

<i>Atlanta rangii</i> , d'Orbigny (?), .	}	= <i>Atlanta lesueurii</i> , d'Orbigny.
<i>Spirialis ventricosa</i> , Eydoux and Souleyet,		
<i>Spirialis rostralis</i> , Eydoux and Souleyet,	}	= <i>Atlanta inflata</i> , d'Orbigny.
<i>Protomedea elata</i> , O. G. Costa, .		
<i>Limacina scaphoidea</i> , Gould, . . .		
<i>Peracle physoides</i> , Forbes, . . .	}	= <i>Atlanta reticulata</i> , d'Orbigny.
<i>Spirialis clathrata</i> , Eydoux and Souleyet,		
<i>Spirialis recurvirostra</i> , A. Costa, . . .		

To these known species I can also add a new form included in the Challenger collection, which may without hesitation be referred to Group II. of undoubted Limacinidæ. Another form, which cannot be identified with any of those hitherto known, seemed at first to be referable to Group III. above, but subsequent examination has shown that it must rather be placed in Group I. along with another species of the same nature.

How are these different species to be distributed throughout the family? Or, in other words, how many distinct genera can be distinguished.

The question is indeed a most difficult one, and there are almost as many opinions on the subject as there are investigators of the group. Very few of the expressed opinions, however, claim much serious attention, for there has hardly been any previous attempt to make a systematic synthesis of the family Limacinidæ.

If we turn to the table of genera (p. 8) we see that twelve generic titles have been invented for living Thecosomata with spiral twisting, that is to say, just the same number of genera as there are certainly admissible species. I append the titles in chronological order:—

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1. <i>Limacina</i> , Cuvier, 1817.               | 7. <i>Peracle</i> , Forbes, 1844.           |
| 2. <i>Heterofusus</i> , Fleming, 1823.           | 8. <i>Scæa</i> , Philippi, 1844.            |
| 3. <i>Spiratella</i> , de Blainville, 1824.      | 9. <i>Campylonaus</i> , Gray, 1847.         |
| 4. <i>Heliconoides</i> , d'Orbigny, 1836.        | 10. <i>Euromus</i> , A. and H. Adams, 1858. |
| 5. <i>Spirialis</i> , Eydoux and Souleyet, 1840. | 11. <i>Protomedea</i> , O. G. Costa, 1861.  |
| 6. <i>Helicophora</i> , Gray, 1842.              | 12. <i>Embolus</i> , Jeffreys, 1869.        |

What increases the confusion resulting from this superfluity of generic nomenclature in a group with so few forms, is the fact that several of these names have been used in different ways by different authors. Hence a complex and contradictory set of synonyms.