

the latter has also found Nummulites (including probably *N. Ramondi*) in the sea-sand off Gascony. Indeed our friend M. E. Vanden Broeck suggests the question, Can the Gulf-stream have had force enough to drift the fossil Nummulites from the Bay of Gascony to the English Channel?*

So many of the aforesaid fossil Foraminifera, dredged up in the Channel, being near their well-known formations in England and France, and one of the *Nummulinæ* (*N. Prestwichiana*) occurring in Hampshire, if not also in Belgium, we need not look for a distant origin for them; and their strata may be, or may lately have been, in place between France and England. Further, though several of the specimens of *N. Ramondi* and *N. Rouaulti* are greatly worn, many show no sign of having travelled very far, and those that have been worn down have not suffered more than the *Discorbinæ* and others.

At all events, the facts are suggestive of further research.

PS. In a letter dated March 7, 1876, Prof. Ansted favours us with his opinion that "it is not impossible or very unlikely that Foraminifera should be drifted from the Bay of Biscay to the Channel Islands. Whatever lives in the southern part of the former sea may be drifted westward by the return storm-waves, reflected from the French coast (and making the notoriously bad and broken seas met with in crossing the Bay) much westward of the line up which comes a drift from the south, caused by the return or back current of the Gulf-stream, when it gets well to the south. Any thing like Foraminifera would then be caught by the tide-wave and carried up-channel."

XXVI.—*Notes on some Heteromerous Coleoptera belonging to the true Tenebrionidæ.* By CHARLES O. WATERHOUSE.

HAVING recently had occasion to refer to one of Motschulsky's papers on Tenebrionidæ published since his death in the 'Bulletin de Moscou' (1873, p. 23), I have thought that a few remarks on it might be useful. At the same time, I must emphatically protest against the publication of this author's papers, which, it is clear from internal evidence, were written

* M. E. Vanden Broeck remarks that M. A. Lafont, in his paper on the Fauna of the Arcachon Basin, says that *Spirula Peronii* is sometimes found on the coast, evidently brought by the currents from the south ('Actes Soc. Linn. Bordeaux,' ser. 3, vol. vi. 1868).

many years ago, are now not a credit to him, and are a great impediment to science.

The first genus referred to in the table of genera is "*Milaris*, Pallas," "Type *Upis maxima*, Erm." This is evidently intended for *Myllaris* (a genus not characterized by Pallas, and only proposed for *gigas*, Linn.); the species is *maxima*, Germ., a close ally of *gigas*, L., Fabr.

2. *Deriles*, Mots., for *Upis excavatus*, Hbst., Brazil, an undescribed species. With this are associated and imperfectly described, *collaris* (Murray, MS.), *guineensis* (Westermann, MS.), and *hypocrita* (Dej. MS.), which appear to be close allies of *Amenophis*, Thomson, 1858. A species "*hypocrita*, Dej.," was described in 1842 by Prof. Westwood; but I think it is different from the one described by Motschulsky, and is a *Taraxides* (see below).

3. *Mederis*, Mots., for *Upis angulata*, Er., = *Promethis*, Pascoe, 1869, for the same insect.

4. *Asiris*, Mots., *angulicollis*, Mots. This is certainly *Meneristes*, Pascoe, 1869. I cannot say to which species *angulicollis* is to be referred.

5. *Nyctobates*, Guér.-M., for *sinuatus*, Fabr., and allies. Guérin-Ménéville says distinctly that the type of his genus is *gigas*, Fabr. (See above, *Myllaris*.) The name *Nyctobates* cannot, therefore, be applied to *sinuatus*; and I propose the name *Taraxides*.

6. *Alobates*, Mots., for *Nyct. pennsylvanica*, De G.

7. *Tænobates*, Mots., for *N. saperdoides*, Oliv., = *Xylopinus*, Le C. 1866, for the same insect.

8. *Menechides*, Mots., for *N. calcaratus*, F., = *Centronopus*, Sol. 1848, for the same insect.

