

LYCAENIDAE AUSTRALASIAE.

I.

New Investigations on the Genus *Lycaenopsis* FELDER.

By

L. J. TOXOPEUS,

(Amsterdam).

When examining the collection of Lycaenidae in the British Museum in London I found amongst other things MOORE's ♀ cotype of his *lavendularis*, of which the ♂ type is the *puspa*-form of Ceylon. I struck me immediately, that this ♀ could not possibly be a *puspa*-♀, I further suspected that it was no ♀ at all, but would be a ♂ *Lycaenopsis* related to *L. argiolus* (L.) belonging also to the group (subgenus or genus ?) *Celastrina* TUTT. Distinctly indicating this are the deep blue wings, the round hind border on the secondaries, the peculiar long hairiness of these wings and a vague light border round the spots on the underside which cannot be well defined.

This cotype I recognized as having been one of MOORE's models for his pictures in "Lepidoptera of Ceylon" (1).

Afterwards I found a second specimen in the collection, this time put under the heading *Lycaenopsis singalensis* (FELDER). There were 2 specimens determined as females of *singalensis singalensis*, from Ceylon. The first was indeed a ♀ *singalensis*, the second had been caught as such by MR. W. ORMISTON, Aug. 1921 at Kandy, Ceylon, and had been given as a present to the B. M. collection; it belongs together with the *lavendularis*-♀ cotype to one and the same species. Through the kind offices of Capt. RILEY, in charge of the butterflies I received the specimen from Kandy for examination. On partly taking away the caudal hairtuft it at once appeared that my suspicion about the sex was well founded, and the subsequent anatomic investigation gave the final decision and also brought to light the relationship to *argiolus* (L.).

Lycaenopsis moorei nov. sp.

Description. Upperside, primaries with rather convex costa, rounded hind margin and a long inner margin; costa grey with distinct white inlets between the subcostal terminations (2). Disc coerulean with royal purple

(1) Also comp. DE NICÉVILLE, Butt. of Ind., Burmah & Ceylon, p. 101, (1891); W. ORMISTON, Butt. of Ceylon, p. 44, (1924); and SEITZ, Grossschm. II, pt. 2, p. 865, t. 152, f. (*singalensis* ♀).

(2) Which might be compared with *Megisba malaya* HORSF. — L. T.

gloss, dusted with white scales at the lower outer corner of the cell and along the veins, which originate there. Outer margin \pm 3 mm. broad, blackish brown, increasing in width towards the wing tip. Secondaries with rather convex costa, circular hind margin and rather strongly bent inner margin. Along the whole hind margin runs a thin but sharply drawn marginal black line, proximally a row of lenticular black spots, of which the subcostal spot, the one near to vein II, and the one near the apex are somewhat larger. All these spots have a lighter margin towards the base, those near the apex are entirely surrounded by white. Further inward the subcostal spot is bordered by a brownish grey crescent from which a convergent ray of white points to the base of wing. The intervenal spaces beneath are strewn with white scales in decreasing densities. The costa is broadly suffused with greyish brown. Fringes of fore wings with sharply separated dark short scales and white long ones, vein tips finely brown. On the secondaries the short scales are light grey, on the vein terminations somewhat darker.

Underside. The common *Lycaenopsis* design, with rather light brownish spots, but the normal spots of the hind wings are black and the latter moreover somewhat lighter ringed on the light greyish white ground. Submarginal spots on the fore wings ranging together, each having the shape of a bird on the wing, by which a crenate line forms itself (points inward) — on the secondaries the corresponding line has its points turned outward.



Lycaenopsis moorei spec. nova, ♂ gen.
app. $\times 40$ (Zeiss Micr. 4 A $\times \frac{1}{2}$).

♂ Genitalia. Annulus narrow, with its pointed bow sharply turned upward. valvae about the same as those of *puspa* but narrower, the harpae more strongly bent, longer and with only one row of infinitely fine saw teeth (nearly as *argiolus*). Uncus rounded, the two lobes connected by a very low bridge. No spines or projections, no trace of a scaphium. Oedaeagus very thin, typically celastrinid (1), carina little chitinous.

