

ledge of the species of Pycnogonida known to occur on the coasts of New England and Nova Scotia. With two exceptions (*Achelia scabra*, Wilson, and *Nymphon macrum*, Wilson) the species here described are the same as those of a former paper by Mr Wilson, published in the Trans. Connect. Acad. Sci., vol. v. pp. 1-26, 1880. The new *Achelia* is quite unknown to me, but *Nymphon macrum*, Wils., is undoubtedly the species which I have described in my report (p. 45) as *Nymphon brevicollum*. The Challenger specimens were taken south of Halifax (83 fathoms), those described by Mr Wilson in the Gulf of Maine (85 to 115 fathoms).

The other paper (Reports on the Results of Dredging, under the Supervision of Alexander Agassiz, along the East Coast of the United States, during the summer of 1880, by the United States' Coast Survey Steamer "Blake," Commander J. R. Bartlett, U.S.N., commanding. xiii. Report on the Pycnogonida, by Edmund B. Wilson; Bulletin of the Museum of Comparative Zoölogy at Harvard College, vol. viii., No. 12, Cambridge, Mass., March 1881, pp. 239-256, pls. i.-v.) contains descriptions of ten species of Pycnogonids, five of which are new. These belong to three genera, two of which are considered by the author as new. The new species are in the first place two species of *Colossendeis*, Jarzynsky, *Colossendeis colossea*, and *Colossendeis macerrima*. Then a new genus *Scaeorhynchus*, with the species *Scaeorhynchus armatus*, is proposed; finally, the new genus *Pallenopsis*, with the species *Pallenopsis forficifer* and *Pallenopsis longirostris*, is described. The descriptions are illustrated by very good figures. On comparing these figures and descriptions with those of my report, there can be little doubt that *Colossendeis colossea* and *C. macerrima* are very nearly related to, if not identical with, my *Colossendeis gigas* and *C. leptorhynchus*. As to the genus *Scaeorhynchus*, I do not think there are sufficient grounds for separating it from *Ascorhynchus*, G. O. Sars. Neither the presence of dactyli on the first pair of legs, nor the structure of the rudimentary mandibles (antennae) makes it proper to separate these genera: *Scaeorhynchus* (like *Gnamptorhynchus*, Böhm) is only a synonym of *Ascorhynchus*. The species *armatus*, Wilson, seems to be different from those hitherto described, and also from those of the present report.

The new genus *Pallenopsis* is intended to embrace those species which come near to *Phoxichilidium*, but which are characterised by ten-jointed accessory legs present in both sexes, and by three-jointed mandibles. Three (perhaps four) species described in my report show these characters also, and (pp. 82 and 88) I have been long in doubt whether I should not propose a new genus for these species. I did not take the step because I do not wish to augment the number of genera more than necessary until our knowledge of generical characters is more perfect. Mr Wilson is not so slow in proposing new genera; in the present instance, I believe, however, that his proposal has a fair chance of being accepted. The two species described by Mr Wilson are, I believe, different from those described in my report.