

Genus *Gammaropsis*, Liljeborg, 1855.

1855. *Gammaropsis*, Liljeborg, Öfversigt af de inom Skand. art. af slägtet *Gammarus*, Kgl. Vet.-Akad. Handl. för år 1853, p. 443.
- 1855-6. „ Liljeborg, Om Hafs Crust., vid Kullaberg i Skåne, Öfv. af Kgl. Vet.-Akad. Förh., Tolfte Årg., p. 455.
1857. *Eurystheus*, Spence Bate, Synopsis, Ann. and Mag. Nat. Hist., ser. 2, vol. xix. p. 11 (sep. copy).
1857. „ White, Popular History of British Crustacea, p. 181.
1859. *Autonoe (pars)*, Bruzelius, Skand. Amph. Gamm., p. 27.
1860. *Gammaropsis*, Boeck, Forh. ved de Skand. Naturf. 8de Møde, p. 659.
1862. *Eurystheus*, Spence Bate, Brit. Mus. Catal. Amph. Crust., p. 196.
1862. „ Bate and Westwood, Brit. Sess. Crust., vol. i. p. 353.
1870. *Gammaropsis*, Boeck, Crust. amph. bor et arct., p. 160.
1876. „ Boeck, De Skand. og Arkt. Amph., p. 580.
1877. „ Meinert, Crust. Isop. Amph. et Decap. Daniæ, p. 150.
1878. *Eurystheus*, Spence Bate, Crustacea in Couch's Cornish Fauna revised and added to, p. 53.
1882. *Gammaropsis*, Sars, Oversigt af Norges Crustaceer, pp. 30, 111.
1884. *Eurystheus*, Chevreux, Assoc. franç. Congrès de Blois, Amph. du Croisic, p. 3.
1884. *Paranænia*, Chilton, Trans. New Zealand Inst., vol. xvi. p. 258.
1885. *Eurystheus*, Carus, Prodromus Faunæ Mediterraneæ, pars ii. p. 413.
1886. *Gammaropsis*, Gerstaecker, Bronn's Klassen und Ordnungen, Bd. v. Abth. ii. p. 495.
1887. „ Bonnier, Catal. Crust. Malac. Concarneau, p. 107.
1887. „ Chevreux, Catal. Crust. Amph. Bretagne, p. 27.

For the original definition of this genus, see Note on Liljeborg, 1855 (p. 286). For the definition of *Eurystheus*, see Note on Spence Bate, 1857 (p. 294). For the definition of *Paranænia*, see Note on Chilton, 1884 (p. 550). It was rather for a subdivision of the genus *Gammarus* than for an independent genus that Liljeborg gave the name *Gammaropsis*, and this is confirmed by the circumstance that he does not include the name *Gammaropsis* in the table of genera which he drew up for the *Gammaridæ* in 1865. It is therefore perhaps an open question whether the name *Eurystheus* which Spence Bate proposed for the genus in 1855, though he did not define it till 1857, should not have been allowed priority. As matters stand, it will be, I think, convenient to give the preference to *Gammaropsis*, which has obtained the more general acceptance. Boeck gives the following definition:—

“ *Upper Antennæ* with the third joint of the peduncle very long.

“ *Hypostome* produced in front and acuminate.

“ Fourth pair of side-plates the largest.

“ *First and Second Gnathopods* in both sexes like one another, but the *Second* the stronger; the fifth joint constituting a subcheliform hand.

“ *First and Second Peræopods* with the finger of moderate size.

“ *Third Uropods* with the outer ramus a little shorter than the inner.”

To these characters should be added the presence of a well-developed accessory