

shown to have six tentacles arranged in a radiate manner around the mouth. The drawings were made from a dried specimen which was first soaked for some time in water, and imperfect though they are, form the only drawings of the polyp of this species with which I am acquainted. A form described under the same name by Pourtalès is, as will be shown later, generically distinct. The drawings of Ellis brought out for the first time an important point of difference between *Antipathes* and *Gorgonia*, namely, that the polyps of the former have only six instead of eight tentacles. More recently this numerical difference has been shown to be accompanied by important structural differences, but until within the last few years the exact bearing of these points on the systematic position of *Antipathes* has not been understood.

Next in point of time follows Esper (21), who in his beautiful work *Die Pflanzenthier* described and figured ten species. This author's descriptions, though long, are often indefinite, but as a rule his figures are good. Three of the species described appear new to science, viz., *Antipathes larix* from the Mediterranean, and *Antipathes virgata* and *Antipathes reticulata*, probably from the East Indies.

Esper's species *Antipathes glaberrima* is the *Savaglia* of Donati and the Italians, and probably forms a considerable part of the "Black Coral" of commerce. In three cases where Esper thought to have obtained species described by Pallas, viz., *Antipathes fœniculacea*, *Antipathes flabellum*, and *Antipathes clathrata*, he describes and figures specimens of decorticated Gorgonidæ and not the true *Antipathes*. All three forms described by Pallas have a spinose sclerenchyma, whereas those described by Esper are all smooth. The same remark applies to his new species *Antipathes ligulata*, which has a smooth axis, and, as first suggested by Dana, is probably a decorticated Gorgonid. *Antipathes compressa*, Esper, is founded on the base of some large species. Dana says that Esper's figure agrees with the base of his *Antipathes arborea*, whilst Gray suggests that Esper's species may be the base of *Antipathes myriophylla*. In any case the name should be dropped, having no specific value, and its retention only adds to the confusion of the group. Esper does not describe *Antipathes ericoides*, but gives a figure of it, and remarks that there are many forms allied to *Antipathes myriophylla*, Pallas, of which *Antipathes ulex*, Ellis and Solander, is one, and *Antipathes ericoides*, Pallas, another. The latter, however, does not seem so closely related to *Antipathes myriophylla* as Esper would have us suppose. Finally his species *Antipathes paniculata* appears to be founded on a variety of *Gorgonia abies*, Linnæus (*Antipathes cupressina*, Pallas), as was first suggested by Lamarck. Dana, however, points out that it differs in the relative development of the lateral branches. There is a fine specimen of this form in the British Museum, which seems to differ from *Antipathes abies* (Linn.) Gray, in possessing stronger lateral paniculate branches, but in other respects agrees with the earlier type; thus, at most, it can only be regarded as a variety.

Bruguère (22) in 1792 gave a synopsis of the species already known, and described