Type of *moorei* nov. = *lavendularis*, ♀ cotype MOORE, in B. M. coll., *moorei* paratype in coll. TOXOPEUS, Amsterdam.

Named after the famous author of the Butterflies of Ceylon.

(1) Compare *argiolus*, *oreas*, etc. (CHAPMAN. P. Z. S. L. 1909). Although the base of the oedaeagus has been broken off and lost, the thin tapering tube gives all necessary data.

According to Mr. ORMISTON (Lep. Ceylon, 1924) the ♀ of *L. singalensis* is very rare. This agrees with my own observations in Java, where I caught 25 ♂♂ of *singalensis astarga* FRUHST. to one ♀ only; and with the very large series of ♂♂ in the Leyden Museum with only one ♀. As Mr. ORMISTON put the new species too under the ♀♀ of *singalensis*, it must without any doubt be a very rare species. The ♀ of *moorei* is still unknown to us, but in analogy to its allies I venture to suppose that it is somewhat lighter blue with broader wing border. It must be closely related to the ♀ of *argiolus*.

Some remarks on the group *Celastrina* TUTT.

I take this opportunity of making some remarks upon allied species. A study in the Tring Museum and of the B. M. collections in London has convinced me that CHAPMAN'S view that *L. argiolus* (L.) forms a great number of races in the Himalayas partly mimicking other *Lycaenopsis* species (vide P. Z. S. L. 1909) is untenable. Although I do not want to discard the mimicry-hypothesis in other cases, it is my opinion that in this case it must be wrong. Instead of considering these forms as *argiolus*, I think they are partly closely related species and partly local subspecies of these (1).

With regard to wing-shape and colour they may all be arranged under the group — or if you like genus — *Celastrina* TUTT, which keeps well apart from the remaining *Lycaenopsis*. *Celastrina* is palaearctic and nearctic, except some few species which are found down the southern slopes of the Himalayas, and the new species just described from Ceylon (2), which just by living there adds an astonishing palaearctic element to the remarkable fauna of that island.

According to my ideas *Celastrina* now includes the following species in Asia:

argiolus (L.) with a subspec. *coelestina* KOLL. in the Himalayas;

sikkima (MOORE);

moorei mihi;

huegeli (MOORE);

oreas (LEECH);

oreana (SWINHOE);

oreoides (EVANS) (a subspec. of *oreana* ?);

morsheadi (EVANS);

to which might be added some odd *argiolus*-forms, named by CHAPMAN, which I was not able however to study so far (and perhaps *jynteana* DE NIC.?).

Beside the Himalayas, North America has become a second centre of development of *Celastrina*. To enter on this lies beyond the objects of this article.

(1) A definite solution can only be got after a thorough revision of all the material available, the basis of which must be the anatomic examination of the male type specimen or that of specimens caught in the same locality and absolutely uniform with them. — L. T.

(2) Most probably there is another species from Celebes, which will be mentioned at the end of this article. — L. T.

Every palaearctic *Celastrina*-species that I could examine possesses an uncus without any trace of a scaphium, the function of which has been taken over by an excrescence of the uncus-tip itself, in most cases.

The place where the furca is joined to the valva bears in *argiolus* (L.) ¹⁾ a very distinct small chitinous lobulus which is hairy and from which starts a ridge terminating in the upper valva end. I consider this lobulus basalis as the basis, the ridge and the sharp bent as the prehensor part of the harpe, the end of which only has escaped from being absorbed. With the *Celastrina*-species this end is much elongated and only dentate at its basis with one row of small teeth, in contrast with *L. puspa* HORSF., which possesses a great number of fine knobs at the basis of its long extended point.

Now with some species belonging to *Celastrina* the harpe point is not so elongated as in *argiolus* so that they show a remarkable likeness to some structures such as occur in other species. From the strong deviation of the point — a characteristic that CHAPMAN too (l. c.) used to separate nearly related structural forms — it appears however that there is an important difference. I refer here specially to *Lycaenopsis oreas* LEECH (whose fore- and hindwings are of the same colour), and *L. oreana* (SWINHOE) (partim *oreas* CHAMP., nec LEECH, with lighter coloured secondaries), in contrast with *Lycaenopsis philippina* (SEMPER).

