

branch of the posterior antennæ have but three setæ at the apex; the inferior eyes are quite small. This sub-genus may include some species referred to *Hemicalanus*.

“2. *Pontellina*.—Antennæ of second pair having five setæ at the apex of the anterior or smaller branch; head either side unarmed.

“3. *Pontella*.—Antennæ as in the last; head either side armed with a reversed spine. The *Pontia atlantica* of Edwards is of this kind. In this division the second of the caudal setæ is considerably longer (one-fourth at least) than the others (in most, if not all cases), which is not true of the preceding sub-genus *Pontellina*.”

Again, Sir John Lubbock¹ has proposed two new genera—*Labidocera* and *Monops*—with three sub-genera, *Labidocera*, *Ivella*, and *Iva*. The generic and sub-generic definitions are as follows:—

“*Labidocera*.—Rostrum furcatum; antenna antica maris dextra geniculans, tumida, lamellis lobulisve dentatis instructa. Oculi superiores duo. Oculi inferiores nulli? Cephalothorax 7-articulatus. Pes posticus maris dexter, prehensilis. Abdomen maris 4-articulatum, feminæ 2-articulatum.

“Sub-genera:—1. *Labidocera*.—Antenna antica maris dextra duabus serratis lamellis instructa. Spina prehensilis, parva, rigido crini similis. Pes thoracicus quintus sinister, parvus, ramum internum 2-articulatum, ad apicem annulatum gerens. 2. *Ivella*.—Antenna antica maris dextra tribus dentatis lobulis instructa. Spina prehensilis, magna. Pes thoracicus quintus sinister, magnus, fortis, ad apicem acutus et corneus, ramum internum non gerens. 3. *Iva*.—Antenna antica maris dextra quatuor dentatis lamellis instructa, tumidissima. Spina prehensilis, maxima, annulata. Pes thoracicus quintus sinister, magnus, ad apicem tumidus, papillosus.

“*Monops*.—Rostrum furcatum. Antenna antica maris dextra geniculans, tumida. Oculi superiores nulli. Oculus inferior unicus. Pes posticus maris dexter crassus prehensilis.”

The characters, however, upon which these divisions are based, though useful as affording specific distinctions, utterly break down when applied to larger groups. It has been already shown that Dana's two species of *Calanopia* belong really to distinct genera, and would scarcely have been brought together if the characters of the mouth-organs and feet, as well as the eyes and antennæ, had been taken into account.² For the same reason, Sir John Lubbock's genera and sub-genera appear to me quite untenable. The restriction of the generic term *Pontellina* as proposed by Dr. Claus, to species having a rostral lens, lateral upper eyes, lateral spines on the head, and a six-jointed apex to the posterior foot-jaw, will, I suspect, also be found impracticable; at any rate if the subordinate character of a three-jointed inner branch to the first foot is to be taken in

¹ *Ann. and Mag. Nat. Hist.*, March, August, and September 1853.

² It will be seen that though I adopt this term *Calanopia* for a genus of which *Calanopia elliptica*, Dana, is the type, I depend for its diagnosis on characters entirely distinct from those originally proposed.