are known to be present. Beyond these variations the ramification and general habit of the colony afford almost the only grounds for the systematic differentiation of the species.[1]

Grammaria stentor, n. sp. (Pl. XXIII. figs. 1, 1*a*).

Trophosome.—Colony attaining a height of between three and four inches, set with pinnately disposed ramuli which are alternate, subopposite or opposite, thinner than the stem, and often carrying secondary ramuli similar in disposition to the primary ones. Hydrothecæ rather long and wide and abruptly though slightly dilated at the orifice, and disposed in six longitudinal series.

Gonosome not known.

Locality.—Station 149D, Royal Sound, Kerguelen; depth, 28 to 60 fathoms.

This is a strong-growing species with the main stem thick towards the base and becoming gradually thinner towards the distal end. From either side the stem sends off pinnately disposed ramuli, which are sometimes opposite, but more frequently alternate or subopposite. The pinnæ, except at their origin, where, as in all the known species they are greatly constricted, are of uniform thickness. They are thinner than the stem from which they spring, and are sometimes simple, sometimes pinnately branched.

The graceful curve of the rather wide tubular hydrothecæ, and the slight trumpet-like dilatation of the orifice, confer on a magnified view of this fine species an aspect of great elegance.

Grammaria magellanica, n. sp. (Pl. XXIII. figs. 2, 2*a*, 2*b*).

Trophosome.—Hydrocaulus set with pinnately disposed alternate ramuli which are given off at rather wide intervals, and very much contracted at their origin. Hydrothecæ cylindrical, with even, circular, non-everted orifice, and disposed in six longitudinal series.

Gonosome not known.

Locality.—Station 314, near the Falkland Islands; lat. 51° 5′ S., long. 65° 39′ W.; depth, 70 fathoms.

The specimens of this species are fragmentary, the hydrorhizal extremity has in no instance been preserved, and the size and general habit of the Hydroid cannot be

[1] Mr. Hincks regards Lamouroux's genus *Salacia* (Exposition Méthodique, p. 15) as identical with the *Grammaria* of Stimpson, whose name he accordingly suppresses in favour of the earlier one. If, however, Lamouroux had really a *Grammaria* before him, his figure of it is altogether so bad, and his description so inadequate, that it is impossible to feel satisfied in the identification with *Grammaria* of the zoophyte to which the French zoologist assigned the name *Salacia*; so that even though Mr. Hincks be right in his reference of the *Grammaria* of Stimpson to the *Salacia* of Lamouroux, the uncertainty which must always hang over the nature of Lamouroux's animal will fully justify us in accepting Stimpson's name for a genus which this zoologist has described so fully as to leave no doubt as to the form intended by him.