The former both have a nearly similar valve with strongly dentate and deviating point, their uncus has a sharp downward pointing spine, which varies in size in the different species. *L. philippina* possesses nearly the same shape of appendages as *oreas* (LEECH), but its harpe-end is more strongly bent inward towards the base.

In this species there is also found a small remnant of the scaphium basis and the oedaeagus is shorter. Whereas I suppose that the western species *oreas* and *oreana* have acquired a shortened harpe secondarily, reduced from the primitive long Zizerine type, — which may be seen from the bent point, — I assume that in *philippina* from the short *Lycaenopsis* terminal spine a near imitation of the *oreas* harpe point has been formed by pronounced enlargement of the teeth. Just as with the other *Lycaenopsis* species of the same group, this point is also in *nedda* closely pressed to the valve body.

There is no question of any nearer relationship between *oreas* and *nedda*.

L. oreas is a western species, a butterfly from the Chinese high mountain regions (occurring even above 10,000 feet), *L. philippina* however is a low country and lower mountain region form within the tropics, and a purely eastern species, which like many other eastern species has penetrated to the Philippines and Palawan (probably even as far as N. Borneo).

(1) Owing to the wrong position it could not be so well noticed in the slides of the other species of this group. — L. T.

Some confusion has arisen in distribution and naming of subspecies owing to the strong superficial likeness of genital apparatus to that of *oreas* and *philippina*, the origin of which can be traced already in SEMPER's work on the Lepidoptera of the Philippine islands.

I will try now to unravel this confusion here.

Lycaenopsis philippina (SEMPER) 1889.

On page 158, t. XXXII, f. 14—18, SEMPER figures some ♂♂ and one ♀ of this *Cyaniris* species, there described as new. These pictures have however had two species for models, to wit 14, 15 ♂ upperside and underside are one species, the others, 16 ♂ upperside, 17 and 18 underside another. This has already been stated by FRUHSTORFER, who consequently mistook the former for a subspecies of the latter (*Cyaniris philippina*, Stettin. Ent. Z. 1910, p. 299).

L. c. he says: „Zwei Inselrassen sind zu erwähnen:

Philippina philippina SEMPER, Luzon;

Philippina hermesianax subsp. nova.

Südphilippinische Stücke meiner Sammlung und Sempers Figuren 14 und 15 differieren von solchen aus Luzon (1) durch bedeutendere Grösse, breitere schwarze Umsäumung, dunkleres Blau und prominentere schwarze Punktierung der Unterseite beider Flügel.

Patria: Mindanao”.

I found it impossible to follow the mental processes of FRUHSTORFER, who, with 5 figures before him — of which the first two were identical with his own material — did not take these for typical *philippina*, but restricted the name to the others, which were practically unknown to him.

However, since he fixed the original of fig. 16 as *philippina philippina*, this name must be taken for this species in the future (2).

This naturally causes a considerable alternation, as *philippina* has to be put in stead of *nedda* for the specific name, the former name being 3 years older than the latter.

The *philippina* subspecies now become the following:

L. p. philippina (SEMPER) 1889, Luzon;

„ „ subsp. (Tring Mus.), Palawan;

„ „ *gradenigra* (FRUHST.) 1910, N. & E. Celebes;

„ „ subsp. (Tring Mus.) Sula isl.;

„ „ *cinctata* (GR. SMITH) 1896, Ternate, Batchian, Halmaheira, (Type in Tring, ♀ cotype = ♂), (*cinctata* FRUHST. 1910, *L. nedda cinctata* FRUHST. 1916; *L. nedda aga* CHAPM. 1909, [B. M. in litt.] Batchian).

(2) It is not possible to conclude from SEMPER's description, what he himself Archipelago. — L. T.

(2) It is not possible to conclude from SEMPER's description, what he himself considered as the type specimen of *philippina*. The original of fig. 16 came from the Benguet valley, N. W. Luzon. In the same place the ♀ of the next figure was caught, which is to be considered as the ♀ paratype. — L. T.

