This article was downloaded by: [New York University]
On: 10 February 2015, At: 11:48
Publisher: Taylor & Francis
Informa Ltd Registered in England and Wales Registered Number:
1072954 Registered office: Mortimer House, 37-41 Mortimer
Street, London W1T 3JH, UK

Annals and Magazine of Natural History: Series 4

Publication details, including instructions
for authors and subscription information:
<http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/tnah10>

XVI.—Answer to Dr. Stoliczka's "Notes on the Indian species of Thelyphonus"

A.G. Butler F.L.S. F.Z.S.

Published online: 13 Oct 2009.

To cite this article: A.G. Butler F.L.S. F.Z.S. (1873) XVI.—Answer to Dr. Stoliczka's "Notes on the Indian species of Thelyphonus" , Annals and Magazine of Natural History: Series 4, 12:68, 114-116, DOI: [10.1080/00222937308680722](http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00222937308680722)

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00222937308680722>

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

Taylor & Francis makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of all the information (the "Content") contained in the publications on our platform. However, Taylor & Francis, our agents, and our licensors make no representations or warranties whatsoever as to the accuracy, completeness, or suitability for any purpose of the Content. Any opinions and views expressed in this publication are the opinions and views of the authors, and are not the views of or endorsed by Taylor & Francis. The accuracy of the Content should not be relied upon and should be independently verified with primary sources of information. Taylor and Francis shall not be liable for any losses, actions, claims, proceedings, demands, costs,

expenses, damages, and other liabilities whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with, in relation to or arising out of the use of the Content.

This article may be used for research, teaching, and private study purposes. Any substantial or systematic reproduction, redistribution, reselling, loan, sub-licensing, systematic supply, or distribution in any form to anyone is expressly forbidden.

Terms & Conditions of access and use can be found at <http://www.tandfonline.com/page/terms-and-conditions>

I have just seen Mr. Cope's synopsis of the Chelydrinæ in the 'Proceedings of the Academy of Nat. Sciences of Philadelphia' for 1872, p. 22, which contains some remarks on M. Bocourt's paper. He observes that

1. *Staurotypus Salvinii*, figured by Bocourt, appears to him to be very different from that described by Dr. Gray, and perhaps pertains to another genus. "Dr. Gray describes the anterior lobe of the sternum in *S. Salvinii* as narrowed like the posterior, while it is broadly rounded in this animal." Mr. Cope forms for this a species, which he names *Claudius pictus*; but he seems to have a doubt if it is distinct from a species which he calls *Claudius severus*, p. 24,—which I think are both the same as *Stauremys Salvinii*.

Mr. Cope's paper induces me to believe that the first section of his genus *Claudius* is synonymous with my genus *Stauremys*, which differs from *Claudius* in having a broader sternal costal process and a distinct inguinal.

2. *Claudius angustatus*, Cope. He seems to consider that his species is different from that figured by M. Bocourt, and is inclined to think that Bocourt was right when he named it *megalcephalus* in 1868, though he afterwards gave it up, believing it to be the same as Cope's. From these observations it would appear as if the genus *Claudius* ought to be confined to this species, peculiar for having a very narrow costal lateral lobe and only a single or no inguinal shield.

XVI.—Answer to Dr. Stoliczka's "Notes on the Indian Species of *Thelyphonus*." By A. G. BUTLER, F.L.S., F.Z.S., &c.

DR. STOLICZKA has just forwarded to me a paper recently read before the Asiatic Society of Bengal, containing a criticism of my monograph of *Thelyphonus* (Ann. & Mag. Nat. Hist. ser. 4, vol. x. pp. 200–206), and supplemented by descriptions of several new species.

It is unfortunate that the author did not acquaint me with his intention to describe new Indian *Thelyphoni*, as I should willingly have deferred the publication of my own paper (Cist. Ent. vi. pp. 129–132) until his descriptions had appeared, and thus avoided adding to the synonymy of the genus. As it is, there can be little doubt that my paper has priority, since it was before the public on May 1, whereas the separate copies even of Dr. Stoliczka's paper appear not to have reached the author much before the middle of that month, the one forwarded to me having left Calcutta on the 15th.

