GENERAL REMARKS ON THE MORPHOLOGY OF THE PHYLLOCARIDA.

The views of zoologists as to the systematic position of the genus Nebalia, the only hitherto known recent form of this group, have been widely different. Leach, the founder of the genus, placed it among the Macrura, and was followed in this view by several other authors, as Lamarck, Bosc, and Desmarest, whereas Milne-Edwards in his important work on the Crustacea put the genus among the Phyllopoda, placing it together with the genus Apus in his family Apusidæ. The great authority of the last named eminent naturalist seemed to have finally settled the question about the systematic position of Nebalia, it being by the general consent of carcinologists regarded as a true Phyllopod, though it was afterwards found necessary to remove it from the genus Apus, and to establish a distinct family, Nebaliadæ, for its reception. More recently, however, the phyllopodous nature of this form has been denied by several naturalists. Thus, Dr. E. Metschnikoff, in studying the development of Nebalia, was led to the result, that this form should more properly be referred to the Decapoda than to the Phyllopoda, and accordingly named it a "phyllopodiform Decapod." A similar view seems also to have been partly adopted by Professor Claus in transferring Nebalia from the Entomostraca to the Malacostraca. Finally, the late Dr. v. Willemoes Suhm, in describing a new form from the Challenger Expedition, places the family Nebaliidæ among the Schizopoda. Mr. Salter was the first to point out the apparent affinity of the recent genus Nebalia, to certain Palæozoic fossils, and Claus also recognised the relationship of Nebalia to these old forms of Crustacea. In 1879 Dr. A. Packard established a distinct order, Phyllocarida, for the reception of Nebalia, together with the above mentioned fossil forms, which formerly had generally been regarded as true Phyllopoda most nearly related to the genus Apus; and in the following year Professor Claus in the third edition of his Zoology likewise referred the genus Nebalia to a distinct order, Leptostraca, removing it far from the Phyllopoda and placing it among the Malacostraca.

As to my own views, I fully agree with the above named authors, that the genus Nebalia ought to be removed from the Phyllopoda, but I am not prepared to agree with Professor Claus in transferring it to the Malacostraca, and still less can I entertain the

¹ On Peltocaris, a New Genus of Silurian Crustacea, Quart. Journ. Geol. Soc. Lond., vol. xix., 1863.