- L. p.* subsp. (Tring Mus.), Obi;
 „ „ *labranda* (FRUHST.) 1916, Amboyna, Ceram,
 (*L. cardia* FELDER ♀ cotype = *L. nedda labranda* FRUHST., Amboyna;
L. nedda ROTSCHILD, Nov. Zool. 1915, Ceram);
 „ „ subsp. (coll. TOXOPEUS), Buru;
 (*Cyaniris philippina*, HOLLAND, Nov. Zool. 1900);
 „ „ *nedda* (GR. SMITH 1894), New Guinea;
 (*L. nedda artinia* FRUHST. 1916, ex errore as he seems not to have known
 that Dorey — Manokwari — is a locality in New Guinea !);
 „ „ subsp. (Tring Mus.), Bismarck Arch.
 (*Plebejus cagaya* PAGENST., Abh. Senck. 1911);
 „ „ *vulcanica* (ROTSCH.) 1915, i.e., Vulcan isl. (Type in Tring);
 (*L. vulcanica*, FRUHSTORFER 1916, in contrast to his supposition there is
 not any point of congruence with *L. acesina* B. BAKER, neither with
pullus J. & TALB.; his hab. is wrong too, as the former German New
 Guinea is inhabited by *L. p. nedda* GR. SMITH);
 „ „ subsp. (Mus. Leyden), Key isl.
 „ „ *phuste* (DRUCE) 1895, Timor.

The second species figured by SEMPER is therefore now the typical *philippina*. It is also the one which was examined by CHAPMAN on structure of genitalia and published as a microphoto. I have studied the slide attached to its specimen in the Br. Mus. collection, as well as the types of the species that I have subordinated to *L. philippina* (SEMPER) insofar as they were accessible to me.

The name of *hermesianax* FRUHST. is kept reserved for the *limbata*-race of the Philippines (FRUHST. 1916).

It is now well worth while to see where FRUHSTORFER has carried the name *philippina*. I found it back under *cardia* (i.e. page 14):

“*L. cardia philippina* SEMP. 1889.

(*C. philippina* SEMP. pro parte, Schmett. Phil. p. 168, t. 32, f. 16, 17 (1).
L. dilecta, CHAPM. p. 453, Luzon)?”

Cardia was chosen by FRUHSTORFER, in sequence to CHAPMAN, for a species, which was assumed to be possibly the same as *singalensis* FELDER by CHAPMAN, FRUHSTORFER however proclaimed it to be without doubt a subspecies of this *singalensis*; moreover he included in this species *dilecta* MOORE with all its forms.

This view is absolutely wrong. *Lycaenopsis cardia* is a purely eastern species from the S. Moluccas, New Guinea, Solomon islands in the Tring Mus. (where I found FELDER's type) and *singalensis* as well as *dilecta* are very well recognizable species, both occurring from India to New Guinea.

The specimen and slide of CHAPMAN's *dilecta* besides, 2 other specimens from Mindanao have been studied by me, but I am still in doubt, whether the latter may be accepted as a *dilecta*-form. With some reserve — I never saw the specimen that SEMPER indicated as *dilecta* MOORE, and its underside was

(1) Fig. 18 was omitted by mere inaccuracy. — L. T.

unrecognizably figured in his book — I should take it for a local mountain-species, closely related to *dilectissima* DRUCE and *aristius* FRUHST. The brilliant blue lustre of the upperside of the ♂ as well as the fine snowy white with the regularly drawn arched line of the underside spots on the fore-wings point to this. FRUHSTORFER created the name *apona* for the unique specimen from mount Apo (figured by SEMPER) —

[“*dilectus* subsp. nova *apona* — nach SEMPER fig. 4, t. 32; Schm. Ph. p. 169” — FRUHST., Stett. Ent. Z. 1910, p. 289; *L. apona* FRUHST. Arch. f. Nat. Gesch. 1916, p. 11] — which name probably must be transferred both to the SEMPER specimen and to CHAPMAN’s *dilecta*.

Consequently we have: *singalensis* FELD. with a subsp. in the Philippines and also *dilecta* MOORE with a subsp. in the Philippines, if indeed specimens of these two species have been in FRUHSTORFER’s collection or have in any other way been studied by him.

For this reason, viz. that I do not know anything about this and have never seen any specimen of these two species from the Philippines myself, I do not propose names for these supposititious races.

