

below with fine spines; tibia with spines all round; tarsus less than one-fourth the length of tibia, cleft at about two-thirds of the length.

*Abdomen*: sixth ventral segment a little longer than the preceding ones, hind margin straight.

*Genital segments*: first below as long as all the ventral abdominal segments together, disk slightly convex, hind margin straight, sides oblique; second with horns reaching three-fourths the length of the third below; near the base of each horn, and exterior to it, is a conspicuous obtuse tubercle. Third above (Pl. II. fig. 2, *g.*) with the lateral angles acuminately produced.

This seems to be a scarce species. Eschscholtz saw the male only (which he calls the female). I have seen two specimens, both males. The female has not been discovered. The Oxford Museum specimen was captured on September 12, 1834.

11. *Halobates frauenfeldanus* (Pl. II. fig. 3).

*Halobates flaviventris*, Frauenfeld (*nec* Eschscholtz), Verhandl. der k. k. zool.-bot. Gesellsch. in Wien, vol. xvii. p. 459, Taf. xii. figs. 3, 4, 7, and 9, 1867.

Oval, widest behind the middle (♀). Pale hoary ash grey above. Head with a brownish-yellow spot on each side posteriorly, united to a narrow line of the same colour on the hind margin. Antennæ with the basal halves of the joints; prosternum; mesosternum with a central longitudinal line broadest behind and narrower in front (absent in the ♂); ventral segments of the abdomen; a spot near the insertion of each of the legs; the front femora below, and a more or less extensive spot at the base above, as well as the under side of the coxæ of the middle and hind legs, yellow. Front femora black above. Antennæ: second, third, and fourth joints equal in length. Front tarsus with first joint about one-third shorter than the second joint. Middle tarsus with first joint two and one-half times the length of the second.

♂. Length 4·1, breadth 1·9, middle femur 5·1 mm.

♀. Length 4·2, breadth 2·4, middle femur 5 mm.

*Habitat*.—Indian Ocean near the Nicobar Islands (Frauenfeld).

I have not seen this species, and have compiled the diagnosis and description from Frauenfeld's paper. The latter author's description is a little confusing, as he sometimes uses the sign ♂ (both in the text and in the plate) when he evidently intended to write ♀. He has made the same mistake as to the sex as Eschscholtz and other writers have done. Moreover, he gives two different measurements for the female (his male). Frauenfeld's description applies chiefly to the female, for, as he thought, the male had already been described by Eschscholtz. I am indebted to Dr. Rogenhofer for measurements of the front and middle tarsi of specimens in the Vienna Museum.