

genti, postice subfoveato), lateribus minus fortiter (quam *P. scauroides*, Cast., multo minus fortiter) arcuatis in parte postica summa sinuatis, angulis posticis rectis; elytris modice convexis, subtiliter perspicue striatis (striis perspicue punctulatis), striis 1^a et 2^a antice fortiter extrorsum versis et prope basin conjunctim profunde sulcatis, inter has strias et suturam fovea sat profunda impressa, parte apicali subrugulosa. Long., 5 $\frac{3}{4}$ l.; lat., 2 $\frac{1}{8}$ l.

In general shape and build this species resembles an insect sent to me by Mr. Sloane under the name *P. semistriatus*, Cast. Its most striking character consists in the strong longitudinal sulcus of the labrum, which is even more deeply impressed than in any of my specimens of the small group of Tasmanian species notable for that character. The puncturation of its elytra is more marked than in any other specimen of the genus in my collection, extending in regular rows from base to apex and being quite distinct even on the lateral portions; it can hardly be the result I think of immersion in spirits. The sinuation (close to the base) of the lateral margins of the prothorax is stronger than in any other *Promecoderus* known to me. This lateral margin is continued along the base (where it becomes thicker and stronger than on the sides) for about a quarter of the width of the segment and is obsolete in the middle. The prothorax is fully as long as (if anything a trifle longer than) wide by careful measurement. The first and second elytral striæ running into a short deep fovea-like sulcus at the extreme base seems to be a good character. I cannot make up my mind as to the sex of the specimen before me. The front tarsi are not spongy beneath, but they are very short and wide for a female,—the basal joint scarcely longer than wide and the following three joints distinctly transverse. I can find only one puncture on each side of the hindmargin of the last ventral segment, but as the setæ of the punctures are wanting and the margin itself is slightly damaged I am not sure that there may not have been two punctures on each side. The lateral foveæ of the ventral segments are not linearly produced towards the middle of the segments. The median longitudinal line of the pronotum is much like that in a specimen sent to me by Mr. Sloane as *olivaceus*, MacL. This species is as brilliantly nitid as *P. scauroides*, Cast.

Western Australia (Yilgarn District).

GNATHAPHANUS.

G. Darwini, Blackb. Mr. Sloane (Proc. L.S., N.S.W., 1899, p. 555) says that a comparison of the description of the above insect with that of *G. (Diaphoromerus) multipunctatus*, Macleay (both published in P.L.S., N.S.W., 1888, Part 2), convinces him

of their identity and that as he feels little doubt of *G. multipunctatus* being identical with *G. impressipennis*, Cast., he thinks *Darwini* is probably in the same case. It seems to me likely enough that my name is founded on the same species as Sir W. Macleay's; in which event, although the two names were published simultaneously my name must sink, as Sir W. Macleay's paper was read before mine; but my *G. Darwini* is perfectly distinct from a Queensland species sent to me by Mr. Sloane as *G. impressipennis*, Cast. (and in my opinion correctly named), from which it differs *inter alia* by its having no punctures on the fourth elytral interstice and none on the front one-third part of the fifth interstice. Unfortunately my *G. Darwini* is a female, and the Queensland specimen is a male,—but I think it very improbable that the female of the Queensland species has such deep elytral striæ or so strongly prominent interstices (which however are flattened,—not keel like,—except close to the base and near the apex) as *G. Darwini*.

LAMELLICORNES.

ANODONTONYX.

A. (Scitula) languida, Er. I have the type before me and find it to be an *Anodontonyx*. It is identical with the species that I regard as *A. nigrolineata*, Boisd. This confirms Burmeister's opinion that the two names are founded on the same insect, but Burmeister makes Boisdual's name the synonym,—whereas the reverse is the case (as Blanchard cites it and as it is quoted in Masters' Cat.).

HETERONYX.

Erichson seems to have overlooked this name altogether as he makes no reference to it in founding his genus *Silopa* to which he refers numerous Tasmanian species. *Silopa* however, as Lacordaire and others have shown, is quite identical with *Heteronyx*. In my "Revision of the genus *Heteronyx*" (P.L.S., N.S.W., 1889, &c.) I was obliged to pass *H. (Silopa) glabratus*, Er., *fumatus*, Er., and *hepaticus*, Er., among the species unknown to me. I have now, through the courtesy of Herr Kolbe, the types of these three species before me and can furnish the following notes on them, assigning to them their places in my arrangement of the genus.

H. glabratus, Er. This species belongs to my Section III., Group I., Sub-group II., having its labrum elevated above the clypeus, its antennæ of eight joints and its claws appendiculate. In my tabulation of that Sub-group it stands beside *H. raucinusus*, Blackb. (P.L.S., N.S.W., 1889, p. 142) along with *H. consanguineus*, Blackb. (a subsequently described species). It differs from both of them by its much less closely and more