

My Dear Sir

You will probably have

expected this sooner, the points to be settled seem however difficult - After the most careful examination of all the specimens the result will appear in the separation of two sorts from *T. Cambalana*, this I have done, not because I am myself fully satisfied of its propriety, but because I found characters which would be considered satisfactory (as distinguishing characters by some (*D'Orbigny inter alia*) characters which some would regard as specific, others as only variations - however my opinion is that wherever a combination of characters distinguishing one subject from another exist, they should always be noticed, whether they be considered as the characters of a species or only of a

variety.

I will now explain my operations.

- 1<sup>st</sup> those of Huafu & Mocha I have described as *T. Chilonensis*
- 2<sup>d</sup> that of Port Desire, together with the Navada (*T. carinifera*) and several specimens without locality, but number 632 I have described as *T. Patagonica*.
- 3<sup>d</sup> the St. Julian must be regarded as neither more nor less than *T. ambulacrum*.
- 4<sup>th</sup> but strike out from the Navada series the one resembling *T. carinifera*.
- 5<sup>th</sup> also the *T. ambulacrum* with somewhat slightly external characters from the Port Desire list.
- 6<sup>th</sup> of the additional specimens one (numbered 632) is already disposed of; the two others are such mere casts or fragments that they cannot be brought into the account.

7<sup>th</sup> I must now add with respect to the fragments from Navada formerly said to resemble *carinifera*, but which I now recommend you to strike out, that, one fragment also belongs to *T. Patagonica*, the rest are probably *ambulacrum*, but are very indistinct.

The specimens shall be packed up on Monday or Tuesday and sent to the Geol. Society for you.

I am My Dear Sir

Yours very obliged,

J. B. Sowerby

17<sup>th</sup> Jan 1846.

N.B. I write for post.