

from the information which is available at present, and which may be tabulated thus :—

	Length of jaws.	Length of body.	Proportion.
In the smallest specimen, . . . .	13½ lines.	36 lines.	nearly 1 : 3.
In Johnson's specimen, . . . .	2½ inches.	8½ inches.	nearly 1 : 3½.
In Mitchill's specimen, . . . .	3 inches.	14 inches.	nearly 1 : 5.
In Harwood's specimen, <sup>1</sup> . . . .	...	20 inches.	about 1 : 7.

3. Mitchill describes the white lines along the dorsal and anal fins, whilst Harwood says nothing about them. Johnson's specimen, which without any doubt is identical with Harwood's fish, has the dorsal lines very distinct, and traces of the anal lines barely visible; it, therefore, agrees in this singular point with Mitchill's fish.

4. The length of the tail would be naturally subject to great variation, its posterior portion being as delicate as the most slender fin-filament; and specimens in which this part is mutilated must be as common as those in which it is intact; probably it is readily reproduced. For this reason I cannot attach any weight to the various statements with regard to the extent to which the dorsal and anal fins are continued towards the extremity of the tail. The longest and perhaps the most perfect tail was observed in Mitchill's specimen, in which it was four times the length of the body, with the dorsal and anal fins continued to its extremity. In the three other specimens the tail is respectively only one and a half times, two and a half times, and thrice as long as the body, and every trace of the dorsal and anal is lost at a greater or lesser distance from its extremity.

5. Mr. Johnson lays particular stress upon a series of free filaments apparently starting from the skin of the back, and described by Mitchill as accompanying the dorsal fin for a considerable distance; they were about one inch in length and some fifty in number. These filaments are certainly not to be seen in the Madeiran fish, but<sup>6</sup> were present in Harwood's specimen, as he mentions them, and some are clearly shown in his figure. As Mr. Johnson nevertheless justly considers his fish to be identical with Harwood's, he should not have relied upon this character as indicating the specific distinctness of his and Mitchill's specimens.

6. All four specimens agree in the dorsal fin commencing at a considerable distance behind the head, and at a short distance in front of the vent.

These considerations led me some twenty-four years ago to the conclusion that there is no sufficient evidence of these specimens being representatives of distinct species; and as no fresh light has been thrown upon this question by the recent discoveries of either the French or the North American surveying vessels, I see no reason to abandon the view then expressed.

<sup>1</sup> Harwood does not give the measurements; the proportion has been ascertained from the figure, allowing for the foreshortening of the curved jaws.