), xix, 1857, 242). See also Chaudoir (Mon. des Chlénien, 285). The species seems to be fairly common throughout continental S.E. Asia.

11. **Brachynus longipalpis**, p. 118. Bengal.

Redescribed by Dejean (Spec. Gen. i, 1825, 314), and by Chaudoir in his Mon. des Brachynides (Ann. Soc. Ent. Belg. 1876, 87). The specimens I have seen all came from Bengal or the Himalayas, except some in the Oxford University Museum (Hope Dept.) labelled "Madras"—probably in error.

(3) ZOOLOGISCHES MAGAZIN, ii, 1 (1823).

12. **Distichus (Scarites) parvus**, p. 37. Bengal.

Chaudoir, though with some doubt, identified this species with his *Scarites opacus* (Mon. des Scaritides, Ann. Soc. Ent. Belg. 1880, 103), and the description rather lends itself to this interpretation. It is in fact identical with Chaudoir's *Distichus lucidulus* (l. c. p. 57), and his name must give place to Wiedemann's. Mr. Henriksen has kindly compared with the type a specimen which I had already compared with Chaudoir's type.



The species ranges from Bengal, through Burma and Siam, to Indo-China, but there are in the Indian Museum two specimens taken by Dr. N. Annandale at Tenmalai, Western Ghats, so that it is probably more widely spread in India than existing records indicate.

13. *Oxygnathus (Scarites) elongatus*, p. 38. Bengal.

Redescribed by Dejean (Spec. Gen. ii, 1826, 474), and by Brullé (Hist. Nat. des Ins. v, 1835, 67).

See also Putzeys (Postscr. ad Cliv. Mon., Mém. Liège, xviii, 1863, 5, t. 1, f. 1). The type measures 12 mm. in length, and the specimen I took to Copenhagen for comparison measures only 8 mm. They appeared to me to belong to the same species, and I find that I have in my collection an example measuring 10.5 mm. I conclude that it varies a good deal in size. The only specimens I have seen, other than the type, were taken by the late Mr. G. Q. Corbett in various localities in Burma, where also it was taken by Mr. Fea (see Bates, Ann. Mus. Civ. Gen. 1892, 274).

14. *Scarites punctum*, p. 38. Bengal (1919, 162).

Chaudoir could make nothing of this species (Mon. des Scaritides, 1880, 127). I recently expressed the opinion that it would probably prove to be identical with Chaudoir's *Distichus puncticollis*, but this was not a good guess, for it turns out to be Chaudoir's *Scarites opacus* (l. c. 103). Confined to North India and not apparently a common species.

I take this opportunity of correcting an inadvertence in my former paper. I said, referring to Macleay's citation of Wiedemann's *S. punctum*, "which comes from Bengal and not Senegal as indicated." I had at the time only Lequien's French translation of the *Annulosa Javanica*, in which "Senegal" is substituted for "Bengal"; in the original English edition, which I now have, the locality is quite correctly given.

15. *Macrochilus (Helluo) impictus*, p. 49. Bengal.

Redescribed by Dejean (Spec. Gen. i, 1825, 287) on a specimen sent to him by Westermann and alleged to come from Java. I have seen examples from various Indian localities, rarely more than one at a time, but none from Java, which I consider in all probability a mistake for Bengal. See also Andrewes (Ann. Mag. Nat. Hist. (9) vi, 1920, pp. 497 and 503).

16. *Creagris (Helluo) distacta*, p. 49. Java (1919, 169).

I knew that this species belonged to the genus *Creagris*, for some little time ago Dr. Lundbeck had, at my request,



examined the type and informed me that the fourth tarsal was bilobed. There are two examples in the British Museum, which I had already identified as Wiedemann's species: I took one of these to Copenhagen for comparison and found that it agreed exactly. Wiedemann's description is rather short, and, as no one else has redescribed the species, I do so at the end of this paper.

17. *Oodes virens*, p. 50. Bengal.

Chaudoir omits all reference to this species in his *Mon. des Oodides* (Ann. Soc. Ent. Fr. 1882), but this work was published after his death. It is identical with his *Oodes varians* (l. c. 352), so that Wiedemann's name must replace his. Chaudoir's specimen also came from Bengal. I have only seen four other examples, viz. two from Assam (Indian Museum and Pusa Coll.), one from Burma (my own collection), and one from the Philippine Is. (Brussels Museum). I compared my own example with both types.

18. *Chlaenius chalcothorax*, p. 51. Bengal.

This species presents some difficulties. Wiedemann described a ♂ specimen, but in the Copenhagen Museum there are two specimens (♂ ♀) side by side, the type label being attached to the ♀. There is a considerable difference in the size of the insects, the ♂ being 16 mm. long and the ♀ 20 mm.; I do not think that they belong to the same species, and I consider the ♂ example to be the type of Wiedemann's species.

Chaudoir supposed that his *C. pubipennis* (Bull. Mosc. 1856, iii, 233) was the same species as Wiedemann's (see *Mon. des Chléniens*, 138), and I took to Copenhagen an example, previously compared with Chaudoir's type, for comparison. The specimens do not agree, *C. chalcothorax* (♂) being a little larger, the sides of the prothorax hardly sinuate before the hind angles, its surface more sparsely but much more coarsely punctate, the base more evidently bordered, the elytra darker and with the puncturation more aciculate. The ♀ Copenhagen example, in addition to the much larger size, has the sides of the prothorax distinctly sinuate before the hind angles, with the basal foveae larger and shallower than in the ♂; the elytra are browner in colour, more dilated behind, and more coarsely punctate, in addition to which they have a yellow border, thus excluding *C. macropus* Chaud., and its allies. I found that I had in my collection a specimen, labelled India, apparently agreeing with Wiedemann's ♂; I sent this to



Mr. Henriksen for comparison, and he informs me that it agrees exactly. He also adds, "Wiedemann saw both specimens, as he determined all Westermann's insects; the labels are written and arranged by Westermann, and the transposition of the labels must thus be due to him, as this part of his collection has not yet been altered."

19. **Lomasa** (**Chlaenius**) **xanthacrus**, p. 51. Bengal.

Redescribed by Redtenbacher as *Chlaenius huegeli* (Reis. Novar. Zool. ii, 1867, Col. 9). I recently described a new genus for the species (Ann. Mag. Nat. Hist. (9), iii, 1919, 479). I have seen a number of specimens labelled "India," but the only exact localities I know are Calcutta and Karachi.

20. **Orthogonius** (**Plochionus**) **alternans**, p. 52. Java (1919, 165).

Redescribed by Dejean (Spec. Gen. i, 1825, 280). See also Brullé (Hist. Nat. des Ins. iv, 1834, 225, t. 8, f. 1), E. Desmarest (Voy. la Bonite 1841, 291, t. 2, f. 1), Schmidt-Goebel (Faun. Col. Birm. 1846, 60), and Chaudoir (Essai monographique sur les Orthogoniens, Ann. Soc. Ent. Belg. xiv, 1871, 102). After seeing Wiedemann's type, I am convinced that Macleay's *O. alternans* (= *macleayi* Andr.) (Ann. jav. 1825, 27) is a distinct species.

