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Abstract. The *canaliculatus* species group of *Stenus (Nestus)* is redefined. Four new Palaearctic species of the group are described and illustrated: *S. (N.) alopec* sp. nov. from the Putorana Highland and Taymyr Peninsula, Russia; *S. (N.) canalis* sp. nov. from SE Siberia and the Russian Far East; *S. (N.) canosus* sp. nov. from the Narat Mt Ridge, Chinese Tien Shan; *S. (N.) delitor* sp. nov. from C & SE Siberia. New distributional data as well as brief analyses of old records for fourteen species described earlier are provided from both Palaearctic and Nearctic material. *S. (N.) milleporus* Casey, 1884 (= *sectilifer* Casey, 1884) is revalidated as a species propria. *S. (N.) sphaerops* Casey, 1884 is redescribed; its aedeagus is figured for the first time; the aedeagus of *S. (N.) caseyi* Puthz, 1972 as well as aedeagi of eight previously described Palaearctic species are illustrated anew. A key for the identification of all the known Palaearctic species of the group is given. A morphology and ecology based analysis of the main evolutionary trends within the group is provided. A lectotype is designated for *S. (N.) melanopus* Marsham, 1802; its Siberian and NE European records are supposed to be erroneous; the monotypic *melanopus* species group is erected.
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Introduction

The *canaliculatus* group was erected by L. Benick (1925) in his keys for Palaearctic *Stenus* species groups. In the short preface to the named article, Benick indicated that the keys provided by him were meant for both practical identification and reflecting phylogenetic relationships between different species. It is clear that a harmonious combination of these two principles is an unrealizable ideal, especially in the case of Steninae, which are a group with extensive parallelism in many lineages. In addition, this circumstance makes all attempts to apply formal cladistics in morphology-based phylogenetic studies of the subfamily ineffective. Benick’s definitions of the species groups could not avoid the
problems connected with the form of the key in his article. The *canaliculus* group within the subgenus *Nestus* Rey, 1884 was defined by the following characters (in the translation below I try to reformulate most hazy items): 1) abdominal segments [3 to 7] distinctly uninterruptedly margined on each side; 2) [anterior visible] abdominal tergites with four short longitudinal basal keels each; 3) pubescence not greyish-silvery; 4) maxillar palpi with basal segment yellow; 5) head not broader than elytra between humeri; 6) body with ground-sculpture developed, otherwise head unusually narrow; 7) body larger; legs usually dark; 8) median longitudinal furrow of pronotum complete, rarely shortened. One can see that the characters have been of unequal diagnostic value. The structure of abdominal tergites as well as their lateral margination and even coloration of maxillar palpi may be regarded as features at the species group level, whereas the body size, colour of legs, proportions of the forebody parts, etc. are fit for the discrimination of particular species only. The character of puncturation, macro- and microsculpture vary widely within each of the species groups in *Nestus*. The long and sharp median longitudinal furrow of the pronotum seems to be a detail typical of any species of the group being discussed; but a similar feature has also arisen independently in other complexes (e.g. in *S. (N.) melanopus* (Marsham, 1802), see below), and careful phylogenetic analysis is necessary in every case to prove a real relationship; on the other hand, the furrow may be very feeble and vague in some species of the *canaliculus* group (*S. (N.) raddei* Ryvkin, 1987, some samples of *S. (N.) canaliculus* Gyllenhal, 1827 and *S. (N.) nitens* Stephens, 1833, etc). It is for the reasons aforementioned that a species group definition based on external morphological criteria solely or primarily has proved to be unsatisfactory. Fortunately, the male genitalia of Steninae, being extremely multiform at the species level, can nevertheless be used in their phylogenetically conservative general structure to establish and confirm the natural groups. Therefore, I have used these characters in the new diagnosis of the *canaliculus* group (see below). I do not consider here the synonymization of the subgenus *Nestus* Rey, 1884 with *Stenus* s.str. undertaken by Puthz (2001), as the matter is discussed by me in a separate paper (Ryvkin 2011).

Since a key for identification with brief distributional characteristics was given by me for continental Palaearctic species of the *canaliculus* group (Ryvkin 1987), some new taxa have been described (Puthz 1987, 2006), and vast material of the group, from both the Palaearctic and the Nearctic, became available to me for study. The material from the former USSR and China is of particular interest since both countries together cover the greater part of the Palaearctic region and are still the least investigated in the faunal aspect. Steninae of the USA and Canada seem also to be studied insufficiently: numerous papers of Puthz (see the list of references below) dealt only with part of the species and with part of the territory; the Nearctic material of many American museums looks rather scanty in comparison with their Neotropical collections. The list of staphylinid beetles provided by Campbell & Davies (1991) for Canada & Alaska contains no references to material and sources published; as a result, it is impossible to verify the data cited, and many erroneous data of old authors remain in the list concurrently with recent records. Unfortunately, the same problem arises with the Palaearctic Catalogue by Smetana (2004) which, owing to the absence of references to the sources of information, turned into a simple check-list, untestable and unusable, in spite of the herculean labour undertaken by the author.

The annotated list given below contains the results of processing the material on the *canaliculus* group, including the descriptions of four new species as well as numerous new data on distribution with brief analyses of old records for fourteen representatives previously described from both the Palaearctic and the Nearctic (other species, for which no new data have been provided, are listed in the ‘Taxa included’ section only, each marked with an asterisk and supplied with short distributional data and a reference to the source). A key for the identification of all the known Palaearctic species of the group is given.
Material and methods

The original material, which the present paper is based on, is represented by 591 specimens (288 ♂♂, 303 ♀♀). A large proportion of these has been captured during my numerous field trips in 1976–2009; others have been either donated or loaned to me for study by many colleagues and institutions. The names of the respective collections in which the material is deposited now are abbreviated and listed below.

In the annotated list below, both type and unique specimen labels are cited in single quotes completely (the type and historic labels with vertical strokes to separate different lines of a label); square brackets are used to complete label data; if necessary, the labels are supplied with remarks in angled brackets; the labels of other specimens are given in English without indicating the original language. The material identified questionably is shown with a question-mark in angled brackets. Catalogue references are given only for the sources concerning essential aspects of taxonomy or distribution; for other references see Herman (2001). Catalogues and compilations have been used mainly if they include any original data and/or interpretations (J. Sahlberg 1899, 1900; Jakobson 1909; Bernhauer & Schubert 1911; Tichomirova 1973, Campbell & Davies 1991, Ryabukhin 1999), while others (Heyden 1881, 1898, etc) are mentioned, as needed, either ad notam or for correcting appreciable errors. The numerous latest regional check-lists, where sources of individual records have been concealed, are mostly not cited below. In cases of doubtful citing, the question-mark in angled brackets was placed either behind the species name (for faunistic records) or before it (for doubtful synonymy) in the respective lines of catalogue sections. If a quite evident misidentification has not been proved by a revision of the material till now, this fact is indicated in the respective catalogue record as ‘?!’ in angled brackets behind the species name. In all cases, when the material identified before by other authors is used, the references to their identifications are given.

The line drawings were made with the drawing apparatus RA-7 (LOMO); the photomicrographs were produced with a Webbers Myscope 130-M digital microscope camera (1.5 Mpix); the images were processed using Helicon Focus 3.20.3 Free software (www.helicon.com.ua).

The measured proportions of body parts are given in points of an eyepiece linear micrometer in a binocular microscope at 56x magnification; prementum of some Stenus species was measured dorsally from its base to the base of the glossae, in glycerine preparations; the head length is measured along the midline from the neck restriction to the base of the labrum.

Abbreviations

♂, ♂♂: male, males.
♀, ♀♀: female, females.
ex: specimen, specimens.
HT: holotype.
PT: paratype.

AR: Collection of A.B. Ryvkin, Moscow, Russia.
ASH: Collection of A.V. Shavrin, Daugavpils, Latvia.
AVS: Collection of A.V. Sokolov, Moscow, Russia.
AYuS: Collection of A.Yu. Solodovnikov, Copenhagen, Denmark.
BM: Natural History Museum (=British Museum (Natural History)), London, UK (M. Barclay, M. Brendell).
DUL: Systematic Biological Institute, Daugavpils University, Latvia (A.V. Shavrin).
FMNH: Field Museum of Natural History, Chicago, USA (M. Thayer, A. Newton).
GMR: Collection of G.M. de Rougemont, London, UK.
Results: systematic part

Redefinition of the *canaliculatus* group

Diagnosis

Body size moderate; body length of the known species: 2.8 to 4.7 mm.

Head fairly small to fairly broad in comparison to elytra and pronotum. Upper surface between eyes feebly evenly convex, nearly flat, to slightly concave as a whole; with longitudinal elevations and impressions nearly absent to well developed. Antennae rather short to long, with the club segments more or less elongated. Internal tooth of each mandible placed a little before the middle, directed only slightly dorsally of the main plane. Maxillary palpi with yellow and not shortened basal segment. A considerable reduction of the adhesion capture apparatus may be supposed for all the members of the group (for more details see the Remarks section below).

Pronotum with long and sharp longitudinal median furrow more or less deep, less often very feeble, stroke-shaped.

Elytra nearly rectangular, large, with short rounded humeri, to shortened, slightly trapezoid with humeri less developed.

Legs moderately long; the segment 4 of tarsi without emargination; segment 1 of metatarsi about the same length as to a bit longer than segment 5 but distinctly shorter than segments 2 to 4 together.

Abdomen moderately convex, with paratergites evident on abdominal segments 3 to 7; four anterior visible tergites each with four short but evident longitudinal keels at basal part; posterior margin of the tergite 7 with well-developed fine membranous fringe.

Puncturation of pronotum and elytra diverse, but always non-rugose.
Ground sculpture cellular or net-shaped to entirely absent.

Pubescence moderate, contiguous to fairly long, outstanding.

**MALE.** Legs without specific features; posterior margin of abdominal sternites 6–7 shallowly emarginated to about straight; abdominal sternite 8 with a broad but not deep, rounded or angularly rounded emargination of posterior margin; abdominal sternite 9 with large posterolateral teeth not incurved inwards; ventral depressions of sternites 6–8, if present, flat and feeble, never flanked by sharp keels. Aedeagus relatively large; median lobe archetypically lanceolate, with apical sclerotized part to a variable extent angular to angularly rounded; endophallus with paired medial bands (optionally, an unpaired bar may also be distinct), small but visible lateral parts, and H-shaped expulsion clasp producing lateral portions fairly broad; basal tube of diverse structure, more or less sclerotized. Parameres cylindrical, with apical broadening, if present, very feeble, rather vague; apico-internal setiferous surface differentiated poorly to moderately, setae fairly uniform.

**FEMALE.** Posterior margin of abdominal sternite 8 broadly rounded to angularly rounded; each valvifer with posterolateral tooth directed backwards. Spermatheca sclerotized to a greater or lesser extent.

In the structure of abdomen, the male genitalia, the abdominal sternite 9 of both males and females (valvifera), the group under consideration is most closely related to the *boops* and *palposus* groups of the same subgenus *Nestus*. It differs from these by the structure of the mandibles, by the adhesion capture apparatus more or less shortened, by the pronotum with long and sharp, line-shaped, longitudinal median furrow, by the evidently narrower aedeagus, by the endophallus with the expulsion clasp’s transversal bridge adjoining to the lateral pieces near their middle, by the abdominal sternite 9 with posterolateral teeth not being curved inwards, by the male legs without peculiar features (not all the species of the named groups have such features well developed); from the *palposus* group it can be easily distinguished by the yellow basal segment of the maxillary palpi. The differences from *S. (N.) melanopus* Marsham, 1802, similar externally to some species of the *canaliculus* group, are given in the diagnosis of the *melanopus* group and in the key (see below). In many characters of the structure of abdomen and male genitalia, the *canaliculus* group also resembles the aggregate including the large and diverse *atratulus-fuscipes-cautus-crassus* complex and some isolated American members, as *S. (N.) mendosus* Puthz, 1971 (1971d) and *S. (N.) sordidus* Puthz, 1988, but phylogenetic relations within the named aggregate remain poorly understood; therefore a thorough analysis seems to be premature. In external morphology, the *canaliculus* group can easily be distinguished from all the species of the mentioned complex by the presence of the long and sharp, line-shaped, longitudinal median furrow of the pronotum.

**Taxa included**

Notes on comparative morphology and evolution

As most other polytypic groups in Steninae, the canaliculatus group reveals diverse evolutionary trends quite evident at a comparison between species of the same lineage. A concise review of the mentioned trends is given below.

A. Upper surface of head between eyes tends either to become flattened, at most slightly convex (S. shogun, S. nitens, S. illotulus, S. raddei, S. caseyi, S. canaliculatus, S. canalis, S. canosus, S. alopex) or to produce distinct longitudinal impressions with median elevation in between (S. labilis, S. idoneus, S. vinnulus, S. brivioi, S. confusus, S. delitor, S. illusor, S. latipennis, S. immigratus, S. gemonimus, S. sphaerops, S. dolosus, S. milleporus). The latter tendency seems to arise and develop independently, at least within the complexes labilis-confusus-delitor-illusor-latipennis-sphaerops and dolosus-milleporus, in spite of the fact that the latter is closely related in the shape of the male genitalia to the ‘canaliculatus s.str.’ complex characterised by a flat front.

B. For three species studied by him (S. canaliculatus, S. nitens, S. labilis), Betz (1996) has shown a considerable reduction of the adhesion capture apparatus. It is expressed both in the degeneration of sticky cushions of paraglossae (decreasing of their surface and number of adhesive setae etc.) and in a shortening of the labium. No data on labium length have been provided by the named author but, as it follows from the text, S. milleporus (as sectilifer Casey, 1884), S. caseyi, S. vinnulus, as well as S. melanopus, which is regarded as a member of the same group, have also been studied in this respect.

