Monoculodes carinatus, Sp. Bate, is disunited from *Monoculodes affinis* of Boeck [which J. S. Schneider thinks may = *Monoculodes stimpsoni*, Sp. Bate]; 142. *Leucothoë furina*, Savigny (Sp. Bate), is thought to be easily distinguishable from *Leucothoë spinicarpa*, Abildgaard, by its slenderer body, a somewhat different form of the gnathopods, and difference of colouring. It may be doubted, notwithstanding, whether any or all of these distinctions suffice to establish the specific difference in question. *Halice grandicornis*, Boeck, is undoubtedly, Sars says, the male of 146. *Halice abyssi*, Boeck. Bate's *Ampelisca gaimardii* (originally *Tetromatus typicus*) is stated to be undoubtedly the male of 148. *Ampelisca tenuicornis*, Lilljeborg, not a separate species, *Ampelisca typica*, as Boeck makes it. But here neither Sars nor Boeck can be right, for the anterior part of the back, both in *Ampelisca tenuicornis* and in Boeck's description of *Ampelisca typica*, is round, while in Spence Bate's species "the anterior half of the animal is much more compressed than the posterior, and narrowed to an angle upon the dorsal surface, the angle increasing anteriorly to the extremity of the head." Hoek is probably right in adopting Norman's suggestion that *Ampelisca carinata*, Bruzelius, is the male of *Ampelisca æquicornis*, Bruzelius, but again neither Norman nor Hoek can be right in uniting *Ampelisca gaimardi*, Sp. Bate, to *Ampelisca carinata*, Bruzelius, for that species has the front part of the back rounded. The name *Ampelisca typica* (Bate, non Boeck) will therefore belong to *Ampelisca gaimardii* (Bate, non Krøyer), while *Ampelisca typica*, Boeck, is united to *Ampelisca tenuicornis*, Lilljeborg. The question, however, remains, whether the specific name of *Tetromatus typicus* can with propriety be retained, when the species to which it refers has been found to belong to a previously established genus. 158. *Corophium bonelli*, M.-Edwards, is distinguished from *Corophium crassicorne*, Bruzelius, by the rounded side-lobes of the head and the far weaker form of the lower antennæ both in male and female. *Siphonœcetes crassicornis*, Sp. Bate, under the title 160. *Cerapus crassicornis*, is referred without doubt to the genus *Cerapus*, Say, as characterised by S. I. Smith. It constructs, out of particles of mud, small, regularly cylindrical tubes, which it carries about with it. The species referred by Boeck to *Cerapus* belong to *Erichthonius*. The females of 163. *Dulichia monacantha*, Metzger, are said to be very like the females of *Dulichia porrecta*, Sp. Bate, while the males are clearly distinguished by the development of the side-plates of the second pair into long forward-directed spine-like processes.

1882. STREETS, THOMAS H.

A Study of the Phronimidæ of the North Pacific Surveying Expedition. Proceedings of the United States National Museum. Vol. V. 1882. pp. 3–9. Pl. I.

Dr. Streets is of opinion that Claus combines in his description of *Phronima sedentaria* more than one species. *Phronima sedentaria* itself Dr. Streets had not had any opportunity to examine. He points out that to Claus is due the discovery that such and such a species known in the female had a male form presenting characteristic differences. He upholds *Phronima atlantica*, Guérin (fig. 1, 1*a*, 2), as a good species, against the researches of Claus, and also *Phronima pacifica*, Streets, fig. 3, 3*a*. In regard to the genus *Phronimella*, Claus, he says, "Claus states that there are 'only two pairs of styliform caudal appendages.' This is true of the female, but not of the male. In one of his plates, where the caudal extremity of a male is given, the three pairs of styliform appendages are very clearly represented." Description and figures (4, 4*a*, 5, 5*a*) are given of *Phronimella elongata*, Claus, with which Dr. Streets identifies his own *Anchylonyx hamatus*, 1877.