

ISSN 1175-5326 (print edition) ZOOTAXA ISSN 1175-5334 (online edition)



# A revision of the Nearctic species of the genus *Halobrecta* Thomson, 1858 (Coleoptera: Staphylinidae: Aleocharinae) with notes on some Palaearctic species of the genus

### VLADIMIR I. GUSAROV

University of Oslo, Natural History Museum, Section of Zoology, P.O. Box 1172, Blindern, NO-0318, Oslo, Norway and Division of Entomology, Natural History Museum and Biodiversity Research Center, University of Kansas, 1460 Jayhawk Blvd., Lawrence, KS 66045-7523, U.S.A. vladimir.gusarov@nhm.uio.no

### Abstract

The marine littoral genus *Halobrecta* Thomson, 1858 is redescribed. Descriptions and a key to species known from the Nearctic Region (*Ha. algophila* (Fenyes, 1909) and *Ha. flavipes* Thomson, 1861) are provided. *Atheta barbarae* Casey, 1910 and *At. importuna* Casey, 1911 are placed in synonymy with *Halobrecta algophila* (Fenyes, 1909). *Atheta pocahontas* Casey, 1910, *At. vaticina* Casey, 1910 and *Aloconota incertula* Casey, 1910 are synonymized with *Halobrecta flavipes* Thomson, 1861. Lectotypes are designated for *Homalota puncticeps* Thomson, 1852, *Halobrecta flavipes* Thomson, 1861, *Atheta algophila* Fenyes, 1909, *At. pocahontas* Casey, 1910, *At. vaticina* Casey, 1910, *Aloconota incertula* Casey, 1910 and *At. importuna* Casey, 1911.

**Key words:** Coleoptera, Staphylinidae, Aleocharinae, *Halobrecta*, Nearctic, taxonomy, nomenclature, synonymy, identification key

### Introduction

Thomson (1858) erected the genus *Halobrecta* and included a single species, *Ha. puncticeps* (Thomson 1852), originally described from Sweden. Later he added a second species, *Ha. flavipes* Thomson, 1861. Since then several additional species were described or moved to *Halobrecta* (Bernhauer & Scheerpeltz 1926; Sawada 1985, 1987; Pace 1999), but only one species (*Ha. algophila* (Fenyes 1909) described from California) was known from North America before my contribution was published. In this paper I redescribe *Halobrecta* and two valid species now known from the Nearctic Region.

Accepted by P. Johnson: 23 Nov. 2004; published: 1 Dec. 2004



I follow the terminology accepted in the taxonomy of Aleocharinae (Sawada 1970, 1972; Newton *et al.* 2000). Additional terms used to refer to some setae and pores of the epipharynx were introduced by Gusarov (2003). A discussion of the terms applied to the parts of the internal sac of the aedeagus can be found in Gusarov (2002b). To avoid confusion on which side of the aedeagus should be called ventral (Gusarov 2002b), I refer to the side of aedeagus bearing the basal orifice as parameral. The spermathecal gland is shown on the drawings solely to illustrate the gland position in relation to other parts of spermatheca.

Alexandria Digital Library Gazetteer Server (ADLGS 2004: http://www.alexandria.ucsb.edu/) was used to find coordinates for some localities.

### **Depositories**

BMNH - The Natural History Museum, London, United Kingdom (Mr. M. Brendell)

- CASC California Academy of Sciences, San Francisco, United States (Dr. D.H. Kavanaugh)
- FMNH Field Museum of Natural History, Chicago, United States (Dr. A.F. Newton)
- KSEM Snow Entomological Collection, University of Kansas, Lawrence, United States (Dr. J.S. Ashe)
- MZLU Museum of Zoology, Lund University, Lund, Sweden (Dr. R. Danielsson)
- NMNH National Museum of Natural History, Washington, DC, United States (Dr. T.L. Erwin)
- ZMUN Natural History Museum, University of Oslo, Oslo, Norway (Dr. V.I. Gusarov)

### Halobrecta Thomson, 1858

(Figs. 1–65)

- *Halobrecta* Thomson, 1858: 35 (type species *Homalota puncticeps* Thomson, 1852, by monotypy). *Halobrectha*: Thomson, 1861: 49 (as valid genus; incorrect subsequent spelling).
- *Glaphya* Mulsant & Rey, 1873: 172 (as subgenus of *Dinaraea* Thomson, 1858; type species *Dinaraea pubes* Mulsant & Rey, 1873, by monotypy).
- Halobrechta: Mulsant & Rey, 1875: 35 (as valid genus; incorrect subsequent spelling).
- Atheta (Halobrecta): Fenyes, 1920: 185 (as valid subgenus).
- Glaphya: Fenyes, 1920: 185 (as synonym of Atheta (Halobrecta)).
- *Exatheta* Cameron, 1920: 265 (type species *Exatheta cingulata* Cameron, 1920, by subsequent designation (Blackwelder 1952)).
- Atheta (Halobrecta): Bernhauer & Scheerpeltz, 1926: 621 (as valid subgenus in subtribe Athetina Casey, 1910).
- Glaphya: Bernhauer & Scheerpeltz, 1926: 621 (as synonym of Atheta (Halobrecta)).
- *Exatheta*: Bernhauer & Scheerpeltz, 1926: 681 (as valid genus in subtribe Schistogeniina Fenyes, 1918).

Atheta (Halobrecta): Scheerpeltz, 1934: 1600 (as valid subgenus).

2

- Halobrecta: Blackwelder, 1952: 179 (as valid genus).
- Glaphya: Blackwelder, 1952: 170 (as synonym of Halobrecta).
- Exatheta: Blackwelder, 1952: 163 (as valid genus).
- Halobrecta: Benick & Lohse, 1974: 219 (as valid genus in tribe Callicerini Lohse, 1969).
- Halobrecta: Moore & Legner, 1975: 434 (as valid genus).
- Halobrecta: Seevers, 1978: 121 (as valid genus in subtribe Xenotae Seevers, 1978 (nomen nudum)).
- Halobrecta: Sawada, 1985: 108 (as valid genus in Coprothassa series).
- Exatheta: Sawada, 1985: 108 (as synonym of Halobrecta).
- Halobrecta: Lohse, 1989: 219 (as valid genus in tribe Athetini).
- Halobrecta: Ashe in Newton, Thayer, Ashe & Chandler, 2000: 369 (as valid genus in subtribe Athetina Casey, 1910).

