the literature of the group something about this *Farrea tubulata*, which, so far as I am aware, is referred to only in this place.

As to the irregular network of beams with central canals of various widths, which adhered to the inner side of a *Farrea gassioti*, Bowerbank, and which is spoken of by Bowerbank as *Farrea parasitica*, one can scarcely say more than that it belonged to a Hexactinellid, for the fact of its connection with the genus *Farrea* is not even plausible from Bowerbank's own description and figure.

The *Farrea valida* of Bowerbank was established upon a small fragment of a reticulated skeleton. The fragment, which is regarded by Bowerbank as representing the dermal skeleton, is distinguished by the possession of uniform square meshes, by thick, smooth, tubular beams in the network, and by short, tuberculated, conical teeth and prickles. This dermal skeleton is associated with an inner body skeleton formed of distinctly thinner, smooth beams, but of this skeleton little is preserved. The numerous hexradiate crowded spicules, which are placed upon, and have one ray at right angles to the beams of the framework, are noteworthy.

Bowerbank designates by the name of *Farrea spinosissima* a fragment of a skeleton, consisting of several reticulated layers, and provided with more or less square meshes. From the tubular beams, which are of various thickness, though generally slender, numerous long pointed prickles project at right angles, and are either smooth or slightly beset with spines.

Farrea spinifera was erected by Bowerbank on the basis of a skeletal fragment, whose beams, which are of various thickness and provided with a central canal, surround more or less regular meshes, and are distinguished by long, transversely disposed, or slightly conical prickles.

A small skeletal fragment, which Bowerbank has named *Farrea spinulenta*, differs from most of the others hitherto referred to in the very convenient circumstance, that in the present case a portion of the soft tissues, along with the free spicules that occurred in them, was preserved in the dried specimen. It is true that here also it is not quite certain whether the dried mass in question really belonged to the same sponge as the siliceous skeleton, but it is in the highest degree probable. The framework consists of a simple network with square meshes and long rough teeth, which project on both sides at right angles to the knots of the network.

As was to be expected, Bowerbank failed to find any central canals in the beams of the siliceous network of this fragment, which was certainly taken from the sea bottom in a living condition. The skeleton was not yet macerated and dissolved internally like the majority of the other specimens of various species of his genus *Farrea*, which have been referred to above. These apparently solid beams of the network are, however, not quite smooth, but are beset with small pointed tubercles or with parallel longitudinal rows of fine prickles, which stand at equal distances from, and alternate with one