The genus comprises eight species, two of which, *Tetraclita rosea*, Krauss, sp., and *Tetraclita coerulescens*, Spengler, sp., are represented in the Challenger collection. For the determination of the species I have composed the following table :—

Tetraclita.

I. Parietes formed by a single row of large tubes, . . *Tetraclita rosea*, Krauss, sp.
II. Parietes formed by numerous rows of tubes.
1. Tergum with the spur joined to the basi-scutal angle.
(*a*) Basis membranous, ... *Tetraclita purpurascens*, Wood, sp.
(*b*) Basis thin, calcareous.
α Radii broad, ... *Tetraclita costata*, Darwin.
β Radii narrow or absent.
(α) Surface of the shell corroded, . . *Tetraclita porosa*, Gmelin, sp.
(β) Surface of the shell with narrow, serrated ribs, ... *Tetraclita serrata*, Darwin.
2. Tergum with the spur not joined to the basi-scutal angle.
(*a*) Basis thick, calcareous, ... *Tetraclita radiata* (Blainville) Darwin.
(*b*) Basis very thin, articular ridge of the scutum very prominent, ... *Tetraclita coerulescens*, Spengler, sp.
(*c*) Basis very thin, articular ridge of the scutum not very prominent, ... *Tetraclita vitiata*, Darwin.

Tetraclita rosea, Krauss, sp.

Conia rosea, Krauss, Die südafrikanischen Mollusken, 1848.
Tetraclita rosea, Darwin, Balanidæ, 1854, p. 335.

Two specimens of this species were taken in Sydney Harbour (Port Jackson). The two specimens are of a somewhat different size; the larger one measures 31 mm. across the base, a size a little greater than Darwin says it has (1·1 inch). This species was taken from a depth of six fathoms. It must have been very near the surface, for in Australia this species lives attached to littoral rocks and shells.

Tetraclita coerulescens, Spengler, sp. (Pl. XIII. fig. 34).

Lepas coerulescens, Spengler, Skrifter af Selsk., I. 1790.
Tetraclita coerulescens, Darwin, Balanidæ, 1854, p. 342.

H.M.S. Challenger, when at Zamboanga (the most south-western point of Mindanao, Philippines), took some specimens of this species at a depth of 10 fathoms. As there existed differences between these specimens and the description and figures of Darwin, I first thought of describing them as belonging to a different, though nearly related,