**Diagnosis.** Halobrecta is distinguished from other athetine genera by the combination of the following characters: body parallel-sided; anterior margin of labrum straight; sensilla a of epipharynx long; antennal article 2 longer than article 3, articles 7–10 transverse; ligula long, parallel-sided, with narrow base and slightly split apically (Fig. 6); labial palpus with setae  $\alpha$  and  $\gamma$  present (Fig. 6); pronotum slightly transverse, 1.1–1.2 times as wide as long, with microsetae directed anteriorly along anterior half of midline, and posteriorly along posterior half of midline; in lateral portions of the disc microsetae directed laterally (Type III, Benick & Lohse 1974) (Fig. 14); pronotal macrosetae long; pronotal hypomera fully visible in lateral view; medial macroseta of mesotibia thin, as long as tibial width; mesothoracic process narrow (Fig. 15); posterior margin of elytra emarginate; tarsal formula 4-5-5; metatarsal segment 1 longer than segment 2; single empodial seta longer than claws; abdominal terga 3–5 with transverse basal impression; posterior margin of female tergum 8 with comb of scattered tiny projections (Figs. 20, 39); median lobe of aedeagus without athetine bridge, apex of paramere long and narrow, medial lamellae of internal sac absent; copulatory piece with pointed apex (Figs. 30, 41, 62) and without sclerotized suspensoria; spermatheca short, not divided into distal and proximal portions, with large umbilicus (Figs. 32, 51).

*Halobrecta* differs from other littoral aleocharines with the same tarsal formula (*Adota* Casey, 1910, *Psammostiba* Yosii & Sawada, 1976, *Pontomalota* Casey, 1885, *Tarphiota* Casey, 1894) in having a different type of pronotal pubescence (Fig. 14); the posterior margin of the elytra emarginate; the posterior margin of the female tergum 8 with a comb of scattered tiny projections (Figs. 20, 39); the median lobe without the athetine bridge (Figs. 25, 28); the paramere with a long apex (Figs. 36, 50) and a short spermatheca with a large umbilicus (Figs. 32, 51).

**Description.** Length 2.9–3.9 mm, pronotal width 0.53–0.66 mm. Body parallelsided, dark brown, with legs, basal or all antennal articles, and mouthparts yellowish brown to yellow.

Head transverse; eye length to temple length ratio 0.7–1.2; infraorbital carina complete. Antennal article 2 longer than article 3, article 4 elongate, 5 elongate or subquadrate, 6 subquadrate or transverse, 7–10 transverse, apical article without coeloconic



zоотаха **746**  sensilla, as long as articles 9 and 10 combined. Labrum (Fig. 1) transverse, with straight anterior margin. Epipharynx (Fig. 2) with long sensilla a, with three pairs of small marginal setae, medial field with 32 pores, lateral rows with two pores each, anterolateral groups with three pores each, transverse row with six pores, posterolateral groups with three-four pores each, with one medial proximal pore on each side and two lateral proximal pores. Mandibles (Figs. 3–5) broad, right mandible with a small medial tooth; velvety patch of dorsal molar area not visible at 400x. Maxilla (Figs. 8–11) with galea projecting slightly beyond apex of lacinia; apical lobe of galea covered with numerous fine and short setae; internal margin of galea with long subapical setae (Fig. 9); distal comb of lacinia is divided into isolated groups of 5 and 2 closely placed spines (Figs. 10-11), middle portion produced medially and covered with numerous fine setae (Figs. 10-11), ventral surface of lacinia with a marginal group of 4 strong setae (Fig. 10), dorsal surface of lacinia with a row of 18 weak setae (Fig. 11). Labium as in Figs. 6–7, 12; ligula long and parallel-sided, with narrow base, slightly split apically (Fig. 6); medial area of prementum with 2 pores and 12 pseudopores, lateral areas each with two asetose pores, single setose pore and 9–10 pseudopores (Fig. 6). Hypopharyngeal lobes as in Fig. 7. Labial palpus with setae  $\alpha$  and  $\gamma$ present (Fig. 6). Mentum (Fig. 12) with concave anterior margin.

Pronotum (Fig. 14) slightly transverse, 1.1–1.2 times as wide as long, with microsetae directed anteriorly along anterior half of midline, posteriorly along posterior half of midline, and laterally in lateral portions of the disc (Type III, Benick & Lohse 1974) (Fig. 14); macrosetae long; hypomera fully visible in lateral view. Meso- and metasternum as in Fig. 15, mesosternal process narrow, extending about 3/5 length of mesocoxal cavities, metasternal process short, mesosternum and mesosternal process in ratio of about 3:1:1; meso-coxal cavities margined posteriorly; mesocoxae contiguous. Medial macroseta of mesotibia thin, as long as tibial width. Tarsal segmentation 4-5-5, metatarsal segment 1 longer than segment 2 (Fig. 17). One empodial seta, longer than claws (Fig. 16). Posterior margin of elytra emarginate. Wings fully developed.

Abdominal terga 3–5 with moderate basal impressions. Tergum 7 is as long as tergum 6. Punctation on terga 6–7 finer and slightly sparser than on terga 3–5. Tergum 7 with wide white palisade fringe. Posterior margin of female sternum 8 with comb consisting of tiny projections (Fig. 21). Posterior margin of female tergum 8 with irregular comb of scattered projections (Fig. 20, 39) (in some males this comb is also present but may consist of just a few projections).

Median lobe of aedeagus without athetine bridge (Figs. 25, 28), internal sac without medial lamellae (Figs. 62–65); copulatory piece with pointed apex (Figs. 30, 62, 64) and without sclerotized suspensoria; paramere with long and narrow apex (Figs. 33–36); spermatheca short, not divided into distal and proximal portions, with large umbilicus (Figs. 32, 51).

Type species. Homalota puncticeps Thomson, 1852, by monotypy (Thomson 1858).



**FIGURES 1–5.** Mouthparts of *Halobrecta sp. aff. algae* (Hardy) (female, Grado, Italy). 1 — labrum; 2 — epipharynx; 3 — left mandible, dorsal view; 4 — left mandible, ventral view; 5 — right mandible, dorsal view. Scale bar 0.1 mm.

**Discussion.** *Halobrecta* is usually placed in the tribe Athetini but it lacks the athetine bridge of the median lobe which is considered as an autapomorphy of Athetini (Seevers 1978; Muona 1987; Newton *et al.* 2000) although this character is also present in the tribes Lomechusini Fleming (1821) and Falagriini Mulsant & Rey (1874). The lack of the athetine bridge in *Halobrecta* may suggest that it belongs to Oxypodini Thomson (1859). Another character traditionally used to distinguish between the aleocharine tribes is the

 $\overline{\mathbf{746}}$ 

zootaxa **746** 

tarsal formula (*e.g.*, Lohse 1974). In *Halobrecta* it is 4-5-5 and supports the placement of the genus in Athetini. However there are examples of changes in tarsal formula even within a genus (*Gyronycha* Casey, 1894 (Seevers 1978), *Microlia* Casey, 1910 (Gusarov 2002a)). In addition to lacking the athetine bridge, *Halobrecta* is similar to some Oxypodini in having the apex of the paramere long; the spermatheca short with a large umbilicus; the posterior margin of the elytra emarginate; the ligula bisetose, long and narrow, split only at the very apex. The tribal placement of *Halobrecta* cannot be resolved until the phylogeny of Athetini and Oxypodini is analyzed.



