

die Imagines. Die Larven aus der II. Schneckenart waren am 21. XI. alle verpuppt und schlüpften am 24. und 25. XI.

Das ♀ ist sehr ähnlich dem ♀ der *Ravinia trivialis* (v. d. W. 1901), die auch an der gleichen Lokalität fliegt, aber letzterer Species fehlt die Wangenborste völlig. Auch die ♂ beider Arten sind auffällig ähnlich, letztere Species hat aber das für das Genus *Ravinia* charakteristische Mittelschenkel-Ctenidium.

Note on *Prosenia sibirita* Fabr. and related Forms (Dipt.).

By J. M. Aldrich, National Museum, Washington, D. C.

In Entomologische Mitteilungen for last September (vol. 16, 1927, p. 345), Mr. C. H. Curran states that the species of *Prosenia* introduced into the United States from Japan is *Prosenia malayana* Townsend, and not *P. sibirita* Fabricius as heretofore supposed. The fly is of considerable importance as a parasite of the so-called „Japanese Beetle“, *Popillia japonica* Newman, in Japan and the United States. As I am responsible for the identification of this species as *sibirita*, I naturally examined the statements of Mr. Curran with uncommon interest, including his key to the species of *Prosenia*.

It seems to me that Mr. Curran has made three mistakes, which entirely vitiate his conclusion regarding the Japanese species. In couplet 4 of his key, he distinguishes *nigripes* n. sp. on account of its having black legs. But Townsend in describing *malayana* (Suppl. Ent., 14, 1926, p. 26) says „Legs almost wholly black in male.“ Hence his males would run to *nigripes*. In couplet 9 of the same key, Curran separates *malayana* from *doddi* n. sp. by attributing to the former „Parafacials with distinct yellowish hair“. What Townsend said was, „The female has black bristles on parafrontal outside of the frontals; these are lacking in the male, only fine yellow micro-hairs being present.“ These hairs are on the parafrontals, not the parafacials, which are not mentioned at all. Anyone familiar with Townsend's work should know that he would make a new genus for a species allied to *Prosenia* but with hairy parafacials. Moreover the Japanese specimens in our collection, which were examined by Mr. Curran, would not run to *malayana* in his key, as they all have bare parafacials. Thus it appears that males of *malayana* would run to *nigripes* and females to *doddi* in this key. Whether these two new species are synonyms of *malayana* I do not know.

The third point relates to the taxonomic value of the pale hairs on the mesonotum of *sibirita*. Mr. Curran thinks they separate *sibirita* specifically from the Japanese form. The National Museum has three males

and five females of *sibirita* from Europe (France, Germany, Hungary), determined by Villeneuve, Bezzi and Kertesz. One male has the pile of the mesonotum almost all white, in the other two it is black for the most part anteriorly and narrowly in the middle, the rest white. The females have only black hair on the mesonotum, so they would run to *doddi* in Curran's key. Our Asiatic and East Indian material consists of 22 specimens of both sexes bred from *Popillia* in Japan by C. P. Clausen; 25 specimens collected in the field in Japan by C. P. Clausen (some of these may have been reared); 2 specimens, male and female, collected at Peking, China, by H. A. Jaynes; 10 males and one female from Hangchow, China, by the same collector; 2 males from Buitenzorg and Tjibodas in Java, collected by Bryant and Palmer; 8 specimens of both sexes collected at Manila, P. I., by R. C. McGregor; one female, Brastagi, Sumatra, by F. J. Meggitt. The specimen from Tjibodas, Mt. Gede, Java, has black legs and is probably *malayana*; the female from Sumatra is almost certainly the same.¹⁾ All the rest seem homogeneous and are what I determined as *sibirita*. The males have only black hair on the mesonotum, except in the one from Peking, in which this hair is pale when viewed from in front, but black from the sides and behind. All the Japanese specimens would run to *doddi* in Curran's key. The genitalia of the 3 European and 12 of the Asiatic males have been spread; they seem identical to me.

I have searched the literature to find a reference to the pale mesonotal hairs of *sibirita*, but they seem not to have been mentioned before Mr. Curran. He called my attention to them when studying our collection some eighteen months ago, but I did not at the time consider them important. He evidently did not notice that they are confined to the males and are variable even there. As the European and Japanese specimens agree in other respects down to the minute detail, including the male genitalia, I am still convinced that the paleness of these hairs has much less then specific importance; hence I still consider that our Japanese specimens belong to *sibirita*.

For what it is worth, I might add that Van der Wulp reported *sibirita* from Java in his „Catalogue of the Described Diptera from South Asia“, 1896, p. 137.

¹⁾ It has only one „bristlet“ on one side of the front, none on the other. I have found these minute bristles in but one other female, which is from Rambouillet, France. In this specimen, an undoubted *sibirita*, there is one on each side and I do not see how the female from Sumatra can be distinguished from this by anything approaching a specific character.