BOOK REVIEW


A world catalogue and bibliography of the jewel beetles (Coleoptera: Buprestoidea) by C.L. Bellamy was published in 5 hard-bound volumes in the years 2008 (Vols 1–4) and 2009 (Vol. 5). This publication is the first catalogue of the world buprestid fauna since the last world catalogue of this family published by J. Obenberger in 6 volumes more than 70 years ago (Obenberger, 1926, 1930, 1934a, b, 1936, 1937). The higher taxonomy used in the reviewed Catalogue follows that of Bellamy (2003) in which all principal recent changes were adopted (Holytski, 1993; Biý, 2000; Kolibáč, 2000; Volkovtish, 2001).

Volume 1 includes 29 introductory chapters (Introduction; The Foundation of the Family; Index to Past Catalogues and Monographs; Format; Abbreviations and Terms; Type Information; Type Repository Codens; Type Repositories of Major Authors; Author Names: Full, Traditional and Practical; Reference Abbreviations and Chronology; The Bibliography and Its Sources; Alteration to Authorship; Reference and Synonymy Limitations; Synonymy Chronology; Major Works suppressed by ICZN; Changes made according to provisions of the 1999 ICZN; Changes not yet made; Lingering Questions; Biogeographical Regions and Definitions; Place Names Then and Now; The Classification Structure of Buprestoidea; Infrasubspecific Names; Subgenera and Species-groups; Type Species; Alternative Spelling and Citations; Original and Subsequent Color Plates; Caveats, Goals, Improvements and Philosophy; Acknowledgements; Dedication) and the first part of Buprestoidea: Fossil Taxa, Schizopodidae and Buprestidae (Julodinae–Chrysochroinae: Poccelonotini).


Unlike Obenberger’s Catalogue, this Catalogue contains the full bibliography – more than 8,000 systematic citations mentioned in the text.

Naturally it is not possible for a reviewer to check all items on 3264 pages of the Catalogue, so I focussed my review on the groups I am familiar with or/and I am working with. It seems that the groups which have been treated by specialists since Obenberger’s Catalogue are without major errors because the author has incorporated all data from the modern revisions or regional catalogues. Unfortunately information taken without checking from Obenberger’s Catalogue can sometimes be very unreliable and users of the Catalogue have to re-check this information; in particular the citations, year of description or pagination. As an example we can use the genus Melobasina Kerremans, 1900 (Vol. 1, page 624–625).

Nesotrinchus Obenberger, 1924a: 12 [missing Pl. 1, Fig. 2; Pl. 2, Figs 10–13]; apicalis Kerremans, 1900c: 69; Distribution: AUS “Tugelo Island” [should be “Tagula”]; australica (Kerremans) 1903a: 127; Théry 1943d: 646 (Nesotrinchus) [should be (Nosotrinchus)]; Bellamy 2002c: 61 [missing (australica)]; Type: BMNH [syntype]; coeruleipennis (Fairmaire) 1877c: 153 [missing paper by Volkovtish, 2001]; fossicollis (Kerremans) 1906: 415 [missing (Exagistus)]; Obenberger 1923a:17 (Exagistus) [should be (Melobasina)]; Théry 1943d: 646 [fossicollis is not mentioned in this paper]; Distribution: AUS Papua New Guinea, Bismarck Archipelago [should be Solomon Islands (distribution is confused with that of ignita Théry)]; ignita (Théry) 1943d: 647; Distribution: AUS Solomon Islands [should be Papua New Guinea, Bismarck Archipelago]; simondsii (Obenberger) 1924a: 13 [missing Pl. 1, Fig. 2; Pl. 2, Figs 10–13]; Type: MNPC 21992 [should be syntypes MNPC 21992, BMNH]; solomonensis (Théry) 1937ti: 38 [missing Pl. 3, Fig. 4];

Most of names are mentioned in the original combinations with the cross-reference to the present combination where the species is treated in detail, e.g. (in the genus Dicerocormopha Deyrolle, 1864 – Vol. 2, page 1004): “pyrochlorus (Fairmaire) [see Haplotrinchus]” or “viridis (Deyrolle) [see Haplotrinchus]” but in some cases the original combination is missing and the species is listed only in its present combination, e.g. “australica Kerremans 1903” is listed only in the genus Melobasina Kerremans, 1900 although it was described in the genus Haplotrinchus Kerremans, 1903, or “arias” Robert, 1858 is listed only in the genus Kisanthobia Marseul, 1865 although it was described in the genus Anthaxia Eschscholtz, 1829.