**FIGURES 6–12.** Mouthparts of *Halobrecta sp. aff. algae* (Hardy) (female, Grado, Italy (6–11)) and *Ha. sp. cf. halensis* Mulsant & Rey, 1873 (female, Lignano, Italy (12)). 6 — prementum; 7 — hypopharynx; 8 — right maxilla, ventral view; 9 — right galea, ventral view; 10 — right lacinia, ventral view; 11 — right lacinia, dorsal view; 12 — mentum. Scale bar 0.1 mm (6–7, 9–12), 0.2 mm (8).



**FIGURES 13–17.** Details of *Halobrecta sp. aff. algae* (Hardy) (female, Grado, Italy). 13 — right antenna; 14 — pronotum; 15 — meso- and metathorax; 16 — left metatarsal segment 5 and metapretarsus, anterior view; 17 — right metatarsus, posterior view. Scale bar 0.1 mm (16), 0.2 mm (13, 17), 0.4 mm (14–15).

According to a recent review of the British intertidal beetles (Hammond 2000) *Halobrecta* includes at least four valid species, all of them recorded from the British Isles: *Ha. algae* (Hardy, 1851), *Ha. flavipes* Thomson, 1861, *Ha. princeps* (Sharp, 1869) and *Ha. algophila* (Fenyes, 1909). Two species from Singapore were described by Cameron (1920) in the genus *Exatheta* Cameron, 1920 (*E. cingulata* and *E. consors*) and subse-

 $\overline{\mathbf{746}}$ 

zootaxa **746**  quently transferred to *Halobrecta* and synonymized with each other by Sawada (1985, 1987). Pace (1999) described *Halobrecta discipula* from Chile. I am aware of an additional species of *Halobrecta* (AUSTRALIA: A, Victoria (FMNH); GREECE: A, 5 specimens (sex undetermined), Kérkira (J.Sahlberg); A, Elevsís (J.Sahlberg) (FMNH); ITALY: 18 specimens (sex undetermined), Friuli, Lignano, 25.v.1929 (A.Gagliardi); A, 1 specimen (sex undetermined), Fiumicino, 7.vi.1898 (FMNH); MACEDONIA: A, Vardar (FMNH); YUGOSLAVIA: 5 specimens (sex undetermined), Sutorina (Paganetti); A, 2 specimens (sex undetermined), Castelnuovo (Hummler) (FMNH)). This species differs from the other four species in the shape of the median lobe (Figs. 64–65) and may be conspecific with *Ha. halensis* Mulsant & Rey, 1873 described from the coast of Languedoc (France).

### Key to Nearctic species of Halobrecta

## 1. Halobrecta algophila (Fenyes, 1909)

(Figs. 18-36)

Atheta (Halobrectha) algophila Fenyes, 1909: 419.
Atheta (s. str.) barbarae Casey, 1910: 18, syn. nov.
Atheta (s. str.) importuna Casey, 1911: 111, syn. nov.
Atheta (Halobrecta) algophila: Fenyes, 1920: 185 (as valid species).
Atheta (Halobrecta) algophila: Bernhauer & Scheerpeltz, 1926: 621 (as synonym of At. flavipes).
Atheta (s. str.) barbarae: Bernhauer & Scheerpeltz, 1926: 638 (as valid species).
Atheta (s. str.) importuna: Bernhauer & Scheerpeltz, 1926: 644 (as valid species).
Halobrecta algophila: Moore & Legner, 1975: 434 (as valid species).
Halobrecta algophila: Seevers, 1978: 263 (as valid species).
Halobrecta algophila: Ashe in Newton, Thayer, Ashe & Chandler, 2000: 369 (as valid species).
Halobrecta algophila: Hammond, 2000: 275 (as valid species).
Halobrecta flavipes: Pace, 2000: 376 (ex parte; as valid species; misidentification).

Halobrecta flavipes: Klimaszewski, Maus & Gardiner, 2002: 483 (as valid species; misidentification).

Halobrecta algophila: Klimaszewski, Maus & Gardiner, 2002: 483 (as synonym of Ha. flavipes).

**Type material.** Lectotype of *Atheta algophila* (here designated): ♂, "San Diego, Cal. [ifornia] Dr. A.Fenyes", "2590", "algophila Feny.", "algophila Fen. Cotypus Fenyes" (yellow label), "Chicago NHMus. M.Bernhauer Collection", "flavipes [pencil] not = [black pen; by Lohse] (= [pencil; crossed with a black pen; by Lohse] *algophila*) [pencil] no! Lohse [with a black pen; by Lohse]" (FMNH); Paralectotypes: 9, "San Diego, Cal. [ifornia] Dr. A.Fenyes", "2597", "algophila Fen. Cotypus Fenyes" (yellow label), "Chicago NHMus. M.Bernhauer Collection" (FMNH); 9, "San Diego, Cal. [ifornia]", "2315", "Type!", golden circle, "A.Fenyes Collection" (yellow label), "Atheta algophila Feny.", "California Academy of Sciences. Type No. 4861" (CASC).

Holotype of Atheta barbarae: 9, "S. [anta] Barbara Cal. [ifornia] 2.7.91 [7.ii.1891]", "Atheta barbarae Csy.", "TYPE USNM 39309" (red label), "CASEY bequest 1925" (NMNH).

Lectotype of Atheta importuna (here designated): 9, "Cal. [with black dot inside C; California: San Francisco]", "importuna Csy.", "TYPE USNM 39298" (red label), "CASEY bequest 1925" (NMNH).

Additional material. CHILE: Palena Prov.: 2 d'd, 8 specimens (sex undetermined), 4 km NW Chaiten, rocky beach drift, 31.i.1985 (S. & J.Peck) (FMNH); FRANCE: J, P, "Corsica" (FMNH); NEW ZEALAND: J, Auckland Wattle Bay, shore debris, 11.i.1984 (P.M.Hammond) (BMNH); ♂, 299, 1 specimen (sex undetermined), Timaru, under littoral algae, 11.i.1978 (S.Peck) (FMNH); UNITED KINGDOM: ♂, "41267" (C.E.Tottenham); 2 specimens (sex undetermined), South sea, Sharp (iv.1914); d, Kent, Chatham (G.C.Champion) (BMNH); UNITED STATES: California: , without locality data (BMNH); Humboldt Co.: d, Samoa, 21.vi.1916 (F.E. Blaisdell) (CASC); Marin Co.: J, Q, Chimney Rock, eelgrass drift, 24–30.iv.2002 (P.M.Hammond) (BMNH, ZMUN); San Diego Co.:  $7 \overset{\circ}{\sim}, 2 \overset{\circ}{\circ} \overset{\circ}{\circ}$ , San Diego (A.Fenyes) (BMNH (2), CASC (5), KSEM (1), ZMUN (1)).

