

taking place from the hindmargin to a little beyond vein  $SM^2$ , or to near  $M^1$ , and the posterior spots also merge together in each row.

The orange marginal area of the hindwing is as broad as in *azota*, being broader than in *protolela*, especially anteriorly; the dots in this area are minute and sometimes nearly all absent.

The underside is, on the whole, a little paler than in the palest *protolela*, and very slightly darker than in the darkest *azota*; the markings in the outer area of both wings are rather more sharply defined than in *azota*.

The penis-sheath bears some minute teeth as in *protolela*.

*Hab.* Between Niembo and Kalembo, west of Lake Tanganyika, 600 m., January 1909 (R. Grauer).

5 ♂♂.

ON *CARNUS HEMAPTERUS* NITZSCH (*CENCHRIDOBIA EGGERI* SCHINER) AND ITS SYSTEMATIC POSITION AMONG THE DIPTERA.

By J. E. COLLIN, F.E.S.

THE capture of this species in Roumania by one of the Hon. N. C. Rothschild's correspondents, constituting as it does the third recorded capture in nearly a hundred years, is of great interest, and has made it possible to correctly locate the species in our present systematic arrangement of the Diptera.

*Carnus hemapterus* was described by Nitzsch in Germar's *Magazin der Entomologie*, vol. iii. (1818), p. 305, in an article entitled *Die Familien und Gattungen der Thierinsekten*, upon seven specimens (1 ♂, 6 ♀♀) found upon young starlings. A few years later (after 1822) excellent figures of both sexes (communicated by Nitzsch himself) were published in Germar's continuation of Ahrens's *Fauna Insectorum Europae*, Fasc. ix. Tab. 24 and 25. Subsequently Egger in 1854 recognised the species from specimens found upon the young of *Falco tinnunculus* and described and figured it in *Verh. zool.-bot. Ges. Wien* vol. iv. pp. 3-7, pl. 2, figs. 7-11; he placed it among the *Pupipara* and gave a copy of Nitzsch's description, pointing out several important instances of disagreement between his specimens and that description, so much so that Schiner in 1862 (*Wien. Ent. Monatschr.* vi. 435) decided that Egger's specimens were generically distinct from those of Nitzsch, gave them the name of *Cenchrudobia eggeri*, and placed them near the *Borboridae*. Schiner apparently made no allowance for the fact that Nitzsch's knowledge of Diptera (with the exception of the *Pupipara*) was very slight, that the proboscis of *Carnus* compared with that of any of the *Pupipara* could easily be described as "geniculate," and that the ocelli of *Carnus* (at least in the specimens I have examined) are small and difficult to distinguish, making it quite possible for Nitzsch to have overlooked them. It certainly is difficult to understand why Nitzsch, in his short diagnosis of the genus on p. 284, described the antenna as one-jointed; but he did not repeat this when he elaborated his diagnosis on p. 306, and one is forced to the conclusion that he made a mistake in so describing it, when the general appearance of specimens, or even of Egger's figures, is compared with the plates in Germar's *Fauna Insectorum Europae*. In

all probability Schiner would have considerably modified his views, had he examined these plates, of which both he and Egger appear to have had no knowledge. I have very little doubt as to the specific identity of Nitzsch's and Egger's specimens, and from the points of resemblance given below do not hesitate to place the genus near *Meoneura* Rond., now considered to belong to the *Milichidae*.

The eyes are transverse oval, the jowls deep (about  $\frac{2}{3}$  the vertical diameter of the eye), the antennae are sunk in two deep foveae and hardly visible from a side view, these two foveae are separated by a chitinous stripe running from the lunule to the upper mouth-edge, the ocelli are very small and indistinct. The frons and its chaetotaxy remind one irresistibly of *Meoneura*; the vertical triangle is large, reaching nearly to the front of frons, but is not sharply defined; apparently only one of the three pairs of orbital bristles are incurved, the two decussate bristles on the front of frons are present as in *Meoneura*, and there are other smaller bristles on the sides of the vertical triangle; the thoracic chaetotaxy as far as I can trace\* does not differ much from that of *Meoneura*, the mesopleurae as well as the sternopleurae bear bristles, including the upturned bristle on the lower part of the mesopleura found in *Meoneura*. Only a short stump of the wing is present, giving one the impression of the wing having been broken off, and such might well be the case, for Nitzsch called attention to, and figured, a specimen with a complete, though narrow wing, on one side only.

The specimens examined were found on May 25, 1907, upon the more naked portions of the head of some very young *Falco sacer* taken from the nest at Malceci in Roumania by A. Rettig.

\* All the specimens were preserved in spirit, consequently many of the bristles had been rubbed off.

Collin, 1911