I have seen examples from Java, Sumatra, Burma, and Assam; according to E. Desmarest, the species is also found in the Philippine Is.

21. **Chlaenius** (**Harpalus**) **leucops**, p. 52. Bengal.

Described by Chaudoir under the name of *C. aeruginosus* (Bull. Mosc. 1856, iii, 271): subsequently and quite correctly identified by its author with Wiedemann's species. I have compared the same specimen with both types.

Very widely spread over S.E. Asia, including the Philippine Is. and Malay Archipelago, but apparently not common anywhere.

22. **Hypharpax** (**Harpalus**) **dentipes**, p. 54. Java (1919, 158).

I need not repeat here the synonymy and other particulars given in my former paper.

23. **Craspedophorus** (**Panagaeus**) **geniculatus**, p. 56. Bengal.

This species was unknown to Chaudoir, who thought it might be identical with *C. hilaris* Laf. (Mon. sur les Panagéides, Ann. Soc. Ent. Belg. 1878, 112). This is not the case, and, as no other description has appeared, I describe at the end the only other specimen I have seen



(Pusa Coll.), which I took with me to Copenhagen and compared with the type.

24. *Callistomimus* (*Panagaeus*) *chalcocephalus*,\* p. 57. Java (1919, 136).

This proves to be *Callistomimus* (*Pristomachaerus*) *messii* Bates (Trans. Ent. Soc. Lond. 1873, 324), described from Hong-Kong, but ranging across Southern China to the Himalayas and Burma. A local race, Bates' *C. quadristigma* (Ann. Mus. Civ. Gen. 1892, 303), also occurs in Burma, and has been found by Mr. R. Vitalis de Salvaza in Laos. I have seen no other examples from Java, and, as Wiedemann was in the same paper also describing specimens from Bengal, it seems possible that some mistake may have been made regarding the locality.

I have seen examples from Hong-Kong, Tonkin (*R. Vitalis de Salvaza*), Burma—Maymyo (*H. L. Andrewes*), Sikkim—Gopaldhara (*H. Stevens*), Kumaon—W. Almora (*H. G. Champion*), and Dehra Dun. In writing his paper on the Scientific Results of the Second Yarkand Mission (Col. 1891, p. 4), Bates—for reasons which I am not able to fathom—attributed a specimen taken in the Jhelam Valley to Wiedemann's species, which he did not know, rather than to his own *C. messii*. This specimen, now in the Indian Museum collection, has lost both head and prothorax, but, judging by the elytra, I have no doubt that the species is the same. Kollar did not know the locality of his *Panagaeus chlorocephalus* (Ann. Wien. Mus. i, 1835, 335, t. 31, f. 4), but it seems probable that it will prove to be the same species.†

25. *Badister thoracicus*, p. 57. Bengal.

I thought I recognised this species, and took over with me an example which I found to correspond exactly with the type. No other description has appeared, and I have therefore redescribed it at the end.

I have seen examples in the British Museum from Bengal—Berhampur, and in the Indian Museum from Calcutta, some "at light" (*F. H. Gravely*).

26. *Stenolophus* (*Badister*) *quinquepustulatus*, p. 58. Bengal (1919, 178 and 189).

\* Already referred to in my note on the genus *Callistomimus* (see note on p. 146).

† I have recently sent an example of Wiedemann's species to Vienna, and Dr. Holdhaus has kindly compared it with Kollar's type. This is unfortunately a wreck, unfit for transport, so that I have not seen it, but Dr. Holdhaus' comparison has convinced him that the two species are different.



See Fabricius No. 34. *Stenolophus smaragdulus*. The type of this extremely common insect has the usual five testaceous spots on the elytra. It was redescribed by Dejean (Spec. Gen. iv, 1829, 414), and references to it are numerous. It occurs throughout the East.

27. *Abacetus* (*Badister*) *rubidicollis*, p. 58. Bengal.

I had no suspicion that this species, upon which no other author seems to have made any comment, would prove to belong to the genus *Abacetus*, and I had therefore no specimen ready for comparison. I had no doubt, however, of its identity with *A. quadrimaculatus* Chaud. (Essai monographique sur le genre *Abacetus*, Bull. Mosc. 1869, ii, 380), and have since sent to Copenhagen for comparison an example of Chaudoir's species already compared with his type. Mr. Henriksen tells me that the two specimens agree exactly.

The only precise locality I know for this species is Dacca (British Museum).

28. *Hexagonia* (*Lebia*) *longithorax*, p. 58. Bengal.

The example of this genus, which I had doubtfully identified with Wiedemann's species, proved to be something quite different. From notes which I made, and subsequent re-examination of a specimen already compared with the type of Chaudoir's *Hexagonia brunnea* (Bull. Mosc. 1861, ii, 531), I came to the conclusion that the two species were the same. I sent the specimen to Copenhagen, where Mr. Henriksen compared it with Wiedemann's type, finding it to agree exactly. This identity was evidently suspected by Schaum (Berl. Ent. Zeit. 1863, 433).

The only exact locality I know is Dehra Dun (Forest Research Institute).

29. *Anchista* (*Lebia*) *brunnea*, p. 59. Bengal.

Another species upon which, so far as I know, no other entomologist has commented. I suspected its identity with Chaudoir's *Anchista picea* (Bull. Mosc. 1877, ii, 238), of which I took with me an example already compared with the type. I found the two specimens to correspond perfectly, so that Wiedemann's name, as the older, must replace Chaudoir's.

Chaudoir's insect came from Dacca, and I have others from Pusa and Nagpur.

30. *Promecoptera* (*Lebia*) *marginalis*, p. 60. Bengal (1919, 165).

A specimen was sent by Westermann to Dejean, who



founded upon it the genus *Promecoptera* (Spec. Gen. v, 1831, 444) and redescribed the species in some detail. I have seen both the types, but no other examples.

31. *Drypta flavipes*, p. 60. Bengal (1919, 170).

Redescribed by Dejean (Spec. Gen. ii, 1826, 442), and later by Chaudoir (Bull. Mosc. 1850, i, 33; id. *ibid.* 1861, ii, 548) as *D. pallipes*. I compared with Wiedemann's type a specimen already compared with Chaudoir's.

Common in North India, but not apparently occurring elsewhere.

Schmidt-Goebel (Faun. Col. Birm. 1846, 24) doubtfully identified Wiedemann's species with an insect from Bengal, which, owing to its pectinate claws, he put into his genus *Dendrocellus*. This is evidently quite another species, which I have not as yet been able to identify\*; Chaudoir renamed it *D. rugicollis* (Bull. Mosc. 1861, ii, 546).