**Diagnosis.** Halobrecta algophila is closely related to Ha. flavipes, but differs in having the body size smaller on average; and the spatuliform apex of the median lobe smaller (in parameral view), the apex is 1.1 times as wide as the median lobe measured subapically at its narrowest point (1.4-1.5 times in Ha. flavipes) (Figs. 22-23, 26-27; 41-44).

Halobrecta algophila differs from the Mediterranean species tentatively identified as Ha. halensis (see Discussion for Halobrecta) in having a narrower median lobe of the aedeagus (in parameral view) (Figs. 22-23, 26-27; 64).

Halobrecta algophila differs from the Palaearctic Ha. algae and Ha. princeps by having the posterior margin of the male tergum 8 rounded and not crenulate (Fig. 18) (in Ha. algae and Ha. princeps the posterior margin is straight and may be slightly crenulate (Fig. 52)); and by the apex of the median lobe broader (Figs. 23, 26; 56).





**FIGURES 18–21.** Abdominal segment 8 of *Halobrecta algophila* (Fenyes) (male lectotype (18–19) and female paralectotype of *At. algophila* (20–21)). 18 — male tergum 8; 19 — male sternum 8; 20 — female tergum 8; 21 — female sternum 8. Scale bar 0.2 mm.

*Halobrecta algophila* differs from the Oriental *Ha. cingulata* in having a different shape of the median lobe (in lateral view) (Figs. 24–25, 28–29: this paper; Fig. 9, G: Sawada 1985).

*Halobrecta algophila* differs from the Neotropical *Ha. discipula* in having a different shape of the median lobe (in parameral view) (Figs. 22–23, 26–27: this paper; Fig. 3: Pace 1999).

**Description.** Length 3.0–3.9 mm. Body dark brown, legs, mouthparts and 3–4 basal antennal articles yellow.

Head surface glossy, with weak isodiametric microsculpture, with strong punctation, distance between punctures equal to their diameter. Eyes 0.7–0.9 times as long as temples. Antennal article 2 slightly longer than article 3, article 4 elongate, 5 slightly elongate or subquadrate, 6 subquadrate or slightly transverse, 7–10 transverse, article 11 as long as articles 9 and 10 combined.



**FIGURES 22–29.** Aedeagus of *Halobrecta algophila* (Fenyes) (male lectotype of *At. algophila* (22–25), and male from the environs of Bolinas, California (26–29)). 22, 27 — apex of median lobe, parameral view; 23, 26 — apex of median lobe, parameral view; 25, 28 — median lobe, lateral view; 24, 29 — apex of median lobe, lateral view. Scale bar 0.1 mm (22, 24, 27, 29), 0.2 mm (23, 25, 26, 28).

Pronotum slightly transverse, 1.2 times as wide as head, width 0.57-0.66 mm, length 0.49-0.57 mm, width to length ratio 1.1-1.2; less glossy than head, isodiametric microsculpture stronger than on disk of head; punctation finer than on head, poorly visible on microsculptured background, distance between punctures equal to 1-2 times their diameter. Elytra much wider (0.57-0.93 mm) and longer (0.61-0.80 mm; measured from humeral angle) than pronotum (elytral length to pronotal length ratio 1.3-1.4), 0.9-1.2

 $\overline{\mathbf{746}}$ 

zootaxa 746 times as wide as long, surface glossy, with weak isodiametric microsculpture; punctation finer than on disk of head but much stronger than on pronotum, distance between punctures equal to their diameter.



**FIGURES 30–36.** Genitalia of *Halobrecta algophila* (Fenyes) (male lectotype (30–31, 33–36) and female paralectotype of *At. algophila* (32)). 30 — details of retracted internal sac, abparameral view; 31 — details of retracted internal sac, lateral view; 32 — spermatheca; 33 — left paramere, view from the side facing the median lobe; 34 — left paramere, marginal view; 35 — left paramere, view from the side opposite to the median lobe; 36 — apex of left paramere, marginal view. Scale bar 0.1 mm (32, 36), 0.2 mm (30–31, 33–35).

Abdominal terga glossy, with poorly visible (at 70x) microsculpture consisting of transverse waves; with fine punctation, distance between punctures equals 2–4 times their diameter on terga 3–5 and 2–6 times on terga 6–7.

Posterior margin of male tergum 8 rounded and not crenulate (Fig. 18).

Aedeagus as in Figs. 22–31, 33–36.

Spermatheca as in Fig. 32.

**Discussion.** The types of *At. barbarae* and *At. importuna* (both females) are similar in external characters to the examined types of *Ha. algophila* as well as in the shape of the spermatheca. Although *Ha. algophila* and *Ha. flavipes* cannot be reliably distinguished without examination of the male genitalia, I consider *At. barbarae* and *At. importuna* to be synonyms of *Ha. algophila* because all examined males from the West Coast belong to that species.

The specimens from Inaccessible Island of the Tristan da Cunha archipelago identified by Klimaszewski *et al.* (2002) as *Ha. flavipes* seem to be misidentified. The (ab)parameral view of the median lobe (Fig. 1: Klimaszewski *et al.*, 2002) does not agree with that of *Ha. flavipes* (Figs. 41–44: this paper;) but fits *Ha. algophila* (Figs. 22–23, 26–27: this paper).

The examined specimens from Chaiten, Chile, listed by Pace (2000) as *Ha. flavipes* belong in fact to *Ha. algophila*.

**Distribution.** *Halobrecta algophila* is known from the coasts of California, Europe, Chile, New Zealand and Inaccessible Island of the Tristan da Cunha archipelago (Klimaszewski *et al.*, 2002).

Natural History. *Halobrecta algophila* is a marine littoral species.

#### 2. Halobrecta flavipes Thomson, 1861

(Figs. 37-51)

Halobrectha flavipes Thomson, 1861: 50.

- Homalota maritima Waterhouse, 1863: 138 (nec Mannerheim, 1843: 224) (replacement name for Homalota flavipes (Thomson, 1861), nec Homalota flavipes (Gravenhorst, 1806)).
- *Homalota halobrectha* Sharp, 1869: 139 (replacement name for *Homalota flavipes* (Thomson, 1861), *nec Homalota flavipes* (Gravenhorst, 1806)).
- Halobrectha flavipes: Mulsant & Rey, 1875: 45 (as synonym of Ha. anthracina (Fairmaire, 1853)).
- Atheta (s. str.) pocahontas Casey, 1910: 19, syn. nov.
- Atheta (s. str.) vaticina Casey, 1910: 19, syn. nov.

Aloconota (s. str.) incertula Casey, 1910: 84, syn. nov.

Atheta (Halobrecta) flavipes: Fenyes, 1920: 185 (as valid species).