The Catalogue also contains citations of papers describing immature stages (paragraphs “Immature”) but information about larval descriptions is missing for 99 species.

Geographical regions are defined in Vol. 1 (chapter “Biogeographical Regions and Definitions”); the border between Australasian and Oriental regions is defined by the Wallace line but in many cases in the paragraph “Distribution” some Eastern Indonesian islands like Ambon, Aru, Halmahera, Mysol, Seram, Timor etc., sometimes also Papua New Guinea, are attributed to the Oriental region. This concerns more significantly the distributional data of genera Agrius Curtis, 1825, Anocisseis Bel- lamy, 1990, Chrysobothris Eschscholtz, 1829, Chrysodeni Laporte & Gory, 1935, Endelomorphus Bíly, 2007, Habroloma Thomson, 1864 and some others. In the distribution of Microac- macodera longicornis (Cobos, 1966) (page 319) data for Afghanistan (type locality) and Pakistan are missing and in the distribution of Bellamyina huanensis (Zhong-Liang, 1992) (page 361) should be “PAL” instead of “ORI”.

Genus Aldabraca Cobos, 1981 (page 387) is treated as a valid genus but it was downgraded by Zabransky (2004) to a sub- genus of Strigopetera Dejean, 1833.

The arrangement of higher taxa (subfamilies, tribes, subtribes) follows the most widely accepted taxonomic treatment (Bellamy, 2003), species in genera are treated alphabetically. Unfortunately, genera in subtribes are not in alphabetical order and sometimes it is very difficult and time-consuming to find small genera without using the index. The same applies to the
fossil taxa – genera should be arranged alphabetically since the attribution to higher taxa (if any) is usually very problematic. There is one piece of information which is missing in the Catalogue and which would be very desirable: the type locality of each species. This information is very important and in 95% of species it should be available from the original descriptions. Information on type localities is essential in most modern systematic catalogues (e.g., Herman, 2001). The type locality is more important than the museum catalogue numbers which are known only for a small number of type specimens.

The collection of André Baudon containing primary types is deposited in the museum in Béziers, not in MNHN (page 17); genus Pseudianthe Fairmaire, 1901 (page 136) was synonymised with Ankaeus Kerremans, 1894 by Cobos, 1979, not Cobos, 1981; the type species of Thripocoryge LeConte, 1858 (page 358) was fixed (according to Nelson et al., 2008) by subsequent designation by Chamberlin (1926) and not by original designation. The type species of Paraacycloptela Cobos, 1959 (page 399) is Paraacycloptela noviliissima Cobos, 1959, not Cobos, 1914. Paramachys bourgoini Théry (nomen nudum): Holyński 1992c: 125 (page 341) was made available by Holyński (1992) who presented diagnosis and designated the holotype (deposited in BMNH, not in ISNB).

In some cases the number of genera of tribes/subtribes in [square brackets] do not correspond with the actual number of genera in the following text, e.g.: Notomorphina Cobos, 1955 [4 genera] (page 145) should be [2 genera]. Acmaeoderoidina Cobos, 1955 [1 genus] (page 146) should be [2 genera] or Trigonogenini Cobos, 1956 [1 genus] (page 1287) should be [2 genera].

There are also some minor missprints like “Vayssieres” instead of “Vayssieries” (page 17), “Ratzeberg” instead of “Ratzeburg” (page 18), “aerolata” instead of “areolata” (page 401) and many others, as well as the wrong gender of some species names. It is not a goal of this review to count all these minor mistakes – some of them are corrected in the Vol. 5 (chapter “Errata & Addenda” which is also available in the author’s web-pages) but also with a few missprints.

Finally my subjective comments: the Catalogue is printed on coated paper of a high quality which is nice, but the total weight of all 5 volumes is 8.20 kg! It also has another, practical disadvantage: every serious user of any catalogue usually makes notes and comments on the blank margins – this is rather difficult on the coated paper.

It is impossible for a single author to produce a Catalogue like this without mistakes; I think that such a huge world catalogue should be compiled by a team of specialists in the various groups.

Regardless of the failures and mistakes pointed out above we now have a new catalogue of the world buprestid fauna compiled by a world specialist, and containing most probably all names used in this family since Linnean times. I am sure that the Catalogue will be used by all students of the family Buprestidae for decades. It would be highly desirable to publish addenda (incl. corrections) in electronic format, so that new items could be added regularly in the future. I can recommend the reviewed Catalogue to all serious students of the family Buprestidae and it should also be present in the libraries of all institutions which own a larger collection of this family.
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