

over, in all essential points rather well with that found in *Nebalia*.<sup>1</sup> The apparent agreement with the Schizopoda in the mode in which the ova and embryos are borne in *Nebalia* during their development, is considerably lessened by the circumstance that there is in the latter form no trace of any true incubatory pouch, the ova being simply received within the valves of the carapace and kept in place by the aid of the branchial legs.

*Concluding Remarks on the Phylogeny of the Nebaliidæ.*—Owing to the suggestion made by most naturalists, that *Nebalia* forms a direct transition between the Phyllopoda and Podophthalmia, it has generally been supposed that the Nebaliidæ have descended from the Phyllopoda, and that, on the other hand, all the Podophthalmia should be regarded as descendants from *Nebalia*-like ancestors. In his interesting treatise on the phylogenetic relationship of the Malacostraca, Dr. Boas has sought to strengthen the latter supposition by instituting a close comparison of the limbs in *Nebalia* with those in the Malacostraca, and has thereby been led to the result, that the connecting link between *Nebalia* and the great bulk of the Podophthalmia is represented by the Euphausiidæ, from which again all the other forms of that division are supposed to have descended. It would seem that the chief reason that has led Dr. Boas to this view as to the supposed close relationship between *Nebalia* and the Euphausiidæ, is the apparent agreement in the number of segments composing the anterior division of the body (cephalothorax), and the uniformity in structure of the eight pairs of limbs succeeding the oral parts in both. For in all other points the difference is in reality so very great, as in most cases only to admit of the statement of a very general homology, such as could also be made by comparing almost any forms of Crustacea. It has been stated above that the resemblance of the branchial legs to the legs in the Euphausiidæ is in the genus *Paranebalia* considerably more pronounced than in *Nebalia*. But notwithstanding this agreement, I still believe that there is no true relationship between the Nebaliidæ and the Euphausiidæ, and that the above mentioned apparent conformity in the construction of some of the limbs in both is merely accidental, a view that seems also to be confirmed by the fact that in an otherwise closely related genus, *Nebaliopsis*, these limbs exhibit a form showing no similarity whatever to the corresponding limbs in the Euphausiidæ. If any true consanguinity had existed between the Nebaliidæ and the Euphausiidæ, the agreement between the two would certainly not be restricted to the above named limbs, but might have been traced also in the rest of the organisation. But this is by no means the case. On the contrary, it may easily be found on closer comparison, that the Euphausiidæ in so far differ from the Nebaliidæ even considerably more than is the case with a great number of other Malacostraca.

As to my own view on the probable phylogenetical relation of the Nebaliidæ to other

<sup>1</sup> On *Cyclestheria hislopi* (Baird), a New Generic Type of Bivalved Phyllopoda, *Forhandl. Vidensk. Selsk. Christ.*, 1887 (to be shortly published).