32. *Drypta aeneipes*, p. 60. Bengal.

No comment has appeared on this species, but Wiedemann's description is fairly good. Having the type before me, I took the opportunity of comparing it with an example of *D. lineola* Macl. *D. aeneipes* is a little smaller (8.0 mm.); the head, prothorax, and a fairly large discal patch on the elytra red, with a faint purple reflection, rest of elytra blue-green, legs aeneous, except base of femora. Head more convex, less punctate, genae longer, neck more constricted; prothorax more shiny, a little shorter, less punctate, relatively wider in front and a little more compressed behind; elytra much more finely striate, puncturation of intervals finer and more distinct, outer extremity of truncature hardly dentate, but forming a sharp angle. Bates' *D. fimbriata* (Ann. Mus. Civ. Gen. 1892, 384) from Burma is only a slight variety.

Since my return I have come across two specimens in the British Museum, which I had identified rather doubtfully with Wiedemann's species some little time ago and subsequently overlooked. One of them I sent to Copenhagen, and Mr. Henriksen tells me that, though the prothorax is a little narrower, it agrees very well with the type.

33. *Tetragonoderus* (*Bembidium*) *dilatatus*, p. 61. Bengal.

\* Since the above was written, I have, thanks to Dr. Jan Obenberger of Prague, seen Schmidt-Goebel's type. I consider his species to be a colour variety only of *Desera geniculata* Klug.



Redescribed by Dejean (Spec. Gen. iv, 1829, 493) on an example sent to him by Westermann, and by Chaudoir in his *Etude monographique des Tetragnodérides*, etc. (Bull. Mosc. 1876, iii, 41). I have seen examples from many parts of India, to which this species seems to be confined.

34. *Tetragnoderus* (*Bembidium*) *punctatus*, p. 61. Bengal.

Also redescribed by Dejean (l. c. 505) on an example sent by Westermann, to which some further notes were added by Schmidt-Goebel (Faun. Col. Birm. 1846, 92), and by Chaudoir (l. c. 48). North India, Burma, and (according to Vuillet) Cochin China.

35. *Tetragnoderus* (*Bembidium*) *taeniatus*, p. 62. Bengal.

Hitherto unidentified, but the description is quite a fair one, and I found no difficulty in determining specimens received from Pusa and Chapra (Agric. Res. Inst.), one of which I took to Copenhagen for comparison. I have also seen one specimen from Kumaon (*H. G. Champion*), and there are a number of specimens labelled "India" in the British Museum. I hardly think it necessary to redescribe this species.

36. *Omophron* (*Scolytus*) *vittatus*, p. 69. Bengal.

Neither this nor the succeeding species seem to have been known either to Chaudoir (Note monographique sur le genre *Omophron*, Rev. et. Mag. Zool. 1868, 56) or to Dr. Gestro (Enumerazione delle specie del genere *Omophron*, Ann. Mus. Civ. Gen. 1892, 964). I believe this type to be a unique specimen, and I give a further description of it at the end.

37. *Omophron* (*Scolytus*) *pictus*, p. 69. Bengal.

Of this species a single example was sent to me some time ago by the Agricultural Research Institute, Pusa: this had been taken at Pusa "at light" (*H. Maxwell Lefroy*). I had already identified it rather doubtfully with *O. pictus*, but, on coming to compare it with the type, I found the identification to be correct. I have seen no other specimens. I give at the end some further notes on the species.

(4) ANALECTA ENTOMOLOGICA (1824).

38. *Catadromus* (*Harpalus*) *rajah*, p. 7. Java (1919, 148).

No doubt identical with *C. tenebrioides* Oliv., referred to in my former paper. In his *Annulosa javanica*, referring to his own example of *C. tenebrioides*, W. S. Macleay says (p. 18): "a piceous variety in my father's collection is the very specimen from which Olivier took his description and figure." Whether Macleay inherited his father's collection,



and, if so, whether he took it with him when he emigrated to Australia, are questions which I have at present no means of determining.

The type of Macleay's *C. tenebrioides* is in the British Museum, and I have compared other examples with Wiedemann's type, so that there is no doubt about the identification. The species is apparently confined to Java.

### III.

Mr. E. Fleutiaux having kindly lent me the collection of Carabidae made by Commandant Delauney and Capt. R. de la Perraudière in Indo-China, and determined by Bates (Ann. Soc. Ent. Fr. 1889, 261-86), I take this opportunity of making a few comments suggested by a re-examination of the material, excluding species which I have dealt with elsewhere. I follow the sequence and give the numbers of the species as they appear in Bates' paper.

1. **Scarites mancus** Bonelli (p. 261) = *S. semicircularis* MacL. (Ann. Jav. 1825, 24). The species has been taken commonly by Mr. R. Vitalis de Salvaza in Tonkin, Annam, and Laos.

2. **Distichus** ?, (p. 261). Bates labelled this specimen "*Distichus* ? impossible de déterminer." I have compared it with an example of *D. lucidulus*, previously compared with Chaudoir's type, and can see no material difference. This species, as mentioned on a previous page, now takes the name of *D. parvus* Wied.

5. **Clivina bacillaria** Bates (p. 261). Although he gave this species a name, Bates differentiated it from *C. siamica* Putz. (as determined by him) only by its larger size and the shallow emargination of its clypeus. Though the prothorax and elytra are similar in form, it seems to me quite a distinct species. The head is relatively much wider, longer, and more roughly sculptured; frontal plates elongate, very little rounded at sides, with a sharp longitudinal ridge running to inner margin of eye; clypeus wide, its side extensions rather sharply angled, a well-marked transverse ridge in the middle; clypeal suture not so deep as in *siamica*, the whole front immediately behind it finely rugose and punctate (a single puncture in *siamica*). The prothorax is a little longer, and the spines on the intermediate tibiae are exceptionally long and strong. Not having yet seen Putzey's types of this genus (except



those at Oxford), I am unable to comment on the other species.

13. **Clivina trapezicollis** Bates (p. 263). Bates recognised in a subsequent note that this species belonged to Putzey's genus *Psilus*. M. Severin, of the Brussels Museum, has recently been good enough to send me the type of *P. acutipalpis* Putz. An examination of these two species leads me to the belief that Putzey's *Ardistomis paradoxus* (Ann. Soc. Ent. Belg. xi, 1868, 21), which he placed with great hesitation in this American genus, actually belongs to the genus *Psilus*, and may indeed be identical with Bates' species.

27. **Chlaenius javanus** Chaud. (p. 265) = *C. circumdatus* Brullé. I agree with Bates in regarding *C. xanthopleurus* Chaud., as a variety, or rather local race, spread throughout Indo-China, Siam, and Southern China; this form is found as far north as Korea (Coll. H. de Touzalin).