Atheta (Halobrecta) flavipes: Bernhauer & Scheerpeltz, 1926: 621 (as valid species).

*Atheta (Halobrecta) maritima* (Waterhouse): Bernhauer & Scheerpeltz, 1926: 621 (as synonym of *At. flavipes*).

Atheta (Halobrecta) halobrectha: Bernhauer & Scheerpeltz, 1926: 621 (as synonym of At. flavipes).

 $\overline{746}$ 

Atheta (s. str.) pocahontas: Bernhauer & Scheerpeltz, 1926: 648 (as valid species). Atheta (s. str.) vaticina: Bernhauer & Scheerpeltz, 1926: 651 (as valid species). Atheta (s. str.) incertula: Bernhauer & Scheerpeltz, 1926: 644 (as valid species). Atheta (Halobrecta) flavipes: Scheerpeltz, 1934: 1600 (as valid species). Halobrecta flavipes: Benick & Lohse, 1974: 219 (as valid species). Halobrecta flavipes: Hammond, 2000: 275 (as valid species). Halobrecta flavipes: Pace, 2000: 376 (ex parte; as valid species).



**FIGURES 37–40.** Abdominal segment 8 of *Halobrecta flavipes* Thomson (male (37–38) and female paralectotypes *Atheta pocahontas* Casey (39–40)). 37 — male tergum 8; 38 — male sternum 8; 39 — female tergum 8; 40 — female sternum 8. Scale bar 0.2 mm.

**Type material.** Lectotype of *Halobrecta flavipes* (here designated): ♂, "L-a [Lomma, Sweden]" (MZLU (Thomson collection)).

Lectotype of *Atheta pocahontas* (here designated): ♂, "Va. [with two black dots under "a", Virginia: Fort Monroe (according to Casey locality code (FitzGerald 1962))]", "*pocahontas*-3 PARATYPE USNM 39310" (red label), "CASEY bequest 1925". Paralectotypes: ♀, "Va. [with one black dot under "a", Virginia: Norfolk (FirzGerald 1962)]", "*Atheta pocahontas* Csy.", "TYPE USNM 39310" (red label), "CASEY bequest 1925"; ♂, with missing head, prothorax and elytra, ♂, "Va. [with two black dots under "a", Virginia:

ZOOTAXA

746)

Fort Monroe]", "*pocahontas*-2 PARATYPE USNM 39310" (red label), "CASEY bequest 1925" (NMNH).

zоотаха 746

Lectotype of *Atheta vaticina* (here designated): 9, "L.I. [Long Island, New York]", "*Atheta vaticina* Csy.", "TYPE USNM 39311" (red label), "CASEY bequest 1925" (NMNH).

Lectotype of *Aloconota incertula* (here designated):  $\hat{\gamma}$ , "Va. [with two black dots under "a", Virginia: Fort Monroe]", "*incertula* Csy.", "TYPE USNM 39076" (red label), "CASEY bequest 1925" (NMNH).

**Diagnosis.** *Halobrecta flavipes* is closely related to *Ha. algophila*, but differs in having the body size smaller on average; and the spatuliform apex of the median lobe larger (in parameral view), the apex is 1.4–1.5 times as wide as the median lobe measured sub-apically at its narrowest point (1.1 times in *Ha. algophila*) (Figs. 41–44; 22–23, 26–27).



**FIGURES 41–44.** Aedeagus of *Halobrecta flavipes* Thomson (male from Oskarshamn, Sweden (41–42), and male paralectotype of *Atheta pocahontas* Casey (43–44)). 41, 43 — median lobe, parameral view; 42, 44 — apex of median lobe, parameral view. Scale bar 0.1 mm (42, 44), 0.2 mm (41, 43).

zootaxa **746**  *Halobrecta flavipes* differs from the Mediterranean species tentatively identified as *Ha. halensis* (see Discussion for *Halobrecta*) in having the median lobe of the aedeagus narrower (in parameral view) (Figs. 41–44; 64).

*Halobrecta flavipes* differs from the Palaearctic *Ha. algae* and *Ha. princeps* by having the posterior margin of the male tergum 8 rounded and not crenulate (Fig. 37) (in *Ha. algae* and *Ha. princeps* the posterior margin is straight and may be slightly crenulate (Fig. 52)), and by the apex of the median lobe broader (Figs. 41–44; 56–57).



**FIGURES 45–48.** Aedeagus of *Halobrecta flavipes* Thomson (males, from Oskarshamn, Sweden (45–46), and lectotype of *Atheta pocahontas* Casey (47–48)). 45, 47 — median lobe, lateral view; 46, 48 — apex of median lobe, lateral view. Scale bar 0.1 mm (46, 48), 0.2 mm (45, 47).

*Halobrecta flavipes* differs from the Oriental *Ha. cingulata* in having a different shape of the median lobe (in lateral view) (Figs. 45–48 in this paper; Fig. 9, G in Sawada 1985).

Halobrecta flavipes differs from the Neotropical Ha. discipula in having a different shape of the median lobe (in parameral view) (Figs. 41–44: this paper; Fig. 3: Pace 1999).

**Description.** Length 2.9–3.2 mm. Pronotal width 0.53–0.61 mm, length 0.43–0.51 mm. Elytra 1.3–1.5 times as long as pronotum.

In all character states very similar to *Ha. algophila*, but differs in the shape of the median lobe as described in the diagnosis.

Aedeagus as in Figs. 41–50. Spermatheca as in Fig. 51.





**FIGURES 49–51.** Genitalia of *Halobrecta flavipes* Thomson (male (49–50) and female paralectotypes of *Atheta pocahontas* (51)). 49 — details of retracted internal sac, lateral view; 50 — apex of left paramere, marginal view; 51 — spermatheca. Scale bar 0.1 mm (50–51), 0.2 mm (49).

**Discussion.** The male types of *At. pocahontas* are similar in external characters to the lectotype of *Ha. flavipes*, as well as in the shape of the aedeagus. These names are deemed to be synonyms.

The only existing type of *Al. incertula* is a female but it was collected in the same locality as the male lectotype of *At. pocahontas*. Since the type of *Al. incertula* is similar to examined specimens of *Ha. flavipes*, the first name is placed in synonymy with the second.

The single existing type of *At. vaticina* is a female but it is similar in external characters to the examined specimens of *Ha. flavipes*. Considering that all examined males from the East Coast belonged to *Ha. flavipes*, I synonymize *At. vaticina* with that species.