I must now briefly refer to a few remarks which occur in Dr. Stoliczka's paper. He says, in the first place, speaking of the sections into which I have grouped the genus, "Turning now to the sections distinguished by Mr. Butler, there are some discrepancies to be noticed in the species referred to them by the author." He then proceeds to point out, amongst other unimportant details, that Koch has not accurately figured the cheliceres of *T. brasiliannus* and *T. linganus*, provided that I have referred them to their proper sections. This I am at once willing to admit; but Koch's figures are exceedingly rude, and Dr. Stoliczka himself is evidently aware that that author laid no stress on the number of "denticles," as appears in his note on *T. brasiliannus*, where he says :—"Their number, it is true, is not mentioned in the description; but if Koch's figure has been found to be incorrect, the correction should have been noticed;" and in his note on *T. linganus*, "Koch's original figure gives six denticles on the second joint of the cheliceres, but does not refer to that number in the text. Is the figure incorrect in that respect?"

It is certainly remarkable, considering how little dependence can be placed on Koch's figures of *Thelyphonus*, that any one can feel certain that "Koch's *T. rufipes* is clearly not the same species as the one originally described by Lucas under the same name;" and, considering the admission that, as regards two other species figured by him, "the differences which he notices as distinguishing the two are decidedly of no specific value," it is, I think, odd that Dr. Stoliczka should assume to believe that the "denticles" on the cheliceres were counted when Koch figured his species, though neglected when he described them. He says, however :—"If those descriptions and figures were found to be incorrect or not reliable, the mistakes had first to be pointed out and corrected before a determination, based upon them, was admitted or rejected." To this I reply that I consider the descriptions reliable, and the figures give a vague notion of the general outline, whilst the localities given assist still more in the determination of the species. I did not consider it necessary to state in full my reasons for every little change which I made; for I consider brevity as much the soul of science as it is the soul of wit.

As regards Guérin's *T. caudatus*, a figure is given, and by no means so careful a one as to enable any body with certainty to determine the species: the locality "Antilles" is therefore the only clue to the species; it is not the locality of *T. caudatus*, which, as Dr. Stoliczka remarks, is stated to be Java. Nothing, therefore, could be more reasonable than to refer it to *T. antillanus*.

My reason for considering Koch's figure of *T. proscorpio* identical with the *T. caudatus* of Lucas is that there is a great similarity in their general appearance, whilst they both have five denticles on the second joint of the cheliceres; the difference of width of joints is one often noticeable in a comparison of figures of the same species drawn respectively by German and French artists, and cannot be depended upon. As to *T. angustus* of Lucas, Dr. Stoliczka appears to be doubtful of his own identification of the species; and therefore I need not discuss it.

Dr. Stoliczka seems indignant at my considering his *T. assamensis* the adult form of *T. rufimanus*; and certainly, if his later figures are taken from the type (in which case the earlier ones cannot be), I should myself allow the two species to be distinct, and should correct the synonymy by considering *T. scabrinus* of Stoliczka identical with *T. rufimanus*, and *T. assamensis* of the later paper and plate as probably a malformed example of my *T. psittacinus*.

I may be allowed to state my view of the really well-executed plate which accompanies Dr. Stoliczka's notes, as follows:—

Fig. 1. *Thelyphonus scabrinus*, Stol., = *T. assamensis*, Stol. (*rufimanus*, Lucas).

2. *T. assamensis*, Stol., = ? *T. psittacinus*, Butl., malformed.
3. *T.* (conf.) *angustus*, Lucas, = ? *T. proscorpio*, Latr., junior.
4. *T. formosus*, Butl., = *T. formosus*, Butl., variety.
5. *T. indicus*, Stol., = *T. sepiaris*, Butl.
6. *T. Beddomei*, Stol., = n. sp.

It appears, notwithstanding the author's statement that "figures of single parts are undoubtedly very useful, but they are not sufficient," &c., that he has been successful in determining my *T. formosus*; and he does not hint at the possibility of any of my other new species being wrongly identified.

In conclusion, if in the above remarks I have felt bound to defend myself, from a consciousness that my determinations are worthy of more consideration than Dr. Stoliczka has shown them, it must be understood that I have done so with a view to the advancement of science, and from no wish to contradict the author of a really useful paper; and I may add that I shall look forward with great pleasure to Dr. Stoliczka's promised paper on the anatomy of the genus, which will, I doubt not, throw much light upon the affinities of this long neglected but most interesting group.