28. **Chlaenius cinctus** F. (p. 266). I gave some notes on this species in a former paper (Trans. Ent. Soc. Lond. 1919, 122), but did not there mention this reference of Bates. The Indo-Chinese species is not *C. cinctus* F., nor is it identical with the Indian *C. pulcher* Nietn. (= *C. cinctus* Chaud., not F.). In addition to the single example in the de la Perraudière collection, I have before me others taken in Annam, Tonkin, and Laos by Mr. R. Vitalis de Salvaza, and I describe them at the end under the name of *Chlaenius pulcher* Nietn. race *asper* nov. I have given a detailed description, as Nietner's is short, and Chaudoir confines himself to comparing the species with an African one.

32. **Simous aeneus** Laf. (p. 266). I have before me examples of Laferté's species from Java, and of *S. lucidus* Chaud. from Laos, compared with the respective types. In spite of the dark cupreous tinge of Bates' specimen, I have no hesitation in identifying it with *S. lucidus* and not *S. aeneus*.

35. **Eccoptogenius moestus** Chaud. (p. 267). As already mentioned, Bates evidently did not know this genus, which differs from *Diplochila* (*Rhembus*) in having the first antennal joint strongly clavate; this is not the case here. I doubt whether *Eccoptogenius* can be retained as a separate genus.

In addition to the single example in this collection, I have seen others taken by Mr. R. Vitalis de Salvaza in Laos and Cambodia. The species agrees closely with the



description of *D. laevigata* Bates (Ann. Mus. Civ. Gen. 1892, 326) except in one particular. Comparing his new species with *D. polita* F. (as then identified), he says, "labro et epistomate similiter emarginato," whereas in the Indo-Chinese specimens the emargination of the clypeus is very shallow. Mr. Fea took one example only of *D. laevigata* at Kaw Kareet, in Tenasserim, and until I have seen this type, I do not like to describe the species as new.

38. *Anisodactylus* ? (p. 268). I have recently described this species (Ann. Soc. Ent. Belg. 1920, 109) under the name of *Gnathaphanus festivus*.

45. *Platymetopus laetulus* Bates (p. 270) = *Dioryche amoena* Dej. The species is not compared with any other. Bates knew Dejean's species, and indeed mentions it a few lines further down, so that I am at a loss to account for the introduction of this superfluous name.

46. *Platymetopus indochinensis* Bates (p. 270). This species, like the last, belongs to the genus *Dioryche*. Bates complained of the inadequacy of Walker's descriptions, but here he has almost eclipsed Walker. The description is contained in two lines, and gives the impression that the species is very much like *D. amoena* Dej., differing in the colour of the first antennal joint and the obtuse hind angles of the prothorax.

It is a duller insect than *D. amoena*, cupreous without any greenish tinge; prothorax with smaller and deeper basal foveae, the sides not flattened out near hind angles, surface more (though sparsely) punctate, the fine basal puncturation confined to the foveae and the space between them, whereas in *amoena* it extends to the sides, leaving the middle of base with comparatively few punctures; elytra shorter and wider, the striae no deeper at apex than on disk, scutellary striae short, intervals rather flatter, 1 and 2 distinctly narrower than the others, punctures on 3, 5, and 7 much larger (though smaller on 7 than on 3 and 5), but fewer in number, minute puncturation identical.

54. *Anoplogenus renitens* Bates (p. 272). The specimen so named by Bates is another example of 52, *Anoplogenus microgonus* Bates, but *A. renitens* does occur in Indo-China.

58. *Acupalpus ovatulus* Bates (p. 273). Bates does not discuss the generic characters. The species has not the facies of *Acupalpus*, and the hind tarsi have a shallow groove on the outer side, a character foreign to that genus. On



the other hand, the fourth tarsal is only slightly emarginate, and the apex of the prosternal process (in the specimen dismounted for examination) is glabrous, so that it will not go into the genus *Stenolophus*. It does not seem wise, without more substantial characters to work on, to propose a new genus, so I leave the species provisionally where Bates has put it.

59. *Perigona ruficollis* Motch. v. *nana* (p. 273). In the *Revue d'Entomologie* 1907 Fauvel discusses this genus, and a specimen of *nana* sent to him for examination bears the label "*plagiata* Putz. ex. typ." (presumably compared with Putzey's type). As, however, Bates' v. *nana* is left by Fauvel (p. 100) as a var. of *ruficollis* Motch., it seems uncertain whether or not it is actually identical with Putzey's species.

60. *Perigona* ? (p. 274). This example was also sent to Fauvel and determined by him as "*P. litura* Perroud ex. typ."

62. *Tachys* ? (p. 274). Bates thought this was *T. pictipennis* Putz., or an allied species. I think probably the latter. I have an example which I identify with Putzey's species and which, like the type, comes from Celebes: in this the spots on the elytra are distinct, but in Bates' example the front and hind spots are joined, the sutural striae are less impressed and the surface more shiny. Without seeing the type, I cannot decide the point.

69. *Triplogenius buqueti* Cast. (p. 276) = 70, *Lesticus* (*Triplogenius*) *chalcothorax* Chaud. It is difficult to surmise why Bates should have picked out this example and labelled it *T. buqueti*. The species are closely allied, but can be readily distinguished by the form of the prothorax. Tchitcherin has already drawn attention to the misidentification (*Hor. Soc. Ent. Ross.* xxxiv, 1900, 177, *Observ.*), but without indicating the correct name.

71. *Abacetus marginicollis* Chaud. (p. 276). This is not the Burmese species. I have compared the specimen with an example of *A. aenigma* Chaud., from Hong-Kong, previously compared with the type: I find them to be exactly similar. Mr. R. Vitalis de Salvaza has lately taken it in some numbers in Laos and Cambodia.

74. *Abacetus lophoides* Bates (p. 277). In a subsequent paper (*Ann. Mus. Civ. Gen.* 1892, 362) Bates says of this species, "scarcely more than a local variety of *A. quadriguttatus*, having 2 instead of 3 apical antennal joints



albotestaceous." The solitary example has unfortunately no antennae left, but in some examples taken by Mr. R. Vitalis de Salvaza the 9th joint is light at the apex only. I consider it identical with Chaudoir's species.

75. *Abacetus* ? A unique example of an undescribed species.

76. *Abacetus* ? This agrees with examples of *A. chaldeolus* in my collection, coming from various localities, one of which I have compared with Chaudoir's type. Mr. R. Vitalis de Salvaza has taken it both in Laos and Cambodia.

78. *Holconotus ferrugineus* Chaud. = *Fouquetius crassimargo* Tchitch. (Ann. Soc. Ent. Belg. 1898, 453). Tchitcherine's memoir on *Holconotus* gives all necessary details, but this generic name being preoccupied, Maindron's *Fouquetius* should be used.

81. *Diceromerus chaudoiri* Flt. = *D. orientalis* Motch. (Et. Ent. 1859, 35). I do not regard this as other than an immature example of Motchulsky's species.

83. *Colpodes* ? I cannot at present identify this unique example with any described species of the genus.

