

recognition, either through the inadequacy of the descriptions or the rough inaccurate character of the figures which are supposed to represent them. Of the first four species described, *Pterotrachea coronata*, *Pterotrachea pulmonata*, *Pterotrachea aculeata*, and *Pterotrachea hyalina* of Forskål, only the first has since been recognised. Even the figure of that species is extremely crude and fanciful. Nothing is known of the three others beyond the information given by Forskål, and since this is so incomplete and the figures so bad, I think it would certainly be advisable to reject these so-called species as beyond recognition.

The next to describe some species belonging to this genus was Lesueur, who in 1817 published short diagnoses and figures of six so-called new species, which he separated on account of the presence or absence of a fin-sucker, the want or possession of the caudal appendage, and the number of "gelatinous points" or denticles in front of the eyes. The stability of these species has been doubted by d'Orbigny and others, and it seems to me probable that in three or four instances only varieties or different sexes of the same species are depicted. Quoy and Gaimard and Risso have also described and figured species which probably will never be recognised, and of several other forms nothing is known except the original figures and descriptions, some of which evidently are inaccurate and incomplete. Still, as it is impossible to relegate them with absolute certainty as synonyms of well-recognised forms, I think it best to let them stand as separate species until it can be shown beyond a doubt what their true position is. It is dangerous to deny or doubt the existence or value of a species because we do not happen to have had the opportunity of examining or possessing an example. Although we may feel most confident that a certain so-called new species is either identical or merely a variety of some well-established form, still we are not warranted in "sinking" an author's species (as is often done by certain writers) upon mere suspicion. It is an injustice, and creates endless confusion in the nomenclature.

In the following list the species are not arranged in the order of their apparent affinity, but merely according to priority of date of publication :—

Pterotrachea coronata, Forskål.

- | | | |
|-------|--------------------------------|--|
| 1775. | <i>Pterotrachea coronata</i> , | Forskål, Descript. Anim., p. 117. |
| 1776. | „ | „ <i>id.</i> , Icones, p. 10; pl. xxxiv. fig. A. |
| 1789. | „ | „ Gmelin, Syst. Nat., p. 3137. |
| 1791. | „ | „ Bruguière, Ency. Méth., pl. lxxxviii. fig. 1 (copy of Forskål). |
| 1801. | „ | „ Lamarck, Syst. Anim., p. 61. |
| 1805. | „ | „ Roissy, Hist. Nat. (Suite à Buffon), vol. v. p. 79. |
| 1822. | „ | „ Lamarck, Anim. sans Vert., vol. vii. p. 676; ed. 2, vol. xi. p. 383. |
| 1826. | „ | „ Risso, Hist. nat. Europ., vol. iv. p. 28. |
| 1829. | „ | „ Chiaje, Mem. Stor. Anim. senza Vert., vol. iv. pp. 182, 197. |
| 1830. | „ | „ Bosc, Hist. nat., vers. ed. 2, vol. i. p. 64. |