

In the following table (pp. 4, 5) I have brought together, in one general scheme, an outline of the several classifications that have been adopted by the more distinguished carcinologists, so far as they relate to the Macrurous Crustacea.

It is interesting to observe how closely these different systems correspond as to their general conclusions, the chief points of distinction being with regard to those genera which, while they resemble one group in external form, approach some other group in some important structural character.

The arrangement of Latreille agrees closely with that of De Haan, even to the introduction of the phyllobranchiate families of the Paguridæ and Porcellanidæ among the anomurous forms.

The classification of Milne-Edwards differs in separating the Eryonidæ, Scyllaridæ, and Palinuridæ from the Astacidea, where all other authors, excepting Heller, place them, and in grouping them along with the Galatheidæ.

Dana differs from the others in the exclusion of the Galatheidæ and allied families from the Macrura altogether, and in forming a sub-tribe to receive *Penæus* and its allied genera, among which he includes *Stenopus*.

The more recent system proposed by Professor Huxley is almost identical with that of Latreille, as given in Cuvier's Règne Animal, 2nd ed., vol. iv., 1829, and quoted by Milne-Edwards in his Hist. des Crust., t. i. p. 217, differing only in the removal of the family of the Penæidæ from among the Salicoques, where all preceding authors, excepting Dana, have placed it, and transferring the same to range with the Trichobranchiata, a section that corresponds with that of the "Homards" of Latreille, and is synonymous with the three divisions—Astaciens, Thalassiniens, and Cuirassés of Milne-Edwards—and with the *Astacina* of De Haan. It, moreover, corresponds with the Astacidea, Thalassinidea, and Penæidea of Dana, and with the Loricata, Astacidea, and Thalassinidæ of Heller, whose classification is identical with that of Milne-Edwards, excepting in the terms selected for the names of the separate groups.

It would thus appear that the various systems of classification have failed to receive acceptance by each successive naturalist, from the circumstance that the several tribes or groups have received their distinguishing title from the most prominent or distinctive animal in its respective group or tribe, a circumstance that must render a nomenclature very liable to be changed with any variation of individual thought, dependent upon the opportunity of study, as well as with the increase of knowledge through extension of research.

The nomenclature recently suggested by Professor Huxley, being based upon the structural character of the branchiæ, appears not to be open to this defect.

He has proposed that the Macrura be divided into three groups,—the Trichobranchiata, the Phyllobranchiata, and the Abranchiata.

*Trichobranchiata* are those that have the branchial plumes made up of long