Marshall,[1] cannot be separated even specifically from *Spongelia pallescens*, Nardo. Notwithstanding, in England, the name *Dysidea* has not been given up, and in order to reconcile English and Continental naturalists, Marshall proposed to retain both these names in order to apply them to different forms. He groups Johnston's *Dysidea fragilis* in the genus *Spongelia* as restricted by F. E. Schulze, and, on the other hand, Bowerbank's species *Spongelia coriacea* and Hyatt's *Spongelia fragilis* in the genus *Dysidea*, giving it a new and detailed diagnosis, and in harmony with Hyatt—who four years before also retained both these genera, and even grouped them in different families on the ground of a thoroughly false supposition as to the manner of growth of the horny skeletal fibres—and, I repeat, in harmony with Hyatt, demands a more pronounced separation of both these genera. This latter view is expressed in a report on his own memoir on Dysideidæ and Phoriospongiæ,[2] while in the memoir itself (*loc. cit.*, p. 91) he seems to be of a rather different opinion, writing as follows: "Ganz scharf zu trennen sind diese genera freilich nicht, so wenig wie *Euspongia* und *Cacospongia*, diese und *Spongelia*." This is, however, of little consequence indeed, but unfortunately, on the whole, instead of having simplified the matter Dr. Marshall complicated it still more. The series of his Dysideidæ in the paper above mentioned he opens by the newly created genus *Psammascus*, characterising it by a great number of peculiarities, each of which, however, must be regarded as almost devoid of any systematic importance. This is also but of little consequence; it is not for the first time that in the Keratosa bad genera have been established and bad generic definitions given, but Dr. Marshall adds to the above definition the following remark: "Of all Dysideidæ this genus (*Psammascus*) shows the closest affinities to the genus *Spongelia*, being however to be readily distinguished from it by the presence of foreign enclosures also in the soft parts."[3] If now the reader will compare the definition Dr. Marshall gives of his genus *Psammascus* (*loc. cit.*, p. 92) with that by which he describes the genus *Dysidea* (*loc. cit.*, p. 98), he will find that this latter genus—apart from the character consisting in the presence of a skin containing numerous foreign enclosures and to be easily drawn off (a character of a very doubtful systematic consequence,[4] but for which nevertheless Dr. Marshall evinces the greatest predilection)—differs from *Psammascus* only in the presence of foreign bodies in the parenchyma; and, when I add, in harmony with F. E. Schulze,[5] that Dr. Marshall has been quite wrong in supposing the true representatives of the genus *Spongelia*, in the sense of F. E. Schulze, to be devoid of any foreign enclosures both in the parenchyma and in the dermal membrane; when I further mention that neither in Dr. Marshall's paper on Dysideidæ nor in the highly detailed and precise memoir on the genus *Spongelia* by F. E. Schulze are any statements to be

[1] *Zeitschr. f. wiss. Zool.*, Bd. xxxv. p. 91.
[2] *Jahresb. d. zool. Stat. Neapel*, 1880, p. 178.
[3] *Zeitschr. f. wiss. Zool.*, Bd. xxxv. p. 92.
[4] Comp. F. E. Schulze's discussion of the question in *Zeitschr. f. wiss. Zool.*, Bd. xxxiii. p. 14.
[5] *Zeitschr. f. wiss. Zool.*, Bd. xxxii. p. 136.