

This genus, when better known, will probably be subdivided. Gegenbaur has already pointed out marked differences in the form of the radiating pouches, which may be considered as generic. He has also indicated, for the first time, a most important distinction between *Cunina*, on one side, and the other genera of this family (in the mode of insertion of the tentacles, in the radial prolongation or between the radiating pouches), which Eschscholtz had simply considered as a generic character, though it may lead to the further separation of the two groups as distinct families.

*Eurybia* Esch., 1829. This genus is a *Cunina* or *Foveolia*, with four pouches and four tentacles.

*E. exigua* Esch., *Acal.*, Pl. 8, fig. 5.—*Pacific Ocean, near the Equator* (Eschscholtz).

*Campanella* DeBlainv., 1834 (not Lesson).—*Æginopsis* J. Müll., 1851, *Leuck., Köll., Gegenb.* (not Brandt).—*Charybdea* Q. and G. (p. p.). This genus is characterized by its eight radiating pouches, in which the genital organs are developed, and its two tentacles arising from the sides of the umbrella in opposite directions. The genus *Campanella* Less. is synonymous with *Melicertum*. *Saphenia* and the bitentaculated *Geryonidæ* have only a remote analogy with this genus.

C. *Capitulum* Q. and G., Msc., DeBl. auct.<sup>1</sup>—*Æginopsis* bitentaculata J. Müll.—*Charybdea* bidentaculata Q. and G., *Zool. Astr.*, Vol. IV. p. 295, *Zooph.*, Pl. 25, figs. 4 and 5.—Lesson, *Ac.*, p. 265.—*Amboina* (Quoy and Gaimard).

<sup>1</sup> DeBlainville quotes Quoy and Gaimard for *Campanula* *Capitulum*; but there is no species described by them under that name. When it is remembered, however, that DeBlainville used Quoy and Gaimard's notes for his references, we should not wonder at occasional discrepancies between their works, nor be surprised that the nomenclature of Quoy and Gaimard, in the *Astrolabe*, is not always identical with that of DeBlainville's *Actinologie*, as they have, now and then, themselves altered the names which occurred in the manuscript used by DeBlainville. It is, nevertheless, much to be regretted that Quoy and Gaimard

should not refer to DeBlainville more frequently in their final publication. This has led to a difficulty respecting the synonymy of this species. The genus *Campanella*, which Q. and G. had proposed in their manuscript, but finally dropped, is good, and the species was new at the time of its publication by DeBlainville. The name *Campanella* *Capitulum* must, therefore, be retained, with the authority, Q. and G., even though, in the work of Quoy and Gaimard, *Zoologie de l'Astrolabe*, neither the generic nor the specific names, said by DeBlainville to have been given by them to this species, were retained for it.