96. *Orthogonius profundestriatus* Schm. Goeb. Bates subsequently identified this species, no doubt correctly, with the same author's *O. puncticollis*. This, as mentioned on a previous page, is identical with *O. duplicatus* Wied.

112. *Crossoglossa latecineta* Bates = *Phloeodromius nigrolineatus* Chaud. (Bull. Mosc. 1852, i, 44). The width of the black, or dark green stripe, upon which Bates seems chiefly to have relied in characterising his species, is very variable. It may be broad, or narrow, or even disappear altogether. The genus *Phloeodromius* W. Macleay (1871) must be substituted for Chaudoir's *Crossoglossa* (1872). Mr. T. G. Sloane informs me (on the authority of Mr. J. J. Fletcher) that vol. ii, part 2, of the Trans. Ent. Soc. New South Wales, containing the description of Macleay's genus, appeared in 1871, though I cannot find that this is revealed by any internal evidence.

#### IV.

In July 1920 Prof. Y. Sjöstedt visited London, and at my request very kindly brought with him the types of some of the Oriental species described by Boheman (*Eugenies*



Resa 1861, Zool. Coleoptera) and also one by Quenselt, now in the Stockholm Museum.

I do not refer to most of them, which are sufficiently well known and accurately determined in various collections I have seen. I was able to compare with all the types examined, examples either in the British Museum collection or in my own, with the solitary exception of *Anchomenus limbatus* (*limbaticollis* Mun. Cat.), of which I have seen no other specimen. I may mention that *Platymetopus melanarius* proved, as I anticipated (1919, 150), to be identical with *Gnathaphanus vulneripennis* MacL., and *Harpalus subcostatus* Dej. *Drimostoma rufipes* (1919, 160) also proves to be identical with *Coelostomus picipes* MacL. Tchitcherin has already pointed out (Hor. Soc. Ent. Ross. xxxv, 1901, 166) that *Stenolophus biplagiatus* is an *Acupalpus*.

There is one species which has been misidentified, viz. *Anchomenus scintillans*, and requires therefore some further notice. In describing his *Anchomenus chalcomus* (Trans. Ent. Soc. Lond. 1873, 280) Bates says, "Very closely allied to the common Chinese *A. scintillans* (Bohem.), from which no difference is perceptible, except the abdomen being pitchy black (like the rest of the under-surface) instead of testaceous." This seems a slender foundation on which to establish a new species, but I have before me Chinese examples labelled *A. scintillans* Boh. in Bates' handwriting, and they certainly appear, apart from the rather lighter colour, identical with *A. chalcomus*. In the same volume of the Transactions (p. 330) Bates described his *A. aeneotinctus*, differentiating it from the species which he supposed to be *A. scintillans*. It is, in fact, identical with the true *scintillans*, so that Boheman's name must displace Bates', *A. scintillans* Bates in litt. (not Boh.) becoming a synonym of his *A. chalcomus*.

#### DESCRIPTIONS OF NEW AND OTHER SPECIES.

***Siagona polita*, sp.n.** Length 20·0 mm. Width 6·5 mm.

*Siagona atra'a* ‡Bates (not Dej.), Ann. Mus. Civ. Gen. 1892, 284.

Black: tarsi and palpi piceous.

*Head* wide (4·5 mm.), rather flat, smooth, with a few scattered punctures on vertex; lateral ridges uninterrupted, reaching basal sulcus, which is only moderately deep; eyes fairly prominent,



mandibles (♂) moderately dilated and bordered outwardly, a slight longitudinal prominence on middle of upper surface. *Prothorax* (5.5 mm. wide) cyathiform, side furrows deep, median line fairly deep and crenulate, surface almost impunctate, except along base and front margin. There is no stridulatory apparatus, which seems to be confined to certain N. African species. *Elytra* not quite twice as long as wide, shoulders well-marked, surface smooth, except for a few mingled large and small punctures at base and on shoulders (a few very small and inconspicuous punctures are visible here and there on disk).

The species is much like *S. atrata* Dej., but easily recognised by its smooth elytra. The eyes are more prominent, the side ridges of head are entire—not half-interrupted, as in *S. atrata*; the median line and side furrows of the prothorax are deeper on the disk, and the elytra are a little longer.

In addition to the specimens recorded by Bates (l.c. supra) from Rangoon and Tikekee, some of which (including the type) are in my collection, I have examples from Tharrawaddy and Paungde (G. Q. Corbett). In the British Museum there are examples from Pegu (*Atkinson*) and Rangoon, and in the Indian Museum also from Pegu and Rangoon (*Armstrong*). In the Hope Dept. at Oxford is a single specimen labelled "Ch." M. René Oberthür kindly gave me an example from Theinzeik, other specimens from the same locality being in his collection.

The species seems to be confined to Burma, whereas all the examples of *S. atrata* Dej. which I have seen come from Central and N.E. India.

***Siagona apicalis*, sp.n.** Length 12.5 mm. Width 3.75 mm.

*Siagona cinctella* ‡Bates (not Chaud.), Ann. Mus. Civ. Gen. 1892, 285.

Piceous black: apex of elytra, metasternum, ventral surface, and tarsi dull red; hind trochanters light red.

*Head* (2.75 mm. wide) flat on vertex, side ridges uninterrupted, reaching mid-eye level, a shallow groove on their inner side, neck strongly constricted, surface moderately and uniformly punctate, with a small smooth patch on vertex, mandibles slightly dilated and bordered outwardly. *Prothorax* (3.25 mm. wide) short, sharply contracted behind, very little in front, median line very fine, the adjacent area longitudinally depressed, side grooves not very deep (for the genus), almost interrupted on disk, surface moderately and



fairly evenly punctate. *Elytra* very gently rounded, almost parallel, shoulders well marked, a shallow depression at a third from base, puncturation moderate, fairly close, and evenly disposed.

Bates (l.c. supra) has pointed out the differences between this species and *S. fesus* F., but the apical border is not light in colour, as in that species, but dull red, and extends from the apex only a short distance forwards along the sides. *S. cinctella* Chaud., as mentioned by Bates, is a much smaller insect; the puncturation is rather similar, but the surface is more shiny, and the apex of the elytra is much lighter in colour.

I have only seen examples from the Fea collection, two of which (including the type) are in my collection, another one being in the British Museum.

***Chlaenius fastigatus*, sp. n.** Length 10.5–11.5 mm. Width 4.0–4.5 mm.

*Chlaenius frater* †Bates (not Chaud.), Ann. Mag. Nat. Hist. (5), xvii, 1886, 74.

Black: head and prothorax metallic green, latter darker with coppery reflections, elytra with a faint aeneous tinge, joints 1–3 of antennae, palpi, apex of elytra, and legs flavous, side border of prothorax and elytra dark red. Prothorax sparsely, elytra more closely but very shortly pubescent.

