

the skeleton of the adherent polype, Valenciennes expressed the belief that we have here to deal with spongoid spicules, and that the polypes occurring upon these belong to the group of the Zoantharia, and are to be looked upon as parasites.<sup>1</sup>

Gray<sup>2</sup> at once defended his views, and pointed out that it was improbable that the polypes should always be found associated with the sponge, or that the association should be so intimate as it was, and noted further that the axis skeleton of the well-known *Gorgoniæ* presents a concentric lamination similar to each of the long siliceous threads.

In a further communication by Gray on the same subject,<sup>3</sup> the family of the "Hyalonemidæ" is regarded as a family of corals, with the single genus *Hyalonema*, with characters which agree, essentially, though not verbally, with the above diagnosis of the genus given in 1835.

Gray reported the presence of ring-shaped or spiral projections on the outer surface of the concentrically laminated long spicules, and communicated the result of the chemical analysis of these by W. Prout and T. J. Pearsall, both of whom gave their composition as hydrated silicic acid.

It is curious that Gray here designates as *Hyalonema mirabilis* the only known species, which he had described in his first communications as *Hyalonema sieboldii*, and that he quotes the Synopsis of the British Museum, 1830, p. 118, as relevant literature. This quotation, which has passed into several later papers by other observers, is proved to be false, inasmuch as in the library of the British Museum no edition of the Synopsis of the year 1830 is to be found, while the edition immediately preceding, published in 1827, contains no communication on *Hyalonema*, either at the page cited or anywhere else. Since I was unable, for want of time, to continue the search further during my stay in London, I requested Mr. Stuart O. Ridley to do so, and the result of his accurate examination—for which I here express my best thanks—has shown that in none of the earlier editions of the Synopsis of the British Museum, down to edition xxvii. of the year 1832—in which the words already quoted are to be found on page 79—does any communication on *Hyalonema* occur. This notice, however, is repeated in the following editions—xxvii. to xl.—without essential change, and further observations are first added in edition xli. of the year 1840. No alternative is therefore left but to believe that Gray made a false quotation from memory, or had perhaps in error taken the note on his museum label or such like for the scientific name which he himself had adopted. This is important, inasmuch as it is not the specific name *Hyalonema mirabilis* used by Gray in the year 1857, but that already given by Gray himself to the same species in 1835, *Hyalonema sieboldii*, which has the priority.

<sup>1</sup> Milne-Edwards and Jules Haime, Monograph of the British Fossil Corals, p. 81.

<sup>2</sup> *Ann. and Mag. Nat. Hist.*, ser. 2, vol. vi. p. 306.

<sup>3</sup> *Proc. Zool. Soc. Lond.*, 1857, pt. xxv. p. 278.