

is enlarged to include the Keratosa, while the name *Monaxona* is made more or less exactly synonymous with the older *Monaxonida*; thus:—

PORIFERA (Phylum).

Class I. PLETHOSPONGIÆ.

Subclass 1. Hexactinellida, . . . . .		{	Order 1. Lyssakina (Zittel).	
			„ 2. Dictyonina (Zittel).	
Subclass 2. Demospongiæ, . . . . .	{	Tribe a. Monaxonida, . . . . .	{	Order 1. Monaxona.
				„ 2. Ceratosa (Grant).
	{	Tribe b. Tetractinellida, . . . . .	{	Order 1. Choristida (Sollas).
				„ 2. Lithistida (O. Scdt.).
Subclass 3. Myxospongiæ, . . . . .			{	Order 1. Halisarcosa (O. Scdt.).
				„ 2. Chondrosiosa.

Class II. CALCISPONGIÆ.

Finally, Dr. R. von Lendenfeld has, in a paper recently read before the Zoological Society of London,<sup>1</sup> given an elaborate scheme of classification of Sponges agreeing more or less closely in its main features with that of Dr. Vosmaer, and adapted, as regards the smaller subdivisions, from the most recently published works on the subject. To this paper we would refer the reader who seeks for further information on this much-vexed question. As the portion of the scheme bearing upon the *Monaxonida* is derived chiefly from our own Preliminary Report we need not here discuss it in detail.

We must, however, point out one very serious error in Dr. von Lendenfeld's paper, which appears to be a misprint. We refer to the use of the name "*Monaxonida*" on p. 583, instead of "*Monaxonia*," as opposed to the "*Tetraxonia*" on p. 580. We point this out as such a mistake is likely to lead to great confusion, for the term *Monaxonida* as used by Dr. von Lendenfeld in this place has a significance very different from that of the same term as used by ourselves.

<sup>1</sup> *Proc. Zool. Soc. Lond.*, December 21, 1886.