*Head* (1.90 mm. wide) convex, shiny, smooth, frontal impressions shallow, joints 3 and 4 of antennae equal, labrum truncate. *Prothorax* transverse ( $2.25 \times 2.50$  mm.), almost quadrate, convex and strongly declivous to front angles, extremities truncate, sides gently rounded, faintly sinuate close to base, front angles rounded, hind angles obtuse but well-marked; median line, transverse impressions, especially front one at its junction with median line, and basal foveae all deep, last named divergent towards apex; surface coarsely punctate at sides, in basal foveae, and along each side of median line, a smooth area on disk, which extends obliquely on each side to front angles. *Elytra* ( $4.0 \times 7.0$  mm.) ovate, convex, very slightly widened behind, sinuate near apex, which is rather pointed, but with a re-entrant angle at suture, border rounded at shoulder, punctate-striate, intervals a little convex, closely and finely punctate, apical border fairly wide, with a jagged edge in front (as in *C. frater*, *C. inops*, etc.). Under-surface punctate and pubescent, much less so along middle of ventral surface; prosternal process unbordered, metepisterna quite half as long again as wide.



Not unlike *C. frater* Chaud., but narrower, and with elytra more pointed behind, prothorax with slightly obtuse hind angles, punctures fewer and not quite so coarse, elytra not so finely punctate and consequently shinier.

CEYLON: Kandy (*G. Lewis*) 3 ex. ♂♀. The type is in the British Museum.

**Pogonoglossus truncatus**, sp. n. Length 9.5 mm.

*Pogonoglossus validicornis* †Bates (not Chaud.), Ann. Mus. Civ. Gen., 1892, 388.

*Libresthis truncata* Schm.-Goeb. Faun. Col. Birm., 1846, t. 2, f. 4 (fig. only).

Pitchy: legs testaceous red; joints 1-3 of antennae, palpi, side margin of prothorax, and ventral surface dull red. Body (except neck) clothed with short yellowish pubescence.

*Head* (2.0 mm. wide) shiny, moderately convex, with two deep foveae on front, neck very strongly constricted, genae bituberculate, sharply contracted behind, surface finely punctate at sides and behind, sparsely on vertex. *Prothorax* transverse (2.0 × 2.3 mm.), cordate, emarginate at apex, widest at a third from apex; sides strongly rounded in front, sinuate at some distance from base, with which they form a right angle, front angles a little advanced but not acute, lateral margins explanate and reflexed, strongly so at hind angles; median line and basal foveae well marked, surface moderately and a little irregularly punctate. *Elytra* (3.5 × 5.5 mm.) elongate, parallel, depressed at a third from base, truncate at apex, outer angles of truncature and shoulders strongly marked but rounded, apex with membranous border, crenulate-striate, intervals flat on disk, more convex at sides, finely but not very closely punctate, 3 tripunctate, 9 seriate-punctate, with some large umbilicate pores behind shoulders, from which and from others along sides issue a few very long fine hairs.

In *P. validicornis* Chaud., the prothorax is small, with quite inconspicuous angles, and the genae have a single tubercle.

The type, which is in my collection, is one of the examples taken by Mr. Fea at Meetan, Tenasserim. The species has also been taken by Mr. R. Vitalis de Salvaza at Hoabinh in Tonkin, and at various localities in Laos.



## Genus MELAENUS.

*Ligula* narrow, corneous, widened and hollowed out at apex, with a sharp longitudinal ridge beneath, truncate, bisetose; *paraglossae* whitish, filamentous, free, rather longer than ligula. *Maxillae* setose on inner side and in addition with a row of long bristles, apex bare, sharp, strongly hooked: outer lobe with two equal joints, stipes with a long bristle on outer side near base, another near apex. *Maxillary palpi* with antepenultimate rather longer than last joint, glabrous (except at apex), penultimate rather shorter than last joint, dilated towards apex, setose, last joint setose, a little inflated, truncate at apex: *labial palpi* with last two joints about equal in length, penultimate bisetose on inner side near apex, but with some smaller setae nearer base, last joint cylindrical, setose, contracted at base, subtruncate at apex. *Mentum* short, with a fine but well-marked suture, moderately emarginate, with a simple median tooth rather shorter than lobes, last named rounded at sides and apex, contracted towards base; epilobes very wide, rounded, extending far in front of lobes. *Mandibles* short, slightly hooked at apex, a seta in the scrobe, right one with two teeth near middle, left one with one tooth near base, upper surface longitudinally strigose. *Labrum* small, front angles rounded, slightly emarginate in front, sexsetose. *Antennae* reaching middle of elytra, joints 1-4 glabrous, 5-11 densely setose; 1 short, cylindrical, with a single seta on upper surface near apex, 2 very short, 3 and 4 with a few setae at apex, 3 equal to and 4 a little shorter than 1, 5-11 distinctly longer than 1, flattened, with a longitudinal ridge down the centre of each. *Eyes* very small, not prominent, distant from buccal fissure, one supraorbital seta; temporal suture visible beneath eye. *Prothorax* cordiform, a single seta on each side at a fourth from apex, none at basal angle, base bordered by very fine yellowish hairs, its sides oblique close to hind angles; front coxal cavities with a single internal opening. *Elytra* with base pedunculate, scutellum small, cordiform, inserted between elytra on their pedunculate part, sides sinuate before apex, and with an internal fold visible at that point; nine deeply punctured striae, 9 merged in 8 before reaching base, the united stria rounding the shoulder, and continuing to the point where the border ends over stria 5, 9 ending behind at the apical sinuation, 8 continuing to apex, scutellary striole wanting; base unbordered over first four intervals on each side, intervals 1-8 ending in a ridge behind, which runs parallel with apical border, so that striae 1-7 all end before apex, striae 1-4 have each a deep puncture in front of but detached from it; a few long setae, chiefly near base and apex, arising from a series of umbilicate pores on stria 9.



*Underside* with prosternal process widened between coxae, narrowed behind, again widened and truncate at apex; mesosternum emarginate behind, epimera not reaching coxal cavities, metepisterna long and narrow; ventral surface bordered throughout, last three segments transversely bordered. *Legs* with femora clavate; front tibiae deeply excised on inner side, tibiae slender, channelled, not dilated at apex, intermediate pair hollowed out externally at apex, with a fringe of yellow setae on outer margin of excavation; tarsi simple in both sexes, pilose on upper surface, joints decreasing in length from 1 to 4, 5 with setae beneath, approximately as long as  $2 + 3 + 4$ ; claws simple. Body glabrous. Insect winged.

