

distinct heads from those without distinct heads, and, badly applying this character, placed some without shells and some with shells in the same subdivision. Oken¹ did the same, placing *Pneumonoderma* and *Clio* in one class, and *Clione* and *Cavolinia* in another class.

It was not until 1824 that de Blainville, relying on very judicious anatomical considerations, arrived at the same systematic result as Péron and Lesueur, and divided the Pteropoda (which he named Aporobranchia) into Gymnosomata and Thecosomata.² He rejected the strange forms that Péron and Lesueur had introduced into the Pteropod group, but he left *Phyllirhoë*,³ which formed in his classification a third group, Psilosomata, of the same value as the two others.

Other groupings based on characters drawn from one organ alone, led to very bad results. Thus, Gray⁴ divided the Pteropoda into Dactylobranchia and Pterobranchia, the genus *Cavolinia* alone forming the first division and all the other genera being united in the second.

Rang,⁵ who followed the Cuvierian subdivisions, through insufficient study of characters placed some Pteropoda without shells and some with shells in the family with a distinct head, and tried to do the same in the case of the group without a distinct head.⁶ This was, however, rather exaggerating the love of symmetry, although not so much as Oken,⁷ who desired that each order should contain four families, each family four genera, &c.

Latreille,⁸ on the other hand, divided the Pteropoda according to the size of their fins, into "Macroptérygiens" and "Microptérygiens." *Pneumonoderma* alone formed the second group, while all the other forms were included in the first.

Cuvier⁹ and his school did not adopt the classification of de Blainville, but followed the divisions established in the first edition of *Le Règne animal*.

Since then, the non-natural arrangements have been gradually abandoned; and the division of the Pteropoda into two distinct groups, Thecosomata and Gymnosomata, is now generally adopted. There is, however, a slight misunderstanding amongst some zoologists as to the relative extent of these two subdivisions; but we shall see further on that this disagreement is really without foundation, and that the separation of the two groups is very clear.

When Cuvier established his division of Pteropoda, only two species (forming two

¹ Lehrbuch der Zoologie, Bd. i., 1815.

² *Dict. d. Sci. Nat.*, t. xxxii. p. 271.

³ This animal remained here for a long time, until it was put in its right place, among the Nudibranchia.

⁴ *London Medical Repository*, p. 235, 1821.

⁵ Manuel de l'histoire naturelle des Mollusques, 1820.

⁶ Description d'un genre nouveau de la classe des Ptéropodes, *Ann. d. Sci. Nat.*, ser. 1, t. v. p. 284, 1825.

⁷ *Loc. cit.*

⁸ Les familles naturelles du Règne animal, 1825.

⁹ *Le Règne animal*, ed. 2.