I have measured the relative length of the prementum (eulabium after Weinreich 1968) for six species of the canaliculatus group: S. canaliculatus (I: 17, 0.53; II: 16, 0.53), S. nitens (33, 0.87), S. labilis (37, 1.12), S. illotulus (26, 0.84), S. raddei (35, 1.09), S. latipennis (31, 0.79); and for three species of other groups of the subgenus Nestus Rey, 1884: S. ruralis Erichson, 1840 (47, 1.52) from the palposus group, S. argus Gravenhorst, 1806 (47, 1.74) from the fuscipes group, and S. melanopus Marsham, 1802 (41, 1.46) presumably representing a monotypic group. In each case above, the first number in brackets means length of prementum whereas the second one is a rounded ratio between the former and the length of the head (two specimens have been measured for S. canaliculatus). One can see that the data split the examined species into three clusters: a) S. canaliculatus; b) the remaining species of the canaliculatus group; c) the species of other groups; both total and relative length of prementum increases from category a) to c). It can be supposed that the reduction of the eulabium is a characteristic feature of all the members of the canaliculatus group, but it must be verified by a specific study. The shortening of the adhesion capture apparatus seems to correlate with some other modifications of the mouth parts, namely the more proximal position of the internal tooth of mandibles as well as its lesser deflection off the main plane of the mandible.

The small median notch of the labrum is a specific character of S. canaliculatus and the most closely related Palaeartic species (S. canalis, S. canosus, S. alopex). Though the functional explanation of this feature is obscure as yet, one can suppose it to correlate with the extreme reduction of the adhesion capture apparatus in this species complex. The Nearctic members of the same complex (S. milleporus and S. dolosus) have only a broad and shallow emargination on the anterior margin of the labrum; the margin is slightly sinuate at the middle in S. nitens, S. illotulus, S. raddei, S. caseyi, S. brivioi, S. vinnulus; lastly, the species of the labilis-confusus-delitor-illusor-latipennis-sphaerops line have the margin nearly straight.

Betz (1996) supposed the reduction of the adhesion capture apparatus in the canaliculatus group to be a result of miniaturisation, but this explanation does not stand up to any criticism. Indeed, the smallest specimens of the species within the group may be considered among the medium-sized representatives of the genus, while even much smaller members of both the pusillus and the pumilio groups have the adhesion capture apparatus well developed (S. (N.) pusillus Stephens, 1833 has been studied by Betz (1996) himself).
I believe that the modification of the mouth parts should be connected more likely to a particular suite of potential prey species. Unfortunately, Betz used only springtails and (to a lesser extent) winged aphids in his interesting prey-capture experiments, but those may not exhaust the list of possible prey objects for Steninae. I did not experiment with species of the canaliculatus group; however other Stenus species were capturing nymphs of Miridae (Insecta: Heteroptera) and Cicadellidae (Insecta: Hemiptera: Auchenorrhyncha), juvenile spiders of the family Linyphiidae (Arachnida: Aranei), small mites (Arachnida: Acari), small pyralid caterpillars (Insecta: Lepidoptera: Pyralidae), small flies (Diptera), soil Enchytraeidae (Oligochaeta), in addition to the aforementioned objects, in my unpublished experiments of 1985–1986. I consider it necessary to undertake a more detailed study of prey for the species of the group being discussed.

C. The tendency of legs to become longer has most likely taken place independently in two species complexes: delitor-illusor-latipennis-confusus-sphaerops and nitens-illotulus-raddei (only the species with the 1st segment of the metatarsus longer than the 5th are listed). S. canaliculatus, S. canalis, S. canosus, S. alopex, S. milleporus, S. caseyi have metatarsi with the 1st segment about as long as 5th; in S. dolosus, S. brivioi, S. vinnulus, and S. labilis, metatarsi remain short (with the 1st segment evidently shorter than the 5th).

D. The plesiomorphic aedeagus with a lanceolate median lobe and unmodified cylindrical parameres (as in S. labilis) can be transformed by different ways. The distal sclerotized part of the median lobe may be shortened, either angularly (as in S. sphaerops) or rounded-angularly (in the delitor-illusor-latipennis line); in only one case with a small apical denticle (in S. vinnulus); this modification usually correlates to a lengthening of the whole aedeagus (see Figs. 6, 7A–I) or only the median lobe (as in S. confusus, see Fig. 2E), although this correlation has not been observed in S. raddei, belonging to another lineage (Fig. 2A, B). The tendency of the median lobe to become narrower (as in S. shogun, S. brivioi, S. alopex) is another way of transformation, being peculiar to the lineages of nitens and ‘canaliculatus s.str.’; one can suppose that the aedeagus of Mexican S. idoneus has evolved in this way. All the modifications mentioned may be followed by forming a more or less developed medial impression or/and keel at the distal sclerotized part of the median lobe.

The main trend in the evolution of the parameres is a differentiation of their setiferous surface. It is expressed more frequently in a flattening of the apicointernal side of each paramere or, on the contrary, in forming a one-sided swell which setae are attached to.

Based on all the characters and tendencies briefly discussed above, we can subdivide the canaliculatus group into four subgroups: the monotypic labilis subgroup (S. labilis), the nitens subgroup (S. immigratus, S. nitens, S. raddei, S. illotulus, S. shogun, S. caseyi, S. geminorum, S. brivioi, S. idoneus), the canaliculatus s.str. subgroup (S. dolosus, S. milleporus, S. canaliculatus, S. canalis, S. canosus, S. alopex), and the confusus subgroup (S. confusus, S. delitor, S. illusor, S. latipennis, S. sphaerops, S. vinnulus).

**Bionomics**

The majority of the species for which enough data have been presented can be grouped into swamp inhabitants and alluvial ones. The former category, comprising the species dwelling in moss and litter of eutrophic and mesotrophic wet habitats, definitely includes S. nitens, S. raddei, S. illotulus, S. caseyi, S. brivioi and S. sphaerops(?), whereas the latter category consists of the members inhabiting open alluvia, like shingle beds, sandy, clayey or silty banks, sometimes sparsely overgrown with grass but without any more or less evident peat-moss or litter layer: S. labilis, S. delitor, S. latipennis, S. confusus, S. dolosus, S. canaliculatus, S. canosus, S. canalis. There are also some species (S. alopex, S. vinnulus, and supposedly S. illusor) living in biotopes of both categories. The peculiar swamp species, excluding
S. sphaerops for which too little data are available, are represented only by the nitens subgroup, which is supposed to be closest to the common ancestor of the canaliculatus group.

**General distribution**

Palaearctic except subtropical regions (spotty-relict in the southernmost temperate territories); the whole Nearctic; the Caribbean Islands. Many species of the group are represented in the northernmost territories of the Holarctic. Thus, five of the fifteen Palaearctic species have been recorded for the Taimyr Peninsula and Putorana Highland, which is more than 1/4 of the regional stenine fauna.

**Species list**

*Stenus (Nestus) labilis* Erichson, 1840
(Fig. 1E)

*Stenus labilis* Erichson, 1840: 697.


*Stenus (Nestus) labilis* – Poppius 1909a: 17.

*Stenus (s. str.) labilis* – Campbell & Davies 1991: 111.

*Stenus canaliculatus* – C. Sahlberg 1832: 428.

*Stenus lapponicus* J. Sahlberg, 1876: 56.


*Stenus latipennis* – Renkonen 1941: 105.

**Material examined**


RUSSIA: 1 ♂, Arkhangelsk Area, 10 km N of Naryan-Mar, near Iskateley, sandy bank of Pechora River, 14 Jul. 1988, P.K. Yeryomin leg. (AR); 1 ♂, Arkhangelsk Area, 5 km S of Naryan-Mar, bank of right confluent of Pechora River, on silt, 19 Jul. 1988, P.K. Yeryomin leg. (AR); 1 ♂, Arkhangelsk Area, Naryan-Mar, swamp, 29 Jul. 1988, P.K. Yeryomin leg. (AR); 1 ♂, Arkhangelsk Area, Nenetzkiy Autonomous Region, Pechora River delta, sedge meadow at lake shore, 7 Sep. 1998, N.S. Mazura leg. (AR); 1 ♂, ‘Yugorskiy Shar, near Velikaya River, tundra, 27.viii.1921, E. Abakumova leg.’ <in Russian>, ‘labilis Er. L. Benick det.’ (ZIN); 1 ♂, Arkhangelsk Area, near Amderma, flood-plain of Amderminka River,


Remarks

This species was named by Erichson (1840) from ‘Fennia’, having been misidentified earlier by C. Sahlberg (1832) as S. canaliculatus Gyllenhal, 1827; redescribed as S. lapponicus J. Sahlberg, 1876 from Finland (up to 68°30’N), but cited as labilis (only!) by J. Sahlberg (1900) in his catalogue of the beetles of the fauna of Finland. Only the Norwegian, Swedish, Finnish, and N Russian records (Thomson 1857; J. Sahlberg 1871, 1899, 1900; Poppius 1909b; Jakobson 1909; Palm 1961; Puthz 1971b) seem to be reliable for the European range of the species. The records for France/Italy (Fauvel 1865), as well as for the Yekaterinoslav Government (=Dnepropetrovsk Area) of the Ukraine (Ilijin 1926), are to be regarded as results of misidentification. In Western and Central Siberia, S. labilis has been known from Polar Ural to W Taymyr (J. Sahlberg 1880, L. Benick 1921a, Puthz 1967a, Shilov 1975, Sokolov 2003 <the latter is based on my identifications>). Puthz (Shavrin & Puthz 2007), without new material, considers the species to be distributed in E Siberia, but the only record by Poppius (1909b), for the Lena basin (‘Mehrere Exemplare auf feuchten, Moos-bewachsenen Wiesen auf der Insel Agrafena, I.VIII.’), has been confirmed by neither subsequent authors nor my vast material from this spacious territory.
Thus, *S. labilis* is unlikely to be represented in Siberia eastwards of E Taymyr. The new material above confirms the distribution of the species in N America (Campbell & Davies 1991: Alaska, Yukon Territory, Northwest Territories). Most captures known to me are confined to alluvial habitats.

**Stenus (Nestus) nitens** Stephens, 1833

(Fig. 1A–D)

*Stenus nitens* Stephens, 1833: 300.


*Stenus aemulus* Erichson, 1839: 541.

*Stenus aemulus* – Hochhuth 1872: 154 (as *S. aemulus* Gyllenhal).

**Material examined**


1 ♂, Krasnoyarsk Territory, Turukhanskiy District, Bakhta River basin, near Keteollo Lake, Noya River source, 323 m a.s.l., mosses and litter among Carex spp., Filipendula ulmaria, Poaceae on tussocks and among those at open river bank, 6 Aug. 1992, A.B. Ryvkin leg. (AR); 1 ♂, Evenkia, Baykitskiy District, Central Siberian Biosophere Reserve, Stolbovaya River 8 km up-stream of river mouth, 60 m a.s.l., mosses and litter on open swamp with Carex spp., Comarum palustre, sparse Menyanthes trifoliata, true mosses, Sphagnum spp. etc., 20 Sep. 1991, A.B. Ryvkin leg. (AR); 1 ♂, Evenkia, Baykitskiy District, Podkamennaya Tunguska River, 175 km up-stream of river mouth, near Belaya Kosa Island, 55 m a.s.l., swamp with Comarum palustre, Sphagnum spp., Equisetum sp., Plagiomnium sp., Carex spp., etc., 23 Aug. 1990, A.B. Ryvkin leg. (AR).

Remarks

Terra typica: ‘London; Suffolk’; for aemulus: ‘Brandenburg’. The species is known from C & N Europe and W Siberia (Tichomirova 1973). Hochhuth (1872) reported it (as aemulus Gyllh. <sic!>) for the Kiev Government (‘Ziemlich selten’); J. Sahlberg cited it for N Karelia (1876: ‘Nordligast har jag funnit den vid Soukelo i Ryska Lappmarken (66°40’)’, ‘Peninsula Kola, Petschora’ (1899); Jakobson (1909) summarized records for ‘Arkhangelsk Government (Lapponia, Pechora), <…> Onolents Government, St.-Petersburg Government, Kiev Government’. Puthz (Pisanenko & Puthz 1991) mentioned that ‘Aus der europäischen Sowjetunion war diese Art Horion 1963 unbekannt’, but, besides the records named above, Puthz (1971a) himself cited an additional find for the Leningrad Area (‘Viipuri’=Vyborg); Tichomirova (1982) recorded the species for the Moscow Area. The sketchy figure of an aedeagus provided by Bordoni (2004) for S. nitens from Italy (‘Veneto: Verona’) seems to belong to a specimen of another species. Unfortunately the specimen which has been figured by Bordoni is not found in Museo Civico di Storia Naturale, Verona (A. Zanetti pers. comm.); thus, the Italian records of the species require a confirmation. The new material proves that the species is widely distributed in W & C Siberia. The E Siberian records by Poppius (1909a: ‘An der mittleren Lena weit verbreitet, aber einzeln. <…> Olekmink, Ytyk-haja, Önkyr-yrjä, Ust-Aldan, zwischen Ust-Aldan und Batylym, Shigansk’) have been confirmed by neither subsequent writers nor the new material. The aforesaid material from W Evenkia seems to provide the easternmost verified records of the species until now. The shape of the aedeagus of the male from Evenkia corresponds well to that of the specimen from European Russia (see Fig. 1A–D).

Stenus (Nestus) raddei Ryvkin, 1987
(Fig. 2A, B)

Stenus (Nestus) raddei Ryvkin, 1987: 156.
Stenus raddei – Herman 2001: 2365.
Stenus (s. str.) raddei – Smetana 2004: 561.

