

- C. mediterranea* Ag.—*Aeginopsis mediterranea* *J. Müll.*, Arch. Anat., 1851, p. 272, Pl. 11.—*Leuck.*, Arch. Naturg., 1856, p. 33, Pl. 2, figs. 8 and 9.—*Gegenb.*, Zeitsch. f. wiss. Zool., 1856, VIII. p. 266.—*Aeginopsis bitentaculata* *Köll.*, Zeitsch. f. wiss. Zool., 1853, IV. p. 320. Not *Æg. bituberculata* as *Leuck.* quotes it.—*Messina* (*Müller, Kölliker, and Gegenbaur*); *Nizza* (*Leuckart*).
- Æginopsis* *Br.*, 1835 (not *J. Müller*). Characterized by its lobed actinostome and four tentacles, each one alternating with four radiating pouches.
- Æg. Laurentii* *Br.*, Ac. St. Petersb., 1838, Pl. 6, *Less.*—*Laurent Bay, Behring Sea* (*Mertens*).
- Aegina* *Esch.*, 1829. Actinostome simple. Four tentacles, each one alternating with two radiating pouches which terminate in a bilobed sac. As characterized, from *Ægina citrina*, the genus *Ægina* is a very natural group; but, besides *Ægina rosea*, *Eschscholtz* has added to it a number of species described by other writers, which do not belong here, although they belong to the same family, and probably to the genus *Pegasia*, to which some *Æquorea* *Pér.* and *LeS.* may also belong.
- Ægina citrina* *Esch.*, Zool. Atl., Pl. 5, fig. 2; *Acal.*, Pl. 11, fig. 4; copied in *DeBl.*, Pl. 39, fig. 1.—*North Pacific*, 34° N. Lat., and 201° W. Long. (*Eschscholtz*).
- Ægina rosea* *Esch.*, *Acal.*, Pl. 10, fig. 3, is likely to become the type of a distinct genus, on account of the numeric relations of the tentacles and radiating pouches, and the form of the latter.—*North Pacific* (*Eschscholtz*).—Mr. W. W. Wood has forwarded to me a drawing of another species from the vicinity of the *Cape of Good Hope*, on its Atlantic side, which belongs to the same type as *Æg. rosea*. Its actinostome is tentaculated; that of *Æg. rosea* is not described.
- Pegasia* *Pér.* and *LeS.*, 1809, *DeBl.*, *Less.*—*Aegina* *Esch.*, 1829 (p. p.).—*Scyphis* *Less.*, 1843.—*Pachysoma* *Köll.*, 1853.—*Ægineta* *Gegenb.*, 1856.—*Paryphasma* *Leuck.*, 1856.—*Stenogaster* *Köll.*, 1853.

There is no excuse for this multiplication of names, unless it should hereafter be proved that there are structural differences between the species here referred to, for *Pegasia* *Pér.* and *LeS.* is not only described in *Ann. du Museum*, Vol. XIV., but *Lesson* and *DeBlainville* have also reproduced that