

Unfortunately, in the species of *Gloiopotes* so far described, there appear to be comparatively few variations in the body form with the exception of the plates on the fourth thoracic segment, or in the appendages, although a system of classification may be derived from the ornamentation of the third pereopods (see Shiino, 1954, p. 278). The disadvantage of this system is that the setae and spines may very easily be damaged and this system must only be used, as it is by Shiino, to confirm identification by other means. Thus it is still necessary to rely to a considerable extent on the spines on the body and the plates on the fourth thoracic segment for identification. However, bearing in mind the variation mentioned above, the author considers that only where the differences in spination involve the presence or complete absence of entire groups or rows of spines and where the differences in the plates involve marked differences in the sinus between the plates, or the shape of the plates, may these characters be used in proposing that differences are specific.

DISCUSSION

The original description of *Gloiopotes huttoni* made by Thomson in 1889 under the name *Lepeophtheirus* leaves little doubt that the present specimens are the same species, although the specimen described by him as a male is obviously a young female as has been pointed out by Wilson (1907, p. 701; 1920, p. 315). Thomson does not illustrate the rows of long hairs and many of the spines on the dorsal body surface. Nonetheless, the size and general body proportions as figured by Thomson are very close to those of the present material provided that the posterior part of the plates on the fourth thoracic segment as shown by Thomson is taken as representing the flange. This assumption seems justified by his figure (Pl. 29, 1a). Thomson's figures and description of the appendages are very full and agree closely with the present material, except in the setation of the endopod of the third pereopod. This he shows as having one seta on the first joint and three on the second, which would agree with the condition found in *G. costatus*. Perhaps Thomson's material was damaged. But, since the exopod of this limb, as well as the other appendages, agree with the present material, the present material is regarded here as belonging to Thomson's species.

Specimens of *Gloiopotes* from *Histiophorus brevis* taken at Madras were identified by Bassett-Smith (1899, p. 458) as *G. huttoni*. The British Museum (Natural History) kindly lent a male and a female specimen from this collection to the present author. These specimens differ from the specimens taken in New Zealand waters only in the length of the row of hairs which runs posterolaterally from the anterior termination of the anterior longitudinal rib. This row of hairs is a little shorter in the females from Madras than in local material, but this difference is not significant in the light of the variation discussed above. The specimens are a little smaller than the local specimens, the female 10.0mm in total length, the male 8.8mm in total length, but this size difference is not considered here to be of taxonomic significance compared with the overall agreement of body proportions and appendages, and the present author agrees with Bassett-Smith that the specimens from Madras are *G. huttoni*.

G. longicaudatus (Marukawa, 1925) is included in the synonymy of *G. huttoni* since the descriptions by Shiino (1954) and Heegaard (1962) show that their material differs from the present material only in the length of the longitudinal row of hairs on the carapace and in the arrangement of a few small spines on the dorsal surface of the body. Both these characters have been shown to vary in the present material.