Material examined

RYVKin A.B., Stenus species of the canaliculatus group

sparse growth of burnt Betula platyphylla and Larix gmelinii near Kamyshovo Lake with Chamaedaphne calyculata, Comarum palustre, Vaccinium uliginosum, Ledum palustre, Sphagnum spp., *Polytrichum* sp., *Hypnum* sp., etc., 19 Sep. 2004, A.B. Ryvkin leg. (AR); 1 ♀, Amur Area, Seledzhinskii District, Norskiy Nature Reserve (buffer zone), Burunda River basin, 1.5 km NW of Burunda cordon, sedge-graminaceous swamp near rill, and also mosses and leaf litter among *Carex* spp. and under *Alnus* sp. on rill bank, 10 Sep. 2004, A.B. Ryvkin leg. (AR); 1 ♀, same locality, plant debris among *Carex* sp. under sparse *Alnus* sp. with young growth of *Larix gmelinii* along rill bank near road, 18 Sep. 2004, A.B. Ryvkin leg. (AR); 1 ♀, Amur Area, Seledzhinskii District, Norskiy Nature Reserve (buffer zone), Burunda River basin, 0.5–1 km NW of Burunda cordon, plant debris and small true mosses among *Carex* spp. & Poaceae (+sweeping) along rill bank, 12 Sep. 2004, A.B. Ryvkin leg. (AR); 3 ♀♀, Amur Area, Seledzhinskii District, Norskiy Nature Reserve (buffer zone), Burunda River basin near Burunda cordon, plant debris and mosses (+sweeping) on swampy sides of flood-plain lake: *Carex* spp., Poaceae gen. sp., *Sphagnum* spp. & Poaceae (+sweeping) along rill bank near road, 18 Sep. 2004, A.B. Ryvkin leg. (AR); 1 ♀, same locality, plant debris among *Carex* sp. under sparse *Alnus* sp. with young growth of *Larix gmelinii* along rill bank near road, 18 Sep. 2004, A.B. Ryvkin leg. (AR); 1 ♀, Amur Area, Seledzhinskii District, Norskiy Nature Reserve (buffer zone), Burunda River basin, 1.5 km NW of Burunda cordon, sedge-graminaceous swamp near rill, and also mosses and leaf litter among *Carex* spp. and under *Alnus* sp. on rill bank, 10 Sep. 2004, A.B. Ryvkin leg. (AR); 1 ♀, same locality, plant debris among *Carex* sp. under sparse *Alnus* sp. with young growth of *Larix gmelinii* along rill bank near road, 18 Sep. 2004, A.B. Ryvkin leg. (AR); 1 ♀, Amur Area, Seledzhinskii District, Norskiy Nature Reserve (buffer zone), Burunda River basin, 0.5–1 km NW of Burunda cordon, plant debris and small true mosses among *Carex* spp. & Poaceae (+sweeping) along rill bank, 12 Sep. 2004, A.B. Ryvkin leg. (AR); 3 ♀♀, Amur Area, Seledzhinskii District, Norskiy Nature Reserve (buffer zone), Burunda River basin near Burunda cordon, plant debris and mosses (+sweeping) on swampy sides of flood-plain lake: *Carex* spp., Poaceae gen. sp., *Sphagnum* spp., *Hypnum* sp., etc., 19 Aug. 2008, A.B. Ryvkin leg. (AR); 2 ♀♀, Khabarovsk Territory, Verkhnevseurskiy District, left side of Olga River valley 3 km up-stream of Sofiyusk, 880 m, mosses, leaf litter & plant debris on gentle slope near rill amid mari with hummocks of *Sphagnum* spp., *Carex ? globularis*, C. spp., Poaceae gen. spp., *Ledum* sp., *Vaccinium uliginosum*, *V. vitis-idaea*, *Polytrichum* sp., *Hypnum* sp., *Hylocomium splendens*, *Pleurozium schreberi*, *Ptilium crista-castrensis*, *Betula divaricata*, *Carex ? globularis*, C. spp., Poaceae gen. spp., *Ledum* sp., *Vaccinium uliginosum*, *V. vitis-idaea*, *Polytrichum* sp., *Hypnum* sp., *Hylocomium splendens*, *Pleurozium schreberi*, *Ptilium crista-castrensis*, *Betula* spp., etc., 19 Aug. 2008, A.B. Ryvkin leg. (AR); 1 ♀, Khabarovsk Territory, Verkhnehseurskiy District, Ust'-Urgal Nature Park (project), near Semicha River mouth, SE side of old channel, 280 m a.s.l., moss and plant debris in larch-*Ledum* sparse forest with *Betula divaricata*, *Vaccinium uliginosum*, *Chamaedaphne calyculata*, *Sphagnum* spp., *Polytrichum* spp., *Dieranum* spp., *Cladonia* spp., *Eriophorum* sp., *Carex* sp., etc., 29 Aug. 2009, A.B. Ryvkin leg. (AR); 2 ♀♀, Khabarovsk Territory, Verkhnehseurskiy District,

Remarks

This species was originally described based on two males (HT: [China:] Island in Sungari River; PT: [Russia: S Maritime Province:] Kedrovaya Pad’ [Nature Reserve]); it was later cited for Hokkaido, Japan, and ‘Amur region [without more precise locality]’ (Naomi & Puthz 1994). It should be noted that neither Herman (2001) nor Smetana (2004) mentioned the Chinese occurrence of this species in their respective catalogues. Both authors seem to have misinterpreted the terra typica as a Russian territory. Based on the new material above, *S. raddei* proves to be a very common species distributed widely in the Russian Far East.

*Stenus (Nestus) illotulus* Puthz, 1972

(*Fig. 2C, D*)


Material examined

RUSSIA: 1 ♀, Tuva, Todjenskiy District, Azas Nature Reserve, near cordon at Azas Lake, 940 m a.s.l., left bank of channel: sedge-gramineous bog (+ *Trollius* sp. etc.) with tussocks, 15 Jun. 1991, A.B. Ryvkin leg. (AR); 3 ♂♂, 3 ♀♀, Buryatia, Okinskiy District, 1900 m, Il’chir Lake, 21–23 Aug 2007, A.V. Shavrin leg., <det. V. Puthz, 2008> (AR, ASh); 2 ♂♂, Amur Area, Zeyskiy Nature Reserve, ‘34th km’ cordon, Gulik River valley, in litter, 23 Jun. 1978, V.V. Belov & S.A. Kurbatov leg. (AR); 1 ♂, Amur Area, Selemdzhinskiy District, Byssa River 10 km below ‘Tyoplyi Klyuch’ spa, 290 m a.s.l., leaf litter among tussocks with *Spiraea* sp., *Calamagrostis* sp., *Carex* spp., etc. in high flood-plain, 3 Jun. 2007, E.M. Veselova & A.B. Ryvkin leg. (AR); 1 ♂, 1 ♀, Amur Area, Selemdzhinskiy District, Byssa River basin, bottom part of mountainside NW of ‘Tyoplyi Klyuch’ spa, 370 m a.s.l., litter under *Alnus* sp. with *Spiraea* sp., undergrowth of *Betula platyphylla*, *Trientalis europae*., Poaceae gen. spp., *Rubus arcticus*, etc., 22 Jun. 2007, E.M. Veselova & A.B. Ryvkin leg. (AR); 1 ♂, 1 ♀, Amur Area, Selemdzhinskiy District, Norskiy Nature Reserve, Selemdzha River basin, 2 km NE of Dyadatsatikha cordon, open swamp near lakeside: plant debris and sparse mosses among tussocks with *Carex* spp., Poaceae gen. sp., *Salix* spp., etc., 9 Aug. 2007, A.B. Ryvkin leg. (AR); 1 ♂, Amur Area, Mazanovskiy District, Nora River mouth, 210 m a.s.l., mosses and leaf litter on natural levee and in flood-plain forest with *Alnus*...

Remarks

This very nice and distinctive species was described based only on the male holotype, from Southern Cis-Baikal (‘Südsibirien: Tunkun-Sajan’). In the same year, Puthz (1972c), based on two specimens deposited in the Helsinki Museum, reported *S. illotulus* for the N Lena basin: ‘Shigansk [=Zhigansk] und <…> Ust-Aldan’. The latter specimen is a male, and the sketch of the aedeagus that I recently received from Dr. Puthz proves that it is unlikely that it belongs to *S. illotulus*. I think it necessary to accumulate additional material from the N Lena basin to give an adequate interpretation of these specimens. Shavrin & Puthz (2007) provided records for the Irkutsk Area (I have seen the specimen) and SE Buryatia; the mention of the Krasnoyarsk Territory and N Mongolia in distributional remarks by the named authors was not accompanied by a reference to any material. The remark concerning the Krasnoyarsk Territory was a misprint (A. Shavrin pers. comm.). The remark for N Mongolia is based on 2 ♂♂, 6 ♀♀, Mongolia, Terelji, 8–12 Jul. 1996, T. Ito leg. (GMR, TI, VP) (V. Puthz pers. comm.). The new data cited above from the Khabarovsk Territory, Amur Area, and Tuva Republic widen the known range of *S. illotulus* as regards both its SW and its E limits. *Stenus illotulus*, as well as *S. raddei*, inhabits moss and leaf litter in habitats moist to moderately wet, but is as a rule less abundant than the latter in those communities.

*Stenus (Nestus) caseyi* Puthz, 1972

(Fig. 5F)

*Stenus (Nestus) caseyi* Puthz, 1972b: 172.

*Stenus caseyi* – Puthz 1975b: 125.

*Stenus* (s. str.) *caseyi* – Campbell & Davies 1991: 110.

Material examined


Remarks

The species was originally described from Michigan, USA, has subsequently been reported from Quebec, Canada (Puthz 1975b) and also cited for the Canadian provinces Ontario, Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia (Campbell & Davies 1991) without citing material. The new data above widen the range to
include Wisconsin. Since the genital preparation of the holotype had been somewhat deformed owing to excessively quick dehydration, the figure of the aedeagus in the original description was not quite adequate. Based on the available material, I herein provide a new figure for this structure (see Fig. 5F).

**Stenus (Nestus) brivioi** Puthz, 1972

*Stenus (Nestus) brivioi* Puthz, 1972c: 12.
*Stenus* (s. str.) *brivioi* – Campbell & Davies: 110.

*Stenus vinculus* – Casey 1884: 112 (pars).

**Material examined**


**Remarks**

Terra typica: USA: Michigan, Maryglade College, E. of Memphis, Macomb Co; Paratype: Eagle Har., L.[ake] Sup.[erior]. Puthz (1972a) attributed paralectotypes of *S. vinculus* Casey, 1884 (see below) from White Fish Point to *S. brivioi* as well, and also reported the latter for Quebec, Canada (1975). Campbell & Davies (1991), without citing material, reported *S. brivioi* for Alaska and most provinces of Canada (excluding British Columbia and Prince Edward Island).

**Stenus (Nestus) dolosus** Casey, 1884

*Stenus dolosus* Casey, 1884: 108.
*Stenus dolosus* – Puthz 1975a: 124.
*Stenus (Nestus) dolosus* – Puthz 1972b: 171.

*Stenus jejunus* Casey, 1884: 112.

*Stenus villosus* Casey, 1884: 109.
*Stenus villosus* – Case 1892: 711.
*Stenus (Nestus) villosus* – L. Benick 1938: 266.
*Stenus* (s. str.) *villosus* – Bernhauer & Schubert 1911: 168.

**Material examined**


Remarks
Terra typica: USA: ‘Fort Garland, Colorado’; for *S. villosus*: ‘California’; for *S. jejunos*: ‘British Columbia’. Casey (1892) himself synonymized *S. jejunos* with *S. villosus*. Revising all three holotypes, Puthz (1972a) found them to be conspecific and placed *S. villosus* in synonymy with *S. dolosus*. Campbell & Davies (1991) reported this species for Alaska and most provinces of Canada: Yukon Territory, Northwest Territories, Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, Ontario, Quebec and New Brunswick, without citing material.

*Stenus (Nestus) milleporus* Casey, 1884 sp. propria

*Stenus milleporus* Casey, 1884: 111.
*Stenus milleporus* – Casey 1892: 711.

*Stenus illustris* L. Benick, 1926: 263.
*Stenus (Nestus) illustris* – L. Benick 1938: 266.

*Stenus odius* Blackwelder, 1943: 213.

*Stenus sectilifer* Casey, 1884: 110.
*Stenus sectilifer* – Herman 2001: 2384.
*Stenus (Nestus) sectilifer* – Puthz 1972b: 171.
*Stenus (s. str.) sectilifer* – Bernhauer & Schubert 1911: 167.

*Stenus teter* Notman, 1920: 699.

Material examined

Remarks
Originally described from the USA: ‘New York, 3; St. Catharine Island, Georgia, 3; Florida, 7’ <the digits refer to the number of specimens in the original type series>; the holotype of *S. sectilifer*: ‘District of Columbia’. *Stenus teter* was described from Florida. Terra typica of *S. illustris*: Mexico; of *S. odius*: Cuba, Soledad near Cienfuegos. Acting as first reviser, Casey (1892) himself synonymized *S. sectilifer* with *S. milleporus*. However, Bernhauer & Schubert (1911) mistakenly regarded *S. milleporus* as a junior synonym of *S. sectilifer*, and this treatment was repeated by Puthz (1972a) when placing *S. teter, S. illustris*, and *S. odius* in the synonymy of *S. sectilifer*. Under Articles 24.2.1 and 24.2.2 of ICZN, the valid name for the species under consideration is *Stenus milleporus* Casey, 1884.
Stenus (Nestus) canaliculatus Gyllenhal, 1827
(Fig. 3D, E)

Stenus canaliculatus Gyllenhal, 1827: 501.


Stenus affinis Stephens, 1833: 298.

Stenus congener Maeklin, 1853: 192.


Stenus (s. str.) congener – Scheerpeltz 1933: 1152.

Stenus cordaticollis Leinberg, 1900: 187.


Stenus (Nestus) foveifrons Rey, 1884: 272.

Material examined


HUNGARY: 3 ♂♂, 1 ♀, Nagycovaczy, 22.v.1982, V.G. Shilenkov leg. (AR); 1 ♀, Budapest, 10 Apr. 1982, V.G. Shilenkov leg. (ASH).

