the Sacculinidæ, and especially by the presence of two symmetrically situated apertures (genital pores) at the ventral side, in the hindermost part of the body.

In consequence perhaps of its being in the Norwegian language, this paper of M. Sars has not become known so widely as it merited. Neither Kossmann [1] nor Delage,[2] both of whom give an extensive bibliography in their papers on the Rhizocephala, mentions the above paper of M. Sars.

In his second paper on the fauna of the Arctic fjords published in 1884, J. Sparre Schneider of Tromsø [3] gave an enumeration of the Crustaceans and Pycnogonids he collected in 1881 in the Kvænangsfjord. In this fjord *Hippolyte pusiola* is common at a depth of 5 to 10 fathoms, at the place where it communicates with the Sørfjord. Schneider says [4] that this species is to a considerable degree infested with parasites, viz., a species of *Sylon* peculiar to *Hippolyte pusiola*, a couple of them being often observed on the same individual.

In the same year Max Weber [5] published the results of his researches on the Isopods collected during the cruises of the "Willem Barents." Speaking of *Phryxus abdominalis* (Kröyer), Weber says [6] that along with the Isopoda of the Barents collection, a specimen of *Hippolyte incerta*, Buchholz, was handed to him, which was infested on the ventral surface by a parasite, that on superficial investigation might be taken for a Bopyrid. On closer examination this idea was given up, and on comparing the parasite in question with specimens of *Sylon* attached to *Hippolyte pusiola*, which he collected himself near Tromsø, he saw at once that the parasite of *Hippolyte incerta*, Buchholz, also belonged to the genus *Sylon*. Through the kindness of Professor Max Weber of Amsterdam University, I was enabled to investigate two specimens of this species of *Sylon*, attached to *Hippolyte pusiola*, Kröyer, and to compare them with the Challenger specimen obtained off Halifax. This comparison brought out the great resemblance between them. They may be different species, but they clearly both belong to the genus *Sylon*. Whether in every case two specimens of *Sylon* living on different hosts should be regarded as different species, I do not venture to decide. From the analogy of similar cases of parasitical Isopoda, great prudence is certainly necessary in coming to a conclusion.

[1] Kossmann (Beiträge zur Anatomie der schmarotzenden Rankenfüssler, p. 5, 1874), says with regard to *Sylon*:—"Der Genusname *Sylon*, welchen zu characterisiren Kröyer durch den Tod gehindert wurde, kann füglich aus unserer Literatur wieder verschwinden, zumal K. seine Exemplare, wie er selbst angibt, sämmtlich verarbeitet hat."

[2] Delage (Evolution de la Sacculine, *Archives d. Zool. expér.* (2), tom. ii. p. 424, 1884), in regard to *Sylon* is also very decided:—"La même année (1855) Kröyer ajoute aux deux genres déjà connus le genre *Sylon*. Mais il omet de le caractériser et de conserver un exemplaire. Personne depuis n'a pu retrouver le *Sylon*, en sorte que c'est là un genre, que sauf Kröyer, personne n'a vu, et dont personne ne connaît les caractères. Le retrouvera-t-on ?"

[3] J. Sparre Schneider, Undersøgelser af dyrelivet i de Arktiske fjorde, II. Crustacea og Pycnogonida indsamlede i Kvænangsfjorden, 1881, *Tromsø Museums Aarshefter*, vii., 1884.

[4] *Loc. cit.*, p. 52.

[5] Max Weber, Die Isopoden gesammelt während der Fahrten des "Willem Barents" in das Nördliche Eismeer in den Jahren 1880 und 1881, *Bijdragen tot de Dierkunde*, 1884.

[6] *Loc. cit.*, p. 34.