

includes the genus *Astacus*, and at p. 415 he gives the following definition of *Astacus crassicornis*:—

“7. A. antennis posticis bifidis, thorace articulato, pedibus sexti paris longissimis.

“Habitat in Oceano americano. *Mus. Banks.*

“Corpus parvum, rubescens. Thorax oblongus, subcylindricus, dorso carinatus, antice retusus absque rostro, articulatus; articulis octo subæqualibus. Antennæ anticæ corpore longiores, setaceæ, crassiusculæ. Abdomen angustatum, quinque-articulatum. Pedes utrinque octo, omnes simplices; sexto duplo longiori, femoreque serrato. Cauda stylis sex exsertis, filiformibus.”

By Herbst in 1796 this species is called “Das Dickhorn. Cancer (Gammarellus) *crassicornis*” (see Note on Herbst, p. 61), but, though he correctly places it in the midst of Amphipoda, he leaves it in so much obscurity that later writers have not accepted it as an Amphipod. By the expressions “antennis posticis bifidis,” and “pedes utrinque octo,” it seems to be entirely excluded from this group, but fortunately there is in the Museum Banksianum, under the care of Dr. Günther in the British Museum at South Kensington, a figure of *Cancer crassicornis*, signed “Sydney Parkinson pinxt. 1768,” to which the description by Fabricius clearly refers. The bifid hinder antennæ were perhaps assigned to it as a matter of course on the presumption that the species belonged to the genus *Astacus*; the eight segments attributed to the thorax probably include the head, and possibly the lower antennæ of a male specimen were counted as the first pair of legs, by this means making the total number of legs eight pairs, and the longest pair the sixth in order instead of the fifth; if these or some equivalent explanations be accepted, it will then, I think, be readily admitted that the *Astacus crassicornis* of Fabricius is the earliest described species of the genus since successively named *Scinà*, *Tyro*, *Clydonia*, while it is beyond all question that Sydney Parkinson’s figure of *Cancer crassicornis* is the earliest known representation of any species of that genus.

The first intelligible description, however, of a species of *Scinà* appears to have been that given by Milne-Edwards in 1830 of *Hyperia cornigera*, which in 1840 he made the type-species of the genus *Tyro*. In the meantime Prestandrea in 1833 had described the genus *Scinà*. For the curiously worded definition, see Note on Prestandrea, 1833 (p. 151). The difficulties introduced into that definition by misprints and bad Latin will disappear on a comparison of it with the specific description which Prestandrea gives of *Scinà ensicorne*, and which for facility of comparison with the other *generic* accounts I here reproduce in English:—

“Body triangular, with the lower surface broader than the lateral, five lines long, dorsally carinate; lateral margins prominent; the colour of the body is deep orange-red, although in the middle there are one or two segments whitish. Head truncate, depressed, with two raised divergent lines, which starting from the beginning of the carina, where they form an acute angle, terminate at the base of the upper antennæ. Upper antennæ