Dejean described this genus in his Supplement (Spec. Gen. v, 1831, 481), immediately after three species of *Graniger* (*Coscinia*). Brullé also gave a description (Hist. Nat. des Ins. v, 1835, 85), correcting some errors made by Dejean. Lacordaire (Gen. Col. i, 1854, 166) placed it at the head of his *Ditomides*, remarking "*Melaenus* et *Coscinia* (surtout ce dernier) font le passage des *Siagonides* à la tribu actuelle." If his *Siagonides* are placed, as they now are, at the end of the Carabinae, this remark is in a measure true, for the genus should come near the beginning of the second great group into which the Carabidae are divided, *i. e.* Harpalinae of Dr. G. H. Horn, Carabidae Coniunctae of Mr. T. G. Sloane.

***Melaenus piger* F.** Length 8–10 mm. Width 2·5–3·0 mm.

Dull black, sometimes with a faint purplish lustre; tarsi, labrum, palpi, and joints 5–11 of antennae brown, the last with a dense, short, yellowish pubescence.

*Head* convex (about 1·6 mm. wide), coarsely punctate, not at all contracted behind, sides forming a ridge in front of eyes, clypeus smooth, bisetose. *Prothorax* convex, slightly transverse (about  $2·0 \times 2·5$  mm.), slightly emarginate both in front and at base, rather more contracted at base than at apex, sides rounded, hind angles forming a small rectangular tooth, front angles well marked, about rectangular; median line strongly impressed, not reaching extremities, basal foveae almost obsolete, surface rather coarsely punctate, a little more sparsely on disk. *Elytra* (about  $3·0 \times 5·5$  mm.) moderately convex, parallel, shoulders well marked, border forming a blunt tooth, directed forwards, at the point where it terminates over stria 5, punctate-striate, striae deeper towards sides and apex, intervals gradually narrower and more convex towards sides. *Underside* coarsely punctate, but elytral epipleurae smooth.



The species is strikingly similar to *M. elegans* Dej., but the temporal suture, which runs back obliquely behind the eye in the African species, is here straight and much deeper (though not reaching base of neck); the elytral intervals also are more convex. The most noticeable difference, however, consists in the presence in *elegans* of a tubercle on the border of the prothorax in the sinuation before the hind angles, which in *piger* is altogether wanting.

Common throughout India, sometimes taken "at light."

**Creagris distacta** Wied. Length 10.0 mm.

Piceous: joint 1 of antennae (rest fuscous), apex of palpi, front margin of labrum, a spot on each elytron, and legs testaceous; rest of palpi and labrum, and base of ventral surface brown. Body shortly pubescent throughout, except labrum, underside of head, and proepisterna.

*Head* (2.0 mm. wide) shiny, rather flat, sparsely punctate, genae short, sharply contracted to neck, clypeus slightly emarginate, labrum depressed at sides, sexsetose, the two middle setae at extreme apex; mentum with a long and very sharp tooth, which is nearly as long as lobes, the tooth with a pair of setae at middle, and another pair at base; palpi short, stout, last joint moderately dilated and truncate at apex, antennae short, moniliform. *Prothorax* transverse ( $1.75 \times 2.25$  mm.), rather flat, cordate, base slightly produced in middle, a little emarginate at apex, sides rounded in front, then sinuate, front angles rounded, hind angles right, surface moderately and rather irregularly punctate. *Elytra* ( $3.0 \times 5.5$  mm.) flat, parallel, shoulders very square though rounded, truncate at apex, with outer angle of truncature rounded; seven well-defined crenulate striae, and a short scutellary striole between 1 and suture, 8 merged in 9, the whole lateral channel occupied by an uninterrupted series of large umbilicate pores, a row of closely placed punctures along each side of striae; intervals convex, 7 narrower than the others and subcarinate, 8 closely punctate; testaceous spots about middle of elytra, more or less rounded, covering intervals 3-7.

Much smaller than *C. binoculus* Bates, colour piceous, legs testaceous, antennae shorter and moniliform, genae contracted more abruptly to neck, prothorax much less transverse and less closely punctate, intervals of elytra more convex, spot rather smaller.

In addition to the type, I have seen two examples in the British Museum and one in the Brussels Museum: quite recently Mr. T. G. Sloane sent me two examples from Buitenzorg.



**Craspedophorus geniculatus** Wied. Length 11.0 mm.

Black: palpi testaceous, antennae, apex of femora, and tarsi brown, two spots on each elytron orange yellow. Pubescence short, greyish-yellow, but black on elytra (except over yellow spots).

*Head* small (1.8 mm. wide), flat, moderately constricted behind eyes, not narrowed behind, coarsely punctate, clypeus and neck smooth and polished, frontal foveae shallow, eyes very prominent; antennae long and filiform, joint 3 about half as long again as succeeding joints, palpi very long and slender, last joint securiform and obliquely truncate at apex; mentum very wide, sinus shallow, lobes short, rounded at sides and apex, mandibles sharply hooked at apex. *Prothorax* transverse ( $2.5 \times 3.1$  mm.), moderately convex, but a little explanate at sides, widest at middle, front angles rounded and inconspicuous, sides strongly and uniformly rounded, widely reflexed before hind angles, which are obtuse, but have a small acute tooth at the angle; median line and basal foveae well marked, the latter linear and slightly oblique, surface coarsely (more so than head) and more or less confluent punctate. *Elytra* ( $4.25 \times 7.0$  mm.) moderately convex, parallel, punctate-striate, intervals convex, finely punctate; front spot behind shoulder, extending from margin to stria 3, tapering a little inwards, hind spot smaller, quadrate, covering intervals 4-8. Beneath, the sterna and base of ventral surface at sides are coarsely punctate, rest of ventral surface finely punctate, base of ventral segments distinctly crenulate, metepisterna longer than wide. Tarsi beneath without special clothing of hairs. Insect winged.

In the form of the head and elytra hardly differing from *C. mandarinellus* Bates, but differing altogether in the shape of the prothorax, which in that species is much more narrowed in front than behind, widest considerably behind middle, with nearly rectangular hind angles, but without so acute a tooth, the surface more coarsely and much more confluent punctate.

**Badister thoracicus** Wied. Length 7.0 mm.

Blue black, iridescent; prothorax, two fasciae on elytra, with suture, margin, and epipleurae, first two joints of antennae (rest fuscous), palpi, clypeus, labrum, sterna, and legs testaceous red.

*Head* (1.5 mm. wide) moderately convex, smooth, opaque and very finely shagreened, clypeus with a pair of setiferous pores on hind margin, behind which the front is transversely channelled, eyes (for the genus) prominent, right mandible deeply emarginate.



*Prothorax* transverse ( $1.30 \times 1.75$  mm.), moderately convex in front, about equally contracted at extremities, but widest at a third from apex, which is strongly emarginate, base truncate but with oblique sides, sides well rounded in front, then straight to base, the oblique sides of which they join at an obtuse angle, strongly reflexed, a setiferous pore at hind angle and another at about a third from apex; median line faint in front, deep behind, basal foveae deep, rounded, surface smooth, with some faint transverse wrinkles, base subrugose. *Elytra* elongate-oval ( $2.3 \times 4.2$  mm.), finely striate, intervals quite flat, 3 with two pores at about a third from base and apex respectively: front fascia occupying the whole of the basal fourth of the elytra, and extending a little way back along the suture, hind fascia narrower, but widening out at the suture and sometimes interrupted on the middle of each elytron.

