

In his notes Dana recognizes *Leptomera*, Latr., as a synonym of *Proto*, Leach. He remarks, p. 830, "it is possible that the *Podocerus Leachii* (Kröyer), should form a distinct genus, as the animal lived in a tube like a *Cerapus*." At p. 832, he says, "*Glauconome* of Kröyer has the hands and antennæ and apparently the other characters of *Unciola*. Say describes the hands of the second pair in *Unciola* as *adactyle*; but they still are probably like those of *Glauconome*." In a note to *Anonyx*, Kröyer, he explains that he omits the genus *Ephippiphora*, White, from his synopsis, on account of its insufficient description. As to "*Leptochirus pilosus*," Zaddach, he asks, p. 910, "May the form be female only?" In a note on "*Iphimedia*, Rathke, D.," he says, "*Dexamine* of Leach, may perhaps be included here," and "the genus *Hyale* of H. Rathke," he says, "contains no characters in its description by this author, which do not apply equally well to species of *Iphimedia*." "*Amphithoe*, Leach, D.," he says, "includes *Pherusa* of Leach." In a note on "*Gammarus*, Fabr., D.," he mentions *Amathia*, Rathke, and *Eusirus*, Kröyer, but does not give them a place in the synopsis. The note on *Lepidactylis*, Say, remarks, "here falls *Bellia* of C. Spence Bate." In the addenda, p. 1595, he observes, "Page 908:—*Callisoma*, Costa (loc. cit.), appears to be identical with *Lysianassa*"; "Page 910.—*Niphargus* is the name of a new genus near *Gammarus*, proposed by Schiödte"; "Page 913. The genus *Lalaria* (*L. longitarsis*) of Nicolet (loc. cit., Pl. 2, f. 8), is between the *Gammaridæ* and *Corophidæ*, and appears to be identical with *Aora* of Kröyer, which was also from Valparaiso."

1852. LILJEBORG, WILHELM.

Hafs-Crustaceer vid Kullaberg. Crustacea marina ad Kullaberg in Scania mense Septembris 1851 observata. Öfversigt af Kongl. Vetenskaps-Akademiens Förhandlingar. Årg. 9. 1852. No. 1 & 2. (Nionde Årgången. 1852. Stockholm, 1853). pp. 1-13.

Among the Crustacea of this district already noticed by others, Liljeborg mentions "*Caprella linearis*, Latr., Örsted, De regionibus marinis, p. 73." He observes that in *Ampelisca macrocephala* as in "*Ampelisca Gaimardi* Kröyer (Voy. en Scandinavie etc. t. 23, f. 1. a, à)" there are four eyes instead of the two to which the Amphipoda had hitherto been limited. In these four he found no trace of facets, or cones, and concludes therefore that they are simple, as given in the original definition of the genus with a query. In the species which he describes as *Ampelisca Eschrichti?* Kröy., he found only two eyes, but with creatures that burrow in the mud at considerable depths, he thought the eyes too unimportant to justify a generic distinction depending on their number. However, in 1855, as *Haploops tubicola*, this species became the type of his new genus *Haploops*. Goës subsequently discovered that *Haploops* agreed with *Ampelisca* in having four eyes. In specimens preserved in spirits the lower pair have a tendency to disappear. Liljeborg was the less inclined to lay stress upon the eyes from noticing that in certain Amphipoda which live at great depths, they are entirely wanting, "as, e.g., in the genus *Stegocephalus*, Kröyer, and probably *Pardalisca* and *Ædiceros* Kr." As the last of these examples shows, it must not be too easily taken for granted that eyes are wanting, because they have not been detected, in species of Amphipoda, though Liljeborg's conclusion is justified that the possession of two eyes, given by Milne-Edwards as a general character for the order, cannot be attributed to it without reserve.

In the Latin description of "*Ampelisca Eschrichti?* Kröy.," corresponding as above-mentioned to *Haploops tubicola*, is included a description of the male, which refers to a separate species, called in 1855 *Haploops carinata*. He here remarks that Örsted, "(Naturhist. Tidskr.