

Foot.—Anterior lobes large, broad in front, narrow and pointed behind, attached in nearly their whole length; posterior lobe short and pointed.

Gills.—Quite absent.

Proboscis short.

Buccal Appendages.—Two or three pairs of retractile, glandular and sensory cones, symmetrically inserted on the two sides of the buccal cavity.

Jaw.—Absent.

Radula always possessing in the adult a rather broad median tooth, without long projecting spines, and rather resembling that of *Halopsyche* than of any other Gymnosomatous Pteropod.

Hook-sacs of moderate size, with hooks of various lengths, so that when the sac is evaginated the extremities of all the hooks reach to about the same level.

The species of this family are generally described by zoologists under the name of *Clio*. But this name was established by Browne in 1756,¹ and preserved by Linné for a Thecosomatous Pteropod which most naturalists now name *Cleodora pyramidata*.

As the description of the genus *Cleodora* by Péron and Lesueur was only published in 1810,² the name *Clio*, on account of its priority, must be preserved instead of *Cleodora*, which is more generally used. O. F. Müller was therefore wrong when in 1776³ he applied the generic name *Clio* to a naked Pteropod, for this name was originally used for a Thecosomatous form, and those zoologists who have followed him to this day are equally in error.

The Gymnosomatous Pteropods that are generally described under the name of *Clio* must be placed in the genus *Clione* which Pallas established as far back as 1774⁴ for the type species, *Clione limacina* (his *Clione borealis*).

For the various Gymnosomata which certainly belong to the genus *Clione*, it was proposed to form new generic sections. Thus for some species whose buccal appendages were not described, Quoy and Gaimard in 1825 established⁵ the genus *Cliodita*, based upon inexact differential characters. But these naturalists recognised later that this group could not stand and they abandoned their genus altogether.⁶ It is therefore rather surprising to find that some more recent writers nevertheless preserve this genus.⁷

On the other hand, several zoologists, without giving new generic names, have shown

¹ The Civil and Natural History of Jamaica, p. 386.

² Histoire de la famille des Mollusques Ptéropodes, *Ann. Mus. Hist. Nat. Paris*, t. xv. p. 66.

³ Faunæ Danicæ prodromus, p. 226.

⁴ Spicilegia zoologica, fasc. x. p. 28.

⁵ Description de cinq genres de Mollusques, *Ann. d. Sci. Nat.*, sér. 1, t. vi. p. 74.

⁶ Voyage de découvertes de l'Astrolabe, Zoologie, t. ii. p. 371, 1832.

⁷ Gray, Catalogue of the Mollusca in the Collection of the British Museum, pt. ii., Pteropoda, p. 37; H. and A. Adams, The Genera of Recent Mollusca, vol. i. p. 62; Bronn, Die Klassen und Ordnungen des Thierreichs, Bd. iii, p. 645; Fischer, Manuel de Conchyliologie, p. 424.