Further: *apona* FRUHST. 1916;

(*dilecta* SEMPER nec MOORE, ? *dilecta* CHAPM. nec MOORE).

What is now left to us, is to trace the fate of *philippina* CHAPM. (partim *philippina* SEMPER). I found it given synonymous to *oreas* ! (FRUHSTORFER l.c. page 30), thus:

“*L. oreas algermoni* nomen novum (*L. philippina* CHAPM. nec SEMPER, p. 432, f. 65). Chapman erwähnt als *philippina* eine Form, welche er nach einer Bestimmung der Godman collection identifizierte. Es handelt sich aber nicht um *philippina* SEMPER, sondern ganz entschieden um eine *L. oreas* Abzweigung, die von wirklichen *oreas* aus China nur durch etwas mehr abgerundete Ansatzstelle der Valvenspitze differiert.”

So the investigation of the ♂ appendages has caused a confusion this time.

The name *algermoni* consequently must be dropped, because it was given to CHAPMAN’s picture of the genital apparatus and the butterfly from which it originated (Br. Mus. coll.) entirely agrees with SEMPER’s fig. 16 (type of *L. philippina*, FRUHST. 1910, nec *philippina* FRUHST. 1916).

This case of congruency proves that one must be most careful in putting together the subspecies of one species and further, that two forms the ♂♂ of which have nearly identical genitalia, may not always be arranged under the same species for that reason.

Lycaenopsis najara FRUHST. 1910.

Herewith I have excluded *philippina* from the (?) genus *Celastrina* TUTT. There are however some indications that a *Celastrina* may occur in the Phil-

ippines after all, and as it is of great importance to inform collectors beforehand which species they might come across, I will publish this hint here.

As I have said before, *argiolus*, and *moorei* still more, possess a valva which reminds one exceedingly of the *puspa* valve. The differences between these two are not strikingly visible if magnified less than 100 \times . Therefore it is possible, that FRUHSTORFER added some species resembling *moorei* to *puspa* HORSE.

I think therefore one is quite justified in calling the *Lycaenopsis najara* FRUHST. a *Celastrina*, although FRUHSTORFER referred to it in 1916 as a mountain form of *L. puspa kühni* after genital examination. This *najara* was found by him at Bua Kraeng, S. Celebes, in the high mountains. Now, *puspa*, though as a rule a coast butterfly, sometimes climbs up to great heights, which can however only be traced in the ♂ sex, as the mountain ♀♀ looked upon as *puspa*, may just as well belong to *limbata*. There is no outward difference between these two!

The Leyden Museum on the other hand possesses some ♂ *puspa* from considerable heights in the Prayangan Mts., Java. These are of a somewhat darker colour like many mountain forms, just like the *puspa* subspecies from Sikkim.

The description of *Cyaniris najara* (Stett. Ent. Z. 1910, p. 287) runs as follows:

“♂ Oberseits sehr nahe *puspinus* (KHEIL 1884, a very light blue *puspa* subsp. from the Isle of Nias), aber noch lighter und glänzender blau. Distalsaum ähnlich jenem von *kühni*, aber namentlich am Apex der Vorderflügel viel schmaler, Hinterflügel nur mit feinem grauen Randbezug. Unterseite grauweiss mit braunen weisslich unfrandeten Punktierungen, die zarter angelegt sind wie bei *kühni*.

♀ Ähnlich grossen ♀♀ von *coelestina* KOLL., aber noch stattlicher. Alle Flügel vorherrschend schwarz, mit dunkel metallblauer, aber stark glänzender discaler Aufhellung.

Patria: Süd-Celebes, Pik von Bonthain, Bua Kraeng, 5000', Febr. 1896 (H. FRUHSTORFER legit)."

To this he adds in 1916 (Arch. f. Nat. Gesch. p. 26):

"*L. puspa kühni* RÖBER 1886, Ost Celebes etc.
forma *najara* FRUHST.

