

- Patella tramoserica*, Lamarck, Anim. s. vert. (ed. Desh.), vol. vii. p. 542, sp. 47.
 " " Reeve, Conch. Icon., vol. viii. pl. xiii. fig. 27.
 " " Angas, Proc. Zool. Soc. Lond., 1867, p. 221, No. 222.

May 1874. Port Jackson, Sydney. 6 to 7 fathoms.

Habitat.—Australia, Port Jackson, Sydney (British Museum, Angas).

2. *Acmæa*, Eschscholtz, 1830.

Species.

1. *Acmæa dorsuosa* (Gould).
2. *Acmæa saccharina* (Linne).
3. *Acmæa virginea* (Müller).

In regard to the name of this genus, the evidence adduced by Mr Dall is on the whole in favour of *Acmæa*, Esch., as against *Tectura*, Audouin and Milne-Edwards. The difficulty, however, of deciding between these two names and the want of agreement still prevailing may justify my restating the case in so far as I have personally ascertained the facts.

No discussion need, I think, be raised regarding the mere words *Acmæa* or *Tectura*, nor regarding the diagnosis of the genera supplied by their respective authors. *Acmæa* is an adjective, but Linné's law says merely, "Nomina generica adjectiva substantivis pejora sunt adeoque non optima." *Acmæa* (*sic*) had been previously proposed by Hartmann in 1821 for the genus now known by Risso's later name of *Truncatella*, but was abandoned by its own author in that very year, and may the more freely be set aside, since the same author's genus *Acme*, also proposed in 1821, has been accepted for a well-known land mollusc. That Eschscholtz in his later diagnosis erroneously puts the branchial cavity on the left instead of the right of the animal is obviously a mere slip of the pen. And, finally, if he did not single out one species in particular as a type of the genus he mentions, what for his purpose was still better, and is true, namely, that all the species of supposed *Patellas* found on the north-west coast of America belong to the genus *Acmæa*.

On the other hand, "Tecture" is the Gallicised form which French writers always used for Latin names, and the characteristic feature of the genus is distinctly stated by Audouin and Milne-Edwards, and *Tectura virginea*, Müll., though not named, is plainly referred to as their type species. Further, these authors (men of experience in such matters) certainly believed they had sufficiently determined their genus, for in their finished work (*Animaux s. vert. des Côtes de la France*, 2 vols. 8vo, Paris, 1832, see vol. i. p. 144, note), from which their memoir to the Academy was an extract, they say, referring to their observations on *Tectura*: "Nous avons pris date pour ce fait . . . dans le résumé des nouveaux recherches sur l'histoire naturelle des côtes de la Manche que nous avons présenté à l'Académie des Sciences dans la séance du 26 Oct. 1829."

I have referred to these points because weight has been laid on them by the advocates of one or other name. But putting aside all these initial questions, we have simply to ask which name, *Acmæa* or *Tectura*, has priority of publication. Now as regards that question, had the British Association accepted the date at which a paper was openly read to a society as the date of publication, no difficulty would have existed, but as the matter stands certainty is impossible. Audouin and