

foot-jaws (fig. 10) small, alike in both sexes, produced apically into a strong hook-like extremity, and bearing on the inner margin several ciliated setæ; posterior foot-jaws (fig. 11) elongated, three-jointed, forming a strongly clawed prehensile hand, the claw larger in the male. First, second, and third pairs of feet with both branches three-jointed (figs. 12, 13), inner branch of the fourth pair (fig. 14) quite rudimentary, or replaced by a single small hair. Fifth pair of feet wanting or excessively minute. Frontal eyes two, each composed of a single, large, colourless, highly refracting lens, situated near the base of the anterior antennæ; median eyes very small.

The principal distinctive characters of this genus are the very large frontally situated corneal lenses, the broad, cylindrical cephalothorax, the very narrow abdomen, consisting only of two-joints and distinctly separated from the cephalothorax, the large, prehensile, posterior antennæ, the one-branched fourth foot, and the absence or very rudimentary characters of the fifth pair. From the most closely allied genus (*Saphirina*), the cylindrical, non-complanate character of the cephalothorax and styliform build of the abdomen distinguish it at a glance.

But though the genus is at once and easily recognisable, the indication of specific characters is a most perplexing task. From the large number of gatherings which have come under my notice it would be easy enough to pick out a considerable number,—perhaps half a dozen types,—which, were we to ignore intermediate forms, might serve for the foundation of as many separate species. But there would still remain numerous individuals, not precisely agreeing at all points with the types, but, allowing for slight variations, referable indifferently to several species. The characters upon which, chiefly, the species already described have been founded are,—the general outline of the body, position of the eyes, form of the two pairs of antennæ and posterior foot-jaws, and of the caudal stylets. I have not, however, been able to satisfy myself of the validity of many of the so-called specific distinctions which have been based upon these variations, so that, while not venturing to deny the possible existence amongst the Challenger collections of more species than I have admitted, it seems to me more consistent with the present state of our knowledge to allow a very wide margin for variation, and so to restrict very considerably the number of specific types. I feel sure, for instance, that some of Dana's species are founded upon characters belonging to immature or quite young forms,—the form and proportions of the caudal stylets and the armature of the posterior antennæ, being notably, as I believe, variable with the growth of the individual. But without the opportunity of observing accurately the growth and development of the animals, it is of course impossible to speak with absolute confidence on these points. We must always bear in mind the possibility of two or more species being mixed up in the same gathering, and when these are very closely allied, and in various stages of development, it becomes almost impossible to unravel the knot.