RUSSIA: 1 ♂, Kaliningrad Area, Rybachiy, 6 Jun. 1959, O.L. Kryzhanovskiy leg. (ZIN); 1 ♀, same locality and collector, 28 Jun. 1959 (ZIN); 1 ♂, Petrop., [is] (ZIN); 1 ♀, same locality, A. Moravitz Collection (ZIN); 1 ♂, St. Petersburg, 30 Mar. 1897, Bianki leg., L. Benick det. (ZIN); 1 ♂, 1 ♀, [St. Petersburg] Smolenskoye cemetery, 18 Aug. 1890 (ZIN); 1 ♀, same locality, 5 Apr. 1891 (ZIN); 1 ♀, same locality, 9 May 1896, G.G. Jakobson leg. (ZIN); 2 ♂♂, 1 ♀, Petrograd [=St. Petersburg], Smolenskoye cemetery, 11 Apr. 1920, A.A. Stackelberg leg., L. Benick det. (ZIN); 2 ♀♀, [St. Petersburg] Ekaterin Hof, sifting, leaves, 2 Apr. 1921 (ZIN); 1 ♀, ‘Small Islands on Neva River, Shliselburg Uyezd [=District], 1 Jun. 1906. G.G. Jakobson leg.’, ‘canaliculatus’ (ZIN); 1 ♀, Pargolovo, Finlandskaya Railway, 8 Aug. 1905, Somina leg., L. Benick det. (ZIN); 1 ♂, St. Petersburg Government, Tsarskoesel’skiy Uyezd [=District], Smolenskoye cemetery, 11 Apr. 1920, A.A. Stackelberg leg., L. Benick det. (ZIN); 2 ♀♀, [St. Petersburg] Ekaterin Hof, sifting, leaves, 2 Apr. 1921 (ZIN); 1 ♀, ‘Small Islands on Neva River, Shliselburg Uyezd [=District], 1 Jun. 1906. G.G. Jakobson leg.’, ‘canaliculatus’ (ZIN); 1 ♂, 1 ♀, [St. Petersburg] Smolenskoye cemetery, 18 Aug. 1890 (ZIN); 1 ♀, same locality, 5 Apr. 1891 (ZIN); 1 ♀, same locality, 9 May 1896, G.G. Jakobson leg. (ZIN); 2 ♂♂, 1 ♀, Petrograd [=St. Petersburg], Smolenskoye cemetery, 11 Apr. 1920, A.A. Stackelberg leg., L. Benick det. (ZIN); 2 ♀♀, [St. Petersburg] Ekaterin Hof, sifting, leaves, 2 Apr. 1921 (ZIN); 1 ♀, ‘Small Islands on Neva River, Shliselburg Uyezd [=District], 1 Jun. 1906. G.G. Jakobson leg.’, ‘canaliculatus’ (ZIN); 1 ♂, Pargolovo, Finlandskaya Railway, 8 Aug. 1905, Somina leg., L. Benick det. (ZIN); 1 ♂, St. Petersburg Government, Tsarskoesel’skiy Uyezd [=District], Smolenskoye cemetery, 11 Apr. 1920, A.A. Stackelberg leg., L. Benick det. (ZIN); 2 ♀♀, [St. Petersburg] Ekaterin Hof, sifting, leaves, 2 Apr. 1921 (ZIN); 1 ♀, ‘Small Islands on Neva River, Shliselburg Uyezd [=District], 1 Jun. 1906. G.G. Jakobson leg.’, ‘canaliculatus’ (ZIN); 1 ♂, Pargolovo, Finlandskaya Railway, 8 Aug. 1905, Somina leg., L. Benick det. (ZIN); 1 ♂, St. Petersburg Government, Tsarskoesel’skiy Uyezd [=District], Smolenskoye cemetery, 11 Apr. 1920, A.A. Stackelberg leg., L. Benick det. (ZIN); 2 ♀♀, [St. Petersburg] Ekaterin Hof, sifting, leaves, 2 Apr. 1921 (ZIN); 1 ♀, ‘Small Islands on Neva River, Shliselburg Uyezd [=District], 1 Jun. 1906. G.G. Jakobson leg.’, ‘canaliculatus’ (ZIN); 1 ♂, Pargolovo, Finlandskaya Railway, 8 Aug. 1905, Somina leg., L. Benick det. (ZIN); 1 ♂, St. Petersburg Government, Tsarskoesel’skiy Uyezd [=District], Smolenskoye cemetery, 11 Apr. 1920, A.A. Stackelberg leg., L. Benick det. (ZIN); 2 ♀♀, [St. Petersburg] Ekaterin Hof, sifting, leaves, 2 Apr. 1921 (ZIN); 1 ♀, ‘Small Islands on Neva River, Shliselburg Uyezd [=District], 1 Jun. 1906. G.G. Jakobson leg.’, ‘canaliculatus’ (ZIN); 1 ♂, Pargolovo, Finlandskaya Railway, 8 Aug. 1905, Somina leg., L. Benick det. (ZIN); 1 ♂, St. Petersburg Government, Tsarskoesel’skiy Uyezd [=District], Smolenskoye cemetery, 11 Apr. 1920, A.A. Stackelberg leg., L. Benick det. (ZIN); 2 ♀♀, [St. Petersburg] Ekaterin Hof, sifting, leaves, 2 Apr. 1921 (ZIN); 1 ♀, ‘Small Islands on Neva River, Shliselburg Uyezd [=District], 1 Jun. 1906. G.G. Jakobson leg.’, ‘canaliculatus’ (ZIN); 1 ♂, Pargolovo, Finlandskaya Railway, 8 Aug. 1905, Somina leg., L. Benick det. (ZIN); 1 ♂, St. Petersburg Government, Tsarskoesel’skiy Uyezd [=District], Smolenskoye cemetery, 11 Apr. 1920, A.A. Stackelberg leg., L. Benick det. (ZIN); 2 ♀♀, [St. Petersburg] Ekaterin Hof, sifting, leaves, 2 Apr. 1921 (ZIN); 1 ♀, ‘Small Islands on Neva River, Shliselburg Uyezd [=District], 1 Jun. 1906. G.G. Jakobson leg.’, ‘canaliculatus’ (ZIN).
Fig. 3. – A–C: Stenus (Nestus) alopex sp. nov.: ♂. A. Aedeagus, ventral view (holotype). B. Apical part of aedeagus, ventral view (holotype). C. Abdominal sternite 9 (paratype). – D–E: S. (N.) canaliculatus Gyllenhal, 1827: ♂. D. Aedeagus, ventral view (Russia: Rostov Area: Nedvigovka). E. Abdominal sternite 9 (Russia: Taimyr: Maymecha River). – Scales = 0.1 mm.
Ryvkin A.B., *Stenus* species of the *canaliculatus* group

(R); 1 ♀, Maritime Prov., Khasan, under boards on littoral, 3 Jun. 1967, A.L. Tichomirova leg. (AR).


Remarks

The species is variable in both external characters and, to a lesser extent, in the shape of the aedeagus. Terra typica: ‘Suecia’ [= Sweden]. Widespread in the Holarctic. In an earlier article devoted to the Caucasian stenine fauna, I summarized the range as follows: ‘Palearctic and Alaska <…>, Michigan <…>, but missing evidently in subtropics and in the southernmost districts of the Pontic biogeographical province (Turkestanian and Kurdish). Unknown to me also from the Crimean, Derbentian, Caucasian, Lenkoranian districts. The records nearest to the Caucasus are in the Rostov Area (Nedvigovka, Azhino, Manyychskaya, Yerokhin, Podtyolkovo, Liventsovka). One cannot deny a possibility of finding it in Ciscaucasia’ (Ryvkin 1990; the biogeographical units follow those of Razumovskiy 1980). In this excerpt I missed the important record from NE Turkey: ‘Benliahmed südwestl. kars’ (Korge 1971); though the locality does not belong to the Caucasus in a strict sense, it lies right at the border between the Caucasian and Kurdish biogeographical districts. This species is missing in the lists for the NW Caucasus (Solodovnikov 1998) and the Samara Area (Goreslavets et al. 2002), but my restudy of the collections of the named authors makes it possible to report *S. canaliculatus* for both the regions (see above: the Material section).

Both records of *S. canaliculatus* in Shavrin (1998) (for “Alar’, Irkutsk Area”, and “Bol’shoye Alginskoye Lake, Buryatia”) are to be referred to *S. incrassatus* Erichson, 1839 (I have seen the material in Shavrin’s collection). Among the material listed under the name ‘canaliculatus’ by Shavrin & Puthz (2007), at least the specimen from ‘Barun-Torej, Myrgen’, Chita Area should be referred to the new species *S. canalis* sp. nov. described below; some other Transbaikalian specimens unknown to me may also prove to belong to this new species. In that article, all the records marked as relating to the material deposited in ‘coll. A.Shavrin’ and ‘Irkutsk State University’, except ‘Sarma’, ‘Shelekhov’, and ‘Selenga delta’ (the latter locality, based on my identifications, has been published by Dubeshko (1984)), should be verified because the respective specimens were not present in the complete collection that Dr. Shavrin has sent me for restudy.

Ryabukhin (1999), based on my identifications in the IBPM collection, listed three localities from Kamchatka.

Campbell & Davies (1991) reported this species for Alaska and all the provinces of Canada, excluding Saskatchewan, Labrador, and Prince Edward Island, without citing material. The American specimens I know from the northernmost localities are very similar to those from NE Asia; but the material from the USA main territory as well as from S Canada demonstrates definite differences both in body proportions (e.g. the head somewhat more wide) and in the shape of the male genitalia; I believe the variability mentioned above requires further analysis based on more representative sampling.
S. congener Maeklin, 1853, according to the original description, was described for a single specimen captured on Kadjak Island (‘in insula Kadjak a D. Holmberg semel captus’). No specimens from the Kenai Peninsula were mentioned in Maeklin’s text; these two localities were distinguished well by both Mäklin and Mannerheim (a good map was provided in Mannerheim 1853, which incorporated Maeklin’s descriptions); therefore, assumptions by Silfverberg (1988) and Puthz (2001) concerning the type status of Kenai specimens in different museums seem to be as premature as unfounded (‘semel captus’<i>!</i> means that the type series cannot be distributed widely over all the main European museums). Casey (1884), L. Benick (1921b), and Scheerpelz (1933) treated <i>S. congener</i> as a species propria; nevertheless, Fauvel (1869, 1873, 1889), Rey (1884), Bernhauer & Shubert (1911), and others regarded this name as a synonym of <i>S. canaliculatus</i>. I think it important that Fauvel (1889), when citing the synonymy, mentioned Maeklin’s type as known to him and cited the terra typica as ‘Kadjak’. Consequently, the synonymy of <i>congener</i> and <i>canaliculatus</i> should be regarded as hypothetical before a reliable type specimen can be found.

<i>Stenus (Nestus) alopex</i> sp. nov.

(Fig. 3A–C)

**Material examined**

**Differential diagnosis**

This species resembles *S. (N.) canaliculatus* Gyllenhal, 1827 and can be distinguished from it by the narrower and shorter elytra, by the much elongated pronotum, by the character of puncturation, and by the shape of the aedeagus. External differences from all the known species of the *canaliculatus*-group are given in the key below.

**Etymology**

The specific name is derived from the Latin generic name of the arctic fox *Alopex lagopus* (Linnaeus, 1758).

**Description**

**Length.** 3.2–3.9 mm (the last value for the specimen with abdomen extended).

**Coloration.** Black, moderately shining, with moderately long and dense greyish- or yellowish-silvery pubescence. Legs pitchy black, tibial apices and tarsi somewhat lighter. Antennae pitchy brown, with segments 1–2 black and club vaguely infuscate; 1st segment of maxillar palpi yellow, 2nd brown with yellowish base, 3rd dark brown, with base a bit lighter.

**Head.** About 1/5 to 1/6 broader than pronotum (47:39), exactly as broad as elytra between humeri (47:47), distinctly narrower than those in broadest part (47:54). Front feebly evenly convex, with very vague and shallow lateral impressions distinguishable only between antennal tubercles and eyes. Puncturation moderately dense and regular, nonconfluent, as a rule, except of periocular areas, without smooth spots and strips; average diameter of punctures about as large as basal cross–section of antennal segment 3. Frontal slope before antennal fossae rather flat. Anterior margin of labrum with a small median notch. Antennae moderately long, reaching the middle 1/3 of pronotum. Length proportions of antennal segments 2–11 = 6:5:4.5:5:4:4:3:3.5:4:5:4; segments of club a little longer than broad (3.5:3, 4.5:4, 4:3.5).

**Pronotum.** Evidently longer than broad (45:39), broadest near middle, narrowed feebly convexly towards anterior margin and feebly concavely towards posterior one. Longitudinal median furrow not deep but evident over almost entire length of disk. Laterobasal depressions very shallow, nearly vanishing. Puncturation dense and fairly deep, sometimes nonrugously confluent near midline; punctures somewhat larger than those of head.

**Elytra.** A bit broader than long (54:52), distinctly longer than pronotum (52:45 in holotype), at suture nearly as long as the latter (46:45 in holotype). Humeral angles short but evident, lateral sides uniformly moderately divergent posteriorly (47:54). Humeral and sutural depressions nearly absent. Puncturation deep and fairly regular, evidently larger in diameter than that of pronotal disk, sometimes confluent, but not forming long furrows.

**Legs.** Fairly short; segment 1 of metatarsi about as long as segment 5.

**Abdomen.** Moderately convex, with well developed paratergites and two pairs of keels at bases of anterior visible tergites. Lateral sides nearly parallel, feebly convergent in apical part. Posterior margin of tergite 7 with fine light fringe. Punctuation of tergites much smaller than that of head and pronotum, on anterior visible tergites denser laterally, medioposteriorly with some interstices comparable to diameter of punctures.

