

NOTE ON RHIPIDANDRI—A CORRECTION.¹BY E. A. SCHWARZ AND H. S. BARBER, *Bureau of Entomology.*

An injustice seems to have been done to Motschulsky's memory by the junior writer in his former notes on this group (Proc. Ent. Soc. Wash., 1913, vol. xv, p. 189), and by other writers also, owing, probably, to the similarity of the names *Xyloborus* and *Xyleborus*. Thus Gemminger and Harold 1872 (Cat., p. 2685), Hagedorn 1910 (Coleopt. Catal. Junk, Ipidæ, p. 101), Barber 1913 (Proc. Ent. Soc. Wash., xv, p. 189-190) and Kleime 1914 (Berl. Ent. Zeitsch., vol. 58, 1913, p. 160) have all been wrong in considering that he had described his species as a Scolytid, and in failing to recognize his generic name. The only writer who seems to have noticed the distinction seems to be Arrow 1904 (Ann. Mag. Nat. Hist. (7), vol. 14, p. 30-33) who for some reason did not make use of Motschulsky's generic name. It is also worthy of record in this connection that cotypes of some foreign species have been added to our National Collection. We append some omitted or subsequent bibliographical references for addition to the list of notices previously given.

The name *Xyloborus* appears among Heteromerous genera in the Dejean Catalogue (1833, p. 201, and 1837, p. 222) with an undescribed species from Buenos Ayres and is therefore a *nomen nudum*, but Motschulsky in 1858 described a related species, *crenipennis*, from Burma using the generic name of Dejean and referring to the South American species, thus validating the generic name, for which his species automatically becomes the type. That he was dealing with a Heteromerous instead of with a Scolytid genus is evident from the remarks following his specific diagnosis and which also mention some generic characters. Moreover the name *Xyleborus* was not used for the genus in the latter family until six years later. *Xyloborus* is thus an older name than any of the other generic names of the group, if *Eledona* be excluded, but it is necessary to examine the status of the genus in which the still older species (*ftabellicornis*) had been placed. Sturm, 1826, evidently intended to write *Xyletinus* instead of *Xylostinus* on page 59 of his Catalogue, for on page 206, and on plate 1, figure 7, the name is correctly spelled. This typographical error should not be perpetuated to supersede *Rhipidandrus* LeConte 1857. The type of *Xyletinus* Latr. 1890, cannot be *pectinatus* as stated by Westwood, for it is not one of the three originally included species. Two of the three are now listed in *Lasioderma* leaving only *bucephalus* Illiger as the logical type.

¹ Presented at meeting of June 4, 1914.

Cotypes and other specimens of some of the foreign species have been received recently by the National Museum from the British Museum, through the kindness of Mr. Arrow, and from Mr. H. Gebien and M. René Oberthür, as follows:

- Rhipidandrus mexicanus* Sharp cotype. Yzabel, Guatemala (Sallé).
Rhipidandrus sulcatus (Gorham) cotypes. St. Vincent, W. I. (H. H. Smith).
Eutomus cornutus (Arrow) cotypes. St. Vincent, W. I. (H. H. Smith).
Eutomus cornutus (Arrow). Guadeloupe, (one of Sallés specimens which were called by him *micrographus*).
Eutomus walkeri (Waterhouse). Matabello Isl. (A. R. Wallace).
Eutomus sp. (possibly ? *peruvianus* Cast.). Paraguay.
Xyloborus crenipennis Mots. Andamans (Roepstorff).
Xyloborus nudus (Gebien) cotypes. Banguay, B. Borneo.
Bolitolaemus fomiticola Geb. cotype. East Usambara, Deremas. (Eichelbaum).

Gen. nov.? *Brunnei* Borneo. Two damaged specimens of an inconspicuous form looking like a robust Cioid but having one of the mandibles bifid so as to receive the point of the other, and having 11-jointed antennæ with 5-jointed club preceded by 4 small joints, were sent by M. René Oberthür, but the material is insufficient for dissection and careful study. Superficially they appear to form an interesting connecting link between the Cioidæ and Rhipidandrini, which well deserves closer examination.

A number of references to members of this group have been omitted from the former chronological bibliography. The following may be added to the list:

1833. DEJEAN (Cat. Coleop., p. 201) lists *Xyloborus costatus* Dej. from Buenos Ayres, not far from *Elcdona* in the series he calls "Taxicornes" most of which are now included in the Tenebrionidæ. This species has never been described and the genus was invalid until used by Motschulsky in 1858. Among the Xylophages (Ipidæ) (l.c., p. 306) Dejean has placed *Eutomus micrographus* Lacordaire, which remained a *nomen nudum* until validated by Lacordaire in 1866.
1837. DEJEAN (Cat. Coleop., p. 222 and 306) same as in 1833.
1886. CHAMPION (Biol. Cent. Amer. Coleop., vol. iv, pt. 1, p. 223) excludes "*Eutomus* Lac. (*Rhipidandrus* Lec.)" from the Bolitophagides on account of the 4-jointed tarsi, and antennal structure.
1895. BLANDFORD (Biol. Centr.-Amer. Coleop., vol. iv, pt. 6, p. 118) refers to the exclusion of the Eutomides from the Scolytidæ and assignment to the vicinity of *Cis*.
1911. TREDL AND KLEINE (Übersicht über die Gesamtliteratur der Borkenkäfer, Beilage zu den Ent. Blättern, 7 Jrg., p. 45) wrongly include *Xyloborus crenipennis*, under the Scolytids described by Motschulsky.

