individual was developed between the penultimate and the last segment. In our own country it is one of the most remarkable sights in the group to observe the parent-stock of this form moving gracefully about with a long string of buds at its posterior extremity. Frey and Leuckart[1] extended the history of the subject by a careful examination of *Syllis prolifera* from the North Sea. They observed in the line between two segments a new process which forms an interpolated segment, and this, as a real bud of the anterior moiety of the animal, is developed after the manner of such structures, and by degrees is separated as a complete individual. From these observations, indeed, and his own on *Nais proboscidea*, Max Schultze concluded that the former was a clear case of fissiparous development, whereas in the latter a division takes place. Greeff[2] also gave an account of the usual budding in *Autolytus prolifer* from Heligoland. Frey and Leuckart did not find the generative products fully developed in their examples of the buds; but Krohn[3] made further observations a few years later, though he did not quite complete the history. The latter was accomplished by Alex. Agassiz,[4] who, in *Autolytus cornutus*, described the parent-stock, and traced from the elements of the male and female buds the growth of the young embryo into a parent-stock. A similar but not identical mode of development occurs in the British *Proceræa picta*. In *Filigrana*, a genus of the Serpulidæ, Sars,[5] Oscar Schmidt[6] and Huxley[7] have shown that linear buds are developed posteriorly.

So far as the foregoing observations go, the specimens exhibited only linear budding, but in 1863 Alex. Pagenstecher[8] described what he termed lateral budding in *Exogone gemmifera*, from the Port of Cette. This, however, as Ehlers has pointed out, is only a further development of the condition formerly shown by Œrsted in his *Exogone naidina*, or as very early indicated by Martin Slabber. Nothing approaching to a lateral bud exists. As stated in 1868,[9] Vaillant's[10] supposed new instance of reproduction by budding is due to a misapprehension. The so-called buds appear to be the tentacles (furnished with pigment-spots at the tip) of a *Polycirrus* or closely allied form. With this view Ehlers[11] coincides.

Fissiparity similar to that in the Syllidians previously mentioned has occasionally been observed in other groups, as in the *Eulalia gracilis* of Verrill.[12] In this, one of the segments is larger than the rest, and develops a distinct pair of eyes. Langerhans, in one of his interesting papers on the Annelids of the Canaries,[13] describes an instance,

[1] Beiträge zur k. wirbell. Thiere, &c., 1847, p. 91.
[2] *Archiv f. Naturgesch.*, 1866, p. 352.
[3] *Archiv f. Naturgesch.*, 1852, p. 66.
[4] *Journ. Boston Soc. Nat. Hist.*, vol. vii. p. 392.
[5] Fauna litt. Norvegiæ, p. 86.
[6] Neue Beiträge zur Naturgesch. d. Würmer, Jena, 1848, p. 33.
[7] *Edin. New Phil. Journ.*, January 1855, p. 113.
[8] *Zeitschr. f. wiss. Zool.*, Bd. xii. p. 267, Taf. xxv., &c.
[9] *Trans. Roy. Soc. Edin.*, vol. xxv. p. 309.
[10] *Ann. d. Sci. Nat.* (Zool.), sér. 5, 1865, p. 243, pl. iii.
[11] *Op. cit.*, ii. p. 15.
[12] Report of U.S. Commissioners of Fish and Fisheries, &c., 1873, p. 586.
[13] *Nova Acta Acad. Cæs. Leop.*, &c., Bd. xlii., No. 3, Halle, 1881, pp. 95–105.