**Microsculpture.** The whole dorsal side with fine and dense ground sculpture visible throughout.
MALE. Meso- and metatibiae without specific characters; posterior margin of 8th abdominal sternite with a fairly broad but not deep angularly-rounded emargination, without deep impressions and keels, slightly depressed in posterior half; abdominal sternite 9 as in Fig. 3C; aedeagus as in Fig. 3A, B.

FEMALE. Posterior margin of 8th abdominal sternite angularly rounded.

Remarks
This new species seems to be a late derivative of S. (N.) canaliculatus Gyllenhal, 1827; the latter also inhabits both the Taymyr Peninsula and the Putorana Highland (see above). Additional material including male specimens is necessary to prove the distribution of the new species up to the Chukot Peninsula.

Stenus (Nestus) canosus sp. nov.
(Figs. 4A–B, 5D)

Material examined

Differential diagnosis
This new species is externally very similar to S. (N.) canaliculatus Gyllenhal, 1827 and differs from it by the character of the puncturation, which is much coarser, more sparse and irregular, by the less developed microsculpture, by the median furrow of pronotum, which is deeper and broader, and by the shape of the aedeagus. External differences from all the known species of the canaliculatus-group are given in the key below.

Etymology
The name of this species is the Latin adjective “canosus” (grey-haired).

Description
Length. 4.0 mm (with abdomen extended).

Coloration. Black, distinctly shining, with moderately long and dense silvery pubescence. Legs dark brown with knees somewhat darkened, brownish-black. Antennae dark brown, with segments 1–2 pitchy-black and club vaguely infuscate; 1st segment of maxillar palpi yellow, 2nd brown with yellow base, 3rd dark brown with very base yellowish.

Head. Distinctly broader than pronotum (50:44), somewhat narrower than elytra between humeri (50:53), much narrower than those in their broadest part (47:54). Front feebly evenly convex, with very vague and shallow lateral impressions distinguishable mainly between antennal tubercles and eyes. Punctuation moderately dense, somewhat irregular, evidently smaller and denser between antennal tubercles, partly nonrugosely confluent both there and at periocular areas, without distinct smooth spots and strips, but obviously spacer and greater in the middle; average diameter of punctures in the middle distinctly larger than the greatest cross-section of antennal segment 3. Frontal slope before antennal fossae rather flat. Anterior margin of labrum with small median notch. Antennae moderately long, scarcely reaching middle of pronotum. Length proportions of antennal segments 2–11 = 6:5:6:4:4:3:4:4:5:6; segments of club longer than broad (4:3, 4.5:4, 6:4).
Fig. 4. – A–B: *Stenus (Nestus) canosus* sp. nov.: ♂ (holotype). A. Aedeagus, ventral view. B. Apical part of aedeagus, ventral view. – C–D: *S. (N.) canalis* sp. nov.: ♂ (holotype). C. Aedeagus, ventral view. D. Apical part of aedeagus, ventral view. [Note that the difference in shape of the apical lobe compared to that in C is due to the level of magnification.] – Scales = 0.1 mm.
Pronotum. A bit longer than broad (45:44), broadest near middle of length, narrowed feebly convexly towards anterior margin and concavely towards posterior one. Longitudinal median furrow deep and sharp over entire length except for very anterior piece. Laterobasal depressions very shallow, nearly vanishing. Puncturation deep and irregular, partly nonrugosely confluent; punctures distinctly larger than those of head.

Elytra. A bit broader than long (60:58), much longer than pronotum (58:45), at suture distinctly longer than the latter (48:45). Humeri angularly rounded, lateral sides uniformly moderately divergent posteriorly (53:60). Humeral and sutural depressions feeble but evident in anterior half of disk. Puncturation deep, much more regular, evidently larger in diameter than that of head and pronotum, sometimes confluent, but not forming long furrows.

Legs. Fairly short; metatibia about 1/3 longer than metatarsus (40:29); segment 1 of metatarsi about as long as segment 5 (8:8).

Abdomen. Moderately convex, with well developed paratergites and two pairs of keels at bases of anterior visible tergites. Lateral sides feebly uniformly convergent. Posterior margin of tergite 7 with fine light fringe. Puncturation of tergites evidently smaller than that of head and pronotum; on anterior visible tergites much denser and smaller laterally, medioposteriorly with some smooth interstices distinctly wider than average diameter of punctures.

Microsculpture. Very fine mesh-like ground sculpture visible between punctures, mainly on elytra and abdominal tergites 8–9, as well as on lateral parts of head, pronotum and anterior abdominal tergites, median parts of abdominal tergites quite smooth or slightly irregularly netted only on edges of punctures.

Male. Meso- and metatibiae without specific characters; 8th abdominal sternite without conspicuous impressions and keels, its posterior margin with very broad and not deep angularly-rounded emargination; abdominal sternite 9 as in Fig. 5D; aedeagus as in Fig. 4A, B.

Female. Unknown.

Remarks
No records of *S. (N.) canaliculatus* were previously known from China or from adjacent countries of Central Asia. The capture of *S. (N.) canosus* sp. nov., which is closely related to *S. (N.) canaliculatus*, proves that their common ancestor was recently widely distributed throughout these spacious territories.

*Stenus (Nestus) canalis* sp. nov.
(Figs. 4C–D, 5E)

*Stenus canaliculatus* – Shavrin & Puthz 2007: 114 (pars).

**Material examined**

RyvkIN A.B., *Stenus* species of the *canaliculatus* group


Differential diagnosis
This species is closely related to *S. (N.) canaliculatus* Gyllenhal, 1827 and differs from it by the smaller body size, by the much more irregular punctuation, by the less developed ground sculpture, by the posterior margin of 8th abdominal sternite, which is much more shallowly emarginated, and by the shape of the aedeagus. External differences from all the known species of the *canaliculatus*-group are given in the key below.

Etymology
The specific name is the Latin adjective ‘*canalis*’ (canine).

Description
Length. 2.8–3.7 mm (the latter value for the paratype specimen with abdomen extended).

Coloration. Pitchy black, distinctly bronze-coloured shining, with moderately long and dense yellowish-silvery pubescence. Legs pitchy black to brownish-black, tibial apices and tarsi somewhat lighter. Antennae dark brown, with 1st segment black and 2nd brownish-black; 1st segment of maxillary palpi yellow, 2nd brown, 3rd dark brown, with very base a bit lighter.

Head. About 1/8 to 1/6 broader than pronotum (46:41, all measurements, except where specifically indicated, are from the holotype), a little narrower than elytra between humeri (46:48), distinctly narrower than elytra in broadest part (46:55). Front feebly evenly convex to nearly flat, with very vague and shallow lateral depressions, distinguishable only between antennal tubercles and eyes and behind the tubercles. Punctuation dense and irregular, partly nonrugosely confluent, sometimes with small but evident smooth spots and strips situated both medially and laterally; average diameter of punctures in middle about as large as the greatest cross-section of antennal segment 3. Frontal slope before antennal fossae rather flat. Anterior margin of labrum with a small median notch. Antennae rather short, scarcely reaching middle 1/3 of pronotum. Length proportions of antennal segments 2–11 = 6.5:5.4:3.3:2.3:2.4:6; segments 9–10 slightly transverse (3:3.5, 4:4.5), the segment 11 distinctly elongate (6:4).

Pronotum. Somewhat longer than broad (45:41), broadest just before middle, narrowed feebly convexly towards anterior margin and concavely towards posterior one. Longitudinal median furrow sharp and deep, well-developed over entire length of disk as a rule, but less evident in some paratypes in anterior 1/3 as well as near both anterior and posterior margins. Laterobasal depressions very shallow, nearly vanishing. Punctuation rather deep and irregular, partly nonrugosely confluent but not forming long furrows; punctures somewhat larger on average than those of head; some bulging smooth interstices between punctures evidently smaller in diameter than surrounding punctures.
ELYTRA. About as broad as long (55:55) to a bit broader, much longer than pronotum (55:45), by suture a bit longer than pronotum (46:45). Humeral angles short, angularly rounded, lateral sides uniformly moderately divergent posteriorly (48:55). Humeral and sutural depressions very feeble to nearly absent. Punctuation larger in diameter and sparser, more regular than that of pronotal disk, as a rule nonconfluent, but individual furrows of merged punctures visible in some paratypes; interstices between punctures distinctly smaller than half average diameter of puncture.

LEGS. Fairly short; metatibia much longer than metatarsus (38:27 in paratype from Magadan Area); segment 1 of metatarsi about as long as segment 5 (7:7 in the same paratype).

ABDOMEN. Moderately convex, with well developed paratergites and two pairs of keels at bases of anterior visible tergites. Lateral sides of abdomen nearly parallel, feebly convergent in apical part. Posterior margin of tergite 7 with fine light fringe. Punctuation of anterior visible tergites comparable in average diameter of punctures to that of head but not so coarse and much more regular; denser laterally, medioposteriorly with some interstices comparable to diameter of punctures or larger.

MICROSCULPTURE. Variable in different specimens. Very fine mesh-like ground sculpture visible, as a rule, between punctures or by edges of punctures on elytra in humeral impressions and near suture, as well as on pericentral parts of head; abdominal tergites quite smooth and glossy at least in their median parts.

MALE. Meso- and metatibiae without specific characters; 8th abdominal sternite without conspicuous impressions and keels, its posterior margin with a very broad and shallow rounded margination; abdominal sternite 9 as in Fig. 5E; aedeagus as in Fig. 4C, D.

FEMALE. No reliable female specimens included in type series.

Remarks

Both the females listed were captured at localities from which no male material is known. Therefore, they are not included in the type series and their attribution to this new species remains questionable. This new species seems to replace S. (N.) canaliculatus Gyllenhal, 1827 in the southernmost and, in part, easternmost territories of E Siberia and the Far East. Additional material is necessary to ascertain the precise distribution of both species in the E Palaearctic.

Stenus (Nestus) delitor sp. nov.
(Figs. 5C, 6A, 7A)

Material examined

Stenus delitor sp. nov. is closely related to both S. (N.) latipennis J. Sahlberg, 1880 and S. (N.) illusor Ryvkin, 1987; it can be distinguished from these species by its smaller elytra, by the character of the puncturation and ground sculpture, and by the shape of the aedeagus. External differences from all the known species of the canaliculatus-group are given in the key below.

Etymology
The name of this species is the Latin noun ‘delitor’ (destroyer).

Description

Length. 4.0–4.6 mm (the latter value for specimens with abdomen extended).

Coloration. Black, shining, with moderately long and dense greyish-silvery pubescence. Legs black, tibial apices and tarsi sometimes a bit lighter. Anterior margin of labrum nearly straight, without median notch. Antennae brown to dark brown, with segments 1–2 black to brownish-black; 1st segment of maxillar palpi yellow, 2nd brown with yellowish base, 3rd dark brown, with base a bit lighter.

Head. Much broader than pronotum (56:46), as broad as to a bit broader than elytra between humeri (56:56 in holotype), somewhat narrower than elytra in broadest part (56:62). Front with broad, moderately prominent longitudinal median ridge, obtuse-angled in cross-section, and flanked with two well developed lateral impressions; median elevation more than twice as broad as each of lateral portions in basal part (20:9). Puncturation fairly coarse and dense, irregular, partly nonrugosely confluent in twos to threes; basal part of median elevation punctured somewhat sparser but without conspicuous spots or strips impunctate; average diameter of punctures somewhat larger than basal cross-section of antennal segment 3. Frontal slope before antennal fossae fairly gentle. Antennae moderately long, scarcely reaching middle of pronotum. Length proportions of antennal segments 2–11 = 7:9:7:6:6:4:5:5:5; segments of club a little longer than broad (5:3.5, 5:4.5, 5:4).

Pronotum. About 1/5 to 1/6 longer than broad (54:46 in holotype), broadest near middle, narrowed convexly towards anterior margin and concavely towards posterior one. Deep median longitudinal furrow well developed over almost entire length of disk. Laterobasal depressions very feeble, visible near base only. Puncturation fairly coarse, irregular, somewhat greater in middle of length, partly transversely confluent; punctures much greater than those of head.

Elytra. As broad as to a bit broader than long (62:61 in holotype), distinctly longer than pronotum (61:54 in holotype), although a bit shorter than pronotum (52:54 in holotype) by suture. Humeral angles short but evident, lateral sides uniformly moderately divergent posteriorly (56:62). Humeral and sutural depressions very feeble, visible near base only. Puncturation deep, more regular and evidently larger in average diameter than that of pronotum, partly confluent, but not forming long furrows.

Legs. Moderately long; metatibia nearly ½ longer than metatarsus (54:37); 1st segment of metatarsi a bit longer than 5th segment (11:10.5).
ABDOMEN. Moderately convex, with well developed paratergites and two pairs of keels at bases of anterior visible tergites. Lateral sides of abdomen nearly parallel, feebly convergent in apical part. Tergite 7 with well developed light fringe at posterior margin. Punctuation of tergites fairly dense, on anterior visible tergites irregular, distinctly sparser medioposteriorly, on preapical tergites more scattered medially; average diameter of punctures on anterior visible tergite about equal to that of median elevation of head.

MICROSCULPTURE. Very fine and dense mesh-like ground sculpture well developed throughout but entirely absent in some areas both on head and pronotum and, mainly, on varnish shining interstices between punctures of elytra and along midline of anterior visible abdominal tergites; abdominal tergites 7–10 with evident reticulation. This character seems to be fairly variable in different populations.

MALE. Meso- and metatibiae without specific characters; abdominal sternites 6–7 slightly depressed along midline and cut medioposteriorly; 8th abdominal sternite with fairly broad but not deep, angularly-rounded emargination of posterior margin and with flat depression in posterior half; abdominal sternite 9 as in Fig. 5C; aedeagus as in Figs. 6A, 7A.

FEMALE. Abdominal sternite 8 with broad, rounded apical margin.

