

*Lower Lip.*—The front lobes narrow, not quite acute, the lip widened below, not produced into mandibular processes.

*First Maxillæ.*—The distal margin forming two processes, of which the inner is the longer; the inner margin indented and carrying a spinule a little below the apical process.

*Second Maxillæ.*—These appear to reach somewhat beyond the first maxillæ and to have the outer margin produced into a small process, while the inner margin apically bulges inwards.

*Maxillipeds.*—The second joint broad, the distal margin and adjacent parts of the outer surface scabrous with spinules of various sizes; the inner plate small, longer than broad, the two embedded spinules planted near together some way below the distal margin; the broad outer plates covering most of the inner plate and arching over it, the corrugated inner margin minutely pectinate; little spinules are spread about on the lower part of the outer surface, and a row is submarginal to the distal part of the outer border.

*Length*, in the position figured, nine-twentieths of an inch.

*Localities.*—October 1875, South Pacific; surface. One specimen, male.

April 28, 1876, North Atlantic; lat.  $17^{\circ} 47' N.$ , long.  $28^{\circ} 28' W.$ ; surface; surface temperature,  $72^{\circ} \cdot 8$ . Five specimens, males.

April 29, 1876, North Atlantic; lat.  $18^{\circ} 8' N.$ , long.  $30^{\circ} 5' W.$ ; surface, night; surface temperature,  $72^{\circ}$ . One specimen, male.

*Remarks.*—The figures, with the exception of fig. *l.i.* A., are taken from the Pacific specimen; it differs from the Atlantic specimens in being without pigment spots, in having longer hands to the gnathopods, and in not having a minute marginal groove in the upper part of the first joint of the fifth peræopods. For these reasons I at first proposed to make of this a new species under the name *Pronoe immaculata*, but I abstain from doing so for want of opportunity to determine whether these slight differences are constant, and for the further reason that, as Guérin says nothing of his species being spotted, but describes it as “jaunâtre,” it is possible that the flecked specimens may have the better claim to be treated as new.

#### Genus *Eupronoë*, Claus, 1879.

1879. *Eupronoë*, Claus, Die Gattungen und Arten der Platysceliden, pp. 23, 26.  
 1886. „ Gerstaecker, Bronn's Klassen und Ordnungen, Bd. v. Abth. ii. p. 484.  
 1887. „ Bovallius, Systematical List of Amph. Hyper., Bihang till K. Svensk. Vetensk.-  
 Akad. Handl., Bd. 11, No. 16, p. 40.  
 1887. „ Claus, Die Platysceliden, pp. 48, 50.

For the original definition of this genus, see Note on Claus, 1879 (p. 492), and for the suggestion that *Orio*, Cocco, 1832, as limited by de Natale in 1850, may be the