

In the Ann. Entom. Soc., France, for 1864, Lucas described, on page 206, a curious mite from Algeria and Tunis. He called it *Rhyncholophus (?) plumipes*. It differed from the ordinary species of this genus in a number of minor characters, but was chiefly remarkable in having on the hind tarsi a dense plume of long hair. Frauenfeld, in the Zool-bot. Ges. Wien., XVIII., p. 892, records having received specimens from Spain and Corfu, which he considers this species. He does not give any description of his forms, so it is not possible to tell whether they were the same species or not. Then, Haller, in his paper—Beit. zur Kenntniss der schweizerischen Milbenfauna—gave a figure and description of a mite, which he considered Lucas's species, from specimens collected in Switzerland. There are, however, numerous differences between his form and that described by Lucas, so there is no doubt that the Swiss species is new. In 1893, Birula, in Horæ Soc. Entom. Ross, p. 388, under the heading of "*Rhyncholophus (Macropus) plumifer*," describes an allied mite. He gives no reference to Lucas, and probably did not know of *R. plumipes*. The subgeneric name, *Macropus*, is not mentioned in the text of the article. His species came from Russian Armenia. C. F. George, in Science Gossip, Vol. III., p. 150 (1896), records *R. plumipes* from the Isle of Jersey; it is not certain that it is the species of Lucas. Now, in 1897, Cambridge, in the Proc. Zool. Soc., London, p. 939, gives the description and figure of a new genus and species of mite from Algeria—*Eatonia scopulifera*. He refers to Birula's paper, but not to that of Lucas or Haller. A glance at his figures and description shows that it is the same as *Rhyncholophus plumipes*, without the shadow of a doubt.

Now the question arises, "What is the name of this mite?" All of these mites have the same peculiar structure of the hind tarsi, and undoubtedly form a natural group of generic rank. The first name proposed, *Macropus*, by Birula (which is not mentioned by Cambridge) has been used several times in Zoology, and so is not available. *Eatonia* has been used at least twice before, and also becomes inapplicable. It is therefore necessary to create a new name for the genus. I propose *Lucasiella*.

As to the species, Cambridge's species is the same as that of Lucas. Haller's form is not the same, and may be called *L. Halleri*. Birula's species is a good one, so that there are at least three species of this genus in the Mediterranean region, which may be tabulated as below :