

allied in many respects. The other parts have been drawn directly from the photographs and specimens.³

Mr. Harvey has published popular accounts of this specimen and the previously captured arm of a still larger one, in an interesting article in the *Maritime Monthly Magazine* of St. John, N. B., for March, 1874, and in several newspapers.⁴ These articles, and extracts from them, have been widely copied in the newspapers and magazines. To him we are, therefore, mainly indebted for these latest and most important additions to our knowledge of these remarkable animals. The preserved parts of this specimen (No. 5) which I have been able to examine are as follows: the anterior part of the head, with the bases of the arms, the beak, lingual ribbon, etc.; the eight shorter arms, but without the suckers, which dropped off in the brine, and are now represented only by the strong marginal rings; the two long tentacular arms, which are well preserved, with all the suckers in place; the tail; portions of the "pen" or internal shell; the ink-bag and pieces of the body.

Since this is the most complete specimen hitherto obtained, it will be first described as a standard for comparison with the other less complete ones.

The general appearance and form of this species,⁵ which appears

³The figure was originally made, from the photographs only, by Mr. P. Roetter, of the Museum of Comparative Zoology, but after the arrival of the specimens it had to be altered in many parts. These necessary changes were made by the writer, after a careful study of the parts preserved, in comparison with the photographs and original measurements.

⁴Acknowledgments are also due to Mr. Alexander Murray, Provincial Geologist, who coöperated with Mr. Harvey in the examination and preservation of these specimens, and who has also written some of the accounts of them that have been published. See the *AMERICAN NATURALIST*, vol. viii, p. 122, February, 1874; "*American Journal of Science*," vol. vii, p. 160; and "*Nature*," vol. ix, p. 322, February 26, 1874.

⁵Mr. W. Saville Kent, from the descriptions and photographs of this species, has seen fit to give it new generic and specific names, viz.: *Megaloteuthis Harveyi*, according to notices of his communication made to the Zoological Society of London, March 3, 1874, in "*Nature*" (vol. ix, p. 375, March 12, and p. 403, March 19). But as no sufficient reason was given for doing so, in the notices referred to, and as his original communication appears not to have been published yet (at least it has not been received here) I am unable to judge what his actual reasons for this proceeding may be.

My identification is based on a comparison of the jaws with the jaws of *A. monachus*, well figured and described by Steenstrup. Their agreement is very close in nearly all respects, but the beak of the lower jaw is a little more divergent in Steenstrup's figure. His specimen was a little larger than the one here described and was taken from a specimen cast ashore in 1853. So that Mr. Kent was probably unaware of that specimen when he said ("*Nature*," ix, p. 403) that *A. monachus* "was instituted for the reception of two gigantic Cephalopods, cast on the shores of Jutland in the years 1639 and 1790, and of which popular record alone remains."

His statement that *Architeuthis dux* Steenstrup is known from the beak alone is