

(4) *Retepora imperati*, Busk, M.S. (Pl. XXVI. fig. 9).*Retepora eschara marina*, Imperato, 1559, p. 821.*Retepora cellulosa*, a. (pars), Auctt.*Millepora foraminosa*, Ell. and Soland., p. 138, pl. xxvi. fig. 2.(?) *Retepora elongata*, d'Orb. and Smitt, var.

*Character*.—Zoarium of large size, repand, flexuose, widely infundibuliform. Fenestræ elongate, rhomboidal, narrow, about 0".085 long. Dorsal surface of trabeculæ smooth and glistening. Zoœcia distinct, ovoid, separated by raised septa; anterior surface granular. Orifice suborbicular, slightly sinuated in front. Peristome thin, much raised on the sides, where it often forms a point. No labial fissure, or suboral pore, or oral avicularium. Oœcia very conspicuous, subeucullate (fig. 9*d*). Anterior avicularia sparse, and placed only on the older zoœcia, rostriform and projecting directly forwards; mandible long, acute, with the point curved forwards. Dorsal avicularia spear-shaped, numerous, irregularly distributed; one usually of larger size than the others at the lower angle of each fenestra. Operculum rounded oval, the muscular insertions on each side above the middle.

*Habitat*.—Station 75, lat. 38° 38' N., long. 28° 28' 30" W., 450 fathoms, volcanic mud. Port Praya, St. Iago, Cape Verde Islands, 100 to 120 fathoms.

[Mediterranean, H.M.S. "Porcupine," M'Andrew].

It is a remarkable circumstance that, so far as I am aware, this very well marked and most conspicuous species should have hitherto, as it would seem, escaped distinct recognition, and the more so as it is probably abundant enough in the Mediterranean, forming, in fact, the bulk of the forms of *Retepora* collected on the voyage of the "Porcupine" in that sea, where, as is well known, three or four other species also occur, all of which have been often confounded under the common appellation of *Retepora cellulosa*.

But reference to the coarse, though sometimes very graphic, figures of the older writers, and especially to that contained in Imperato's work, will suffice to prove that in many, if not most cases, they have had the present form before their eyes.

It has, however, unfortunately happened that most later authors since Ellis have apparently only been acquainted with the two common northern forms, whose general similarity with that figured by Dr. Solander has led to their being confounded with it, although most have recognised a certain difference of habit, leading to the suspicion that the species might be distinct.

In the British Museum Catalogue (1852), the account of the species designated *Retepora cellulosa* was drawn up from specimens in Dr. Johnston's collection, amongst which it so happened that I noticed only the form so named, and another described by Mr. King as *Retepora beaniana*. The former may probably have been intended by Dr. Johnston, under the name of *Retepora reticulata*, but the reten-