

TABLE OF GEOGRAPHICAL AND BATHYMETRICAL RANGE—*continued*.

	North Atlantic (Stations 1-110, and 348-364).	South Atlantic (Stations 111-148, and 317-347).	Southern Ocean (Stations 144-160).	Indo-Australian (Stations 161-165, and 181-220).	North Pacific (Stations 221-270).	South Pacific (Stations 165-180, and 271-303).	Patagonian (Stations 304-316).	0-50 Fathoms.	50-200 Fathoms.	200-1000 Fathoms.	1000-3000 Fathoms.
<i>Spirastrella papillosa</i> , n. sp.,				x				x			
<i>Latrunculia apicalis</i> , n. sp.,		x	x						x	x	
„ <i>brevis</i> , n. sp.,		x								x	
„ <i>bocagei</i> , n. sp.,			x					10-70			
„ (?) <i>acerata</i> , n. sp.,		?							?		

DISCUSSION OF THE GEOGRAPHICAL DISTRIBUTION.

In glancing over the list of localities at which Monaxonid sponges were obtained, one can scarcely fail to be struck with their small number as compared with the total number of dredgings made by the Challenger. Out of a total of 277 distinct stations we find only 50 represented in the collection, supplemented by 20 "localities" to which no station number is attached.

This is a very remarkable circumstance; it is probably to be accounted for partly by the fact already pointed out in our Introduction (p. v), viz., that the Monaxonida are, as a rule, very insignificant and uninteresting in external appearance, and hence extremely likely to be overlooked amongst the rubbish in sorting out the contents of the trawls and dredges, unless a specialist be on the spot to look out for them, and also partly by the fact that the sponges in question are usually very soft and fragile, and hence peculiarly liable to destruction by the rough treatment to which they are necessarily exposed in trawling, and, more especially, dredging operations.

These explanations are, however, hardly sufficient to account entirely for the absence of Monaxonida from the great majority of localities examined by the Challenger, and we are forced to conclude that the Monaxonida are not, on the whole, a predominant group in deep water, although, as we shall subsequently show, individual genera range down to very great depths, and are occasionally, but very rarely, found in great abundance in deep water (*e.g.*, Station 320). Thus, as the Challenger confined its operations mainly to deep water, we have an explanation of the facts before us; an explanation precisely similar in kind, though not so far reaching in degree, as that arrived at by Poléjaeff in the analogous case of the Keratosa.

Conversely, we find that in those cases where explorations were made by the Challenger in shallow or comparatively shallow water, rich harvests of Monaxonid