occupying the usual position in the ectosome and the calthrops occurring in the choanosome. Anatriænes are absent. The microscleres are spirasters, plesiasters or oxyasters, and microxeas.

History.—The Sponge on which Bowerbank founded this genus was named by him Normania crassa, it was dredged off Shetland by the Rev. A. M. Norman (vide p. 98). First mentioned in the British Association Report (loc. cit.), it was afterwards fully described in the Monograph of the British Sponges (loc. cit.). In 1878 Carter¹ stated that Ecionema compressa, Bowerbank, 1866, Hymeniacidon placentula, Bwk., 1874, and Normania crassa, Bwk., 1868, are identical species, and only varietally different from Thenea muricata. Specimens placed in my hands by the Rev. Dr. Norman for the purpose, enabled me to confirm this statement as regards the identification of the first three species, but not as regards the closeness of their association with Thenea muricata.²

This was clearly an error, as Norman³ has also pointed out, and as Carter⁴ has since admitted.

Since the first three species are identical it becomes necessary to make a choice of generic and specific names. And first as to the genus. Hymeniacidon can at once be put out of court; whatever else that genus may be it does not belong to the Tetractinellida. There remain Ecionema and Normania; Carter, on the ground that Ecionema has precedence, declares for it, I think, somewhat hastily; the genus Ecionema was defined by Bowerbank⁵ in 1864, and the species Ecionema acervus, Bwk., specially assigned to it as the type. The genus cannot therefore be used to include species generically different from Ecionema acervus. Now this species, as we know from Bowerbank's descriptions with full illustrations given later, does not even belong to the family Theneidæ; it is plainly a member of the Stellettidæ, and stands there as the type of the genus Ecionema.

Ecionema therefore is not available as a generic name for Normania crassa, Hymeniacidon placentula, and Ecionema compressa; and Normania alone remains with a claim; I should have much preferred to retain this as connecting Norman's name with the Sponges, in the investigation of which he has rendered such invaluable assistance; but it appears to have been preoccupied; true, Bowerbank remarks that Brady's genus Normania, which has precedence, cannot stand, but this makes no difference, since according to convention, a discarded name which has ceased to be used for one species, or genus, cannot be applied to another, otherwise the door would be opened to confusion. I therefore propose to rename the genus Pacillastra.

¹ Carter, Ann. and Mag. Nat. Hist., ser. 5, vol. ii. p. 174.

² Sollas, Ann. and Mag. Nat. Hist., ser. 5, vol. ix. p. 433, 1882.

⁸ Bowerbank, Mon. Brit. Spong., vol. iv. p. 29, 1882.

⁴ Carter, Ann. and Mag. Nat. Hist., ser. 5, vol. xi. p. 359, 1883.

⁶ Bowerbank, Mon. Brit. Spong., vol. i. p. 173, 1864.

⁶ Bowerbank, Proc. Zool. Soc. Lond., p. 322, pl. xxx. figs. 1-6, 1873.