

3. *Pustulopora*, Blainville.

*Pustulopora*, Blainville (text), Man. d'Actin., p. 418, 1834; Milne-Edwards, Hagenow (*nec* Geinitz), Reuss, Michelin (?), Grube, Meneghini; Busk, Brit. Mus. Cat., pt. iii. p. 20, &c.; Macgilliv., Proc. R. Soc. Vict., December 1880, p. 6.

*Pustulipora*, Blainv. (index), Johnston, Gray, Sars, Joliet.

*Tubulipora* (pars), Couch.

*Entalophora* (pars), d'Orbigny (*nec* Lamouroux), Hincks, Brit. Mar. Polyz., p. 455; Smitt, Florid. Bryoz., vol. i. p. 11; Stoliczka, Waters, &c.

*Character*.—Zoarium erect, simple or branched, cylindrical; branches irregular, composed of tubular zoecia partially or wholly connate or immersed; opening on all sides of the branch, and disposed quincuncially or irregularly, sometimes in more or less annular or subspiral order.

Although most recent writers, including such high authorities as Professor Smitt and Mr. Hincks, have adopted the name *Entalophora* for the genus here intended, I am inclined, with the greatest deference, to prefer M. de Blainville's and M. Milne-Edwards' name, for the reason that the species named *Entalophora* by Lamouroux appears to me to differ in at least one most important respect, it may be said, from all the other known Cyclostomata, and most certainly from all with which I am acquainted, either recent or fossil, viz., in the appendages, as he terms them, being trumpet-shaped, or gradually increasing in diameter as they increase in length. Whether this arises from an error of observation on the part of Lamouroux or of his draughtsman, or is the true condition, may perhaps admit of doubt; with the exception of M. Michelin (Iconog., pl. lvi. fig. 4), whose figure very strongly resembles that of Lamouroux, no one seems to have recorded any other form with trumpet-shaped tubes, and as even his figure does not represent them as having that form, I am much inclined to assume that Lamouroux's specimen is unique in that respect, and if correctly figured and described, that it must on that account alone be referred to a distinct generic type from all other known Pustuloporidæ, and in fact, as above observed, from all other Cyclostomata. (May it not be a coralline?).

On the other hand, M. de Blainville's definition of *Pustulopora*, as distinguished from Lamouroux's *Entalophora*, is so clear and precise, and his genus has met with the acceptance of M. Milne-Edwards, Hagenow, Reuss, and numerous others, and in fact may be said, until quite recently, to have been in full possession of the field, that I feel no hesitation in retaining it for all forms with cylindrical tubes of the same diameter throughout; and in relegating those forms, if there really be any, with trumpet-shaped tubes, to at least a distinct genus.

With respect to the spelling of the name there can be no doubt that *Pustulopora* is the correct way, *Pustulipora* being apparently merely a printer's error in the index to the Manuel d'Actinologie. In the text (*loc. cit.*) M. de Blainville has it *Pustulopora*. Mr. Macgillivray has passed over a similar misprint (*loc. cit.*) the name being spelled *Pustulopera* in the text and *Pustulopora* in the description of the plates.