

"No 2," preserved in the Museum at St. John's, N. F. He states, in this letter, that all the suckers were originally denticulated around the margin, as suggested by me in the last number of the NATURALIST, and that this fact was previously overlooked on account of the mutilation it had undergone. He has also furnished to me a full series of measurements of its various parts. It has contracted excessively in the alcohol, and is now only thirteen feet and one inch in length (instead of nineteen feet, its original length), the enlarged sucker-bearing portion being two feet and three inches; the large suckers occupy twelve inches; the terminal part bearing small suckers, nine inches; circumference of slender portion 3.5 to 4.25 inches; of largest part 6 inches; breadth of face, among large suckers, 2.5 inches; from face to back, 1.62 inches; diameter of largest suckers outside, .75 of an inch: inside, .63 of an inch. It will be evident from these measurements, when compared with those made while fresh and from the photograph, that the shrinkage has been chiefly in length, the thickness remaining about the same, but the suckers are considerably smaller than the dimensions previously given.

Mr. Harvey also mentions that a specimen was cast ashore at Bonavista Bay, December, 1872, and his informant says that the long arms measured thirty-two feet in length, and the short arms about ten feet in length, and were "thicker than a man's thigh." The body was not measured, but he thinks it was about fourteen feet long, and very stout, and that the largest suckers were 2.5 inches in diameter. The size of the suckers is probably exaggerated, and most likely the length of the body also. It is even possible that this was the same specimen from which the beak and suckers described in my last article, as No. 4, from Bonavista Bay, were derived, for the date of capture of that specimen is unknown to me. The latter, however, was much smaller than the above measurements of the former would admit, and it will, therefore, be desirable to give this one a special number (11).

Another specimen, which we may designate as No. 12, was cast ashore this winter, near Harbor Grace, but was destroyed before its value became known, and no measurements are given.

*Architeuthis princeps* Verrill, sp. nov., figures 25, 26, 27. This species is based on the lower jaw mentioned as No. 1 in my former papers, and on the upper and lower jaws designated as No. 10, in the first part of this article; besides these jaws we only have the