

smooth, and the carpos of the second pair of pereopoda uniarticulate, according to Milne-Edwards' figure and description.

Dr. Stimpson<sup>1</sup> described a new genus founded on *Hippolyte acuminata*, Dana, under the name of *Verbius*, in which he placed *Hippolyte varians* as one of the recognised typical forms. This arrangement has been followed by Heller,<sup>2</sup> for he figures *Hippolyte varians*, Leach, as *Verbius varians*; by Miers,<sup>3</sup> by Mr. J. S. Kingsley in his list of North American Crustacea,<sup>4</sup> and in his revision of the genera of Crangonidæ and Palæmonidæ,<sup>5</sup> and more lately by Professor Sars.<sup>6</sup> Dr. Stimpson establishes his genus *Hippolyte* on Fabricius' species of *Cancer aculeatus*, which corresponds with the forms of Milne-Edwards' third division of *Hippolyte*, in which also falls Sowerby's species of *Cancer spinus*. The latter species Kingsley<sup>7</sup> regards as the type of the genus *Hippolyte*. It is to be regretted that neither Stimpson nor Kingsley gave priority to Leach's definition of *Hippolyte*,<sup>8</sup> and which was founded on the species known as *Hippolyte varians*, in 1815. In the same volume in which this definition appeared, Sowerby's prawn was named *Alpheus spinus*<sup>9</sup> by Leach, and therefore at that time it was not recognised as belonging to *Hippolyte*, and it was not until he published the twenty-ninth plate of his *Malacostraca Podophthalmia Britannica*, a work which came out in parts between 1815 and 1817, that Sowerby's *Cancer spinus* was named *Hippolyte sowerbæi*.

Undoubtedly *Hippolyte varians*, Leach, and *Cancer spinus*, Sowerby, belong to two distinct genera, a fact that was probably recognised by Leach himself when he placed the latter, under the name of *Hippolyte sowerbæi*, in a second division of *Hippolyte*. This arrangement was followed by Milne-Edwards, who divided *Hippolyte* into three divisions, placing *Hippolyte varians* in the first, and *Hippolyte sowerbyi* in the third division.

Extended research has undoubtedly justified the division of the genus, upon purely anatomical grounds, into distinct genera.

When Leach first described the genus he had only one specimen to classify, and that was sent to him by Montagu from Devonshire, and this specimen he states to be the type of the genus. The specimen that he had named *Alpheus spinus*, the "Cancer spinus" of Sowerby, he evidently saw approached nearer to the new genus *Hippolyte* than to *Alpheus*; he therefore made a division and arranged it within the genus upon grounds which would not now be accepted, namely, the number of teeth on the dorsal surface of the telson, the number of articuli of the second pair of pereipoda and the presence of a synhipod on the mandible.

<sup>1</sup> *Loc. cit.*

<sup>2</sup> *Loc. cit.*

<sup>3</sup> *Proc. Acad. Nat. Sci. Philad.*, p. 421, 1879.

<sup>4</sup> *Loc. cit.*, p. 419.

<sup>5</sup> *Loc. cit.*, p. 347.

<sup>6</sup> *Loc. cit.*, taf. x. fig. 4.

<sup>7</sup> *Bulletin Essex Inst.*, vol. x. p. 63.

<sup>8</sup> *Loc. cit.*

<sup>9</sup> *Trans. Linn. Soc. Lond.*, vol. ix. p. 346.