slender, the joints being from twice to thrice or four times as long as broad, the caudal stylets very slender, and bearing four terminal setæ, the longest of which are about twice as long as the furca.

Habitat.—In lat. 6° 48′ N., long. 122° 25′ E. (Station 200); lat. 40° 3′ S., long. 132° 58′ W. (Station 288); lat. 9° 43′ S., long. 13° 51′ W. (Station 342); lat. 12° 16′ S., long. 13° 44′ W. (Station 341); lat. 5° 28′ N., long. 14° 38′ W. (Station 349); lat. 9° 9′ N., long. 16° 41′ W. (Station 351).

All these are Atlantic Stations, and situated either within or near the tropics, but the type specimens described by Dr. Claus were taken in the Mediterranean (Messina), and, so far as appears, are in every respect similar to those brought home by the Challenger. The male was not seen by Dr. Claus, but I think there can be little doubt that the form figured here in Pl. LIV. figs. 3, 4, is referable to that sex; in all structural details it agrees with the female Lubbockia squillimana, except in the presence of a single very long antennal seta, in the weaker build of the posterior foot-jaw, the somewhat different form of the last two thoracic segments, and the slightly larger size of the animal. Only two examples of the male were found, both from Station 349. From the other Stations only very few specimens have been discovered, not more than about a dozen in all.

## Oncæa, Philippi.

Oncæa, Philippi, Wiegmann's Archiv, 1843. Antaria, Dana, Proc. Amer. Acad. Sci., 1849.

In general appearance much like Corycaus. Corneal lenses (conspicilla) small, situated in the front of the head. Fifth thoracic segment very small, and bearing a pair of very minute rudimentary feet. Abdomen of the male five-, of the female four-jointed, the median joints very small, first joint very large. Anterior antennæ short, six-jointed, posterior, three-jointed, prehensile, the last joint armed with numerous setæ. Swimming feet four pairs; all the branches three-jointed.

The generic name Oncoa, proposed by Philippi, is ignored by Claus on the ground of insufficient description, but Philippi's figures are so characteristic as to leave no doubt, as I think, of the animal to which they are intended to apply; the description also, as far as it goes, is perfectly applicable, though incomplete, owing to the accidental loss of the specimen before the author's observations were finished. On the ground of priority, therefore, it seems right to adhere to the name Oncoa.

The genus is a very interesting one, as though agreeing with other Corycæidæ (and especially with Corycæus) in the essential characters of mouth-apparatus, as well as in the general appearance of the animal, it differs altogether in the structure of the posterior antennæ, which, though prehensile, are more like those of Cyclops, and of the foot-jaws, which resemble those of some Harpacticidæ; the caudal stylets are very distinctly Cyclo-