Remarks

Until recently I have interpreted this species as being a western form of *S. illusor* Ryvkin, 1987. The specimen from the Khamar-Daban was not included in the type series of the latter owing to evident differences in both external appearance and the shape of the aedeagus. Study of the material from Middle Siberia and Tuva demonstrates that *S. delitor* is a valid new species.

_Stenus (Nestus) illusor* Ryvkin, 1987
(Figs. 5B, 7B)


Material examined


Remarks
The species was previously known only for the male holotype: ‘Khabarovsk Territory, Amur basin, Lyanchli River, confluence of Gorin River, 5.ix.1975, O.N. Kabakov leg.’ (ZIN). Based on the new material, I regard it as being widely distributed across the Russian Far East, except the southernmost territories.

_Stenus (Nestus) latipennis_ J. Sahlberg, 1880
(Figs. 5A, 7C–H)

_Steus latipennis_ J. Sahlberg, 1880: 78.
_Stenus (Nestus) latipennis_ – Poppius 1909b: 19.
_Stenus (s. str.) latipennis_ – Campbell & Davies 1991: 111.

Material examined
Remarks

The type series was collected by Nordenskjöld’s ‘Yenisei expedition at five localities from Chyornyi Ostrov (‘Tschorrnaya ostrov’ in the original description, present-day Chernoostrovsk village) to Dudinka (‘Habitat ad ripas rivulorum torrentium inter lapillos in territorio frigido et arctico et parte boreali territorii silvosii rarius’). This species was reported for the first time for NE European Russia (‘Petschora’, without more precise locality) by J. Sahlberg (1899), based on the collection made by the botanist O. Kihlman; a decade later it was recorded from the Kanin Peninsula (‘zwei Exemplare unter Moos am Rande von Schneefeldern auf dem Bergrücken (Paë) bei Bugranitza am 4. VII. und ein drittes auf gleichartigen Stellen bei Madoha am 16. VII. gefunden’, Poppius 1909b); Dr. Puthz has seen the two females from Kanin in ZMH, but has not seen the specimens from Pechora (pers. comm). Jakobson (1909), not being acquainted with the latter Kanin findings, summarized the range as ‘Arkhangelsk Government (Pechora); Yenisei Government’. Puthz (1965), based on earlier misidentifications by Hellen (Hansen et al. 1939; Renkonen 1941), believed the species to be represented in N Finland, notwithstanding the fact that Palm (1961) had revised all Fennoscandian records a few years earlier and noticed them to be erroneous (see S. (N.) labilis above and S. (N.) confusus below); nevertheless, Finland (without citing new material or references) was recently mentioned in the Distribution section for this species by Shavrin & Puthz (2007); just before the present manuscript was completed, Dr. Puthz informed me that two unpublished specimens (male and female) from ‘Lapponia inariensis’ had been identified by him as latipennis in 1974, but that the material should be revised again (e-mail of 2 Dec. 2010). The figure of the aedeagus of the male from Dudinka (Puthz 1965) is more or less adequate, except the missing longitudinal middle keel at the apical part of the median lobe. All further mentions of this species from the Palaeartic are confined to Siberia and Polar Ural: ‘Polarer Ural, Gouv.[ement] Tobolsk’ (Puthz 1967a); ‘Im Museum Helsinki je ein Stück von Irkutsk und Ytyk-haja’ (Puthz 1972d; I believe the specimen from the former of these two localities may be related to S. delitor sp. nov.; the female specimen is repeatedly cited by Shavrin & Puthz 2007); records for Komi ASSR (Puthz 1974; Shilov 1975) do not go beyond the northernmost part of the territory (Sob’ River, Vorkuta, Yeletsikiy, ‘Polyarnyi Ural’ railway station, etc). Tichomirova (1973) indicated the range as Siberian only. This species has also been reported for the Nearctic (Puthz 1974: ‘Belege aus dem North West Territory, dem Yukon Territory und Alaska im Museum Ottawa und in Waschington’; Campbell & Davies 1991: ‘AK, YK, NT’), but I do not know of any reliable American specimens and cannot state whether the range of S. latipennis is really subcircumpolar or whether the Nearctic findings concern a related species. In an earlier paper (Ryvkin 1987), I regarded S. latipennis warily as a N-Siberian species; after some closely related taxa have been described, it would probably be useful to revise all the material from other territories where the species has been recorded again.

**Stenus (Nestus) vinnulus** Casey, 1884

*Stenus vinnulus* Casey, 1884: 112.


*Stenus (s. str.) vinnulus* – Campbell & Davies 1991: 112.


Material examined


Remarks
Originally described from the USA. When revising Casey’s heterogeneous type series, Puthz (1972a) designated the specimen from Cambridge, Massachusetts as the lectotype and placed S. confusoides Renkonen, 1935, that had been known until then from Fennoscandia (Renkonen 1936; Strand 1954; Palm 1961; Puthz 1965, 1970) and E Siberia (Puthz 1967a: Chita Area: ‘Dorf Udotschnoje am Ingodazufluss’), in the synonymy of S. vinnulus. The specimens from Isle Royale, Lake Superior and Marquette, Michigan, were also attributed to the latter species, but the paralectotypes from White Fish Point were identified as S. brivioi Puthz, which was described in the same year (Puthz 1972c). The same author cited E Siberian ‘Poppius-Funde von Ytyk-haja, Ust Aldan und Olekminsk’ for S. vinnulus in the same year (Puthz 1972d). Campbell & Davies (1991), without providing material, reported the species for Alaska and most provinces of Canada, excluding British Columbia, Saskatchewan, Prince Edward
Fig. 6. Aedeagus, ventral view. A. *Stenus (Nestus) delitor* sp. nov. (holotype). B. *S. (N.) sphaerops* Casey, 1884 (U.S.A.: New York: Albany Co.). – Scales = 0.1 mm.
Island, and Newfoundland (the first records for Alaska and the Yukon Territory had been provided by Fall 1926). Ryabukhin (1999) mentioned a single specimen of this species from the Magadan Area, Russia, based on my identifications from the IBPM collection (see Material examined above).

**Stenus (Nestus) sphaerops** Casey, 1884
(Figs. 6B, 7I–J)

*Stenus sphaerops* Casey, 1884: 68.
*Stenus (s. str.) sphaerops* – Campbell & Davies 1991: 112.

**Material examined**


**Differential diagnosis**

Based on many external characters, this species might be placed separately within the *canaliculatus* group. Nevertheless, from the shape and structure of the aedeagus, one can suppose it to be most closely related to the *latipennis-illusor-delitor* complex. *S. sphaerops* differs from all the known species of this complex by the broader head with eyes much more convex, by the greater and more bulging pronotum, by the shorter elytra, by the much coarser forebody puncturation, by the less developed ground sculpture, and by the shape of aedeagus.

**Redescription**

**Length.** 4.0–4.1 mm.

**Coloration.** The single specimen on hand is somewhat immature; therefore, the genuine coloration is probably darker than described here. Body pitchy black, moderately shining, with fairly short silvery pubescence. Legs dark brown with middle parts of femora somewhat lighter, reddish; antennae reddish-brown with 1st segment pitchy black and 2nd segment dark brown; palpi brown, with segment 1 and base of segment 2 yellow.

**Head.** Evidently broader than elytra between humeri (69:62), nearly as broad as elytra in posterior quarter (69:70). Front with a pair of fairly broad and deep longitudinal impressions and a broad keel-shaped median elevation that is not very prominent but well developed; median elevation 1.8 times as broad as each of lateral pieces. Puncturation coarse and dense, irregular, partly rugose along internal margins of eyes, with small smooth spot in middle of median longitudinal ridge; diameter of coarsest punctures evidently larger than basal cross of antennal segment 3. Frontal slope before antennal fossae fairly gentle. Antennae long, reaching basal 1/4 of pronotum. Length proportions of antennal segments 2–11 = 8:11.5:10:8:7:5:6:7:5; segments of club distinctly elongate (6:3.5, 6:4.5, 7.5:4).

**Pronotum.** Distinctively large, bulging, uneven, a bit longer than broad (55:52), broadest near middle of length, narrowed convexly anteriorly and concavely posteriorly. Median longitudinal groove deep over almost entire length of disk, vanishing just behind slightly elevated anterior margin. Laterobasal depressions shallow though laterobasal prominences developed. Punctuation coarse, in part nonrugosely obliquely confluent, distinctly greater in middle of length; punctures much larger than those of head.

**Elytra.** Somewhat broader than long (70:63), nearly as broad between humeri as long (62:63), about 1/7 longer than pronotum (63:55) although a bit shorter than pronotum (53:55) by suture. Humeral angles short but prominent, lateral sides slightly convexly and moderately divergent posteriorly (62:70).
Humeral and sutural depressions rather feeble, vanished posteriorly. Punctuation deep, distinctively larger in diameter than that of pronotum, more regular, partly nonrugosely confluent but not forming long furrows.

**Legs.** Rather long; segment 1 of metatarsi obviously longer than segment 5 (15:12) though shorter than segments 2–4 together.

**Abdomen.** Moderately convex, with well developed paratergites and two pairs of keels at bases of anterior visible tergites. Lateral sides uniformly convergent posteriorly. Tergite 7 with very fine light fringe at posterior margin. Punctuation of tergites fairly dense, on anterior visible tergites distinctly sparser medioposteriorly; average diameter of punctures on anterior visible tergites about equal to that of median elevation of head.

**Microsculpture.** Very fine but regular mesh-like ground sculpture evident between punctures on abdominal tergites 6–10; other surfaces smooth or with infrequent, extremely vague netting mainly by margins of punctures.

**Male.** Meso- and metatibiae without specific characters; abdominal sternites 6–7 slightly depressed along midline and slightly emarginated medioposteriorly; abdominal sternite 8 with broad but not deep, rounded emargination of posterior margin and with flat depression in posterior half; lateral pieces uniformly rounded; abdominal sternite 9 as in Fig. 7J; aedeagus as in Figs. 6B, 7I.

**Remarks**

Originally described for the male holotype only: ‘Massachusetts’. Campbell & Davies (1991), without citing material, recorded it for the Canadian provinces Ontario, Quebec, and Nova Scotia, as well as the Northwest Territories. The original description, though fairly long and detailed, did not contain some necessary data comparable to those of present-day publications. Inasmuch as neither descriptions nor figures have been provided for *Stenus* *sphaerops* since Casey (1884), I thought it useful to give such a description here.

**Stenus (Nestus) confusus** J. Sahlberg, 1876

(Fig. 2E)

*Stenus confusus* J. Sahlberg, 1876: 58.


*Stenus (s. str. + Nestus) confusus* – Puthz 1973c: 50.

<*>*Stenus aemulus* – Thomson 1857: 224.

*Stenus (Nestus) latipennis* – Hansen et al. 1939: 32 (pars).

*Stenus (Nestus) protensicollis* Kráša, 1941: 166.

**Material examined**


Remarks

Terra typica: Russian Karelia and Finland (‘jag har funnit den vid Vigsjön [= ‘Lac. Wig’ (Silfverberg, 1988)] (63°50’) och Svir i Ryska Karelen, i Kihtelysvaara, Eno och Nurmis socknar i norra Karelen äfvensom vid Jyväskylä och Helsingfors’). In the original description, Sahlberg supposed that Thomson’s (1857) record of S. aemulus Erichson, 1839 (see S. (N.) nitens above) for Sweden should be referred to S. confusus, but this seems to be doubtful since the species description is quite adequate to S. nitens Stephens, 1833, for which aemulus is in fact a synonym. Poppius (1909a) reported the species from the middle reaches of the Lena River: ‘An der mittleren Lena an lehmigen Ufern, ein Exemplar bei Jakutsk, 1.vII!, ein anderes auf einer Insel nördlich von Önkyr-yrjä, 8.vII!.’ (the East Siberian latipennis specimens, identified by Poppius as confusus and found by Puthz (1972c) in ZMH, were collected at other localities and cannot

be correlated to the material cited in Poppius 1909a). Jakobson (1909) summarised the range as follows: ‘Sweden <the record is most likely based on Thomson’s misidentification of confusus as aemulus: see above>; Lapponia, Finland, Olonets Government’. Munster (1921) provided some distributional data for northernmost Norway: ‘Kaaaford i Alten, Sirma i Tanen samt Neiden, Langf Jordbunden, Vagatim og Graenese-Jakobselv i Syd-Varanger’; L. Benick (1924), a bit later, cited the only female from SE Siberia (‘Tschita’); Palm (1961) confirmed N Swedish records of this species (Norrbotten, Jämtland); Haberman (1983) provided three mapped localities from Estonia; a pair of specimens (1♂, 1♀) have been published recently from the Moscow Area (Semenov, 2004). The terra typica of S. protensicollis Krása, 1941, which was placed in synonymy with confusus (Puthz, 1973c, 1998): ‘Simbirsk, Rossia m.[ed]’.

The new material above confirms that S. confusus is rather widespread in the Northern Palaearctic, but the species has proved to be rare and sporadic in its distribution. It is essential that all the Siberian records known to me are represented by females only. I expect the range to have a relict pattern.

What is Stenus melanopus (Marsham, 1802)?

**Preliminary remarks**

Stenus melanopus has been included in the present paper for the following reasons. Firstly, some authors consider the species to be closely related to the canaliculatus group (e.g. Betz l.c.); I believe such an interpretation to be not perfectly correct. Secondly, owing to its external resemblance to several other species, including those of the canaliculatus group, S. melanopus has been recorded repeatedly for territories where it is in fact not represented. In addition, inasmuch as my study of the material from Stephens’ collection (BM) revealed heterogeneity in the series that probably contains the type of S. melanopus, a lectotype designation appears to be called for in order to provide stability in name usage. Lastly, a preliminary analysis of the literature on the species under consideration forces me to call into question some synonyms which have been established earlier and, at least, to raise a question regarding the thorough revision of these synonyms.

