

view of the late Dr. v. Willemoes Suhm in placing it among the Schizopoda. In my opinion the genus *Nebalia* ought to be retained within the order of the Branchiopoda, though representing a distinct subdivision or suborder, for which the name Phyllocarida, proposed by Dr. A. Packard, as the older one, must be preferred to that proposed by Professor Claus. The order Branchiopoda will thus contain the following subdivisions:—Phyllocarida, Phyllopoda, Cladocera, Branchiura, the type of the last division being the genus *Argulus*, which in my opinion cannot properly be referred to the Copepoda, as proposed by Claus, but, in accordance with the views set forth by Thorell and others, may find its proper place among the Branchiopoda, though it deviates still more from the type of the order, the Phyllopoda, than is the case with the genus *Nebalia*.

It seems to be a generally adopted assumption, that the genus *Nebalia* forms a distinct transition between the Phyllopoda and the Podophthalmia, and that its affinity to the latter is even closer than to the former. I have been led to a rather different view as to the relationship of *Nebalia*, and I think we shall find, on closer examination, whether we consider the external or internal organisation, that this presumed affinity to the Podophthalmia is in reality only very slight, and that most of the characters adduced to show the decapodous nature of *Nebalia* do not hold good, since they are found fully as pronounced either in other Branchiopoda or in certain Crustacea not at all belonging to the Podophthalmian group. Thus, the stalked mobile eyes are not only met with in the Podophthalmia, but also, as is well known, in a section of true Phyllopoda, the Branchipodidæ, and as to structure the eyes in *Nebalia* evidently agree much more with those in the latter than in the former. The carapace in *Nebalia*, it is true, exhibits some resemblance to that in certain Schizopoda, as *Gnathophausia*, in being not connected with the trunk, but we must remember that this is also the case in the Phyllopoda, both in *Apus* and in the bivalved forms, and that this character in the Branchiopoda is universal, whereas in the Podophthalmia it is exceptional, only distinguishing a very restricted number of forms. Besides, the carapace in *Nebalia* shows both in its structure and especially in the presence of a distinct adductor muscle a much closer resemblance to the bivalved shell in the Phyllopoda. The form of the exposed part of the body in *Nebalia* is very unlike that met with in the Podophthalmia, whereas the resemblance in this respect to certain Phyllopoda and still more to the Copepoda is unmistakable. The internal organisation of *Nebalia*, though rather deviating from that in the Phyllopoda, does not show any marked resemblance to that in the Podophthalmia, being much more similar to that in the Amphipoda; neither in my opinion can the development be adduced as evidence of the decapodous nature of *Nebalia*.

As to the several limbs, their structure is in fact highly remarkable, indicating a peculiar mixture of characters found in very different groups of Crustacea, and on the whole their presumed resemblance to those in the higher Crustacea may on closer examination turn out to be only very slight. Thus, the structure of the two pairs of antennæ