

Professor Kossmann uses the term *first pereiopod* as an alternative for *first gnathopod*, thus adding one more to the many confusions in the nomenclature of our subject. It is surely of the first importance in scientific language that as far as possible one word should be restricted to one meaning. Since the inventor of the term *first pereiopod* applied it to the limb behind the *second gnathopod*, it is open to other naturalists to reject the term altogether as inconvenient or erroneous, but not to apply it to the limb in front of the second gnathopod. For other confusions in nomenclature see the Note on Wrześniowski, 1881.

In the family Gammaridæ, to the genus *Ædicerus*, Krøyer, Kossmann assigns the synonyms *Westwoodilla*, Spence Bate; *Monoculodes*, Stimpson; *Krøyeria*, Spence Bate. To show the close connection of the four he gives the following table:—

“Zweiter Gnathopode:

“A. scheerenförmig	Krøyeria, Spence Bate.
“B. subcheliform, Carpus	
a. bis gegen den Dactylus verlängert	Monoculodes, Spence Bate.
b. nicht bis gegen den Dactylus verlängert	Ædicerus, Krøyer.
“C. weder subcheliform, noch scheerenförmig	Westwoodilla, Spence Bate.”

The other distinctions, he says, depend only on the proximity or separation of the eyes. For *Ædicerus* he offers the following diagnosis:—

“Kopf in ein spitzes, abwärts gebogenes Rostrum ausgezogen. Vorderantennen ohne Nebenast. Mandibel mit dreigliedrigem Taster. Maxillarfüsse mit starker Endklaue. Letzter Pereiopode ausserordentlich verlängert, mit griffelförmigem Endgliede. Hintere Pleopoden sämtlich zweiästig, die Aeste ganz oder fast völlig nackt. Telson einfach.”

He describes *Ædicerus aquimanus*, n. s., Taf. xiii. Fig. 6–8, in which, he says, the eyes appear to be separate; the pigment was no longer visible, but there were two lateral faceted corneæ to be seen.

Leucothoë crassimana, n. s., Taf. xiii. Fig. 9–10, is probably, as suggested by Miers in his “Alert” Report, 1884, a synonym of *Leucothoë spinicarpa*, Abildgaard. Kossmann’s largest specimen was a female with eggs, 7 mm. in length. Under *Mæra* (properly *Mæra*), he describes *Mæra erythra*, n. s., Taf. xiv. Fig. 1–8, which he says is very like Dana’s *Gammarus brasiliensis*. That species, he thinks, Sp. Bate ought to have placed in the genus *Mæra*, not in *Gammarella*. It may indeed be noted that the description of the antennæ does not agree with Sp. Bate’s own definition of *Gammarella*. Meantime Kossmann’s species does not well agree with *Mæra*, but suits very fairly with *Elasmopus*, Costa, as defined by Boeck, both in respect of the mandibles, antennæ, uropods and telson. It may well stand at present as *Elasmopus erythreus*.

Mæra massavensis, n. s., Taf. xiv. Fig. 9–11, is described as belonging “to that subdivision of the genus *Mæra* of which *M. tenella*, Dana, is typical. It would perhaps not be impossible to characterise it as a new genus. Apart from the slenderer habit, its characters are the presence of a double claw on the pereiopods (see Dana, Expl. Exp. Crust., Atl., pl. 65, fig. 7*d*) and the peculiarity, that the second joint of the upper antennæ is much longer and thinner than the preceding.” It is perhaps by some oversight that Kossmann describes “the hinder pleopoda” as quite like those of the preceding species, although with less numerous, finer spines. This is, with little doubt, a species of *Mæra*, and in that genus the last uropods have long rami projecting beyond the first and second pairs.

In the family Podoceridæ he mentions *Amphithoë filosa*?, Savigny’s species, and *Amphithoë erythra*, n. s., Taf. xiv. Fig. 12, 13, with the “general form quite as in *Amphithoë jilicornis*, Dana; stellate pigment distributed over the whole body.” I do not think this species can be separated from “*Amphithoë Vaillantii*,” Lucas, 1849.

Under *Amphithoëides*, new genus, Kossmann remarks that “Claus says in his Lehrbuch, (3rd Edition, p. 515) of the genus *Amphithoë*: ‘die vordern (Antennen) meist ohne