

which I propose the generic name of *Gnathaster*. I have also retained as genera several of the sections relegated by Perrier to subgeneric rank under *Pentagonaster*, viz., *Calliaster*, *Calliderma*, *Astrogonium*, *Stellaster*, and *Ogmaster* (= *Dorigona*). Though the characters upon which these genera are based exhibit many transitional stages, it appears to me too sweeping a measure to merge them in one generic term. That the differences should be slight and the cases of transition frequent in a large and widely distributed family such as the *Pentagonasteridæ* is not surprising. As, however, the morphological characters of the forms in question are in my opinion sufficient to warrant recognition, it seems to me that to lose the record of their significance by an unnecessary exercise of comprehensiveness would be a mistake.

*Astrogonium* and *Dorigona*, it should be mentioned, have recently been restored by Perrier<sup>1</sup> himself as generic names, but the sense in which they have been applied appears to me to be inadmissible, for reasons which I shall give in detail.

I have substituted the generic name *Ogmaster* for that of *Dorigona*. The starfish described by Gray<sup>2</sup> in 1866 under the name of *Dorigona reevesii* is the same species as that previously described by Müller and Troschel<sup>3</sup> in 1842 under the name of *Goniodiscus capella*. In 1865 von Martens<sup>4</sup> placed this form in a subgenus to which he gave the name *Ogmaster*, ranking it under *Goniaster*. The claim of this form to generic recognition has since been admitted, and it follows in my opinion that the name of the starfish in question should therefore be *Ogmaster capella* (M. & T.), von Martens. (Its synonyma are *Dorigona reevesii*, Gray, and *Goniaster mülleri*, Lütken; but not *Goniaster (Stellaster) mülleri* of von Martens.) The *Goniaster (Stellaster) mülleri* of von Martens is a true *Stellaster*, which is so nearly allied to *Stellaster childreni* that I am unable to distinguish it, and I am therefore constrained to consider *Goniaster mülleri* as a synonym of that species. Both Lütken and Perrier have been in error in regarding von Martens' form as identical with the species described by Gray as *Dorigona reevesii*.

A second form which has been referred to the genus *Dorigona* is the starfish described by Möbius<sup>5</sup> under the name of *Astrogonium longimanum*. This form is totally distinct from Gray's form, and merits, in my opinion, an independent generic recognition. I therefore propose for it the name of *Iconaster*. It is characterised by the naked abactinal plates margined by very remarkable valve-like plates, by the character of the adambulacral

<sup>1</sup> *Ann. Sci. Nat. (Zool.)*, 1885, t. xix., Art. No. 8, p. 30. I would here take the opportunity of mentioning that the sheets of this Report which treat of the *Porcellanasteridæ* and *Archasteridæ* were printed off before I had seen this last mentioned important memoir by Prof. Perrier, and I was consequently unable to refer to the species described therein, as I otherwise should have done.

<sup>2</sup> *Synop. Spec. Starfish Brit. Mus.*, London, 1866, p. 7, pl. 7, figs 3, 3a.

<sup>3</sup> *System der Astoriden*, 1842, p. 61.

<sup>4</sup> *Ueb. Ostasiat. Echin. Archiv f. Naturg.*, Jahrg. xxxi., Bd. i. p. 359.

<sup>5</sup> *Neue Seesterne des Hamburger und Kieler Museums*, 1859, p. 7, taf. i., figs. 5, 6. (*Abhandl. a. d. Gebiete Naturw. hrsg. v. d. naturwiss. Verein, Hamburg*, Bd. iv. Abth. 2, 1860.)