A Note on Canon Norman's Remarks. By F. Jeffrey Bell.

I am glad I have succeeded in "drawing" Canon Norman, as I have the highest respect for his views on questions of natural

history.

If I did not make myself clear to his acute intelligence I fear I must be very generally misunderstood. I have, then, to say that my references to Forbes's robbery were intended to be sportive; I very deeply regret that they should have seemed to be offensive. I need not say that there was no intention to offend the living or reflect on the dead.

Although I have the honour of numbering Dr. Sutherland among my correspondents, his reputation as a collector is not as extensive as I hoped it was; at the same time I could hardly have implied more distinctly than I did that his collection of Echinoderms was made on the east coast of Ross-shire—as a matter of fact in Cromarty Firth.

It is a little cruel that I should be charged with an implication that I did not mean, and that one that seems clear enough should have been missed. But I know Canon Norman is a busy man, and I own that one should write—if one can—so that he who runs may

read.

I am glad Dr. Norman has taken the fence of Goniaster; there was an ugly take-off, owing to the way in which Messrs. Perrier and Sladen had broken up the ground, and I feared a deepish ditch on the other side; and I congratulate myself that by doing other things first Dr. Norman has come up and shown me the way over a very nasty place.

Anseropoda having asserted its priority, I for one am quite willing to let it lie beneath the mud with which Canon Norman has bespattered it. Succeeding synonymists are requested to note

its place and mode of burial.

Just to complete what may be said about the matter, I may, however, add that the students of Echinoderms have not been quite as sharp as the ornithologists, who found out in 1879 (see Mr. H. T. Wharton's paper in the 'Ibis' for that year, p. 456) that Merrem meant his genus to be called Ortalis, and not Ortalida. Anseropoda is clearly in the accusative singular; Anseropus modified to Anseripes would have made a passable name, but we need not displace Palmipes to make way for it.

As to the date of Lophaster furcifer, I will only remark that I am astonished at Dr. Norman citing the "author's own statement of date;" if there is one man who is not to be trusted as to the date

of a name my experience tells me it is the author of it.

If Dr. Norman will, when he has a moment to spare—it won't take more—turn up M. Perrier's descriptions of the species of Marginaster, he will see that the plea he makes is not an answer to the charge. I need not trouble the readers of the 'Annals' with the details.



Bell, F. J. 1891. "A note on Canon Norman's remarks." *The Annals and magazine of natural history; zoology, botany, and geology* 7, 465–465. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1080/00222939109460647">https://doi.org/10.1080/00222939109460647</a>.

View This Item Online: <a href="https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/item/63422">https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/item/63422</a>

**DOI:** https://doi.org/10.1080/00222939109460647

Permalink: <a href="https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/partpdf/59214">https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/partpdf/59214</a>

## **Holding Institution**

University of Toronto - Gerstein Science Information Centre

## Sponsored by

University of Toronto

## **Copyright & Reuse**

Copyright Status: NOT\_IN\_COPYRIGHT

This document was created from content at the **Biodiversity Heritage Library**, the world's largest open access digital library for biodiversity literature and archives. Visit BHL at <a href="https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org">https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org</a>.