A new monotypic species group, the melanopus group, is defined and diagnosed below; its differences from the canaliculatus group, as well as from other groups of the subgenus Nestus, are provided; a lectotype of S. melanopus is designated; a brief analysis of the main published records makes it possible to define the species distribution more exactly and to evaluate the reliability of the synonymy provided.

**Definition of the melanopus group**

**Diagnosis**

Body size moderate; body length of only known species: 2.8 to 3.7 mm.

Head rather small in comparison to elytra and pronotum. Upper surface between eyes bisulcate, with longitudinal elevations and impressions well developed. Labrum with anterior margin straight, neither sinuate nor notched. Internal tooth of each mandible placed much more distally than middle, turned evidently dorsally of the main plane. Maxillar palpi with basal segment yellow and not shortened. Prementum of normal length, not reduced. Antennae fairly short, with penultimate club segments globular to slightly transverse, the last segment a bit longer than broad.

Pronotum with sharp longitudinal median furrow, rather broad and deep in basal half, vague or vanishing before the middle.
Elytra moderately long, slightly trapezoid with humeri developed.

Legs moderately long; segment 4 of tarsi without emargination; segment 1 of metatarsi a bit shorter than segment 5, distinctly shorter than segments 2 to 4 together.

Abdomen moderately convex, with paratergites evident on abdominal segments 3 to 7; four anterior visible tergites with four short but evident longitudinal keels at basal part each; posterior margin of tergite 7 with well developed, fine membranous fringe.

Puncturation of pronotum and elytra moderate, non-rugose, with interstices fairly flat.

Ground sculpture entirely absent, upper surface varnish shining.

Pubescence moderate, contiguous.

**Male.** Legs without specific features; posterior margin of abdominal sternites 6–7 about straight; abdominal sternite 8 with broad and very shallow, rounded emargination of posterior margin, without evident depression; abdominal sternite 9 with posterolateral teeth very short, not incurved inwards. Aedeagus relatively small; median lobe archetypically lanceolate, with apical sclerotized part angularly rounded; endophallus with paired medial bands and unpaired bar distinct in middle, with very small but visible lateral parts, and with H-shaped expulsion clasp producing fairly broad lateral portions; basal tube evidently sclerotized. Parameres cylindrical, without apical broadening; apico-internal setiferous surface poorly differentiated, setae rather uniform.

**Female.** Posterior margin of abdominal sternite 8 obtuse-angularly rounded; each valvifer with very short posterolateral tooth, backwards directed. Spermatheca sclerotized.

In the structure of the mandibles, the abdominal tergites, the male genitalia and abdominal sternite 9 of both males and females (valvifera), the *melanopus* group is most closely related to the *atratulus-fuscipes-cautus-crassus* complex. It differs from all the species of this complex by the presence of a long and sharp, longitudinal median furrow on the pronotum, as well as by the posterolateral teeth of abdominal sternite 9 of both males and females, which are very short and not incurved inwards.

**Taxa included**

*S. (N.) melanopus* (Marsham, 1802).

**Bionomics**

See below.

**General distribution**

See below.

*Stenus (Nestus) melanopus* (Marsham, 1802)

(Fig. 7K)

*Staphylinus melanopus* Marsham, 1802: 528.

Ryvkin A.B., *Stenus* species of the *canaliculatus* group


*Stenus (Nestus) cribrellus* Rey, 1884: 261.

*Stenus nitidus* Lacordaire, 1835: 450.


*Stenus (Nestus) sulcicollis* — Rey 1884: 256.

*Stenus tythus* Schaufuss, 1833: 295 (nomen dubium).

*Material examined*


UKRAINE: 1 ♂, 3 ♀♀, Odessa Area, Bolgradskiy District, near Krinichnoye, fresh-water lake shore, in reed drift, 5 May 2003, A.V. Gontarenko leg. (AR).


*Measurements of the lectotype*

Entire body length: 3.1 mm; head width: 48; pronotum length: 45; pronotum width: 45; elytral length: 59; elytral length by the suture: 50; elytral width between humeri: 53; maximum elytral width (in posterior ¼): 64.
Remarks

The lectotype of *S. melanopus* is designated from among the four specimens under this name in Stephens’ collection and originating likely, at least in part, from Marsham’s collection. Only this female belongs to *melanopus* in the commonly accepted interpretation. Only this specimen has been marked with a small patch of red paper and only for this specimen is the number ‘53’ indicated, which corresponds to the number of the species in Stephens’ ‘Illustrations of British Entomology’; it is believed to have been placed by Waterhouse on a small white oval label, without additional daggers. I have transferred it to a new rectangular board; the old, smaller board remains on the same pin.

Similar problems that have arisen during the revision of the collections of Marsham, Kirby, and Stephens have been discussed many times by many authors (e.g. Tottenham 1937; Hammond 1972). An excellent historical reference was kindly compiled by Mrs. Sharon Shute (Department of Entomology, BM), in addition to the material received by me on loan in 2002. Below, I give a slightly abbreviated version of the text of this reference with the permission of the author and management of the Department [e-mail of February 20 2004]:

“*Stenus melanopus* Marsham

This species was described by Marsham 1802. Stephens redescribes this species, in Illustrations of British Entomology […]. Stephens acquired specimens from Marsham’s collection when it was sold after his death and normally indicates in his text if he had a Marsham specimen. The species name in the Illustrations is attributed to Marsham, however, he does not mention that he had Marsham’s specimen. The Staphylinidae in the Stephens collection normally bear small, white, round labels if they come from the Marsham collection, (see Hammond 1972[ […]]). It is thought these were put on by Stephens, although they do not occur on the specimens of the species of many other families in his collection although we know from Stephens sale list of the Marsham collection that he did indeed purchase specimens of many of these species. The larger oval white labels with black ink numbers are ( ? Waterhouse) attached to all four specimens of this species in the Stephens collection. The numbers on these labels refers to the species number in The Illustrations Vol. v. there is no indication what the asterisks mean. None of these specimens have a Marsham round, white label, whereas other species within this genus do. This is a mystery because Waterhouse in his paper with Janson, on some of the British *Stenus* species, […], says that the ‘type’ is in the Stephens collection. This may have been an assumption on his part and he may not have known what the round, white labels meant. The fact that Stephens does not mention having Marsham’s specimen at the time of the redescriptions I think can be taken to assume he did not have it in his collection. Although the series label is not in his hand and could be Marsham’s ???. […] It may be advisable to select a neotype from the Stephens collection as without a label on the specimen it will not be possible to identify which if any of the four specimens came from the Marsham collection. Please note that as the specimens in the Stephens and Kirby collections do not have any locality data it is not possible to tell if the specimens are those he had in front of him at the time of his descriptions or later additions. It is known that he exchanged material and often disposed of specimens if he collected ‘better’ ones which is why in a number of cases it has been found that the specimens standing as a particular species in Stephens collections do not fit his description. Care must be taken when using these specimens to ‘fix’ names, to take account of common usage of names and the common interpretations of such species before changing names as a result of examining Stephens specimens, which should in every case be carefully checked against Stephen’s description. […]” [e-mail of May 16 2002]

Unfortunately, Marsham’s original description cannot help sufficiently with identification of the original type specimen: ‘St. niger obscurus scaber, pedibus concoloribus. Long. corp. 1½ lin. Habitat -----.. Descr. Simillimus *St. immuni*, at pedes omnino nigri.’ Every third *Stenus* species appears to conform to the diagnosis cited. Even the reference to *S. immunis*, described by Marsham in the same monograph, can add little clarity to solving this problem. The latter name, having been synonymized with no evident
proof with either *S. (Nestus) circularis* Gravenhorst, 1802 or *S. (Hemistenus) pallipes* Gravenhorst, 1806, at different times, requires a separate revision in itself.

The redescription by Stephens (1833), on the contrary, is much more detailed and corresponds well, in main features, to the *melanopus* in commonly accepted interpretation. The only inconsistency may be found in the coloration of the maxillar palpi: ‘antennae and palpi black, immaculate’ whereas the basal segment of the palpi is in fact yellow. The following information provides an explanation for this inconsistency: ‘It is said of Stephens that he declined to use a microscope regularly believing that what could not be seen with the naked eye was not worth studying’ (Darby 2010). I can confirm that the colour of the basal segment of the palpi may be poorly visible in a total specimen even at a high magnification. The redescription given by Waterhouse & Janson (1855) ‘according to the type specimen in Stephens’ Coll.’ relates undoubtedly to *S. melanopus* in commonly accepted interpretation and conforms to the unique female mentioned above. It is necessary to remember that the paper by Waterhouse & Janson (1855) was published just about three years after the death of Stephens, by authors who had been close to him and had known his collection for many years. Thus, both the redescriptions obviously indicate that Stephens had at least a specimen of the ‘true’ *melanopus* in front of him at the time of his redescription.

I suppose ‘the label problem’ to be confused in this case not so far as the author of the aforementioned historical reference finds. Waterhouse & Janson (1855) reported that ‘the specimens which Mr. Stephens used to call his ‘Type specimens’ are almost always marked by some kind of ticket attached to the pin holding the insect. The Marshamian specimens are thus marked by a round yellow ticket; and when the species is described in the ‘Entomologia Britannica’, a number will be found on the under side of the ticket, corresponding to the number of the species in that work. Other type specimens are either marked by a round white ticket without a number, or by a small square ticket with a number. Mr. Stephens’ own species are not marked’. I should like to stress the words ‘almost always’ in the text cited. In my opinion, they may prove that not all the ‘type specimens’ in the collection were actually marked in the way they described. About the small round labels Hammond (1972) mentions: ‘All internal evidence from the collection suggests that the colour of these labels is of no great significance but that they all indicate specimens originating from Marsham’s collection’; however, he did not present valid arguments against the possibility that specimens without such round tickets or having labels of other shapes may also have belonged to the named collection. The same author further stated: ‘The significance of certain other labels attached to various specimens, including white rectangles bearing a number and small red squares of paper, has not been discovered’; however, these ‘white rectangles’ may have conformed to the ‘small square tickets with a number’ in the aforecited fragment by Waterhouse & Janson (1855). Apropos, the latter authors did not indicate a colour of the ‘tickets’, and the small red squares of paper may be analogs of the white rectangles: as we can see in the text, Waterhouse & Janson did not regard the numbers as indispensable attributes of the type labels.

Stephens never stated that all the material from Marsham’s collection would be specified separately in his ‘Illustrations’. Indeed, he mentioned such material directly in the *Stenus* section in the following three cases:

1. under *S. marshami* Stephens, 1833 (=*S. (Tesnus) brunnipes* Stephens, 1833; =*S. immunis* Marsham, 1802, pars); it was, at least in part, based on material in the series of *immunis* from Marsham’s collection (see the ‘Systematic Catalogue’: Stephens 1929: 289);
2. under *S. immunis* Marsham, 1802 (the name requires a revision, see above); since the series proved to be heterogeneous, it was reasonable to show that a part of the original series remained under the name of *immunis*; besides, since Marsham’s descriptions did not contain precise references to localities, Stephens gave additional data (London & Norfolk), having mentioned that his own specimens came ‘from the Marshamian collection’;
3. under *S. laevis* Stephens, 1833 (= *S. (Metatesnus) pubescens* Stephens, 1833), which he attributed to Marsham and therefore, to explain the posthumous attribution, found it appropriate to mention that his specimen had been ‘obtained from the Marshamian cabinet’.

However, I can find no reasons for particularly citing material from Marsham’s cabinet under the name *melanopus*: the species was thoroughly described and published by Marsham. It was a well known fact that Stephens had purchased Marsham’s collection. In this case, Stephens merely gave the redescription more detailed based on the ‘type specimen’ and then added: ‘Also found, not uncommonly, within the metropolitan district and in Norfolk’, with a reference to the habitat data provided by L. W. Dillwyn, Esq. The word ‘also’ here means, in my opinion, that the above redescription is based on Marsham’s original material.

Based on the statement by Waterhouse & Janson (1855), as well as on all the facts aforesaid, I consider the specimen under discussion to be an original type specimen that can be designated as the lectotype.

The remaining three specimens (1 ♀ of *Stenus (Tesnus) brunnipes* Stephens, 1833; 1 ♂, 1 ♀ of *Stenus (Nestus) boops* Ljungh, 1810) have not been marked as paralectotypes inasmuch as their belonging to the original type series seems improbable; all those have been supplied with my common determinative labels. Each of these specimens has also been labelled by Waterhouse: ‘The species follow in succession, in the cabinet, in accordance with the descriptions in the “Illustrations,” but in one or two instances there have undoubtedly been some accidental transpositions; and to prevent further changes of this nature, all the species, and indeed nearly all the specimens, have now been numbered to correspond with the numbers of the species as given in the “Manual.”’ [ Stephens 1839]. The numbers here alluded to are on small oval tickets attached to the specimens […]’ (Waterhouse & Janson 1855). Besides the number ‘53’, the oval individual labels bear additional markings: one dagger under *S. brunnipes*; two daggers (one under another) under each of the specimens of *S. boops*. The daggers may have marked extraneous species within each series.

In different times different species have been erroneously synonymized with *S. melanopus*: *S. (N.) capitatus* Eppelsheim, 1878 (Fauvel 1878, 1902; Fowler 1888; Ganglbauer 1895; Reitter 1909), *S. (N.) discretus* Rey, 1884 (now a synonym of *S. (N.) crassus* Stephens, 1833) (Ganglbauer 1895; Fauvel 1902; Reitter 1909; Bernhauer & Schubert 1911; L. Benick 1929; Dauphin 1993), *S. (N.) ignotus* Eppelsheim, 1890 (Fauvel 1902), *S. (N.) piscator* Sauley, 1864 (Fauvel 1902), *S. (N.) arctulus* Hochhuth, 1849 (now a synonym of *S. (N.) incanus* Erichson, 1839) (Fauvel 1902), *S. (N.) morulus* Baudi, 1870 (now a synonym of *S. (N.) piscator* Sauley, 1864) (Fauvel 1902) and *S. (N.) sulcifrons* Eppelsheim, 1878 (now a synonym of *S. (N.) piscator* Sauley, 1864) (Fauvel 1902). Among the names having been regarded as synonyms of *S. melanopus* till now, only *S. tythus* Schaufluss, 1882 does not raise doubts: its female type was studied and identified as *melanopus* by Puthz (1967c). None of the names *S. cribrellus* Rey, 1884, *S. nitidus* Lacordaire, 1835 or *S. sulcicollis* Stephens, 1833 have been revised based on the type material.

