

davu, Fiji ; between Api and Cape York ; between Arrou and Banda ; off the north and south coasts of Papua ; Arafura Sea ; lat. $46^{\circ} 46' S.$, long. $45^{\circ} 31' E.$ (Station 146) ; lat. $47^{\circ} 25' S.$, long. $130^{\circ} 32' E.$ (Station 159) ; in several places amongst the Philippine Islands ; between Japan and Honolulu ; Pacific, north of the Sandwich Islands ; lat. $42^{\circ} 43' S.$, long. $82^{\circ} 11' W.$ (Station 302) ; lat. $36^{\circ} 44' S.$, long. $46^{\circ} 16' W.$ (Station 325) ; lat. $37^{\circ} 45' S.$, long. $33^{\circ} 0' W.$ (Station 330) ; in many gatherings from the tropical Atlantic between lat. $12^{\circ} 16' S.$, long. $13^{\circ} 44' W.$ (Station 341) and lat. $32^{\circ} 41' N.$, long. $36^{\circ} 6' W.$ (Station 354).

If the Challenger collections may be taken as a fair indication, this would seem to be the most abundant and most widely distributed of all the pelagic Copepoda.

At the same time the possibility must be admitted of more than one species being included in the series which I here refer to *Euchæta communis*. In very many gatherings, though females were abundant no males could be found, and on the characters of the latter sex perhaps some specific distinctions might have been based. As to the females, I have not found any variations which appeared to me of specific value. The form of the male described by Sir John Lubbock as *Euchæta sutherlandii*, occurs not uncommonly, and I do not doubt is simply the immature male of *Euchæta prestandræ* ; this view is also taken by Dr. Claus. And though it is difficult to decide the point absolutely from Dana's drawings and descriptions, I believe that the same remark applies to his *Euchæta concinna*. Nor do I find any sufficient marks to warrant the separation of *Euchæta pubescens* : the characters given as belonging to this last species I have found not unfrequently in what I take to be mere varieties of *Euchæta prestandræ*. It would indeed be wonderful if a species so widely distributed did not present many varieties dependent upon race and external conditions.

If I am right in regarding all *Euchætæ* with a notched rostrum and a single elongated tail seta as belonging to one species, we may fairly identify it with that described by Philippi as *Euchæta prestandræ* ; but no other characters of specific value are noticed by that author. Dr. Claus, at any rate, has referred to *Euchæta prestandræ*, the Mediterranean species figured in his work, which is undoubtedly also identical with Lubbock's *Euchæta atlantica*. There is more doubt about the reference to Dana's *Euchæta communis*, though there is nothing in the figures or descriptions, except insufficiency of detail, to discredit that reference. It is scarcely possible that a species so common and widely distributed as that now under discussion should have been missed by Dana : and a more appropriate term than *communis* could hardly have been applied to it, but if, as appears likely, Philippi's name referred to the same species, it has the claim of priority in date.