

Leachia, Lesueur, 1821 ; Steenstrup, 1861.

Anisoctus (?), Rafinesque.
Loligopsis (*pars*), d'Orbigny, Auctt.
Dyctydiopsis, de Rochebrune.
Perotheris, Rathke.

1. *Leachia cyclura*, Lesueur.

1821. *Leachia cyclura*, Les., Journ. Acad. Nat. Sci. Philad., vol. ii. p. 90, pl. vi.
 1833. *Loligopsis guttata*, Grant, Trans. Zool. Soc. Lond., vol. i. p. 24, pl. ii.
 1833. *Perotheris pellucida*, Rathke, Mém. Savans Étrang. St. Petersb., t. ii. p. 149.
 1833. „ *Escholtzii*, Rathke, *Ibid.*
 1861. *Leachia cyclura*, Stp., Overblik, p. 82.
 1884. *Perotheris Dussumieri*, Rochebr., Monogr. Loligopsidæ, p. 28.
 1885. *Leachia cyclura*, Hoyle, Loligopsis, p. 326.

2. *Leachia ellipsoptera* (Adams and Reeve), Steenstrup.

1848. *Loligopsis ellipsoptera*, Ad. and Rv., Voy. "Samarang," Moll., p. 2.
 1861. *Leachia ellipsoptera*, Stp., Overblik, p. 80.
 1884. *Dyctydiopsis ellipsoptera*, Rochebr., Monogr. Loligopsidæ, p. 18.
 1885. *Leachia ellipsoptera*, Hoyle, Loligopsis, p. 328.

3. *Leachia dubia* (Rathke), Hoyle.

1833. *Perotheris dubia*, Rathke, Mém. Savans Étrang. St. Petersb., t. ii. p. 170.
 1885. *Leachia dubia*, Hoyle, Loligopsis, p. 329.

Loligopsis,¹ Lamarck, 1812.

Loligopsis, Auctt. (*pars*).

1. *Loligopsis peronii*, Lamarck.

1812. *Loligopsis Peronii*, Lmk., Extrait de son Cours de Zool., p. 123 (*fide* d'Orb.).
 1861. „ „ Stp., Overblik, p. 85.
 1885. „ „ Hoyle, Loligopsis, p. 314.

2. *Loligopsis zygæna*, Vérany.²

1851. *Loligopsis zygæna*, Vèr., Céph. médit., p. 125, pl. xl. fig. c.
 1884. *Zygænopis zygæna*, Rochebr., Monogr. Loligopsidæ, p. 20.
 1885. ——— (?) *zygæna*, Hoyle, Loligopsis, p. 331.

¹ The true position of this genus is entirely uncertain : the description of the type species, based upon a drawing, is so fragmentary, that nothing can be extracted from it as to the affinities of the animal. See also note p. 20.

² This is certainly not a *Loligopsis* in the Lamarckian sense, but at present there is no ground for referring it to any known genus whatever, nor do I think its characters sufficiently well known to enable a new genus to be erected of it ; I therefore leave it as placed by the original describer. The name proposed by de Rochebrune is preoccupied.