Auf 5000 Fuss Höhe fing ich im Februar 1896 eine extreme Trockenzeitform, welche sich durch schmalen schwarzen Rand beider Flügel und das hellblaue Kolorit der Oberseite dermassen *L. puspa puspinus* KHEIL nähert, dass ich sie für eine besondere Art hielt. Erst die Untersuchung der Klammerorgane verwies mich auf ihre Zugehörigkeit zur Kollektivspezies *L. puspa*. Das ♀ hat gar keine Analogie mit irgend einem der bekannten *puspa* ♀♀, sondern ist durchaus ♂ ähnlich, hat dieselbe spitze Flügelform und differiert oberseits nur durch eine mehr als doppelt so breite, braunschwarze Umrandung beider Flügel vom ♂."

Further FRUHSTORFER had the ♂ pictured in SEITZ t. 152 row c (1922).

In this case therefore, the high mountain regions should have caused a *puspa*-form the ♂ of which is much lighter blue than even the lightest *puspa* extreme known, very narrowly bordered, a characteristic that especially the S. Celebes forms never display ⁽¹⁾, and whose ♀♀ show a likeness to *coelestina*-♀♀ (compare page 367). The ♂ genitalia were, according to FRUHSTORFER, not to be distinguished from those of *puspa*.

For the foregoing reasons the arrangement of *najara* under *puspa* must doubtlessly be considered wrong. Moreover there is in the mountain jungle of S. Celebes no extreme dry season, which should have rendered the ♂♂ lighter and on the other hand the ♀♀ darker blue.

All peculiarities mentioned, to wit: bright blue colour, greyish white underside with fine brown lines, bordered with white, the puspoid harpe of the ♂♂, the blue wings their broad borders of the ♀♀, without exception all point to *Celastrina*.

The occurrence of a *Celastrina* in Celebes is not more astonishing than in Ceylon, because Celebes too contains a rather considerable number of continental species of old pedigree. In this respect I may refer to *Bothrinia celebica* FRUHST. 1916 a. o. Therefore it is not impossible, that the mountain region of the Philippines, which in many other cases have proved to be an import way for continental genera to N. Celebes, may yield in the future an intermediate form between *L. najara* FRUHST. and some continental species.

LIST OF LITERATURE.

- G. T. BETHUNE BAKER, Ent. Rec., 1914. Synonymic Notes on the Rurilidae.
A. G. BUTLER, Ann. & Mag. of N. Hist., 1900. A List of the Species of Cyaniris.
T. A. CHAPMAN, Pr. Z. Soc. Lond., 1909. A Review of the Spec. of the Lep. genus *Lycaenopsis*.
R. FELDER, Verh. Zool. Bot. Ges. Wien, 1868. Diagn. der von E. Baron v. Ransonnet in Vorder-Indien ges. Lep. (*L. singalensis*!).
H. FRUHSTORFER, Stett. Ent. Z., 1910. Neue Cyaniris-Rassen und Übers. der bek. Arten.
H. FRUHSTORFER, Arch. f. N. Gesch., 1916. Rev. der Lye. Gattung *Lycaenopsis* auf Grund morph. Vergl. der Klammerorgane.
H. GROSE SMITH, Nov. Zool. I, 1894, id. 1896.
NAPOLEON M. KHEIL, Rhop. v. Nias, 1884.
J. H. LEECH, Butterfl. of China, Japan & Corea, III, 1893.
F. MOORE, Lep. of Ceylon, I, 1880—81.
L. DE NICÉVILLE, Butterfl. of India, Burmah & Ceylon, III, 1890.
W. ORMISTON, Butterfl. of Ceylon, 1924.

(1) According to FRUHSTORFER (SEITZ l.c., p. 870) the normal *kühni* ♀ of Maros is nearly black. — L. T.

- M. C. PIEPERS & P. C. T. SNELLEN, Rhop. of Java, IV, 1918 (*argiolus* not Javan).
 W. ROTSCCHILD, Nov. Zool. 1915.
 A. SEITZ, Grossschm., Hauptt. II, Ind. Austr. Lyc. (excerpt from FRUHST.'s
 Rev., with some afterwards described species included).
 G. SEMPER, Schmett. der Phil. Ins., I, 1886—1892 (*Cyaniris*, 1889 !).
 J. W. TUTT, Nat. Hist. Br. Lep., 1899—1910.

APPENDIX.

