

*Circe castrensis*, *Circe trimaculata*, and *Circe cerina*, will, I think, perceive the gradual transition of one form into the other, and will be convinced that neither *Lioconcha* nor *Gouldia* (as understood by Dall) should take generic if even subgeneric rank.

Mr. Dall states that "we do not know the animal of *Circe*." This is not correct, for Deshayes (Proc. Zool. Soc. Lond., 1853, p. 171) has examined the soft parts of several species belonging to the two principal groups of the genus "(*Circe scripta*, Linn., and *Circe testudinalis*, Chemn.)," and figures the animal of *Circe divaricata*. He observes that "ces animaux ne diffèrent en rien de celui des *Meretrix*" and "de cette identité, parfaitement constatée pour nous, entre les *Meretrix* et les *Circe*, nous concluons que ce dernier genre doit rentrer dans le premier à titre de simple division; en réunissant les espèces des deux groupes on voit s'établir entre elles une transition insensible dans la transformation de formes extérieures."

Römer, in his monograph of the genus *Venus*, regards *Lioconcha* as a "sectio" of *Cytherea*, which is termed by him merely a subgenus of *Venus*. *Circe* he also considers a section in the same way.

*Gouldia parva*, which I hold as the type of the genus, is considered by Dall to belong to *Eriphyla* of Gabb, which is stated by Dall to be a subgenus or section of *Crassatella*. This location of *Eriphyla* cannot, however, be correct, if Gabb's description is to be relied upon, for, besides an external ligament, that genus apparently has a different hinge, and according to Stoliczka partakes more of the general character of certain forms of Veneridæ. Dall says that *Gouldia parva* and the like "differ from the typical *Crassatella* chiefly in form, in the elongation and more distant location of the lateral teeth, the usually unequal valves, and in their uniformly small size." Now, of these points of distinction, I maintain that form and size are not generic or even subgeneric characters, the inequality of the valves I fail to discover in the series of specimens in the British Museum, and the difference mentioned in regard to the lateral teeth does not appear to me to exist. In *Crassatella kingicola*, which may be regarded as a typical species, I find the posterior lateral teeth and those less pronounced on the anterior side, extending from the upper end of the muscular impressions towards the umbones. This too is constant in all the other species of the genus which I have examined, including that under discussion, *Crassatella parva* of C. B. Adams. To show the absolute agreement of this form with *Crassatella* I would point out two minor features which I believe have not as yet been referred to, namely, the coarsely striated character of the cardinal teeth and the presence of a small deep distinct pedal muscular scar just above the anterior adductor impression.

A summary of the whole discussion and difference of opinion may be given in a few words.

I regard *Gouldia parva* as the typical species; Dall holds to *Gouldia cerina*. I