

Synoptical Table of the Genera of the Family Halacaridæ.

A. Rostrum short, triangular; four joints in the palpi, which are short, convergent.	}	Palpi lateral, separate	1. RHOMBOGNATHUS, Tt		
		Palpi touching above the rostrum.	2. SIMOGNATHUS, Tt		
B. Rostrum elongate, not constricted at its base, with the palpi parallel.	}	Four joints in the palpi.	Only three joints in the palpi	3. COLOBOCERUS, Tt	
			Joint 3 of palpi much shorter than joint 4.	Palpi terminated by a simple point.	4. HALACARUS, Goss.
				Palpi terminated by a double point.	Subg. LEPTOPSALIS, Tt
			Joint 3 of palpi nearly as long as joint 4.		5. AGAUR, Lohm.
C. Rostrum much elongated, constricted at its base, pyriform.	}	Palpi lateral, widely separated, appearing to be formed of only three joints.	6. SCAPTOGNATHUS, T		
		Palpi in contact above the rostrum, with four well-developed joints.	7. LEPTOGNATHUS, H		

XXVI.—*The right Generic Names of some Amphipoda.*

By the Rev. THOMAS R. R. STEBBING, M.A.

IN the 'Annals and Magazine' for December 1868, Norman defined a new genus *Helleria*, with *Helleria coalita*, n. sp., for the type. By a slip either of the pen or of the press the superior antennæ were said to be *with*, instead of *without* secondary appendage. That the superior antennæ were much shorter than the inferior was made a generic character. Earlier in the same year, 1868, as was subsequently pointed out by Eaton, the name *Helleria* had been given by Ebner to a genus of the Isopoda. The Amphipod genus, however, was left with its name unaltered until 1887. In that year E. Chevreux, having obtained specimens of both sexes of Norman's species, renamed the genus *Guernea*, with a Latin rendering of the original definition. In this he retained the statement that the upper antennæ have an accessory flagellum, but omitted the character describing them as longer than the lower antennæ, because he found that this did not apply to

the female. In the same year, 1887, H. J. Hansen described his *Prinassus Nordenskiöldii*, n. gen., n. sp., without giving any separate generic definition. His single specimen was a female, in which the upper antennæ were rather longer than the lower, and had no accessory flagellum. There is every probability that his species is the same as Norman's *Helleria coalita*, and there can be no doubt that his genus is identical with that defined by Norman and Chevreux. Whether *Guernea* or *Prinassus* should have the priority is not so easy to decide. Chevreux's paper comes to hand as an "Extrait du Bulletin de la Société Zoologique de France, t. xii. 1887," and is dated on the cover as published in Paris, 1887. Hansen's paper similarly comes to hand as a "Særtryk af Vidensk. Meddel. fra den naturh. Foren. i Kjøbh. 1887," and is dated on the titlepage as published in Kjøbenhavn, 1887. Extracts from the 'Annals and Magazine' have the great advantage of showing the exact month in which the description of a new genus or species has appeared, but in the extracts above-mentioned there is nothing to indicate which has the priority. It would be a decided boon if, in all publications of the kind, this inconvenience could be remedied. In papers extracted from the reports, for instance, of our own British Association, there is in general nothing which decidedly shows whether they were published during the year in which they were read, or not till the following year. In the case of the Transactions of a Society for any given year, the presumption will be that they were not actually published till the year following, although in some instances parts of these Transactions may have been in fact issued while the year to which they refer was still current. It would save much trouble if "separate copies" were provided with an exact reference to the volume and paging of the work from which the excerpt is made, as well as with the true date, not of the reading, or not of that alone, but of the first actual publishing of the paper concerned.

It may be of interest to English readers to know that the genus *Eriopis*, Bruzelius, which Boeck identified with *Niphar-gus*, Schiödte, was reinstated in 1888 by the eminent Polish writer, Wrześniowski, who found that the maxillæ were distinct in the two genera. It appears, however, from Scudder's 'Nomenclator Zoologicus,' that *Eriopis* was preoccupied before its use by Bruzelius, and therefore, as *Opis* was altered into *Opisa*, I propose to change *Eriopis*, Bruzelius, into *Eriopisa*.

Dr. P. P. C. Hoek, recently appointed Director of the new Zoological Station at Helder, last year explained that his

Orthopalame Terschellingii had proved to be identical with *Microprotopus maculatus*, a genus and species described by Norman in the 'Annals and Magazine' for December 1868. The genus *Orthopalame* is therefore cancelled.

M. Jules Bonnier has also, during 1889, discovered and pointed out that in instituting the new genus *Dryope* in 1862, the late Mr. Spence Bate was in error in attributing two branches to the last uropods, and that, in fact, the genus *Dryope*, of which the name was preoccupied, is identical with the genus *Unciola*, Say. The uropods in question are difficult to observe, because, while above they are covered by the minutely scabrous telson, below they are almost concealed by the produced ventral plate of the sixth segment of the pleon. It may be questioned whether the inner branch of the third uropods in this genus is not rather coalesced with the peduncle than absolutely wanting. This is a point which some embryologist might decide.

Of the species which Dr. Julius Vosseler described last year among the Amphipoda of Spitzbergen under the name "*Amphitopsis dubia*, n. sp.," it may be said that there is great reason to regard it as identical with *Amphitopsis glacialis*, Hansen, 1887, although Hansen does not figure or mention the pair of apical setules which Vosseler notices and represents on the telson. Hansen suggests that his species ought possibly to be referred to Boeck's genus *Laothoës*, because the lower antennæ are longer than the upper. In Boeck's genus, however, it is the upper antennæ that are longer than the lower. Further, in *Laothoës* the first maxillæ have a little one-jointed palp, while Vosseler, at least for his "*Amphitopsis dubia*," figures the first maxillæ as having a large two-jointed palp. Boeck himself says that *Laothoës* was preoccupied by Fabricius among Lepidoptera in 1808, and therefore ought to be exchanged for some other name to stand among the Amphipoda. Scudder gives "*Laothoe*, Fabr. Lep. 1808, A;" and if this is correct, there will be no need to alter Boeck's generic name, but figures of *Laothoës Meinerti*, Boeck, are, I believe, still a desideratum.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTICES.

The Flora of Suffolk. By W. M. HIND, LL.D., assisted by the late CHURCHILL BABINGTON, D.D., F.L.S. London: Gurney and Jackson, 1889. Pp. xxxiv, 1-508.

IN 1860 a 'Flora of Suffolk' by the Rev. J. S. Henslow and E. Skepper was published, the former of whom regarded himself as "a consulting but sleeping partner." This, which was issued more as