

Notwithstanding Lesson's assertion to the contrary, I see no reason why the genus *Neis* Less. should be removed from the immediate vicinity of the Beroids proper and brought into close relationship with *Mnemia*. Every word in the description of that beautiful *Acaleph* bearing upon its structure, coincides with the impression made by the figure published in the *Zoologie de la Coquille*, Pl. XVI. *Fig. 2*, in strengthening the conviction that *Neis* belongs to the Ctenophoræ Eurystomæ. It has the wide mouth and truncated oral margin, and the vascular reticulation throughout the spherosome; and if the anterior and posterior spheromeres seem to project like the lobes of the Ctenophoræ Lobatæ, a careful analysis of the description, compared with the figure, will show at once that the interambulacral space between these spheromeres alone differs from the rest of the surface of the body in being more brightly colored, but that they do not form a lobe-like expansion, nor are there tentacular tubes or auricles, which exist in all the *Mnemiidæ*. While I am convinced, therefore, that *Neis* belongs to the Eurystomæ, I am not quite so sure that it should not be considered as the type of a distinct family, the NEISIDÆ Less.; for Lesson expressly states that the abactinal pole is not only much more compressed than the actinal, but also deeply emarginate, and thus giving the whole body a wedge-shaped and heart-shaped form, which can scarcely be the result of the same arrangement of the motory cells as exists in the Beroids proper, the body of which is thinner at the actinal pole. According to his figure and description there is also a marked difference in the disposition of the rows of locomotive flappers, which are nearly equal in the true Beroids; while in *Neis* the anterior and posterior pairs are much longer than the lateral pairs, and converge towards the circumscribed area, the lateral ones converging towards one another. If these traits are not in themselves family characters, they seem at least to indicate family differences. Gegenbaur erroneously refers *Neis* to the family of the *Cydippidæ*.

The *Beroids* proper as a family would then embrace the species thus far referred to the genera *Beroë*, *Idya*, *Cydalisia*, *Medea*, and *Pandora*, subject to a critical revision of their closer affinities. The names *Beroë* and *Beroidæ*, it is true, were first introduced by Goldfuss and Rang to designate the whole order of Ctenophoræ, and then limited by Eschscholtz and Lesson to the Ctenophoræ Eurystomæ; but if *Neis* and *Idya dentata* Less. constitute distinct families, the family of BEROIDÆ will in the end only embrace those Ctenophoræ Eurystomæ whose body is evenly compressed laterally and provided with nearly equal rows of locomotive flappers,¹ the regular forms of which arise from the even distribution of the radiating and

¹ In all regular rounded or slightly compressed Ctenophoræ, the equality of the rows of locomotive flappers is only nominal. A searching comparison discloses in all these *Acalephs*, even in the most