

latior; supra finem pedunculi pedum ultimi paris spuriorum porrecta, sursum paullo curvata, non fissa, margine postico 3 sinibus haud profundis, quorum medius latus, laterales arcti, setis singulis præditi. *Integumenta* cephalocormi et caudæ nitida, punctis impressis rotundis confertissime collatis.—*Corporis longitudo* 51<sup>mm</sup>, *latitudo maxima* 17,5<sup>mm</sup>, *altitudo maxima* 11<sup>mm</sup>. *Longitudo antennarum superiorum* a) pedunculi 5<sup>mm</sup>, b) flagelli primarii 10<sup>mm</sup>, c) flagelli accessorii 3,3<sup>mm</sup>. *Longitudo antennarum inferiorum* a) pedunculi 7,5<sup>mm</sup>, b) flagelli accessorii 17<sup>mm</sup>.

“*Habitat* in Mari Sibiriae Glaciali inter promontorium Vankarema et Fretum Beringianum fundo arenoso, orgyarum 4–6 profunditate.”

No doubt the word “accessorii” is applied to the flagellum of the lower antennæ in the above account by an accidental mistake in writing.

1880. THOMSON, GEORGE M.

*New Species of Crustacea from New Zealand.* The Annals and Magazine of Natural History. No. 31. July 1880. Vol. VI. Fifth Series. London, 1880. pp. 1–6.

The observations refer to the Crustacean fauna of Dunedin Harbour, the maximum depth of the bay being probably about 6 fathoms. Under “Amphipoda Normalia. Fam. Gammaridæ. Subfam. *Stegocephalides*,” there is instituted the new genus *Panoplæa*, thus defined:—

“Coxæ of the four anterior segments well developed, those of the second pair of pereopoda excavated on the upper part of the posterior margin. Antennæ subequal, without a secondary appendage. Mandibles with an appendage. Maxillipeds with a squamiform process on the ischium. Gnathopoda feeble, almost chelate. Three posterior pairs of pleopoda double-branched. Telson simple, squamiform.” Mr. Thomson says, “I have formed this genus to include two species which appear to me to be the southern representatives of the arctic genus *Pleustes*. It differs from *Pleustes* only in the well-developed squamiform plate on the ischium of the maxillipeds, and in the gnathopoda being slender and more or less chelate. In the general appearance of the species, however, there is a very perceptible difference.” The new species, figured Pl. I. figs. 2, 3, are named *Panoplæa spinosa* and *Panoplæa debilis*. Of these, through the kindness of Mr. Thomson, I have been able to examine specimens, and it appears to me that *Panoplæa spinosa* is certainly an *Iphimedia*, while *Panoplæa debilis* has numerous points of resemblance to *Amphithopsis longimana*, Boeck, but as the species has three dorsal spines, it may be more correct to place it in the closely allied genus *Halirages*, Boeck. It cannot be generically united with *Panoplæa (Iphimedia) spinosa*. In “Subfam. *Phoxides*. Genus *Amphilochus*, C. Spence Bate,” is described “*Amphilochus squamosus*, n. sp. (Pl. I. fig. 4.)” In “Subfam. *Gammarides*. Genus *Eusirus*, Kröyer,” is described “*Eusirus cuspidatus*, Kröyer, var. *antarcticus*, n. var.” Of “*Melita tenuicornis*, Dana (*Mæra tenuicornis*, Sp. Bate, *Paramæra tenuicornis*, Miers),” it is said, “the females are remarkable for possessing a hook-like process on the coxal lamellæ of the fourth pair of pereopoda, almost exactly similar to that figured and described by Fr. Müller (Facts for Darwin, p. 27) as occurring in *M. insatiabilis*.” In “Genus *Megamæra*, Spence Bate,” “*Megamæra fasciculata*, n. sp. (Pl. I. fig. 5), is described. In “Fam. *Corophiidae*. Genus *Corophium*, Latr.” a description is given of *Corophium contractum*, Stimpson.