

Avondale Road, Croydon.

June 7. 1889

Dear Sir W. Dawson,

Your letter of the 22<sup>nd</sup> May and the M. S. have duly reached me. On some of the points touched therein, I have already referred in the notes sent from here on the 14<sup>th</sup> May which you will doubtless have ere now received.

I do not find much additional matter for comment in the M. S. You are quite right in having the enlarged figures of the spicular structure drawn all to the same scale, so as to allow of

ready comparison). I presume that you will also have the sponges themselves drawn natural size when their preservation allows it to be done.

It will be very desirable to point out in the text that the smaller spicules in the Protospongia were originally as regularly arranged as the larger, though now displaced.

8) Hyalostelia metaria - It will be necessary to examine carefully the three-rayed spicules, which from your rough sketch look like as if they were equiangular - such as those of Calispongia and the Tetraactinella - whereas in hexactinella sponges generally, the rays, even when reduced to three, are at right angles to each other.

Your term of 'defensive' sponges for those projecting from the surface in some of these sponges has not been usually employed since Bowerbank's time, and I think it is open to criticism, since this by no means certain that the main purpose of these projecting rays is to defend the sponge; they might rather be supposed to support the outer delicate membrane or skin. Though of course it is quite possible that they may have served to ward off enemies as well.

Bowerbank employed other qualifying terms, such as Connectives, prehensile-, retentive - sponges, &c



which are now quite obsolete.

I should much prefer if  
you would incorporate such of my  
observations as may seem suitable,  
with your own, and it will perfectly  
content me to have you mention  
that I have seen the specimens and  
given you my opinion on them.

Believe me

Yours very truly

George J. Rude