

(7) *Catenicella umbonata*, Busk, var. (Pl. I. fig. 1).

*Catenicella umbonata*, Bk., Brit. Mus. Cat., vol. i. p. 11, pl. x. figs. 4, 5; Voy. of Rattles., vol. i. p. 362.

*Character*.—Zoëcia pyriform, contracted below, bulging or ventricose above. Lateral processes reduced to the avicularian loculus, which is large and strong, usually with a perforated border above (probably representing the superior loculus). Vittæ long and narrow, extending from the level of the mouth to the bottom of the zoëcium, usually furnished with acuminate papillæ. A broad compressed projecting process on the middle of the back.

*Habitat*.—Station 163B, off Port Jackson, 35 fathoms, hard ground.

[Bass Strait, 45 fathoms, Voy. of Rattles.; Tasmania, Mrs. Smith.]

The variety in the Challenger collection differs from the typical form in its great delicacy of structure, and the only occasional presence of the dorsal prominence. Nor does it show any papillary processes or vittæ, on the front.

(8) *Catenicella pulchella*, Maplestone (Pl. I. fig. 4).

*Catenicella pulchella*, Maplest., Journ. Micr. Soc. Victoria, vol. i. (1880), p. 64, pl. v. fig. 4.

*Character*.—Zoëcia flattened in front, convex behind, ovate in outline, surface quite smooth. Orifice semicircular, lower lip emarginate. A row of large circular raised spots on each side. Lateral processes short and thick, subconical, with a perforation at the base (seen on the side).

*Habitat*.—Station 163B, off Port Jackson, 35 fathoms, hard ground.

[Australia, Maplestone.]

“An interesting form” as Mr. Maplestone remarks, and at first sight scarcely referrible to either the fenestrate or vittate section. But it appears properly to belong to the latter. The lateral series of elevated discoid spots may be regarded as homologous with the vittæ, and as in the other *Vittatæ*, the oëcia are not terminal, but as Mr. Maplestone says “geminate and not terminal.”

The lateral spots are completely covered with a sort of convex lid, and have the aspect of pustulose elevations.

*Catenicella pulchella* differs from *Catenicella rufa* in its white colour and the absence of puncta all over the front, as well as in the absence of the peculiar dorsal stigmata which exist in the latter species.