

suiting for the purposes of later classifications, yet each remodelling requires to be tested by that earliest form which is here reproduced. While every definition has been given which claimed to refer to a new genus, references have also been made, wherever available, to authorities who have disputed the claim of novelty, or to other reasonable grounds for rejecting the defined name. When the type-species is well known, and specimens of it have been examined by more than one competent observer, the true position of a genus is comparatively easy to determine. But sometimes the solitary specimen on which a genus was founded has since been lost or destroyed or damaged past recognition. In some of these cases the genus remains either absolutely obscure or only the sport of ingenious guesses. It would be convenient if some limit of time could be established, so that after fifty or a hundred years the names which no one had been able to identify throughout such a period should lose their right of priority.

With species, as with genera, all that have ever been published as new ones are admitted to the record. So far the task is simple. But here too an attempt has been made, by references and suggestions, to guide the reader through the labyrinth of synonyms. This part of the work is full of perplexity and complication, and the labour here bestowed upon it can pretend to little more success than that of having drawn into one view a large number of problems still requiring solution. Conjectural determinations for or against the validity of a species, apart from observation of the actual specimens described, must be accepted with much reserve even from the most experienced writers; for example, a consensus of important authorities had long referred Krøyer's *Stegocephalus inflatus* to Phipp's earlier *Cancer ampulla*, yet in 1887 Hansen decides that Krøyer's species is after all distinct. But the very fact that mistakes are so often made in the attempt to regulate synonymy should at least have the useful result of awakening attention to the extraordinary amount of trouble caused by vague and inadequate descriptions, especially when these are given without explanatory figures of the object described.

In the general treatment of the large mass of literature here brought under review I have desired as much as possible to save trouble to any naturalist who might in the future have to deal with a collection similar to that which is the subject of this Report. Hence brief notices of the Amphipoda and descriptions of single species embalmed in large works have been quoted in full, and occasionally for the same reason short separate treatises have received a longer notice than their intrinsic importance, apart from their rarity, would have demanded. On the other hand, some works, such as the British Sessile-Eyed Crustacea by Bate and Westwood, and Boeck's great work on the Arctic and Scandinavian Amphipoda, have been only briefly noticed, since they are already widely known and of necessity in general use, so that the enormous space required for an exhaustive discussion of their contents would have been to a great extent needlessly absorbed. Among the writings of the last century, attention should, I think,