

folding antennæ, may be regarded as the latest development, but the whole group of Hyperina must be supposed to be interconnected, not to be derived partly from one branch and partly from another branch of the existing Gammarina. It may be noticed, indeed, that though the Gammarina by their maxillipeds testify to an older type than is seen in the Hyperina, yet the latter in some genera retain in their turn a mark of antiquity which the Gammarina have lost, in the simplicity of the gnathopods, for these in *Dairella* and *Lycæopsis* are like ordinary peræopods. The general structure of the upper antennæ in the Hyperina calls to mind the family Lysianassidæ, but there is the marked distinction that in none of the Hyperina is there a secondary flagellum to these antennæ; yet here the recently discovered *Hyperiopsis vøringii*, Sars, may supply a link, since with the antennæ of the Lysianassidæ this curious species combines the eyes of a Hyperid. A connection between the Hyperina and the Lysianassidæ has already been indicated by Boeck, who placed the family Prostomatidæ at the head of the Gammarina, in immediate sequence to the Hyperina, because of the agreement which he considered to exist between that family and the Hyperidæ and Orchestidæ. The Prostomatidæ are in close relationship with the Lysianassidæ, and might, in my view, well be included in the older family. But if the Hyperina make any real approach to the Lysianassidæ, it must not be supposed that they are derived from them, for the mandibles of the Gammaroid Hyperina point more directly to the *Gammarus*-form than to that found in the Trochalognatha.

In offering these contributory suggestions towards a classification of the Amphipoda, my hope is that either by occasionally hitting the mark they may be of service, or that where they have missed it they may provoke a fruitful criticism, and either way that they may excite the ambition of the discerning and ingenious to throw light upon the many problems which are still obscure.

*Nomenclature.*—Most naturalists will sympathise with the lady who thought that, of all the discoveries astronomers had made about the stars, the finding out their names was the most wonderful. In zoology the new discoveries are generally far more troublesome to name than they would be if they were only stars or planets. A genus of sharks is bound to give way, if it turns out that a genus of animalcules has received the same appellation a month earlier, and the genus of animalcules, however laboriously and scientifically described, must give way in its turn, if it should prove that the same group of creatures has been obscured rather than explained fifty years before under a different name. But apart from these casualties, there is the enormous and increasing difficulty which arises from the multitude of workers in every field of natural history, who, in the absence of any rule or convention to the contrary, publish new genera and species in any literary vehicle that is for the moment handiest. One isolated description may have to be sought for in a costly volume of travels, and another in the local journal of Timbuctoo. It is rather to be wished than expected that an international law in science should intervene, and allow validity and priority only to names adequately published in