

Chitonellus lævis (?), Lamarck, Hist. Nat. Anim. s. Vert., 1819 (ed. 1), vol. vi. p. 317; Blainville, 1825 (*loc. cit.*), p. 603, pl. lxxxvii. fig. 5; Deshayes in Lamarck, 1836 (*loc. cit.*), p. 481; Reeve, Conch. Syst., 1842, pl. cxxxv. fig. 2 (not of Reeve, Conch. Icon., 1847, fig. 1, which is *Choneplax strigatus*, Sow.).

„ *fasciatus*, Reeve, Conch. Syst., 1842, vol. ii. pl. cxxxv. figs. 3, 4 (not fig. 5, which is *Chitonellus oculatus*).

„ „ Reeve, Conch. Icon., 1847, fig. 2 a, b.

Not *Chitonellus larvæformis*, Reeve, Conch. Icon., fig. 3, which is *Chitonellus burrowi*; Smith, Report Zool. Collect. of H.M.S. "Alert," 1884, p. 85.

Chitonellus fasciatus, Gould, U.S. Explor. Exped., 1852, vol. xii. p. 333; Atlas, pl. xxviii. figs. 429, 429a.

Chiton eruciformis, Sowerby, Genera Recent and Fossil Shells, 1820-1825, No. 12, pl. cxxxix. fig. 5.

Cryptoplax fasciata + larviformis, Adams, Genera of Recent Mollusca, 1858, vol. i. p. 484; vol. iii. pl. lv. figs. 6, 6a.

Habitat.—Kandavu, Fiji. Shallow water.

Tongatabu, Friendly Islands (Quoy and Gaimard); Dalaquete, Zebu, Philippines (Cuming).

There can be little doubt that *Chitonellus larvæformis*, Blainv., is the same species as *Chiton fasciatus*, Quoy and Gaim., which latter has been copied and redescribed by Lamarck, Reeve, Gould, and others. E. A. Smith has recently shown that the *Chitonellus larvæformis* of Reeve is not that species, but a new one which he named *Chitonellus burrowi*; Mrs Gray's figures of *Cryptoplax larviformis* (*sic*)¹ are copied from Blainville, and those of *Cryptoplax fasciatus*² from Quoy and Gaimard, and J. E. Gray himself³ referred to these as separate species. *Chitonellus lævis*, Lam., is believed by E. A. Smith to be this species. No mention is made of tufts of spines ("pores"). Blainville's figure in the "Manuel" of *Chitonellus larvæformis* is very rough, and there is no indication of the transverse bands on the girdle, but he figured the tufts, and being aware of their existence in one form, he might be expected to look out for them in the other, hence his silence on that point is worthy of note. Deshayes, in the second edition of Lamarck's work, admits Blainville's figure as a representation of *Chitonellus lævis*, and he ignores the pores. Whatever this species may prove to be, Reeve⁴ is clearly in error in referring *Chiton strigatus*, Sow., to it; in the Conch. Syst.⁵ he names Sowerby's species *Chitonellus strigatus*. Dall⁶ refers to this as the type species of the genus *Choneplax* of Carpenter. E. A. Smith is undoubtedly correct in regarding *Chiton eruciformis*, Sow., as a synonym of this species. Sowerby did not believe in the generic distinction of *Chitonellus* from *Chiton*, so he re-named what he believed to be *Chitonellus lævis*, Lam., as *Chiton eruciformis*, as, though he does not say so, the specific name was pre-occupied (*Chiton lævis*, Penn.). This figure of the detached valves is copied in Reeve's Conch. Syst., where it is referred back to *Chitonellus lævis*, Lam.

¹ Figures of Molluscous Animals, 1859, vol. ii. pl. clxxxix. figs. 4, 4a. ² *Ibid.*, figs. 5, 5a.

³ Guide to the Systematic Distribution of Moll. in the British Museum, 1857, p. 187.

⁴ Conch. Icon., fig. 1. ⁵ Pl. cxxxv. fig. 6. ⁶ Proc. U.S. Nat. Mus., 1881, p. 288.