

was the first¹ to note the affinities of "*Cleodora curvata*," Souleyet, to this group, but he did not detect what these four forms really represented, and regarded "*Pleuropus*" as a group within the genus *Clio*.

The adults of most of the species of *Pleuropus* are known. As to the others, it is possible to predict, from some of their features, what forms they will probably turn out to be when arrived at sexual maturity. The designation *Pleuropus* is therefore to be abandoned.

III. *Diacria* is a characteristic conchological genus. Gray erected it for the reception of *Cavolinia trispinosa* and two young stages of typical *Cavolinia* forms (group B of Boas), viz., *Hyalæa depressa*, d'Orbigny, and *Hyalæa lævigata*, d'Orbigny, which it would have been more natural to place beside *Pleuropus*. He leaves in the genus *Cavolinia*, *Cavolinia quadridentata*, though it is in all respects the neighbour of *Cavolinia trispinosa*. And, further, he places the same species (*Cavolinia orbigny*, Rang, fossil) both in the genus *Diacria* and in the genus *Cavolinia*.²

On the other hand, the brothers Adams,³ and others after them, take this title *Diacria* as synonymous with *Pleuropus*,⁴ and therefore add to *Cavolinia trispinosa* and to the two forms *Hyalæa depressa* and *Hyalæa lævigata* all the other young forms regarded as independent species. At the same time they agree with Gray in leaving *Cavolinia quadridentata*, separated from *Cavolinia trispinosa*, beside the typical *Cavolinia* forms.⁵

Now, it is certain that if *Cavolinia trispinosa* is to be separated from the other species of *Cavolinia*, *Cavolinia quadridentata* must go with it. The two species are in their structure most closely allied, and form a well-defined subgroup contrasting with the six other species.

And if, in their embryonic shell, in the form of their fins, and in the posterior portion of the foot, they present resemblances to *Clio* (*Cleodora*), they at the same time exhibit the characteristic features of *Cavolinia* in a way that makes separation impossible. They are certainly the most archaic living forms of the genus, but not sufficiently distinct to warrant a separate genus. One may, however, follow Boas in establishing a subsection (*Hyalæa*, A), within the genus *Cavolinia*.

IV. *Orbignyia*, which was only regarded as a subgenus by A. Adams, is based on *Cavolinia inflexa*, which is usually considered as allied to *Clio* (*Cleodora*). There is,

¹ Catalogue of the Mollusca in the Collection of the British Museum, pt. ii., Pteropoda, p. 14.

² This Catalogue is in other respects full of inaccuracies and carelessness. It would be desirable to re-edit it, especially since the collection of Pteropods in the British Museum is many times richer to-day than it was in 1850.

³ The Genera of Recent Mollusca, vol. ii. p. 611.

⁴ Similarly Pfeffer, Uebersicht der auf S.M. Schiff Gazelle und von Dr. Jagor gesammelten Pteropoden, Monatsber. d. k. preuss. Akad. d. Wiss. Berlin, 1879, p. 236.

⁵ Pfeffer (Die Pteropoden des Hamburger Museums, Abhandl. d. Naturw. Ver. Hamburg, t. vii.) places *Cavolinia trispinosa* in the subfamily Cleodorinæ, and *Cavolinia quadridentata* in the subfamily Hyaleinæ.