It seems appropriate to discuss the status of the names listed as synonyms of *Ha. flavipes* by Fenyes (1920) and Bernhauer and Scheerpeltz (1926). Unfortunately, these authors sometimes did not distinguish between newly proposed names and subsequent usage of these names. This practice, followed by some recent authors (*e. g.*, Klimaszewski *et al.* 2002), is very confusing. The entries for "*elongatula* Stephens, 1832", "*atricilla* Scriba,

zootaxa (746)

1866" and "*puncticeps* Mulsant & Rey, 1875" (see Fenyes 1920, p. 185; Bernhauer & Scheerpeltz 1926, p. 621; Klimaszewski *et al.* 2002, p. 483) in fact refer to subsequent citations of the names proposed by Gravenhorst (1802, as *Aleochara elongatula*); Erichson, (1839, as *Homalota atricilla*) and Thomson (1852, as *Homalota puncticeps*). Stephens (1832, p. 127), Scriba (1866, p. 290) and Mulsant and Rey (1875, p. 38) clearly did not intend to describe new species and referred to original papers of Gravenhorst, Erichson and Thomson. Even if Stephens, Scriba and Mulsant and Rey applied the same species names in a different sense, their usage did not create new nominal taxa but instead represents misidentifications.

Despite the fact that Thomson described *Ha. flavipes* as a member of the genus *Halobrecta*, this taxon was not accepted as a genus separate from *Atheta* by some of his colleagues (*e.g.*, Waterhouse 1863; Sharp 1869; Bernhauer & Scheerpeltz 1926). Since Waterhouse (1863) placed *Halobrecta flavipes* Thomson in *Homalota*, together with *Aleochara flavipes* Gravenhorst, 1806 (now considered a member of *Notothecta* Thomson, 1858), he had to introduce (Waterhouse 1863, p. 138) a new name (*Homalota maritima*) to replace the resulting secondary junior homonym *Homalota flavipes* (Thomson). Unfortunately, the name proposed by Waterhouse is preoccupied and Sharp (1869) had to propose a different replacement name for *Homalota flavipes* (Thomson). Now that *Halobrecta flavipes* Gravenhorst, 1806 is a member of *Notothecta*, the replacement names *Homalota maritima* Waterhouse and *Ho. halobrectha* Sharp are unnecessary and become objective synonyms of *Ha. flavipes*.

*Homalota atricilla* Erichson, 1839, described from Sardinia, is usually considered a member of *Halobrecta* (*e.g.*, Bernhauer & Scheerpeltz 1926). If this is true then *Ho. atricilla* is the oldest name in the genus *Halobrecta*. However the description of this species, particularly the shape of the antennal segments 4–10 does not fit any of the five species of *Halobrecta* examined by me. According to Kraatz (1857) and Scriba (1866) the single type of *Ho. atricilla* (deposited in the museum of Turin) is an immature poorly pigmented specimen. Scriba (1866) considered *Ho. atricilla* to be conspecific with *Ha. flavipes* but Sharp (1869) did not agree with this opinion because Erichson's description did not fit Sharp's specimens of *Ha. flavipes* (which he referred to as *Ho. halobrecta*). In my opinion, *Ho. atricilla* may not even belong to *Halobrecta*. Reexamination of the type of this species is necessary to clarify the status of this name.

Two species of *Halobrecta* were described from the Channel coasts of northern France: *Ha. pubes* (Mulsant & Rey, 1873) from Normandy and *Ha. anthracina* Fairmaire, 1853) from the embouchure of the River Somme. One species, *Halobrecta halensis* Mulsant & Rey, 1873, was described from the Mediterranean coasts of France (Languedoc) and may be conspecific with the specimen from Italy illustrated in Figs. 64–65 (See Discussion in *Halobrecta*). Examination of types is necessary to clarify the status of these three species.

The examined specimens from Chaiten, Chile, listed by Pace (2000) as *Ha. flavipes* belong in fact to *Ha. algophila*.

**Distribution.** *Halobrecta flavipes* is known from the Atlantic coast of North America (Virginia and New York), from Chile and Europe.

Natural History. Halobrecta flavipes is a marine littoral species.

### Palaearctic species of Halobrecta

*Halobrecta algae* (Hardy, 1851) (Figs. 52–61)

Homalota algae Hardy, 1851: 78.

Homalota puncticeps Thomson, 1852: 133.

Halobrecta puncticeps: Thomson, 1858: 35.

*Halobrecta puncticeps*: Thomson, 1859: 39 (misspelled as *Halobrectha*; as valid species). *Halobrecta puncticeps*: Thomson, 1861: 49 (misspelled as *Halobrectha*; as valid species).



**FIGURES 52–55.** Abdominal segment 8 of *Halobrecta algae* (Hardy) (male lectotype (52–53) and female paralectotype of *Homalota puncticeps* Thomson (54–55)). 52 — male tergum 8; 53 — male sternum 8; 54 — female tergum 8; 55 — female sternum 8. Scale bar 0.2 mm.

ZOOTAXA

746)

Atheta (Halobrecta) algae: Fenyes, 1920: 185 (as synonym both of Ha. flaviceps and Ha. pucticeps).

Atheta (Halobrecta) puncticeps: Fenyes, 1920: 185 (as valid species). Atheta (Halobrecta) algae: Bernhauer & Scheerpeltz, 1926: 621 (as synonym both of Ha. flavipes

and Ha. puncticeps).

ZOOTAXA

(746)

*Atheta (Halobrecta) puncticeps:* Bernhauer & Scheerpeltz, 1926: 621 (as valid species). *Halobrecta puncticeps:* Benick & Lohse, 1974: 219 (as valid species). *Halobrecta algae:* Hammond, 2000: 275 (as valid species).

(other references are omitted)



**FIGURES 56–61.** Genitalia of *Halobrecta algae* (Hardy) (male lectotype (56–60) and female paralectotype of *Homalota puncticeps* Thomson (61)). 56 — median lobe, parameral view; 57 — apex of median lobe, parameral view; 58 — median lobe, lateral view; 59 — apex of median lobe, lateral view; 60 — apex of left paramere, marginal view; 61 — spermatheca. Scale bar 0.1 mm (57, 59–61), 0.2 mm (56, 58).

**Type material.** Lectotype of *Homalota puncticeps* (here designated): ♂, "Lā [Lomma, Sweden]" (MZLU). Paralectotypes: ♂, 2♀♀, "Lā [Lomma, Sweden]" (MZLU (Thomson collection)).

**Additional material. SWEDEN:** ♂, ♀, Oskarshamn, 10.vi.1941 (H.Bachlund) (KSEM).

**Diagnosis.** See Benick and Lohse (1974). Male tergum 8 and aedeagus: Figs. 52, 56–60.

**Discussion.** The lectotype of *Ho. puncticeps* agrees with accepted concept of *Ha. algae* (see Benick & Lohse 1974; as *Ha. puncticeps*). *Halobrecta puncticeps* has not been recorded outside Europe, unlike *Ha. algophila*, *Ha. flavipes* and *Ha. sp. cf. halensis*. However, considering the wide distribution ranges of the last three species, it is possible that *Ha. puncticeps* has also been introduced to other parts of the world. Examined Mediterranean specimens, externally similar to *Ha. algae*, differ in the shape of the aedeagus, particularly in having a narrower median lobe (in parameral view: cf. Fig. 62 and Fig. 56) and in less bent median lobe (in lateral view: cf. Fig. 63 and Fig. 58). These Mediterranean specimens are likely to belong to an undecribed species. Revision of European species of *Halobrecta* is outside the scope of this paper. A revision of the British species of *Halobrecta* is being prepared by Peter Hammond.



