*Locality.*—"Porcupine" Expedition:

Station 47A. 1869. In the Faeröe Channel. Lat. 59° 34′ N., long. 7° 18′ W. Depth 542 fathoms. Bottom temperature 6°·5 C.; surface temperature 12°·2 C.

*Remarks.*—I have expressed the opinion on a preceding page that *Goniaster hispidus*, Sars, is congeneric with the present starfish. I have, however, never seen an example of *Goniaster hispidus*, but so far as I can judge from the admirable description and figures given by Sars, *Lasiaster villosus* differs from that form by the definitely prolonged rays, by the absence of the marginal fringe of spines on the infero-marginal plates, by the actinal intermediate plates bearing a group of spines instead of arc-formed series of spines, and by the different character of the adambulacral armature, which in *Lasiaster villosus* consists of a pair of spinelets on the furrow margin of the plate and a transverse series of three on the actinal surface, whereas in *Lasiaster hispidus* the armature is described as forming a transverse series only. It is to be remarked that an approximation to this arrangement occurs at the extremity of the ray of *Lasiaster villosus*, from which it may be inferred to be a juvenile character.

From its small size the type-example of *Lasiaster hispidus* is probably an immature specimen, but from the differences above mentioned I do not suppose that it belongs to the same species as the form under notice. Danielssen and Koren[1] state that large examples of *Lasiaster hispidus* (one measuring 72 mm. in diameter) have been dredged in the Drontheim Fjord by Mr Storm, but no details are given. The *Goniaster hispidus* of Sars was referred by Perrier[2] to the genus *Pentagonaster* (and placed in the subgenus *Astrogonium*), an opinion with which I am unable to agree.

## Family ASTERINIDÆ (Gray, 1840), *emend.* Perrier, 1875.

This family appears superficially to hold an intermediate position in many respects between the Phanerozonia and Cryptozonia. The marginal plates in the genera *Asterina* and *Palmipes*, although exceedingly small, essentially define the ambitus in a conspicuous manner; in other members of the family, however, they are large and superficially Phanerozonid in their character. This circumstance, taken in conjunction with the strictly limited abactinal distribution of the papulæ, and the nature of the actinal plating, appear to me to justify the classification of the Asterinidæ under the Phanerozonia. Furthermore, the alliance of some genera of the Asterinidæ with the Gymnasteriidæ is unquestionable, and their natural position would appear to be in sequence to the latter family. The general structure of the Asterinidæ, as a whole, supports these views.

I am unable to agree with the classification of Dr Viguier,[3] who includes in the

[1] Den Norske-Nordhavs Expedition, 1876–1878, Zoologi, xi. Asteroidea, Christiania, 1884, p. 58.

[2] *Nouv. Archives Mus. Hist. Nat.*, 1878, 2e Série, t. i. p. 84.

[3] *Archives de Zool. expér.*, 1878, t. vii. p. 205.