

books and buying of books, how many journeyings to and fro, how many researches ending in nothing, are necessarily involved in such consultation, those who have had a similar experience will well know, and those who have not had it can scarcely be made to understand. Without therefore expatiating on the difficulties which I suppose myself to have conquered or on the difficulties which conquered me, it may suffice to mention that, as the record proceeded, the plan of it was more than once changed, the earlier notices being rewritten and expanded, under the influence of a growing desire that as much of the task as possible should be done once for all and need no second doing. In the form actually adopted, the titles of works are given in chronological order, so far as the year of publication is concerned, but within that year they for the most part follow the alphabetical order of the authors' names.¹ Accuracy in the dates given has been anxiously aimed at, seeing that without this accuracy it is sometimes impossible to determine those questions of priority on which scientific nomenclature so much depends. But precision is very difficult to arrive at, when the only available copy of a work is an undated extract from a foreign magazine, or from the proceedings of a learned society, read in one year and published in the next or the next but one. It is greatly to be wished that "separate copies" should not only have the true paging, as Darwin² urges, but that they should also have that date of publication from which the new genera and species contained in them have a claim to reckon their priority.

The title of each work mentioned in the Bibliography is accompanied, it will be seen, as a rule by some notice of its contents. There are a few exceptions, where papers, of which the titles could be cited on adequate authority, have remained inaccessible, or where the titles themselves seemed sufficiently suggestive without further comment. Here and there, like a sign-post with the legend "No Road" upon it, the title of a book has been given for the sake of saying that it contains nothing about the Amphipoda. On the other hand some obscure works, perhaps really bearing on the subject, are omitted from the general list and only incidentally referred to as occasion offered. In the notices taken collectively two special objects have been aimed at:—

1. To quote the original definition of every genus of the Amphipoda.
2. To give under its proper date the name of every new species.

Two objects of a more general character have also been kept in view, namely, first, to give some idea of the character of the information which the various writings supply, and secondly, in so doing to produce a record, after the annalistic method, of the progress of knowledge in this branch of natural history.

It will be readily understood that a generic definition as at first framed is often little

¹ The following names are exceptions to the alphabetical order on the pages mentioned:—Seba, Linnæus, p. 18; Linnæus, p. 20; Strøm, p. 28; Olafsen, p. 36; Ginnani, Hammer, p. 38; Fabricius, p. 40; Pallas, p. 41; Forskål, p. 43; de Quéronic, p. 47; Linnaeus, p. 53; Roemer, p. 55; Pallas, p. 65; Latreille, p. 71; Rafinesque, p. 87; Leach, p. 89; Pollini, de Blainville, p. 93; Leach, p. 107; Costa, Krøyer, p. 177; Kraus, p. 205; Bate and Westwood, p. 340; Gerstaecker, p. 342; Cunningham, p. 404.

² The Life and Letters of Charles Darwin, edited by his son, Francis Darwin, vol. iii. p. 141.