

Family BRISINGIDÆ, Sars, 1875.

The family Brisingidæ was established by G. O. Sars¹ for the reception of the single genus *Brisinga*, of which at that time two species only were known, *Brisinga endecacemos* of Asbjørnsen and *Brisinga coronata* of Sars. In 1878, Viguier² included in the same family the genera *Labidiaster* and *Pedicellaster*. In 1883, De Loriol³ added the genus *Brisingaster*. In 1884, Perrier⁴ added the genus *Hymenodiscus*, but removed *Pedicellaster* to an independent family. In the following year Perrier⁵ also added the genera *Freyella* and *Odinia*, which may to a certain extent be considered as dismembersments of *Brisinga*, since species of both genera had primarily been described as *Brisinga*. Perrier further added at the same time the new genus *Coronaster*, and replaced the genus *Pedicellaster* in the family Brisingidæ. With this latter step I am unable to agree. In 1884, Studer⁶ added the new genus *Gymnobrisinga*, and confirmed on anatomical grounds the classification of *Labidiaster* with the Brisingidæ, but expressed a doubt, modified however by the subsequent discovery of an eight-rayed form from South Georgia, as to the correctness of placing *Pedicellaster* in the same family.

As to whether the differences between *Hymenodiscus* and *Gymnobrisinga* are of generic value, and as to whether these forms are generically distinct from *Brisinga*, I am unable to express an opinion, as I have not seen examples of either of the forms. The descriptions alone are insufficient to settle the question, and lead to the inference that the alliance of the forms mentioned is of the closest description and that all are perhaps congeneric.

I am also in doubt as to whether *Brisingaster* can justly be separated from *Brisinga*. From the admirable description and figures given by M. de Loriol, as well as from the examination of a dried specimen, I am inclined to think that the differences are not sufficient to warrant the establishment of an independent genus, but I have refrained from directly placing *Brisingaster* as a synonym of *Brisinga*, as I have not had the opportunity of examining alcoholic examples of the well-defined Mauritius species.

So far as I can judge from the description alone I am unable to recognise in *Coronaster* a member of the family Brisingidæ. I venture to think that the genus in question will prove to be much more nearly related to the Asteriidæ.

On the grounds above stated I have not included the four genera, *Brisingaster*, *Gymnobrisinga*, *Hymenodiscus*, and *Coronaster*, in the subjoined synopsis of the genera constituting the family Brisingidæ.

¹ On some remarkable forms of animal life from the great depths off the Norwegian coast. Part II. University Program, Christiania, 1875, pp. 100, 101.

² *Archives de Zool. expér.*, 1878, t. vii. pp. 93, 119.

³ *Mém. Soc. Phys. et Hist. Nat. Genève*, 1883, t. xxviii. No. 8, p. 55.

⁴ *Nouv. Archives Mus. Hist. Nat.*, 2e Série, 1884, t. vi. pp. 166, 189.

⁵ *Ann. Sci. Nat. (Zool.)*, 1885, t. xix. Art. No. 8, pp. 5, 9.

⁶ *Anhang z. d. Abhandl. d. k. preuss. Akad. d. Wiss. Berlin*, vom Jahre 1884, p. 13.