**FIGURES 62–65.** Details of *Halobrecta sp. aff. algae* (Hardy) (male, Grado, Italy (62–63)) and *Ha. sp. cf. halensis* Mulsant & Rey, 1873 (male, Lignano, Italy (64–65)). 62 — median lobe with everted internal sac, parameral view; 63 — median lobe with everted internal sac, lateral view; 64 — median lobe with partially everted internal sac, parameral view; 65 — median lobe with partially everted internal sac, lateral view. Scale bar 0.2 mm.

 $\overline{\mathbf{746}}$ 





**FIGURE 66.** Geographical distribution of *Halobrecta algophila* (Fenyes) and *Ha. flavipes* Thomson in North America.

### Acknowledgements

I am grateful to Terry Erwin and Dave Furth, National Museum of Natural History, for the loan of the Casey Collection of Aleocharinae. I am greatly indebted to Martin Brendell, Dave Kavanaugh, Roberta Brett, Al Newton and Phil Parrillo for the loan of specimens deposited in their respective institutions. I am grateful to Peter Hammond, Paul Johnson and two anonymous reviewers for their comments which helped to improve my manuscript. This work was supported by National Science Foundation PEET grants DEB-9521755 and DEB-9978110 to Steve Ashe and by the Russian Federal program "Russian Universities – Fundamental Sciences" (project 07.01.056).

#### References

- ADLGS (2004) Alexandria Digital Library Gazetteer Server. Available from <a href="http://www.alexandria.ucsb.edu/">http://www.alexandria.ucsb.edu/</a>. Last updated: May 4, 2004. Accessed: June 16, 2004.
- Benick, G. & Lohse, G. A. (1974) 14. Tribus: Callicerini (Athetae). In: Freude, H., Harde, K. W. & Lohse, G. A. (Eds.), Die Käfer Mitteleuropas. Band 5, Staphylinidae II (Hypocyphtinae und Aleocharinae). Pselaphidae. Goecke & Evers Verlag, Krefeld, pp. 72–220.
- Bernhauer, M. & Scheerpeltz, O. (1926) Staphylinidae VI. In: Junk, W. & Schenkling, S. (Eds.), Coleopterorum Catalogus, Pars 82. W. Junk, Berlin, pp. 499–988.
- Blackwelder, R. E. (1952) The generic names of the beetle family Staphylinidae with an essay on genotypy. *United States National Museum Bulletin*, 200, i–iv + 483 pp.
- Cameron, M. (1920) New species of Staphylinidae from Singapore. Part III. *Transactions of the Entomological Society of London*, 1920, 212–284.
- Casey, T. L. (1885) New genera and species of Californian Coleoptera. *Bulletin of the California Academy of Sciences*, 1(4), 283–336.
- Casey, T. L. (1894) Coleopterological notices. V. Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences, 7 [1893], 281–606.
- Casey, T. L. (1910) New Species of the Staphylinid Tribe Myrmedoniini. *Memoirs on the Coleoptera I*. The New Era Printing Company, Lancaster, pp.1–183.
- Casey, T. L. (1911) New American species of Aleocharinae and Myllaeninae. *Memoirs on the Coleoptera II*. The New Era Printing Company, Lancaster, pp.1–245.
- Erichson, W. F. (1839) *Genera et species staphylinorum insectorum coleopterorum familiae*. F. H. Morin, Berlin, pp. 1–400.
- Fairmaire, L. (1853). Excursion entomologique dans la Baie de la Somme. Lettre à M. le Dr. Aubé. Annales de la Société Entomologique de France, (2)10 [1852], 663–691.
- Fenyes, A. (1909) New Aleocharinae (Staphylinidae, Col.) of the U.S. *Entomological News*, 20, 1909, 418–425.
- Fenyes, A. (1918) Coleoptera. Fam. Staphylinidae, subfam. Aleocharinae. In: Wytsman, P. (Ed.), Genera Insectorum, Fasc. 173A. L. Desmet-Verteneuil, Bruxelles, pp. 1–110.
- Fenyes, A. (1920) Coleoptera. Fam. Staphylinidae, subfam. Aleocharinae. In: Wytsman, P. (Ed.), Genera Insectorum, Fasc. 173B. L. Desmet-Verteneuil, Bruxelles, pp. 111–414.
- FitzGerald, W. (1962) *Casey locality code*. Manuscript kept with Casey collection at the National Museum of National History, Washington, D.C.
- Fleming, J. (1821) Insecta. In: Supplement to the fourth, fifth and sixth editions of the Encyclopaedia Britannica, with preliminary dissertations on the history of the sciences. Vol. 5. Archibald Constable and Company, Edinburgh, pp. 41–56.
- Gravenhorst, J.L.C. (1802) Coleoptera Microptera Brunsvicensia nec non Exoticorum quotquot exstant in collectionibus entomologorum Brunsvicensium. C.Reichard, Brunswick, lxvi + 207 pp.
- Gravenhorst, J. L. C. (1806) *Monographia coleopterorum micropterorum*. Henricus Dieterich, Göttingen, xvi + 248 pp.
- Gusarov, V. I. (2002a) A revision of the genus *Microlia* Casey, 1910 (Coleoptera: Staphylinidae: Aleocharinae: Hoplandriini). *Zootaxa*, 34, 1–24.
- Gusarov, V. I. (2002b) A revision of Nearctic species of the genus *Geostiba* Thomson, 1858 (Coleoptera: Staphylinidae: Aleocharinae). *Zootaxa*, 81, 1–88.
- Gusarov, V. I. (2003) A revision of the Nearctic species of the genus *Stethusa* Casey, 1910 (Coleoptera: Staphylinidae: Aleocharinae). *Zootaxa*, 239, 1–43.
- Hammond, P.M. (2000) 16. Coastal Staphylinidae (rove beetles) in the British Isles, with special reference to saltmarshes. In: Sherwood, B.R., Gardiner, B.G. & Harris T. (Eds.), British Saltmarshes. Joint Symposium on British Saltmarshes organized between the Linnean Society of

London, the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds and English Nature (2000: London). Forrest Text, Cardingan, pp. 247–302.

