

as is referred to by Dr Hector in his paper, read in November 1872, as having been captured in Port Cooper, and the skeleton of which was being prepared for the Canterbury Museum. Dr von Haast named the animal *Epiodon (Ziphius) novæ-zealandiæ*. In an appendix to his paper he applied the same name to another skull, also of an adult female stranded in July 1873 in Akaroa Harbour. Von Haast considers that these animals are closely allied, if not belonging, to the same species as *Epiodon chathamensis*, but as there are some minor differences between them, of which he more especially refers to the form of the teeth, he prefers to apply a different specific name to these animals.

Professor Flower, at the same meeting of the Zoological Society,¹ in commenting on Dr von Haast's paper, stated that he saw no good grounds for distinction between *Ziphius novæ-zealandiæ* and *Ziphius chathamensis*, and that, indeed, von Haast's two animals differed more from each other than either of them did from *Ziphius chathamensis*. Further, that the photographs sent by Dr von Haast, when compared with the skull at the British Museum which Dr Gray had named *Petrorhynchus capensis*, did not show any greater differences than are consistent with the range of individual variation, and that no proof had yet been given that any clearly defined specific difference existed between *Petrorhynchus capensis*, *Ziphius australis*, and *Ziphius cavirostris*.

Dr Hector, in a second memoir in the Transactions of the New Zealand Institute (vol. x. p. 342, 1878), states that the specific distinction made by von Haast between the Chatham Island and New Zealand specimens is founded on little more than the form of the teeth, which in the specimen in the Canterbury Museum had become absorbed, only the fangs being left, whilst in the specimen from the Chatham Islands the teeth were still large and serviceable. He does not recognise, therefore, any specific difference between the animal he had originally described and those named by von Haast *Ziphius novæ-zealandiæ*. But Dr Hector goes still further, and, influenced evidently by the facts and arguments advanced in my memoir on *Ziphius cavirostris*, to which he makes special reference in his paper, now regards his *Epiodon (Ziphius) chathamensis* as the same species as the *Ziphius cavirostris* of Cuvier; a conclusion which coincides entirely with that which I had arrived at from a comparison of the skulls of these animals. M. Van Beneden in a recent paper On the Geographical Distribution of the Cetodonts² reviews the whole of the evidence up to that time advanced on this subject. He now regards not only his *Ziphius indicus* but the specimens from the Cape, and that described by Dr Burmeister from near Buenos Ayres, as the same as the *Ziphius cavirostris*, so that he supports the opinion I had expressed in my original memoir, that the exotic as well as the European crania, which have up to this time been described, are all examples of one species—the *Ziphius cavirostris* of Cuvier. The present state of our knowledge of this cetacean strengthens, therefore, the statement which I had made in that memoir that the geographical range of the *Ziphius cavirostris* equals that possessed by the spermaceti whale.

¹ Proceedings, 1876, vol. xlv. p. 477.

² Bulletin de l'Académie royale de Belgique, April 1878, vol. xlv. No. 4.