



Revision of the Australo-Papuan genus *Spilopyra* Baly (Coleoptera: Chrysomelidae: Spilopyrinae)

C. A. M. REID¹ & M. BEATSON²

Department of Entomology, Australian Museum, 6 College Street, Sydney, NSW 2010, Australia.

E-mail: ¹chris.reid@austmus.gov.au; ²max.beatson@austmus.gov.au

Table of contents

Abstract	1
Introduction	1
<i>Spilopyra</i> Baly, 1860	2
Key to species of <i>Spilopyra</i> Baly	19
<i>Spilopyra safrina</i> sp. nov.	20
<i>Spilopyra scratchley</i> sp. nov.	21
<i>Spilopyra semiramis</i> sp. nov.	23
<i>Spilopyra stirlingi</i> Lea, 1914	24
<i>Spilopyra sumptuosa</i> Baly, 1860	27
Acknowledgements	31
References	31

Abstract

The genus *Spilopyra* Baly is revised, with five valid species, three new: *S. safrina* **sp. nov.**, *S. scratchley* **sp. nov.**, *S. semiramis* **sp. nov.**, *S. stirlingi* Lea, 1914, *S. sumptuosa* Baly, 1860. *Spilopyra stirlingi* is a senior synonym of *S. flavicornis* Weise, 1923 (**syn. nov.**). Lectotypes are designated for *S. stirlingi* and *S. sumptuosa*. The genus may be considerably more diverse, as three of the species are known from just 7 specimens. *Spilopyra* species occur from northern New South Wales, Australia, to central New Guinea, and known hosts are Sapindaceae.

Key words: fiery leaf beetle, morphology, taxonomy

Introduction

The small leaf-beetle (Chrysomelidae) tribe Spilopyrini was elevated to subfamilial status in 2000 from several genera placed originally in 4 unrelated subfamilies: Chrysomelinae, Criocerinae, Eumolpinae and Sagrinae (Reid 2000). Spilopyrinae was given subfamilial rank because its unique combination of adult and larval morphological attributes, many of them contextually plesiomorphic, indicated a sister-group relationship with more than one other subfamily, most likely a combination of Eumolpinae, Lamprosomatinae and Cryptocephalinae. An early molecular study of eumolpine phylogeny did not include two of these putative sister taxa, Lamprosomatinae and Cryptocephalinae, so that although Spilopyrinae were separated from Eumolpinae, the relationship of these two subfamilies to each other and other taxa was indeterminate (Gomez-Zurita *et al.* 2005). That study's inappropriate taxon sampling is overlooked by those who cite it as proof of the close relationship of Eumolpinae and Spilopyrinae (Jolivet & Verma 2008 and references therein). More recent large-scale molecular studies (Gomez-Zurita *et al.* 2007) corroborate the morphological evidence (Reid 1995, 2000) and strongly support the validity of Spilopyrinae.