- Hardy, J. (1851) Family 1. Staphylinidae, Leach. In: Hardy, J. & Bold, T.J. A Catalogue of the Insects of Northumberland and Durham (Part ii). Transactions of the Tyneside Naturalists' Field Club, 2, 21–97.
- Klimaszewski, J., Maus, C. & Gardiner, A. (2002) The importance of tracking introduced species: New records of athetine rove beetles from South Atlantic Inaccessible Island (Coleoptera, Staphylinidae, Aleocharinae). *Coleopterists Bulletin*, 56(4), 481–490.

Kraatz, G. (1857) Ueber Coleoptera. Berliner Entomologische Zeitschrift, 1, 175–178.

- Lohse, G. A. (1969) Vorschläge zur Änderung der Aleocharinensystematik (Coleoptera: Staphylinidae). In: Bericht über die 10. Wanderversammlung deutscher Entomologen, 15. Bis 19. September 1965 in Dresden. Deutsche Akademie der Landwirtschaftswissenschaften zu Berlin, Berlin, pp. 169–175.
- Lohse, G. A. (1974) 22. U.F.: Aleocharinae. In: Freude, H., Harde, K. W. & Lohse, G. A. (Eds.), Die Käfer Mitteleuropas. Band 5, Staphylinidae II (Hypocyphtinae und Aleocharinae). Pselaphidae. Goecke & Evers Verlag, Krefeld, pp. 11–15.
- Lohse, G. A. (1989) Ergänzungen und Berichtigungen zu Freude-Harde-Lohse "Die Käfer Mitteleuropas" Band 5 (1974) In: Lohse, G. A. & Lucht, W. H. (Eds.), Die Käfer Mitteleuropas. 1. Supplementband mit Katalogteil. Goecke & Evers Verlag, Krefeld, pp. 185–243.
- Mannerheim, C. G. (1843) Beitrag zur Kaefer-Fauna der Aleutischen Inseln, der Insel Sitkha und Neu-Californiens. Bulletin de la Société Impériale des Naturalistes de Moscou, 16(1–2), 175– 314.
- Moore, I. & Legner, E. F. (1975) A catalogue of the Staphylinidae of America North of Mexico (Coleoptera). Special publication 3015, Division of Agricultural Sciences, University of California, 514 pp.
- Muona, J. (1987) Some aspects of Aleocharinae systematics a response to Dr. G. A. Lohse. *Entomologische Blätter*, 83(1), 19–24.
- Muslant, E. & Rey, C. (1873) Description de divers Coléoptères Brévipennes nouveaux ou peu connus. Opuscules Entomologiques, 15, 147–189.
- Muslant, E. & Rey, C. (1874) Tribu des Brévipennes. Famille des Aléochariens. Septième branche: Myrmédoniaires. Annales de la Société d'Agriculture, Histoire Naturelle et Arts Utiles de Lyon, série 4. 6 [1873], 33–738.
- Muslant, E. & Rey, C. (1875) Tribu des Brévipennes. Famille des Aléochariens (suite). Septième branche: Myrmédoniaires. 2e partie. Annales de la Société d'Agriculture, Histoire Naturelle et Arts Utiles de Lyon, série 4, 7 [1874], 27–496, Pl. vi–ix.
- Newton, A. F., Thayer, M. K., Ashe, J.S. & Chandler, D. S. (2000) Staphylinidae Latreille, 1802. In: Arnett, R. H., Thomas, M. C. (Eds.), American Beetles. Vol.1. Archostemata, Myxophaga, Adephaga, Polyphaga: Staphyliniformia. CRC Press, Boca Raton, Florida, pp. 272–418.
- Pace, R. (1999) Aleocharinae del Cile (Coleoptera, Staphylinidae). Bollettino del Museo civico di Storia naturale di Verona, 23, 119–210.
- Pace, R. (2000) Aleocharinae del Cile, nuove o poco note (Coleoptera, Staphylinidae). Bollettino del Museo regionale di Scienze naturali, Torino, 17(2), 355–510.
- Sawada, K. (1970) Aleocharinae (Staphylinidae, Coleoptera) of the IBP-Station in the Shiga Heights, Central Japan (I). Bulletin of the National Science Museum, 13(1), 23–64.
- Sawada, K. (1972) Methodological research in the taxonomy of Aleocharinae. *Contributions from the Biological Laboratory, Kyoto University*, 24(1), 31–59.
- Sawada, K. (1985) *Atheta* and its allies of Southeast Asia (Coleoptera: Staphylinidae). IV. Ten oriental species described by M. Bernhauer and M. Cameron. *Contributions from the Biological Laboratory, Kyoto University*, 27(1), 91–110.
- Sawada, K. (1987) Atheta and its allies of Southeast Asia (Coleoptera: Staphylinidae). V. Sin-

ZOOTAXA

746

gaporean species described in Cameron, 1920. *Contributions from the Biological Laboratory, Kyoto University*, 27(2), 137–150.



- Scheerpeltz, O. (1926) Staphylinidae VIII. In: Junk, W. & Schenkling, S. (Eds.), Coleopterorum Catalogus, Pars 130. W. Junk, Berlin, pp. 1501–1881.
- Scriba, W. (1866) Ueber Staphylinen. Berliner Entomologische Zeitschrift, 10(1–3), 289–290.
- Seevers, C.H. (1978) A generic and tribal revision of the North American Aleocharinae (Coleoptera: Staphylinidae). *Fieldiana: Zoology*, 71, vi + 275 pp.
- Sharp, D. (1869) A revision of the British species of Homalota. Transactions of the Entomological Society of London, 1869 (2–3), 91–272.
- Stephens, J.F. (1832) Illustrations of British entomology; or, a synopsis of indigenous insects: containing their generic and specific distinctions; with an account of their metamorphoses, times of appearance, localities, food, and economy, as far as practicable. Baldwin and Cradock, London, 448 pp.
- Thomson, C.G. (1852) Insekt-slägtet Homalota. Öfversigt af Kongl. Vetenskaps-Akademiens Förkhandlingar, 9(6), 131–146.
- Thomson, C G. (1858) Försök till uppställning af Sveriges Staphyliner. Öfversigt af Kongl. Vetenskaps-Akademiens Förkhandlingar, 15, 27–40.
- Thomson, C.G. (1859) *Skandinaviens Coleoptera, synoptiskt bearbetade. Tom 1.* Berlingska Boktryckeriet, Lund, v + 290 pp.
- Thomson, C.G. (1861) Skandinaviens Coleoptera, synoptiskt bearbetade. Tom III. Berlingska Boktryckeriet, Lund, 278 pp.
- Waterhouse, G.R. (1863) [Untitled notes on the genus Homalota] Proceedings of the Entomological Society of London, 1863, 136–140.
- Yosii, R. & Sawada, K. (1976) Studies on the genus Atheta Thomson and its allies (Coleoptera, Staphylinidae). II: Diagnostic characters of genera and subgenera with description of representative species. Contributions from the Biological Laboratory, Kyoto University, 25(1), 11–140.