

“Darwin's ‘true ovaria,’ which Cuvier thought to be salivary glands, were also subjected to a close inspection, and were shown to be digestive glands pouring their secretions into the alimentary canal. The body of these glands is composed of one kind of cell only, belonging apparently rather to the pancreatic than to the hepatic cells, which are found in the digestive glands of the higher Crustaceans (Weber). To the same category of problematic organs, in which Cirripedia always were very rich, no doubt belongs the small organ of vision discovered by Leidy; it is attached to the surface of the stomach and covered by the ligament between the two scuta, and by the muscles placed between this ligament and the widened stomach. Leidy's observation is quite in accordance with the facts, and these beautifully illustrate the persistence of an old larval structure which can hardly be considered to be of any use to the animal.

“Though in general Krohn and Kossmann had a correct notion of the structure of the female genital apparatus, our knowledge, as far as details are concerned, has been considerably augmented by the investigation of the Challenger material. The results of the researches with respect to this apparatus have been published in the last chapter of the Supplementary Report. The discovery of the occurrence of the segmental organ communicating with the exterior by means of the openings in the outer maxillæ, perhaps casts light on the peculiar place of the female genital openings of Cirripedia. These would appear to be nothing but the openings of a second pair of segmental organs; thus the first pair of segmental organs furnishes a direct communication of the body-cavity with the surrounding medium, whereas the second serves for the evacuation of the female genital products.”

*The Pycnogonida.*—“The Pycnogonids form together a little group of Arthropodous animals. Though they are often met with by zoologists studying the marine fauna, they have hitherto, with a few exceptions only, been but superficially investigated. The naturalists who paid more special attention to the group had but few specimens at their disposal, and these belonged to a couple of species only; thus it happened that though the number of papers treating of these animals had grown rather large, and though a considerable number of new species had from time to time been described, our knowledge of the group was but little increased. By far the greater number of the species were described so inaccurately as not to admit of comparison with one another, and so far as the morphology of the group is concerned, we have till recently been almost entirely in the dark. The papers of Dohrn (1869) and Semper (1874) are among the first that tried to shed light on this question, and it is well known that they have arrived at very different conclusions. Dohrn's conclusion was that the Pycnogonids, though not Crustaceans, appear by the presence of a Nauplius-larva in their ontogenetical development to be nearly related to Crustaceans; Semper, on the contrary, tried to demonstrate the truly Arachnid nature of these animals.