

axis. A small specimen in the University Museum at Copenhagen, which was received through the Museum of Comparative Zoology, agrees with Verrill's description, and is the one on which my description has been based. Lamouroux's description is too indefinite to enable one to decide with certainty whether this specimen agrees with his type.

Lamouroux's *Exposition Méthodique* (25) contains no new information regarding the Antipathidæ, and so far as that section of the work is concerned, simply reproduces the descriptions and figures from Ellis and Solander's work.

In 1824 he published in the *Encyclopédie Méthodique* (26) a synopsis of the forms already known. Twenty-six species are described, of which one is new to science. This (*Antipathes eupteridea*) has since been identified by Pourtalès from Martinique, the original locality, and judging from the mode of branching, may possibly prove, when the polyps are better known, to belong to the subfamily Schizopathinæ. At any rate it appears to have a type of branching which so far as is known at present is not found amongst the Antipathinæ. The same work gives a rather fuller description of *Antipathes boscii*, but again no reference is made to the spines. Lamouroux mentions that he has received fragments of this species from the Ile de Ré, off the West Coast of France.

Risso (27), two years later, only recorded one species of *Antipathes* (*A. larix*, Espr.) as the result of his researches on the Mediterranean shores of France, but another form which he named *Eunicea Antipathes* may also have belonged to the group, though it appears impossible to decide at present.

In 1832 Gray (28) contributed a note on the Animal of Antipathes, the purport of which will be discussed in connection with a later paper of his on the same subject.

Blainville (31), in his *Manuel d'Actinologie* (1834-1837), instituted a new genus, *Cirrhopathes*, for the reception of *Antipathes spiralis*, Pallas, and another simple form which he named *Cirrhopathes Sieboldi* (= *Palmijuncus anguinus*, Rumphius?), but of which he gives no description. This genus was proposed by Blainville in consequence of Ellis' observations on the form of the polyp of *Antipathes spiralis*, Pallas, and for the reception of forms which, like it, have an unbranched sclerobasic axis. The systematic value of this genus as defined by Blainville will be considered later when discussing the merits of the classification adopted by Milne-Edwards.

In 1842 Gray (32) proposed to separate those species of Antipathidæ having a smooth sclerobasis, and include them in a new genus *Leiopathes*. The name occurs in the 1842 edition of the *Synopsis of the British Museum*, but he does not appear to have defined the genus until the publication (40) of his *Revision of Axiferous Zoophytes* in 1857. In addition to the smooth nature of the axis, Gray calls attention to the presence of spicules in the cœnenchyma, a character which he considered linked this genus more closely to the Gorgonidæ. I propose to refer to the subject again when considering the arrangement suggested by Milne-Edwards.