

accurately corresponds with specimen C. in the above tables. I have no hesitation in identifying *Chiton granulatus*, Gmel., with the *Acanthopleura* which appears to be so common at the Barbadoes (A. and B., *ante*); and it is equally probable that *Chiton piceus*, Gmel., is identical with my specimen C. I feel some hesitation in retaining that name for it; as, judging from its geographical distribution, Gmelin's form would include two distinct species. Blainville, however (Dict. des Sci. Nat., vol. xxxvi.), gives only the American locality, and, as has been above noted, the Red Sea species differs from any West Indian form.

Blainville¹ gives Gmelin's two species, and describes on p. 544 a new species, *Chiton convexus*, which is of very doubtful value.

Sowerby gives the following synonymy for *Chiton piceus* in the Conch. Illust., p. 1:—“*Chiton convexus*, *Chiton granulatus*, *Chiton gemmatus*, *Chiton tuberculatus*, *Chiton unguiculatus*, *Chiton zonatus* (auctorum);” these are all Blainville's species (*loc. cit.*). Reeve² follows Sowerby in the synonymy, but it is not clear what species he intends, as in the Conchologia Iconica³ *Acanthopleura spiniger* is referred to as *Chiton piceus*. Gray⁴ refers to this species as “*Maugeria picea*, West Indies.”

Reeve describes *Acanthopleura occidentalis* from the West Indies,⁵ which is probably one of these two forms.

Acanthopleura spiniger and its varieties can now be distinguished from the other species without much difficulty.

The posterior valves alone separate *Acanthopleura incana* from all the preceding. The Japanese and Australian specimens of this form appear to have well-marked differences. It can only be decided after an examination of a greater number of specimens than I have studied, and of examples from intermediate localities, whether these distinctions are to be considered as specific or varietal. In the former case Gould's name must be retained for the Australian form,—he describes the interior of the shell as being “red and violet, somewhat iridescent,” and certainly the madder-brown and pinkish colour of my specimens offers a marked contrast to the uniform black or blackish brown of the Japanese specimens. The laminae of insertion are relatively smaller in the Australian form, and the sculpture of the shell appears to differ slightly, but my specimens are considerably eroded.

Except for the colour of the under surface, the posterior valve of *Acanthopleura incana* very closely resembles that of *Euplaciophora petholata*, Sow., also from South Australia. There may be some connection between the two forms, but the character of the insertion plates and the nature of the girdle sufficiently separate the two genera. It should not be forgotten that Carpenter divides the whole group of Chitons into Regular and Irregular, basing his classification upon the dissimilarity between the anterior and

¹ Dict. des Sci. Nat., 1825, vol. xxxvi. p. 545.

² Conch. Syst., 1842, p. 11.

³ 1847, pl. xiii. fig. 70.

⁴ Guide Moll., 1857, p. 184.

⁵ Conch. Icon., 1847, pl. xix. fig. 76.