species; the only difference between them is the apparently smaller size of the anterior avicularium. Should the two turn out to be identical, Mr. Hincks' name must, of course, be adopted.

(8) Smittia stigmatophora, n. sp. (Pl. XXII. fig. 6).

Character.—Zoœcia completely immersed, flattened in front, irregularly quincuncial; surface shining, with closely placed large circular punctures, which are larger round the border. Primary orifice arched, dentate; secondary clithridiate with a small avicularium with spatulate mandible just within the lower lip, and in front of the hammer-shaped denticle. Oœcia inconspicuous, completely immersed; surface granular and presenting a crescentic or reniform, punctured stigma in front.

Habitat.—Station 315, lat. 51° 40′ S., long. 57° 50′ W., 12 fathoms, sand and gravel (on shells).

In some respects resembling Lepralia (Smittia) cheilostoma, Manzoni, as well as Lepralia (Smittia) bella, Busk, it differs from the former in having an avicularium within the lower border of the orifice; in the deeply immersed occium with its peculiar stigma, resembling that in many Australian Retepores, as well as in the absence of a raised septum, or even of a sulcus between the zoccia. It has a dull purplish colour, and is very closely attached to the shell upon which it is growing, and the posterior wall of the zoccia in a small detached fragment is deficient.

(9) Smittia graciosa (Pl. XXII. fig. 13).

? Porella concinna, var. β . gracilis, Hineks, loc. cit., p. 324, pl. xlvi. fig. 9.

Character.—Zoœcia elongate, oval, attenuated and somewhat raised towards the orifice. Secondary orifice clithridiate, enclosing within the lower border a small circular avicularium with a spatulate mandible, and behind this an internal denticle. Peristome thin, two oral spines above but only in the youngest cells. Surface punctured, the punctures rather distant and uniformly distributed.

Habitat.—Station 148, lat. 46° 47′ S., long. 51° 37′ E., 210 fathoms, hard ground, gravel and shells.

This form appears to bear a strong resemblance to that described by Mr. Hincks. It differs, however, to judge from his figure, in the form of the zoœcia, which in Mr. Hincks' species are apparently longer and slenderer and separated by raised septa, which are entirely wanting in the present form. Notwithstanding this, it is by no means clear that the two are not identical; if so, I should nevertheless be inclined to refer neither to $Porella\ concinna$, an essential character of which, as indeed is pointed out by Mr. Hincks, is the presence of a row of marginal pores, of which there is no trace either in $Porella\ concinna\ \beta$, or in the present form.