

triangular projection, as also two posteriorly curved mucroniform spines, embracing the base of the telson.

The eyes (see fig. 10) are comparatively small, and almost wholly covered above by the frontal plate, without, however, being lodged, as it were, within orbital hollows, as in *Lophogaster*. The cornea occupies a comparatively small part of the eyes, and does not exhibit any appreciable dilatation; its pigment is dark, and the visual elements are normally developed.

The antennular peduncle (fig. 11,  $\alpha^1$ ) is short and thick, not, however, to such an extent as in *Lophogaster*. The last joint does not exceed the basal in length, while in *Lophogaster* it is even larger than the two remaining joints taken together. As in the latter genus, the basal joint is somewhat applanated, and projects exteriorly as a pointed lappet. Of the flagella, the inner is very small, scarcely more than half as long as the peduncle, and composed of rarely more than ten short articulations. The outer flagellum, too, would seem to have been much more strongly developed, but its length cannot be exactly stated, the terminal part having been broken off in the specimen examined.

The basal part of the antennæ (see fig. 11) is thick and highly chitinised, forming on the external side a keeled prominence. The terminal part ( $\alpha^2$ ) is of the same structure as in *Lophogaster*. On the other hand, the scale (fig. 11, *sq*; fig. 12) exhibits a totally different and very peculiar appearance. It is almost twice as long as the antennular peduncle, and has the form of a very narrow, strongly chitinised, and somewhat flexuous plate, without any trace of the usual marginal bristles, but provided with several strong angular projections. The exterior part of the plate is rather prominently curved outwards and somewhat dilated at the apex, which projects in two acute angles, the one pointing straight forward, the other recurved in the shape of a hook. In the middle, the inner edge of the plate forms a similar recurved projection, and in front of this may be observed another short angular prominence. As regards both form and structure, this scale is wholly dissimilar to anything observed in other known Podophthalmia, and hence it undoubtedly represents one of the features most characteristic of the genus.

Concerning the oral parts, they would appear, on the whole, so far as they admit of being examined in the only specimen obtained, to agree with those in *Lophogaster*. Viewed from below (fig. 11), the following parts may be more or less distinctly observed within the comparatively very broad buccal area; anteriorly, on the median line appears the galeate anterior lip (*L*), and on each side the mandibles (*M*), with their palps (*p*), which are very elongate and slender; posterior to the mandibles are the maxillæ, of which, however, only the second pair admit of being partly examined, their exognaths ( $m^2$ ) being wholly exposed and rather large, elliptic, and fitting into a semicircular opening, that leads to the branchial cavity; they are as usual fringed with a row of strong ciliated bristles. The maxillipeds (*mp*) marking off posteriorly the buccal area,