

to be the *Architeuthis monachus* of Steenstrup, is well shown by fig. 1. From the great size of the large suckers on the long arms, I judge it to be a male. The body was relatively stout, and according to the statement of Mr. Harvey, it was, when fresh, about seven feet long and five and one-half feet in circumference. The portion of the body shown in the photograph appears to have been only about five and one-half feet long, and is badly mutilated anteriorly, so that it is possible that Mr. Harvey has allowed too much for the missing parts. In restoring the figure here presented, the length of the body was reckoned at seven feet, and reduced twenty-two times. The "tail" or caudal fin (fig. 2) is said by Mr. Harvey to have been twenty-two inches across, but the preserved specimen is considerably smaller, owing, undoubtedly, to shrinkage in the brine and alcohol. It is remarkable for its peculiar spear-shaped or broad sagittate form. The posterior termination is unusually acute and the lateral lobes extend forward considerably beyond their insertion. In the preserved specimen the total length, from the anterior end of the lateral lobes to the tip of the tail, was twenty-three inches; from the lateral insertions to the tip of the tail, thirteen inches; from the dorsal insertion thirteen and five-tenths inches; total breadth about fifteen inches; width of lateral lobes six inches. The body, as seen in the photograph, is badly collapsed and it must be a matter of great difficulty to obtain the true diameter of the body in any of these large squids, owing to the

Fig. 2.



Tail of No. 5

erroneous, for Steenstrup, Harting, and Dr. Packard, in their articles on this subject, all state that the suckers, parts of the arms, and the internal shell or pen were preserved, and they have been figured by Prof. Steenstrup; Harting has also given a figure of the lower jaw. Steenstrup mentions having the arm-hooks (*Tandvæbningen*), which would indicate a genus distinct from our species.

Should the *Architeuthis dux* prove to belong to a genus distinct from this and all known genera, it might perhaps be taken as the type of *Architeuthis*, and in that case the generic name given by Kent could be retained, and the two species here described would then be called *Megâloteuthis monachus* and *M. princeps*, if my identification of the former species be correct.