Allied to the Japanese *B. pictus* Bates, but larger and more iridescent: head larger and eyes more prominent, prothorax wider, its sides straighter behind, hind angles less obtuse and more strongly reflexed, elytra wider, more finely striate, the yellow fasciae and coloured sutural area much narrower.

***Omophron vittatus* Wied. Length 5.75 mm.**

Pale straw colour: antennae and sides of prothorax dull orange, underside brown, the epipleurae of elytra and prothorax, and last two ventral segments rather lighter; transverse patches on back of head and middle of prothorax, both projecting forwards at middle, and a series of stripes on elytra dark green. These stripes occupy intervals 1, 2, 4, 6, and 10 from base to near apex; on 8 there are two short patches of colour, one at about a third from base, the other rather longer just behind middle; a stripe on 12 commences at a little distance from base and stops some way before apex, being interrupted at a fourth from base and just behind middle.

*Head* finely striate near eyes, coarsely but not closely punctate behind, the subocular ridge taking the form of a fine furrow with one or two coarse punctures, the surface close to the eyes coarsely punctate. *Prothorax* bisinuate in front, quadrisinuate behind, increasing gradually in width from apex to base; surface finely rugose-punctate, smoother at sides. *Elytra* with fifteen punctate striae, intervals smooth and shiny; only striae 1 and 2 reach the apex, 3 and 4 coalesce and join 2 near apex, 5, 6, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, and 15 all end separately at some distance from apex, 7 and 8 are



very short and coalesce, 11 is very short but remains separate. Proepisterna smooth, except for a few punctures at base; met-episterna smooth, hardly longer than wide.

I know of no other species with a pattern like this, which, when further specimens are found, should render them easily determinable.

**Omophron pictus** Wied. Length 6.0 mm. Width 3.8 mm.

Testaceous: middle of underside and apex of mandibles dark brown: a patch at back of head, another on middle of base of prothorax, and an elytral pattern green. The last is more easily described if the elytra are considered as green, with testaceous pattern and border. A basal horse-shoe-shaped patch (convex forwards) over intervals 3-9, not quite reaching base, short on 6, longer on 7-9; a median patch on 3-5; an apical patch, not reaching the border, also on 3-5, longest on 3; a short patch on 7-9, just below the outside part of the basal patch, succeeded behind by another patch on the same intervals, which joins both the border and the apical patch; two side patches from interval 11 to border, just touching on 12, but distant on 13-14.

Head rather flat, smooth in front with faint cross-striation, wrinkled near eyes and finely punctate at back; subocular ridge extending inwards beyond buccal fissure, surface in front of it uneven, subpunctate near eye. Prothorax rather flat, bisinuate in front, base bisinuate on each side, increasing in width from apex to base, all angles acute; surface finely rugose, punctate in front, more coarsely along base, nearly smooth on disk; basal patch rather small, ill-defined, triangular, apex not quite reaching front margin. Elytra with fifteen punctate striae, 8 and 12 very short, intervals smooth but not very shiny, flat on disk, moderately convex at sides and towards apex. Underside smooth and shiny, a few coarse punctures on prosternal plate, sides of prosternum, base of proepisterna, sides of metasternum and basal segment of ventral surface.

In shape almost exactly like *O. maculosus* Chaud., but head and prothorax much less punctate, and the prothoracic green patch greatly reduced. The elytral pattern is not altogether dissimilar, but in *O. maculosus* the basal testaceous patch is small and covers intervals 7-9 only, the median and apical patches are less developed, the hind patch on 7-9 quite short, and interval 13 is green throughout.



**Chlaenius pulcher** Nietn. race **asper** nov. Length 18.0 mm. Width 7.75 mm.

Black: head and prothorax metallic green, both cupreous on disk, elytra greenish-black; epipleurae and margins of elytra to stria 8, margin of ventral surface, and legs (except coxae) flavous, palpi and antennae brown (latter lighter at base); underside slightly iridescent. Pubescence short, yellowish, rather sparse.

*Head* (3.3 mm. wide) rather flat, vertex finely rugose, some striation near eyes, punctate at back and sides, eyes prominent, joint 3 of antennae a third as long again as 4. *Prothorax* (4.75 mm. wide) slightly transverse, quadrate, flat but declivous to front angles, sides of base oblique, sides evenly rounded but rather wider at base than apex, hind angles obtuse and rounded, median line and basal foveae both clearly marked but shallow, surface finely rugose, coarsely punctate, more finely at sides, more closely along base. *Elytra* nearly parallel, but widest a little behind middle, border angled at shoulder, crenulate-striate, striae with a row of fine punctures along each side, intervals convex, rather coarsely punctate, odd ones slightly raised and more or less smooth along median line, 8 more finely and closely punctate. *Underside* smooth and polished along median line, prosternal process bordered and setose at apex, all episterna and sides of metasternum closely punctate, metepisterna not quite half as long again as wide, sides of ventral surface finely rugose, punctate near base. Front femora (♂) without tooth, tarsi glabrous on upper surface.

Closely allied to *C. pulcher* Nietn. (= *C. cinctus* Chaud., not F.), but that species is shorter (16 mm.), with smoother vertex, head, prothorax, and elytra more finely punctate, sides of prothorax slightly sinuate before hind angles, which therefore though obtuse are sharper, marginal channel narrower, especially behind. In *C. pulcher*, too, the elytra are generally a deeper black (sometimes bluish), and the even intervals, like the odd ones, are often smooth and polished along median line.

TONKIN: Hoabinh. LAOS: Vientiane. ANNAM: Hué and Keng Trap (*R. Vitalis de Salvaza*). CAMBODIA: Pnomh-Penh (*Capt. R. de la Perraudière*). CHINA (British Museum).

NOTE.—In Ann. Mag. Nat. Hist. (9), vii, 1921, p. 406, I recently described a species of *Omophron* under the name of *O. gemma*. I find this name is preoccupied, and I therefore desire to substitute for it the name of *O. gemmeus*.





Andrewes, H E. 1921. "III. Notes on Synonymy and on some Types of Oriental Carabidae in various foreign collections." *Transactions of the Entomological Society of London* 69, 145–190.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2311.1921.tb02805.x>.

**View This Item Online:** <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/item/51239>

**DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2311.1921.tb02805.x>

**Permalink:** <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/partpdf/37044>

#### **Holding Institution**

Smithsonian Libraries and Archives

#### **Sponsored by**

Smithsonian

#### **Copyright & Reuse**

Copyright Status: Public domain. The BHL considers that this work is no longer under copyright protection.

This document was created from content at the **Biodiversity Heritage Library**, the world's largest open access digital library for biodiversity literature and archives. Visit BHL at <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org>.