9. *Lobetas*, Mots., for *Zophobas costatus*, Guérin, = *Hipalmus*, Bates, 1870, for the same insect.

10. *Pediris*, Mots., *longipes*, Mots. This I think must be *Nyctobates sulcigera*, Boisd. The only difficulty in the reconciliation of the two is in the fact that *Pediris* is placed in the section in which the mesosternum is excavated, a character not existing in *sulcigera*; but as *Iphthimus* is placed in the same section, and also wants this excavated mesosternum, perhaps it is altogether a mistake.

11. *Setenis*, Mots., for *N. valgus*, Wiedem. Two of the new species described in this genus are compared to "*Set. unicolor*, Hbst.," which is, I believe, an undescribed species; another, "*impressa*, Mots.," appears to be *impressa*, Fab.

12. *Rhophobas*, Mots., will stand as a good genus.

13. *Notiolesthus*, Mots., type *natalensis*, Mots., but including *Upis rotundicollis* (Esch.), Casteln. 1840 (Philippine Islands).

Notiolesthus morosus, Mots. 1873, is evidently *Nyct. rotundicollis*, Westw. 1842; and *morosus* will have to stand, on account of the earlier *rotundicollis*.

14. *Nuptis* and *Augolesthus* are at present unknown to me.

Above I have proposed the generic name *Taraxides* for *Nyct. sinuatus*, &c. This genus, with *Deriles* and *Amenophis*, is remarkable for the deeply excavated mesosternum, the sides of the excavation being angular in front.

The three may be distinguished as follows:—

- A. Four posterior tibiæ channelled nearly the whole length of their outer edge.
 - a. Antennæ with the joints slightly serrate from the fifth joint *Deriles*.
 - b. Antennæ with the joints broader and strongly serrate from the fourth joint *Amenophis*.
- B. Four posterior tibiæ cylindrical, not channelled .. *Taraxides*, n. g.

From a note just received from Prof. Westwood respecting some species of *Nyctobates* described by him, it is clear that *N. hypocrita*, *mærens*, and *punctatus* must be placed with *Taraxides*, and *N. lugens*, Mots., will sink as a synonym of *mærens*, W. *N. transversalis*, Westw., will belong to *Deriles*. *N. brevicornis*, W., remains unknown to me: it “has the hind tibiæ cylindrical, except at one third of distal end, which has a slight impression gradually widening to the tip; mesosternum with the hind half convex, but with a groove on each side; metasternum with a central impression, scarcely distinct in front, but deeper in its hind part.” It is evidently a *Setenis*.

XXVII.—*Description of a new Species of Chalinolobus from Australia.* By G. E. DOBSON, M.A., M.B., F.L.S., &c.

Chalinolobus signifer, sp. n.

Ears and nostrils as in *Chalinolobus tuberculatus*; but behind the nostrils on the face, between and slightly in front of the eyes, an erect transverse process (like the transverse nose-leaf in *Phyllorhina*, but smaller and not concave in front) is placed. This process commences on each side at a short distance from the eye; and its free upper margin is regularly convex.

Wings from the base of the toes; tail wholly contained within the interfemoral membrane; postcalcanal lobe well



Waterhouse, Charles Owen. 1876. "XXVI.—Notes on some heteromorous coleoptera belonging to the true Tenebrionidæ." *The Annals and magazine of natural history; zoology, botany, and geology* 17, 287–289.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/00222937608681951>.

View This Item Online: <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/item/63494>

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/00222937608681951>

Permalink: <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/partpdf/59564>

Holding Institution

University of Toronto - Gerstein Science Information Centre

Sponsored by

University of Toronto

Copyright & Reuse

Copyright Status: NOT_IN_COPYRIGHT

This document was created from content at the **Biodiversity Heritage Library**, the world's largest open access digital library for biodiversity literature and archives. Visit BHL at <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org>.