1912. PIC (Coleop. Cat. Junk. Anobiidæ, p. 48) still includes *flabellicornis* Sturm as a valid species in *Xyletinus*.
1914. KLEINE (Berl. Ent. Zeits., 58, 1913, p. 160) lists *crenipennis* Mots., from the East Indies as a valid species in the Ipid genus *Xyleborus*.
1914. DURY (Journ. Cincinnati Soc. Nat. Hist., p. 165) describes *Rhipidandrus fulvomaculatus* n. sp., from Alabama and Florida, which is apparently a small species of *Eutomus*.
1914. DURY (Journ. N. Y. Ent. Soc., xxii, p. 173) defines the Cioidæ so as to exclude "the Rhipidandrinæ which form a tribe in the family Tenebrionidæ."
1914. LENG AND MUTCHLER (Bull. Am. Mus. Nat. Hist., xxxiii, pp. 461-462) cite the two West Indian species under three generic and four specific names under which they have been recorded by Sallé, Arrow and Gorham.
- (1914? Gebien in a letter mentions descriptions of new forms in this group that were to appear shortly in the Bulletin of the Sarawak Museum, but the writers have not yet seen this journal.)

The position of the Rhipidandri still appears very vague. Sharp was probably mistaken about the front tarsal joints, for the writers can find but four joints, as in the Cioidæ, in all tarsi of *Rh. flabellicornis*, *Eu. cornutus*, *peninsularis* and *fuscomaculatus*, while the tarsi of *Eledona* are typically heretomerous. The value of this character may have been overestimated. The antennæ do not differ essentially, and it is interesting to note that Sharp & Muir (Tr. Ent. Soc. Lond. 1912, p. 3, p. 618 and 619) have tentatively grouped a number of "Heteromerous" families with the Cioidæ in the superfamily *Cucujoidea*, but say the ædeagus in *Cis* is not similar to anything else. The Rhipidandri appear to be intermediate between *Eledona* and the Cioidæ in many of their characters and are probably worthy of family rank, but the undescribed genus from Borneo, above referred to, seems to link them more closely with the latter than does *Bolitolæmus* to *Eledona*. It is to be regretted that no larvæ of any member of this group are at hand. The only description of the immature form is by Friedenreich and has been abstracted by Arrow.

At the meeting of November 1, 1914 a special committee consisting of A. Busck, E. A. Schwarz and N. Banks presented the following which was ordered printed.

THEODORE N. GILL.

There is no need in this brief notice to attempt any eulogy of Dr. Gill. As one of the greatest naturalists of the age his accomplish-

ments and connection with various scientific societies are known to all throughout the world. We wish more especially to record his relations with our Society which date back more than twenty-five years, when upon invitation of a member he attended one of the meetings. He was so interested in the discussion, that in 1891 he became an active member, and thereafter the Society was highly honored by his regular attendance. He read but few formal papers before the Society, but very frequently took part in the discussions, and with his inexhaustible knowledge of taxonomy and comparative anatomy was able to present the broader view of many questions. His extemporaneous remarks were often so thorough and extensive as to constitute a general zoological review of the entire matter. Among the more important matters touched upon by Dr. Gill may be mentioned the following:

The Larva of Insects, An Intercalated Stage. Ent. Soc. Wash. Pro., vol. II, p. 304, 1892.

On a Remarkable New Family of Crabs from the Coast of Coromandel at a Depth of 150-200 Fathoms, Proposing new generic name *Retropluma* and the new family *Retroplumidae*. Ent. Soc. Pro., vol. III, p. 182, 1894.

Relative Value of Different Groups of Animals from the Faunistic Standpoint. Ent. Soc. Pro., vol. IV, p. 194, 1897.

On the Evolution of Genus Making. Ent. Soc. Pro., vol. IV, p. 345, 1898.

Note on Micropterous Island Insects. Ent. Soc. Pro., vol. IV, p. 488, 1898.

On the Fauna of Hawaii. Ent. Soc. Pro., vol. IV, p. 491, 1898.

On the Character of the Philippine Island Fauna. Ent. Soc., Pro. vol. VI, p. 174.

On Taxonomic Groups. Ent. Soc. Pro., vol. XIII, p. 181.

On Secondary Sexual Characters. Ent. Soc. Pro. vol. XIV, p. 204.

Dr. Gill's uniform kindness in aiding his fellow members not only in zoological but in linguistic and bibliographic matters will never be forgotten by the many of us who personally benefited thereby. No one will ever know how many generic and other names credited to various entomologists really originated with Dr. Gill.

Dr. Gill's genial presence added greatly to the scientific and social success of our meetings and the loss of our most notable member will be deeply felt by all of us.
