side of the disk upon which the tentacle is attached (Pl. XXV. Figs. 14 and 14<sup>a</sup>, n) is a little larger than the rest of the bell, and, on this account, the medusa appears asymmetrical and gibbous, and hence its name.<sup>1</sup>

The base (Figs. 14 and 15,  $b^4$ ) of the tentacle is broadly triangular, and quite thick, but varies in this latter respect when its cavity is more or less distended with the circulating fluid. Beyond the swollen, triangular portion, the tentacle is solid, and covered by a layer of coarse, loose cells, which appear as distinct groups, in rings, when the tentacle is extended (Fig. 15,  $g^4$ ). The length of the tentacle varies from twice to three times the length of the bell. There are times when the hollow base stretches until it is two thirds as long as the height of the disk (Figs. 15 and 15°, g), and then it may be distinguished from the solid portion ( $g^4$ ) by the absence of the transverse rings of cells. At first sight the base of the tentacle may seem to be manifoldly lobed (Figs. 14, 14°, and 15,  $f^2$ ) on the inner side; but closer inspection reveals the true nature of these seeming lobes. They are, in reality, medusæ, in various stages of development, the oldest of which seem to be identical with the one from which they bud.

There are five orange-red, granular bands (Figs. 15 and 15" k k1 k2 k3 k4), about as broad as the radiating canals, which extend from the base of the disk to, or near, its apex, on its exterior surface; two of them, starting from a broad, triangular base (Figs. 15 and 15", k1 k2), suddenly narrow, and pass upwards, one on each side of the radiating canal which leads to the tentacle, and gradually converge in the direction of the apex (Fig. 15", k4); the other three having a similar basis (12), opposite the point of junction of the circular and radiating canals, pass upward, each one over a radiating canal (Figs. 15 and 15", k3) towards the apex, or, more correctly, to points opposite the junction of the canals with the digestive cavity At the latter end of the breeding season in April, these bands were not so conspicuous as to attract attention, and, therefore, were not represented in the figures (Figs. 14 and 14") made at that time, and if they were really present, they have been mistaken for mere wrinkles in the epidermis. Early in the season they are so strongly marked as to be seen by the naked eye, although the medusa is not larger than 12 of an inch in diameter. The difference in the season may also account for the fact that the later medusa (Figs. 14 and 14a) have so few, and so imperfectly developed buds, whilst on the earlier ones (Figs. 15 and  $15^{\circ}$ ) the young (f) are more numerous, and have quite long tentacles ( $f^2$ ).

The close resemblance of our medusa to those described by Forbes as Steenstrupia and Euphysa leaves no doubt in my mind that these two genera are founded upon the free brood of some of the European species of the genus Tubularia,

<sup>1</sup> ύβος, hump, κώδων, a bell; Hybocodon.