funde punctato), femoribus versus apicem, tibiis, tarsisque plus minus cinereo indutis.
Long. corp. lin. 5-6.

Calandra striata, Petit, in litt.

— —, in Dej. Cat. (edit. 3) 329 (1837).

Sphenophorus striatus, Fahræus, in Schönh. Curc. viii. 251 (1845).

Hab. in Brasilia, Madera, India orientali, et (nisi fallor) Japonia et Tasmania; truncos *Musæ* destruens.

The larva of this weevil is a thick fleshy grub, ovate or fusiform in outline, without legs, and of a dirty white, though with an obscure darker line (obsolete in parts) down the dorsal region. Its head is shining, of a pale reddish brown, and studded with a few erect hairs; and there are also a few erect hairs towards the anal extremity.

Teignmouth, Sept. 17, 1877.

XLIV.—*Remarks on Prof. E. Haeckel's Observations on Wyvillethomsonia Wallichii and Squamulina scopula.* By H. J. CARTER, F.R.S. &c.

I HAVE just received the first number of the 'Jenaische Zeitschrift für Naturwissenschaft,' published on the 20th March last; and in this I find that Prof. E. Haeckel has identified his *Haliphysema echinoides* (p. 16, Taf. ii. f. 127) with Dr. Perceval Wright's *Wyvillethomsonia Wallichii* (Quart. Journ. Micr. Sci. 1870, vol. x. p. 7, pl. ii.); also that he has identified his *Gastrophysema scopula* (p. 24) with my *Squamulina scopula* ('Annals,' 1870, vol. v. p. 309, pl. iv. figs. 1-3).

Now, as I had already identified *Wyvillethomsonia Wallichii*=*Dorvillia agariciformis*, Kent, = *Tisiphonia agariciformis*, Sir Wyville Thomson, with one of the sponges dredged up on board H.M.S. 'Porcupine' in the Atlantic Ocean ('Annals,' 1876, vol. xviii. p. 471), unmistakably, and have stated with respect to its plentifulness (p. 405) that "there is hardly a specimen [of *Tethya cranium*] among the sponges dredged up by the 'Porcupine' which has not one or more in various degrees of development adhering to it (the same might be said, almost, of *Tisiphonia agariciformis*),"—I must protest against this ignorance!

Further, as regards *Squamulina scopula*, I have found the original specimen, called by the late Dr. Bowerbank "*Haliphysema Tumanowiczii*," and given to him by Mr. Tuma-

nowicz, among the former's collections now in the possession of the British Museum; and the two are identical; so that here, again, I must "protest" against Prof. Haeckel's unjustifiable contradiction!

In October 1870 ('Annals,' vol. vi. p. 346) I published a "Note on the Branched Variety of *Squamulina scopula*," wherein it is stated that I was in a position "to afford positive evidence, from my own observation," of the foraminiferous nature of *Squamulina scopula* and its variety *ramulosa*. This "positive evidence" was deduced from the pseudopodous extension of the sarcode being exactly like that represented by Max Schultze in his memorable illustrations ('Ueber den Organismus der Polythalamien,' "Foraminiferen," Taf. 2-4, 1854), in addition to what I had before published respecting the test &c. of *Squamulina scopula*.

Again, in my paper on the "Polytremata" ('Ann.' March 1876, vol. xvii. p. 202), just a year before the number of the 'Jenaische Zeitschrift' to which I have alluded was published!) is the following passage:—

"The internal sarcodic contents [of *Squamulina scopula*] and the peculiar form presented by the extended pseudopodia during active life being identical with that of a foraminiferous animal." Now Haeckel regards it as a 'polyp' which he names '*Gastrophysema*.' It is useless to criticize such vacillation.

The "peculiar form presented by the extended pseudopodia" was that to which I have alluded; and this is so totally different from the tentacles of a polyp, while it is so preeminently characteristic of the Foraminifera, that the merest tyro in such matters ought to be able to distinguish between the two—so much so, indeed, that were the characteristic form of the test absent, that of the pseudopodia when extended in active life is almost sufficient to indicate the kind of animal.

With Prof. Haeckel all this goes for nothing, apparently, as in a footnote to p. 5, I am held up to derision in the following terms:—"Wie ausserordentlich willkürlich, unlogisch und kritiklos Carter in seinen Arbeiten verfährt, habe ich schon in meiner Monographie der Kalkschwämme gezeigt,"—having previously noticed that my *Diffugia bipes*, which I have described in the same paper with *Squamulina scopula* (pl. v. figs. 7-9), is a *Cyphoderia*, not from the form of the pseudopodia, but from the structure of the test, thus placing the structure of the latter before the form of the living animal, which, in *Diffugia bipes*, is as characteristic of a *Diffugia* as that of *Cyphoderia* is allied to *Gromia* (see Max Schultze's excellent representations, *op. cit.* Taf. 1).

Again, Prof. Haeckel's illustrations of his genera *Haliphynema* and *Gastrophysema* (*op. cit. l. c.*) appear to me to be more fitted for a "caravan" at a fair than for scientific purposes. And when we come to the latter genus (p. 24, Taf. iv.-vi.), with which my *Squamulina scopula* is identified, we find that the cavity of the body does *not* extend to the discoid foot (the pseudopolythalamous nature of which tubulated into the body of the erect portion is the most striking feature of its foraminiferous nature), but is altogether absent.

What are we to say of this? Are we to infer that it has been omitted by mistake, or are we here to apply my words, which Prof. Haeckel (at p. 6) has also held up to derision, viz.:—"Mental operations are seldom so correct as visual ones"?—words which I applied to one who had mistaken the polyps on the cord of *Hyalonema Sieboldii* for the "oscula" of this sponge; or are we to say, as a German naturalist wrote to me in a similar case, "One knows not ("ob man darüber lachen oder sich ärgern soll") whether one ought to laugh or to be angry."

Such a course may suit Prof. Haeckel for his "*Gastræa-Theorie*," but not those who want to possess an accurate knowledge of species, which, I presume, would be the test of a candidate's knowledge under examination, before that of the *Gastræa*-theory!

It may do very well for Prof. Haeckel to puff off his "*Gastræa-Theorie*" at another's expense, with a "flourish of trumpets" and huge caravan-like diagrams (not a bit less frequent in this country than in Germany); but it does not make me the less regret that any part of the 'Challenger' collections should have ever been placed in his hands for description and illustration.

XLV.—*Descriptions of Ceylon Lepidoptera.*

By F. MOORE, F.Z.S.

RHOPALOCERA.

Fam. Nymphalidæ.

Neptis disrupta.

Female. Upperside black: fore wing with whitish discoidal streak and triangular terminal spot; three spots from middle of hind margin and a fourth smaller spot beyond the trian-