

Notes on some Weevils.

By

Victor Hansen.

1. *Bagous frit* Herbst. In his excellent work on the genus *Bagous* in „Die Käfer Europas“ XXXIV 1907, 68 Schilsky mentions as a new character for this species, that the last dorsal segment has a semicircular excision in the middle of the hind margin. It is however only the female, which possesses this character, while in the male the segment is quite simple and not excised. The character therefore is more valuable in separating the two sexes, than in separating the species from its allies.

2. *Bagous brevis* Gyll. In the same work Schilsky mentions *B. brevis* Gyll. among the species, that were unknown to him. In his „Systematisches Verzeichnis der Käfer Deutschlands und Deutsch-Oesterreichs“ 1909 p. 172 *B. brevis* Gyll. is however stated as a synonym to *B. limosus* Gyll. and so does Reitter too in „Fauna Germanica“ V, p. 210. *B. brevis* Gyll. is however a good species, that seems indeed not to be much known. It is not at all similar to *B. limosus* Gyll., from which it may be very easily separated by narrower elytra, much finer punctuation in their striæ, and shorter tarsi, but it is allied to *B. subcarinatus* Gyll. (*claudicans* Boh.) and *B. frit* Herbst on account of the short second and third joints of tarsi. It may however be easily known from the allied species, by having the thorax broadest before middle (so as to appear often feebly cordate) and furnished with a deep and broad central furrow which is not

sharp as in *B. frit* (*B. subcarinatus* has no central furrow at all on thorax) by having rostrum very short, and the scape of antennæ also very short, scarcely longer than the width of rostrum. The striæ of elytra are rather closely and very distinctly punctured and the alternate interstices are a little raised.

The species is very rare in Denmark and also in Sweden Thomson states it to be rare, which might be the explanation of this distinct species being unknown to many authors.

3. *B. Zwalinae* Seidl. In the same work Schilsky states that *B. Zwalinae* Seidl. is only a variety of *B. tempestivus* Herbst. I don't however doubt that *B. Zwalinae* Seidl. is a well marked species. It differs from *B. tempestivus* not only in having the third joint of tarsi a little broader than the second but also in having the elytra a little shorter, not quite twice longer than broad, in being larger and in having the thorax quite white, only with two dark spots at base.

4. *Anthonomus bituberculatus* Thoms. This name is often stated as a synonym to *A. cinctus* Kollar (ref. for instance Heyden, Reitter and Weise, Catalogus Coleopterorum Europae p. 682). It is however a good species and may be easily known from *A. cinctus* by the absence of tooth on the hind femora.

5. *Amalorrhynchus melanarius* Steph. This species, which has formerly been placed in the genus *Ceuthorrhynchidius* has by Reitter correctly been separated as a new Genus *Amalorrhynchus* (Bestimmungstabellen der europäischen Coleopteren Heft 68, pag. 70; Fauna Germanica V, p. 149, 179) as it fails the two lists on the anterior margin of thorax, which are characteristic for *Ceuthorrhynchidius*. Reitter states however, that the species has the anterior margin of prosternum simple (without any emargination in the middle). On this point however he is wrong. The species has the same deep emargination as the Genus

Ceuthorrhynchus and seems therefore in so far to be more closely allied to *Tapinotus* Schøn. than to *Amalus* Schøn.

6. *Rhynchites longiceps* Thoms. This name often is stated as a synonym to *Rh. tomentosus* Gyll. (*uncinatus* Thoms.) (ref. for instance Heyden, Reitter & Weise: *Catalogus Coleopterorum Europae* pag. 705, Schilsky: *Systematisches Verzeichnis der Käfer Deutschlands und Deutsch-Oesterreichs* pag. 185, Reitter: *Fauna Germanica* pag. 263). But this is quite wrong. The species is quite another one than *Rh. tomentosus*, from which it may be very easily separated by having no spine at the anterior tibiæ, by having the rostrum a little longer in both sexes and by having the striæ of elytra a little stronger and the interstices a little narrower. From *Rh. nanus* Payk., which quite as *Rh. longiceps* differs from *Rh. tomentosus* in wanting the little spine in the interior tibiæ, it may be easily distinguished by having the head considerably narrower than the thorax at the broadest point, by considerably longer rostrum in both sexes, by more regular punctuation of thorax, by having the scutellar stria evident and by a deeper blue colour. *Rh. longiceps* Thoms. undoubtedly has been mixed up with *Rh. tomentosus* by several authors, for instance Reitter; this may be seen from the fact, that Reitter in „*Fauna Germanica*“ pag. 263 does not at all name, that *tomentosus* differs from *nanus* in having a spine at the apex of anterior tibiæ, although this spine is just the best character in separating the species.

Rh. Harwoodi Norman H. Joy (*Entom. Monthly Mag. Sec. Series XXII* (1911) pag. 270) is undoubtedly quite the same species as *Rh. longiceps* Thoms., which name must therefore be applied as being the elder.

The species is found in Denmark in company with its allied and is not more rare than *Rh. tomentosus*.