

and probably several others described by Lacordaire are in the same position. Crotch in his revision [Cist. Ent. i. p. 450] mentions eleven species which he considered to be synonymous. I feel that no scientific advantage is gained by recording these species as distinct, but in some cases I have not seen sufficient specimens to enable me to corroborate his opinion or otherwise.

## 2. *Mycotretus nigropunctatus*.

*Erotylus nigropunctatus*, Duponch. Monogr. Erotyl. p. 22, t. 2. f. 34<sup>1</sup>.

*Erotylus puncticollis*, Duponch. Monogr. Erotyl. p. 25, t. 2. f. 43<sup>2</sup>.

*Mycotretus nigropunctatus* (Dej.), Lac. Monogr. Erotyl. p. 142<sup>3</sup>.

*Hab.* COSTA RICA, Volcan de Irazu (*Rogers*).—BRAZIL<sup>1 2</sup>, Rio Janeiro<sup>3</sup>.

In this species (if indeed it can be treated as distinct from *M. ornatus*) the tridentate mark has disappeared from the base of the thorax, and all the black marks tend to disappear, the last to go being the four transverse spots of the thorax and two spots on the elytra below the shoulders. Lacordaire mentions four varieties, but it is difficult to find two specimens entirely alike. One of our specimens from Irazu has the four thoracic spots, the three elytral spots, and black scutellum; in the other the four thoracic spots are very faint, the others are absent from the elytra, and the scutellum is yellow.

The legs in the two specimens from Irazu before me vary, being clouded and with fuscous tarsi in the more maculate example, and entirely yellow in the other.

## 3. *Mycotretus tigrinus*. (Tab. III. fig. 9.)

*Erotylus tigrinus*, Oliv. Enc. Méth., Ins. vi. p. 437<sup>1</sup>; Ent. v. p. 485, t. 3. f. 40; Duponch. Monogr. Erotyl. p. 22, t. 2. f. 35<sup>2</sup>.

*Mycotretus tigrinus*, Lac. Monogr. Erotyl. p. 145<sup>3</sup>; Crotch, Cist. Ent. i. p. 451<sup>4</sup>.

*Hab.* MEXICO, Toxpam (*Sallé*); GUATEMALA, San Gerónimo (*Champion*).—GUIANA, Surinam<sup>1 3</sup>, Cayenne<sup>4</sup>; BRAZIL<sup>2</sup>; AMAZONS<sup>4</sup>.

The present insect affords an instance of the uncertainty of using the form of the mentum as a sectional character: Crotch differs from Lacordaire in regarding it as "rounded in front." On examination it appears to me formed just as in *M. ornatus*, but the angles of the pentagonal raised portion apparently are a little less sharp. The striae are not at all gemellate in any specimens I have seen. It is a variable species, the spots on each elytron and even on each side of the thorax not being symmetrical; but in our specimens, including one from Mexico, the spots are fewer and larger than in a typical one from Cayenne (*Reiche*), and those on the thorax are placed regularly, four in front in a square, three near the base, and two externally near the front angles. The scutellum is black in the San Gerónimo specimens, but I do not think there is ground for considering these distinctions of specific value. The abdominal lines are