The last of these seems to be a nomen dubium. Waterhouse & Janson (1855: 148-149) indicated: ‘The detailed description in this work is possibly from a small specimen of *St. [(Hemistenus)] subaeneus*, Er. The insect in Mr. Stephens’ cabinet which stands for *sulcicollis* evidently is misplaced by a black-legged species, i.e. *St. melanopus*, of Marsham’. The result of this mess was marked well by Rye (1870): ‘This *sulcicollis* and the preceding *assimilis* are given as valid species in Gemm.[inger] & v. Harold’s Cat[ologue], ii, though (‘because’ they are not recognizable or known to British Entomologists. The former is represented by *brunnipes*, and the latter by *melanopus*, in Stephens’ collection. See Wat. & Janson ([ […] 1855), from whose account of the confusion with regard to these insects it is evidently impossible to do anything but ignore them altogether.’ Fauvel (1869), without any explanation, put the
The name *sulcicollis* in the synonymy of *melanopus*. The assumption by Puthz (2008) that Fauvel had seen the ‘type’ in Stephens’ collection before synonymizing *sulcicollis* (‘FAUVEL hat das 1869 wohl ebenso gesehen, sonst hätte er seine Synonymie nicht ausgesprochen’) is contrary to fact: unlike many other names, which are supplied with remarks ‘ex typ.’ in the paper cited, the pair ‘*S. sulcicollis* Steph. = *S. melanopus* Marsh.’ has no such remark. In addition, the reference by Puthz (2008) to the ‘indisputable authority’ of Fauvel, who actually had the name of ‘master of false synonymy’ (Lohse 1985; see, for example, the list of erroneous synonyms above) seems not to be the best way to confirm ‘ausgesprochene Synonymie.’ By the way, in the later work (1873), Fauvel himself discussed the problem much more deliberately, with a reference to Rye (1870): ‘Le *sulcicollis* Steph. (Ill. Brit., V, 295), représenté dans la collection Stephens par le *melanopus*, est une espèce méconnaissable à rayer des catalogues (V, Rye, *Ent. Annual*, 1870, 84)’. Bernhauer & Schubert (1911), based on the original description, placed *S. sulcicollis* within the subgenus *Hemistenus* Motschulsky, 1860 (s.l.) as a valid species. Thus, I find the synonymy of *S. sulcicollis* with *S. melanopus* to be ill-founded.

The original descriptions of both *S. cribrellus* and *S. nitidus* correspond rather to species of the *atratulus* complex than to *S. melanopus*: ‘un exemplaire […] à prothorax paraissant un peu plus court, subtransverse, avec une fossette ponti-forme, obsolète, seulement visible suivant un certain jour et située près de la base […]’ (Rey 1884); ‘Prothorax un peu plus long que large, […] avec une fossette oblongue peu marquée sur le disque […]’ (Lacordaire 1835). It is obvious that the small ‘fossette ponti-forme, obsolète’ as well as ‘fossette oblongue peu marquée’ cannot conform with the long and deep furrow on the pronotum in *S. melanopus*. Therefore, most subsequent records of *S. nitidus* may have been the result of misidentification of *S. melanopus*. Thus, *S. tythus* may be regarded as the only reliably established synonym of *S. melanopus*.

This species, widely distributed over the Mediterranean, W & C Europe, and also introduced into the Nearctic (see Puthz 1966; Campbell & Davies 1991), is rather variable and similar to many other representatives of different groups in many characters; therefore the range: ‘Mittel-Südeuropa, südliches Nordeuropa, Nordafrika, Kanaren, Kleinasien, Westsibirien, östliches Nordamerika’ (Puthz 1971a, 1972), seems to be greatly exaggerated. J. Sahlberg (1876) first recorded *S. melanopus* for S Finland (‘Sällsynt; funnen några gånger invid Åbo af O.Reuter, och förf.[attare]’). The same data (‘Regio Aboënsis’) was cited by him in the subsequent Catalogue (J. Sahlberg 1900). Although L. Benick (1921a) ascertained that this record had resulted from misidentification (‘Ein von Sahlberg […] genanntes Stück (Reuter, Åbo) in der Sammlung des Mus. Hels. (‘Reuter, Pargas’) ist *atratulus* Er.’), many subsequent authors continued to cite Finland in the range description of *melanopus* (Palm 1961; Horion 1963; etc). Benick (l.c.) soundly questioned also the record by Poppius (1899: ‘statsradet A. Günther […] i trakten kring Petrosawodsk’) for N European Russia (‘Die Angabe von Poppius, nach der die Art in Russ. Karelien […] vorkommen soll, ist nachzuprüfen’). In his well-known work on Siberian Coleoptera, J. Sahlberg (1880) found *S. melanopus* to be distributed over the Ob’ basin (‘In territorio silviso prope oppidum Tobolsk 3/6 unicum specimen inventit Bergroth’). This misleading record was repeated by Heyden (1981) and became a source of erroneous citation of this species for W Siberia by many authors up to present time (Jakobson 1909; L. Benick 1929; Scheerpeltz 1933; Smetana 1959; Szujecki 1961; Horion 1963; Puthz 1971a, 1972; Tichomirova 1973; Dauphin 1993). Neither Puthz (pers. comm.) nor I have seen *melanopus* specimens from territories eastwards of Denmark and southernmost Sweden. One can confidently suppose the N Russian and Siberian records to relate to another species; most likely, it may be a species of the *canaliculatus* group, either *S. labilis* or *S. confusus*.

The record for Yekaterinoslav [=Dnepropetrovsk] of the Ukraine (Ilijin 1926) may also be a result of misidentification. The only material I have seen from the territory of the former USSR is given in the Material section (see above: Odessa Area). The recent record of this species for Lithuania (Monsevičius & Pankevičius 2001: 1 specimen of undisclosed sex) requires confirmation.
The bionomics of this species seem to be rather diverse. Along with different open alluvia: seashore, riverside, and lakeside (Hardy 1851; Rye 1864; Fauvel 1873; Fowler 1888; Johansen 1914; L. Benick 1929, 1947; Palm 1961; Horion 1963; Anderson 1984; Dauphin 1993), many other types of habitats have been reported: hay-stack rubbish (Rye 1864), manure heaps (Tottenham, 1954), dry manure (Dauphin 1993), compost heaps (Anderson 1984), detritus (Smetana 1959; Dauphin 1993), humus (Bordoni 1974) and bogs, including peat and Sphagnum (Horion 1963).

The suppositions of halophily for S. melanopus (L. Benick 1947; Puthz 1965, 1971, 1972) seem to be ill-founded, inasmuch as inhabiting seashore alluvia and lakesides of brackish basins is not a sufficient ground to consider a species to be halophilous. The idea was argued and rejected by Horion (l.c.: ‘Von einer allgemeinen Halophilie dieser Art kann keine Rede sein’). I believe that the fact that S. melanopus inhabits Sphagnum bogs is quite enough for the assumption of halophily to be denied.

As to the records of the occurrence of this species in manure and compost heaps, I should like to note that those habitats are common shelters which many Stenus species use during adverse weather or in adverse seasons.

**Key to the Palaearctic species of the canaliculatus group**

1. Front with deep longitudinal impressions and high median elevation in between. Seventh abdominal tergite varnish shining, without ground-sculpture between punctures. Punctuation of pronotum and elytra fairly deep and coarse, average diameter of punctures on pronotum larger than basal cross of antennal segment 3. Disk of pronotum with deep longitudinal furrow rather broad and not line-shaped throughout. Internal tooth of each mandible shifted distally, directed mediodorsally of the main plane. Abdominal sternite 9 of both males and females (valvifera) with posterolateral teeth very short. Aedeagus small (see Fig. 7K). 2.8–3.7 mm …………………………………………..

   – If front with deep longitudinal impressions and 7th abdominal tergite between punctures without regular ground sculpture, punctuation of pronotum very fine and dense with average diameter of punctures distinctly smaller than basal cross of antennal segment 3. Longitudinal median furrow of pronotum more or less deep but always long, line-shaped. Internal tooth of each mandible shifted distally, directed mediodorsally of the main plane. Abdominal sternite 9 of both males and females (valvifera) with posterolateral teeth normally developed (see Fig. 5A–E). Aedeagus large ………………………………………………………………..[canaliculatus group] 2

2. Front with distinct lateral impressions and median elevation in between …………………….3

   – Front feebly convex or feebly concave, with median elevation and lateral depressions rather vague or entirely absent ……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………..8

3. Median elevation of front broad and knob-like. Punctuation of pronotum very fine and dense, average diameter of punctures distinctly smaller than basal cross of antennal segment 3. Disk of abdominal tergite 7 without regular ground sculpture or with reticulation very feebly and vague. Aedeagus as in Fig. 1E. 3.3–4.5 mm ……………………………………………………………..labilis Erichson, 1840

   – Median elevation of front ridge-shaped, angular in its cross section, flanked by broader and less sharp lateral impressions. Punctuation of pronotum coarser, average diameter of punctures about as large as or larger than basal cross of antennal segment 3 ………………………………………………………4

4. Apical abdominal tergites without ground sculpture. For aedeagus, see Puthz 2006 (fig. 4). 2.9–4.0 mm ……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………..immigratus Puthz, 2006

50
At least tergites 7–10 distinctly reticulated ...........................................5

5. Elytral suture about 1/4–1/5 longer than pronotum. Aedeagus as in Fig. 7C–H. 4.0–4.7 mm ..........................................................latipennis J. Sahlberg, 1880
– Elytral suture not more than 1/7 longer than pronotum ...........................................6

6. Elytral suture a bit shorter than pronotum. Aedeagus as in Figs. 6A, 7A. 4.0–4.6 mm …delitor sp. nov.
– Elytral suture distinctly longer than pronotum ...........................................7

7. Elytra more than 1/4 broader than head. Puncturation less coarse, much more regular; interspaces between punctures along the midline of anterior visible tergites distinctly wider than average diameter of punctures. Aedeagus as in Fig. 2E. 3.4–4.0 mm …confusus J. Sahlberg, 1876
– Elytra by 1/4–1/5 broader than head. Puncturation much coarser, distinctly irregular; interspaces between punctures along the midline of anterior visible tergites smaller than average diameter of punctures. Aedeagus as in Fig. 7B. 3.9–4.4 mm …illusor Ryvkin, 1987

8. Elytra not longer than pronotum, nearly as broad as head. Abdominal tergites with very dense and deep ground-sculpture. Aedeagus as in Fig. 2C, D. 3.5–4.7 mm (the latter value for specimens with the abdomen extended) ...........................................illotulus Puthz, 1972
– Elytra longer than pronotum, broader than head ........................................................9

9. Front as a whole feebly concave, with median elevation very vague, nearly flat, situated below internal margin level of eye; the upper surface except abdominal tergite 10 without ground sculpture. For aedeagus, see Puthz, 1987 (Abb. 1). 3.3–3.7 mm …shogun Puthz, 1987
– If front as a whole concave, at least abdominal tergites 7–8 with evident ground sculpture ………10

10. Front with median elevation and lateral depressions rather feeble but evident. Median parts of anterior abdominal tergites with puncturation very small, scattered, and shallow. For aedeagus, see Renkonen, 1935 (fig. 1). 3.0–3.8 mm …vinnumulus Casey, 1884
– Front with median elevation entirely absent or, occasionally (in S. nitens Stephens, 1833), represented by narrow, smooth longitudinal strip ...........................................11

11. Elytra with fairly small and dense puncturation. Anterior margin of labrum with a small median notch ..........................................................12
– Elytra with puncturation larger and more or less sparse. Anterior margin of labrum without distinct median notch, at most feebly sinuate ...........................................15

12. Pronotum 1/7–1/8 longer than broad. Aedeagus as in Fig. 3A, B. 3.2–3.9 mm (the latter value for specimens with abdomen extended) ...........................................alopex sp. nov.
– Pronotum not, or only a little, longer than broad ...........................................13

13. Entire body with ground sculpture more or less visible. Aedeagus as in Fig. 3D. 3.0–4.5 mm (the latter value for the American specimen with abdomen extended, the maximum value for Palaearctic specimens known to me: 4.3 mm) ...........................................canaliculatus Gyllenhal, 1827
– At least median part of abdominal tergites 3–7 without traces of microsculpture ...............14

14. Elytra between punctures with ground sculpture throughout. Aedeagus as in Fig. 4A, B. 4.0 mm (with abdomen extended) ...........................................canosus sp. nov.
– Elytra between punctures with ground sculpture mainly in humeral impressions and near suture. Aedeagus as in Fig. 4C, D. 2.8–3.7 mm (the latter value for specimen with abdomen extended) ...........................................canalis sp. nov.
15. Middle of front punctured much sparser than lateral parts, occasionally with a small longitudinal strip or spot broader than the average diameter of punctures. Elytra only a bit (1/14th to 1/15th) broader than head, being punctured larger and sparser. Aedeagus as in Fig. 1A–D. 3.4–4.0 mm (the latter value for specimens with the abdomen extended) ………………\textit{nitens} Stephens, 1833

Front with puncturation more regular, without evident smooth strips or spots. Elytra l/7 to l/10 broader than head, being smaller and denser punctured. Aedeagus as in Fig. 2A, B. 3.1–4.1 mm (the latter value for specimens with the abdomen extended) ………………\textit{raddei} Ryvkin, 1987
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