

*Eudora Pér. and LeS. (not Lesson).*

*E. undulosa Pér. and LeS.; Cur., Règn. An., Ill. ed., Pl. 54, fig. 5.*  
— *DeWill's Land (Péron and LeSueur).*

*Proboscidaactyla Br.* — *P. flavicirrhata Br., Pl. 19.* — *Petropolarisky (Mertens); Gulf of Georgia (A. Agassiz).*

*Willia Forbes.*<sup>1</sup> (Spelled *Willsia* by Forbes.)

*W. stellata Forbes, Nak. Med., Pl. 1, fig. 1; Gosse, Devon., Pl. 20, figs. 1-5.* — *Bay of Oban and Penzance (Forbes).*

*W. ornata McCr., Pl. 9, figs. 9-11.* — *Charleston Harbor, South Carolina (McCrady); Naushon, Massachusetts (A. Agassiz).*

12th Family. NUCLEIFERÆ *Less.* — *Oceanidæ Esch. (p. p.), Gegenb., McCr.*

*Conis Br.* — *C. mitrata Br., Mém. Acad. St. Petersb., 1838, Pl. 2.* — *Bonin Islands (Mertens).*

*Turris Less.* — *Oceania (Auct. p. p.)*<sup>2</sup> — *Hydra: Clavula Wright.*

*T. papua Less.; Eyl. and Soul., Bonite, Zooph., Pl. 2, figs. 1-3.* — *Waigiou (Lesson).*

*T. digitalis Forbes, Nak. Med., Pl. 3, fig. 1.* — *Medusa digitalis O. F. Müll.* — *Melicerta digitalis Pér. and LeS.* — *Eirene digitalis Esch.* — *Turris borealis Less.* — *German Ocean (O. F. Müller); British Seas (Forbes).*

*T. neglecta Less.; Forbes, Nak. Med., Pl. 3, fig. 2.* — *Clavula Gossii Wright, Edinb. Phil. Journ., 1859, Vol. X. p. 105; Gosse, Devon., Pl. 13, figs. 6-10.* — *British Seas (Forbes).*

<sup>1</sup> Dedicated to Dr. Will. by Prof. Forbes, and should, therefore, be written *Willia*, and not *Willsia*.

<sup>2</sup> As characterized by the French naturalists, the genus *Oceania* does not at all correspond to the genus *Oceania* of Forbes and the modern German zoölogists. Eschscholtz does not seem to have observed a single species himself, and adopts nearly the same limits for it as Péron and LeSueur. So does also DeBlainville. Moreover, Péron and LeSueur unite the *Oceaniæ* of modern writers with the species which Lesson has retained in this genus, after restricting it so as to exclude the Forskalian species. The result of all this is, that the Lessonian *Oceaniæ* are united with some of the *Æquoridæ* of Eschscholtz, even though Eschscholtz had already proposed the name *Oceanidæ* for a family which is entirely different from the *Æquoridæ*. As there are types of several distinct families united

at the outset under the name *Oceania*, by Péron and LeSueur, the question now is, for which that name ought to be retained, if retained at all. Lesson perceived the confusion, and took the first steps towards remedying it; but he did it very imperfectly. I see, however, no reason why the name *Nucleifera*, which he proposed for the old Forskalian type, should not be retained for this family, and the name *Oceania* and *Oceanidæ* applied specially, as Lesson has done, to *Oceania phosphorica*, which Péron and LeSueur place in the first section of the genus. This section corresponds to the genus *Thaumantias* of modern writers. The second section answers to the genus *Oceania*, as limited by Forbes; but since Lesson had previously divided the genus in a different way, Forbes' arrangement cannot be adopted. The third section corresponds to *Geryonopsis*.