

Quoy and Gaimard (*loc. cit.* p. 409) state: "Il est probable que neuf spiracules accompagnent les valves de chaque côté; mais nous n'avons jamais pu en voir cinq." As they were on their guard we must admit their statement as being beyond doubt; of course they figure only five.

In one of the specimens collected by the Expedition, the anterior five pairs of tufts are readily seen, as is also the sixth tuft on the right side, but that on the left side is not visible, nor the seventh or eighth pairs. Their apparent absence may, however, be possibly accounted for by the fact that the skin is much wrinkled in the places where they might be expected to occur; but this does not apply to the interspace between the last two valves, which is quite smooth and yet exhibits no trace of a tuft.

Deshayes (*loc. cit.* Lamarck, ed. 2, p. 482) says of *Chiton fasciatus*, Quoy and Gaim., "Sur l'extrémité antérieure on remarque de chaque côté cinq ocelles d'un brun assez foncé."

Reeve figures the pores,¹ but in the otherwise much better figure of the same species (*Chiton fasciatus*) in the *Conch. Icon.*, fig. 2b, they are omitted, as is also the case in fig. 2a, and no mention is made of them in the text. The normal number of pores is present in the British Museum specimens, hence Reeve's silence on this point can only be attributed to carelessness.

Gould refers his specimen to *Chiton fasciatus*, Quoy and Gaim. He is probably correct in his identification, but his account is imperfect and does not correspond with the figures. He makes no mention of pores.

The brothers Adams² define the genus *Cryptoplax* as having the "mantle spinulose, encircled with a series of setigerous pores." They include *Cryptoplax striatus* and *Cryptoplax oculatus* and others in the same genus, although pores have not heretofore been shown to occur in the former. They give a fair figure of *Cryptoplax fasciatus*, with the nine lateral pores and a supernumerary one in front.

In most cases the silence of authors concerning the presence or absence of pores or tufts is not to be taken as an argument for their absence, as they are always small and are often scarcely, if at all, visible in old and rubbed, dry specimens.

The only conclusion at which we can arrive at in this species is that normally nine pairs of tufts are present, but that in some specimens more or fewer of the posterior pairs may be absent. This further leads us to the supposition that they may be entirely absent, although we have at the present time no direct evidence in support of the last alternative.

Cryptoplax striatus (Lamarck) (Pl. I. fig. 9, Pl. III. figs. 9a-9m).

Chitonellus striatus, Lamarck, *Hist. Nat. Anim. s. vert.* (ed. 1), 1819, vol. vi. p. 317, and (ed. Deshayes) 1836, vol. vii. p. 481.

„ „ Sowerby, *Genera of Shells*, 1820-1825, No. 12, pl. cxxxix. fig. 4.

¹ *Conch. Syst.*, vol. ii. pl. cxxxv. fig. 4.

² *Genera of Recent Mollusca.*