

the species collected during the cruise of H.M.S. Challenger, as I have neither the long experience of the great monographist, nor the disposal of collections comprising very numerous species.<sup>1</sup> It is true we possess at present all the information laid down by Darwin in his monograph; yet the difficulties with which one has to struggle in determining supposed new species of this genus are very considerable, and may be fairly judged from the curious fact, that in the nearly thirty years which have elapsed since the publication of Darwin's book, only *one* species (*Balanus armatus*, Fritz Müller) has been added to the genus—a genus of which Darwin knew forty-five species—representatives of which may be collected almost everywhere, and on every coast. Many authors, no doubt, have been engaged in investigating species belonging to this genus, and must have met with forms which could not in a very natural way be classed among any of the species described by Darwin. However, as they had not at their disposal a very rich material for comparison, they must have been left in doubt, and hesitated to introduce it into science as a new species. I think, in most cases, these authors have been right in doing so; yet I believe that in some cases the publication of a description, illustrated with good figures, may be useful for the development of our knowledge of the genus and the distribution of its species. Should the identity of any species with one described already before be proved afterwards, as may result from a comparative study of good descriptions and figures, I cannot understand what harm is done to science.

In consequence of the admirable completeness with which Darwin has given in his monograph the descriptions of the species, it has been possible, even easy, to identify with certainty seven of the twelve samples of specimens with species already described. Two of these belong to *Balanus tintinnabulum*, Linn., two to *Balanus trigonus*, Darwin, one to *Balanus lævis*, Bruguière, and two to *Balanus amaryllis*, Darwin. With the five remaining groups this has not been possible. Of these three consist of specimens belonging to species which I have described as new, but which probably are nearly related to species described by Darwin; at least it was possible to rank them with the species of Darwin in the sections into which he proposes to divide the genus. The two other samples of specimens, on the contrary, represent two closely allied but distinct species, which, however, scarcely admit of comparison with species Darwin knew. They form a distinct section of the genus. I was for some time uncertain whether it was not necessary to establish a new genus for their reception. I have not done so, however, because both species come very well within the genus *Balanus*, as characterised by Darwin (compartments six; basis calcareous or membranous; opercular valves sub-triangular). Under *Balanus corolliformis* I will give the characteristics of

<sup>1</sup> Of the forty-five species described by Darwin, I only know the following by my own examination:—*Balanus tintinnabulum*, Linn. (different varieties); *Balanus psittacus*, Molina, sp.; *Balanus trigonus*, Darwin; *Balanus lævis*, Brug.; *Balanus perforatus*, Brug.; *Balanus amphitrite*, Darwin; *Balanus improvisus*, Darwin; *Balanus porcatulus*, da Costa; *Balanus crenatus*, Brug.; *Balanus balanoides*, Linn.; *Balanus hameri*, Ascanius; *Balanus amaryllis*, Darwin.