the caudal shield is excavated posteriorly, the postero-lateral margins being prolonged beyond the articulation of the uropoda, but in *Ianthe* the excavation is deeper.

Certain species of *Janira* already described by myself in the present Report (p. 6) have a mandibular palp, and the same structure is present in *Janira maculosa*. I cannot therefore admit that the presence or absence of a palp to the mandible is any safe criterion of generic distinction. The only structural feature in which *Ianthe* differs from *Janira* is in the want of an articulated scale—the rudimentary exopodite—upon the antennæ. In pl. i. fig. 7 of his Memoir, Bovallius figures the antenna of *Ianthe speciosa*, and it may be seen from that figure, as well as from the description, that the third joint of the peduncle is furnished with a stout spine on the outer side in a position exactly corresponding with the exopodite. In the figure this spine is represented as being articulated. and in a species presently to be described, I shall refer to a similar spine having an exactly similar position, being fixed to the third joint of the peduncle, and separated from it by a joint. In any case it appears to me to be a matter of impossibility to distinguish exactly between such a spine and the articulated scale of *Janira* or *Stenetrium*.

A second species of Isopod has been referred to this same genus by Studer, in his account of the Isopoda collected by the German exploring vessel "Gazelle." Studer's description of this form rests upon the examination of a single imperfect specimen from Kerguelen. The Challenger during its long stay at Kerguelen obtained a very large number of specimens of this Isopod, which was named by Studer *Ianthe bovallii*. I cannot however, agree with Dr. Studer in regarding this species as closely allied to Bovallius's species. It certainly agrees with it in the general shape of the body even more than is apparent from Studer's figures, since there are two rows of blunt tubercles along the back instead of only a single row as represented by this author. The antennary organs are very different; the first pair of these or the antennules are much more like those of *Jæra* in the shortness of the flagellum, which consists in my specimen of only four or five joints, whereas in *Ianthe speciosa*, as in *Janira*, the flagellum is long: this difference is noted in the figure by Studer. The flagellum of the antenna as correctly figured by Studer is proportionally short; with regard to the rudimentary exopodite there is a conical spine on the third joint which seems to me to be the equivalent of this structure.

The most marked difference, however, apart from the antennules, is the form of the uropoda, which were wanting in Studer's specimen. These are displayed in fig. 8 of Pl. V.; the basal joint is extremely long, the two distal joints short, the endopodite being larger than the exopodite; it has been already mentioned that in *Ianthe speciosa* the uropoda are precisely similar to those of *Janira* in that the two rami are subequal to each other and to the basal joint. Again the first thoracic appendages in neither sex of *Ianthe bovallii* are modified into a prehensile hand. In view of these differences it is in my opinion necessary to distinguish generically *Ianthe bovallii* from *Ianthe speciosa*, and whether there is or is not (in my opinion not) any necessity for a new generic term