After having sent my manuscript to the printer I received a letter from Mr. ORMISTON, Galle, Ceylon, giving another version of the above described *Elycaenopsis (Celastrina) moorei* than I did, viz:

"I have always been of the opinion that this was distinct from *puspa*, but all other collectors treated it as a variety of that species. MOORE went so far as to call it *puspa* ♀.

I had a good series of it but have sent every specimen away in the hope of finding out if it was new. I did not send it to the British Museum as *singalensis* ♀, but as MOORE's *puspa* ♀, and they put it as *singalensis* there. I sent my last specimen to Capt. RILEY last Christmas, too late for you to see".

Indeed I have not seen this last specimen, I am sure it will be another *moorei*. I regret to have thrown a wrong light upon my friend's capacities and I wish to express here my great admiration that he was already aware of so small a difference as exists between *puspa* and *moorei*, which, had I not noticed the conspicuous gap between the appendages of both species, would have led me to the same conclusion as the other collectors, to which he so liberally distributed his specimens.

Afterwards he told me that in the course of this year (1925) he got 3 ♂ specimens of *moorei* caught in Kandy by natives, and probably the obtaining of the still unknown ♀ of that species will only be a question of time.

Meanwhile Col. EVANS of Simla (Br. India) informed me that he had a strong suspicion that *moorei* might be the same species as *lilacea* HAMPSON or *crissa* DE NICEVILLE.

The latter species was called a synonym of *lilacea* by SWINHOE in MOORE's Butt. of India and as I could neither get specimens nor the original descriptions, this vision may be true; however both *lilacea* and *orissa* were caught in S. India, and as I do not know any butterfly from Ceylon and from those localities which congrue in every respect, the Ceylonese form might stand as a new one.

Should therefore *lilacea* or *crissa* be the first described form of this species even then *moorei* would stand as the name of the Ceylonese subspecies. This cannot be settled before some investigator gets the opportunity of dissecting the types of HAMPSON's and DE NICEVILLE's species, or of specimens from the same localities controlled with these types.

In enumerating the subspecies of *L. philippina* I omitted by mistake some new subspecies of SETTZ, *Grossschmetterlinge der Erde*, p. 875 (15. IV. 1922). They are:

proba, Palu, Central Celebes (Dr. L. MARTIN legit), „grösser, breiter schwarz umrandet. Unterseits in der Submarginalzone ein rein weisses Feld, dass *gradenigra* fehlt”.

lychorida (*lugra* RIBBE — Iris 1899 — nec DRUCE), Kinigunang, Neu-Pommern (= New Britain).

The third form, *pullus* JOYCEY & TALBOT, treated as a *philippina* (*nedda*) subspecies, „eine weitere Form des Papua Gebiets, Wandammengebirge” is as far as can be judged from its picture, no *philippina*, but seems to be a good species, one of those that the highest mountains in the Dutch Indies will yield in dozens as soon as they are thoroughly explored.

To *phuste* H. H. DRUCE 1895 (see p. 370) the following can be added: CHAPMAN, l.c. p. 432, calls it a form of *nedda* GR. SM., though the type specimen lacks most spots of the underside.

“Not having examined the appendages I can make no positive assertion, but I see no difference between *phuste* and *cinctata* except the absence on the underside of all spots save the marginal ones. This is a form of aberration one expects to meet with occasionally in most *Lycaenines*. Ordinary *cinctata* occur in Dili whence this specimen comes”. (CHAPMAN).

This is impossible. *L. philippina cinctata* was described from Batjan, and though the ordinary form of Timor may have a wing border just like *cinctata*, it is rather smaller than that subspecies, and therefore the name *phuste* must be kept.

Another question is, whether this name must be taken for all the Timor specimens or only for those that are just like the type. My opinion in this matter is the following:

L. philippina phuste is the general name for the Timor subspecies. *L. philippina phuste aberratio phuste* H. H. DRUCE are specimens lacking the discal spots. The ordinary specimens (products of the wet season ?) may not be called *L. philippina cinctata* nor *L. philippina phuste forma cinctata* CHAPM., because this name was preoccupied, therefore I propose a new name for this form, viz. *Lycaenopsis philippina phuste forma typica cincta nova forma mihi*.