

a new one, *Antipathes triquetra*, from Manila. Unfortunately this species is based on specimens which were too imperfect to give specific characters, though they certainly appear to have differed from the species described by Pallas. The species has not been identified by subsequent authors, and is omitted from the work of Milne-Edwards. Its thick triangular stem, with the angles twisted spirally, should make this form easily recognised, even in the absence of particulars of the mode of branching; I am in the meantime, however, obliged to include it amongst the *species dubiæ*.

In 1816 Lamarck (23) described six species of *Antipathes*, but appears to have been particularly unfortunate in his identifications. His *Antipathes mimosella* is probably the same as *Antipathes ulex*, Ellis and Solander, and the latter name has priority. On his own admission, Lamarck's *Antipathes scoparia* is synonymous with Esper's *Antipathes virgata*, whilst *Antipathes pyramidata* is not an *Antipathes* at all, having a smooth and somewhat vitreous axis, and probably comes under Verrill's genus *Iridogorgia*. A fine specimen in the British Museum collection is labelled *Iridogorgia pyramidata*. Lamarck gave the name *Antipathes radians* to Esper's *Antipathes fœniculacea*, which he showed to be different from the true *Antipathes fœniculacea*, Pallas; the species as already stated does not belong to this order. *Antipathes corticata*, Lamarck, is a distinct form figured by Haeckel in his *Arabische Korallen*, but neither author gives us a detailed description. The remaining species, viz., *Antipathes lacerata* and *Antipathes pectinata*, may be distinct also, but Lamarck's descriptions are very unsatisfactory, and neither form has been identified by subsequent investigators, so that for the present both must be included amongst the *species dubiæ*, the definitions being insufficient for identification.

Lamouroux (24) next added two species to the list, both of which have been accepted by subsequent investigators. It appears probable, however, that his *Antipathes pinnatifida*, which has since been observed by Studer amongst the Corals of the "Gazelle" Expedition, may prove to be a variety of *Antipathes ulex*, Ellis and Solander. There appears to be very great variation amongst specimens of the *Antipathes myriophylla* and *Antipathes ulex* type, and at present it seems difficult to distinguish between those points which are of specific value, and others which only represent individual variations. Owing to the limited number of specimens which I have been able to compare, it has been impossible to decide with certainty, but seeing that no two specimens of this type appear alike, I have preferred temporarily to consider all varieties of one form, for which it seems necessary to retain the name *Antipathes ulex*, Ellis and Solander. In the description of *Antipathes boscii*, Lamouroux makes no reference to the occurrence of spines, a fact which may perhaps have led Gray to include this species in his genus *Leiopathes*. Verrill has more recently described a specimen, which he considers referable to this species; it was obtained by Agassiz off South Carolina, the original habitat. In this specimen the spines are apparently well marked on all parts of the sclerobasic