

placed within the same order, the Branchiopoda, though representing the type of an anomalous suborder, the Phyllocarida.

In order to facilitate a closer comparison of the Nebaliidæ with the Copepoda, I subjoin a cut of a male specimen of one of our most common marine forms of the Harpactoid group, viz., *Diosaccus tenuicornis* (Claus).

*Homology of the Body-Divisions.*—In examining the body of a Nebaliid, its general resemblance to that of a Copepod, especially of the Harpactoid group, may at once be recognised. But it is at the same time readily seen that there is in the Nebaliidæ a distinct division of the body which is only faintly indicated in the Copepoda, viz., the trunk, or, as it is generally termed, the thorax. What is described as thorax in the Copepoda does not at all answer to the thorax in the higher Crustacea, but undoubtedly is homologous with the anterior part of the "abdomen" in these Crustacea, or the division in the Nebaliidæ described above as the pleon, whereas the so-called abdomen in the Copepoda evidently answers to only the posterior part of the abdomen in the higher Crustacea or the division in the Nebaliidæ succeeding the pleon, and described above as the tail. This is especially distinctly seen in the above described form, *Paranebalia longipes* (Pl. I. fig. 1; Pl. II. fig. 1), where the latter division is very sharply marked off from the pleon, both exhibiting a form very similar to that in the Copepoda, and, moreover, quite agreeing in function, since the tail here evidently admits of being moved as a whole upon the pleon, in the very same manner as in the Copepoda. A closer comparison between the Nebaliidæ and Copepoda thus clearly shows that the terminology generally adopted in describing the higher Crustacea has been wrongly applied as regards the lower forms (Copepoda), since the divisions "thorax" and "abdomen" in the former do not answer to the similarly named divisions in the latter. This misapprehension may indeed have been the cause why the affinity of *Nebalia* to the Copepoda has not been recognised. Thus, in order to explain the supposed abnormal number of segments in the "abdomen" of *Nebalia*, Professor Claus has set forth an hypothesis, which seems to me very unreasonable, viz., that the two last segments together with the caudal rami in *Nebalia* answer to the telson in the Podophthalmia, which latter part, he suggests, has been originally formed by several segments. The fact is, however, that the so-called abdomen in *Nebalia* does not show any similarity at all to that division in the higher Crustacea, whereas it is constructed upon the very same type as in the Copepoda, the number of segments being in full accordance with that found in a great number of these Crustacea, admitting the above given explanation of the homology of the body-divisions in both. As to the limit between the two divisions in the Nebaliidæ, described above as pleon and tail, it should be remembered that the first segment of the latter division, properly speaking, answers to the segment in the Copepoda generally described as the last thoracic segment, but which in most of the forms evidently has a much closer relation to the succeeding division, the tail, or, as it is wrongly termed, the abdomen.