

*Antipathes fœniculacea*, Pallas (*non* Esper).

*Antipathes fœniculacea*, Pallas, Elench. Zooph., p. 207.

? *Antipathes fœniculum*, Lamarck, Hist. nat. anim. sans vert., t. ii. p. 308; Lamouroux, Polyp. flex., p. 379; Encycl. méthod., t. iv. p. 71; Blainville, Manuel d'Actinol., p. 583; Dana, Zooph., p. 582; Milne-Edwards, Coralliaires, t. i. p. 318; Studer, Monatsber. Akad. Berlin, 1878, p. 548.

“*Antipathes ramosissima*, ramis setaceis, decomposito pinnatis. *Frutex* pedali sæpe major, in latum expansus, diffusus, tenuicaulis. *Truncus* in maximis calamo non crassior, ramosissimus, subdivisus. *Rami* inordinati, creberrimi, fere distichi, patentis, rigentesque, setacei; *setis* distichis, sine ordine alternis vel suboppositis, aliquando ramosis pinnati. *Lignum* fruticis, ubi opacum, atrum extus tenerrime hispidum. *Rami* aliqui infracti quasi, cum contiguisque coaliti. *Tegumentum* mucosum, setaceis maxime ramis crassissimum, ex altero fruticis latere in nodulas per intervalla collectum, siccatumque ramulas nodosos sistens” (Pallas, *op. cit.*). Pallas thinks the *Fœnum marinum*, Rumphius, from the East Indies, may belong to this species, but his type came from the Mediterranean. So far as I am aware Studer is the only author who has recently recorded this species, but he adds nothing to the descriptions already given. His specimens (referred to *Antipathes fœniculum*, Lamarck) were obtained off Dirk Hartog, &c., West Australia, in 45 to 50 fathoms.

Lamarck's diagnosis has usually been followed, but it is not so complete as the original. One expression, viz., “ramulis ultimis setaceis lævigatis,” renders it possible that he may not have had a truly spinose species before him. A comparison of the figure in the Herbarium Amboinense of Rumphius, with that in Wilkens and Herbst's translation of the Elenchus Zoophytorum (the original work was not illustrated), has led me to suppose that this species may be allied to *Antipathes dichotoma*, Pallas, if not identical with it. Both species are from the Mediterranean, which, so far, supports this view, but I have not seen any specimen agreeing with the definition of *Antipathes fœniculacea*. It is a much more densely paniculate form than *Antipathes dichotoma*, but, so far as the type of branching goes, if the figures referred to are to be relied on, it is the same in both cases. It may be, however, that an examination of the polyps and spines may show the two forms to be distinct. In the meantime, at any rate, it appears better to retain both names.

It should be noted that Pallas' type specimen came from the Mediterranean, but I am not aware that the species has since been recorded from that area. Lamarck's type, which, so far as can be ascertained from his description, does not appear to offer any essential points of difference, came from the Indian Ocean, as did also the specimen more recently recorded by Studer. It is therefore at present uncertain whether all belong to one species.