

after death,¹⁰ but this may possibly be a sexual character. The fishermen estimated the body of this individual to have been about 60 feet in length and 5 feet in diameter, but if the above proportions be correct, as I believe, then the body could not have been more than about 10 feet long, and 2.5 feet in diameter, and the long arms should have been about 32 feet in length. Allowing 2 feet for the head, the total length would, therefore, be 44 feet.

Another specimen (No. 3), probably of the same species, and similar in size to the last, was captured at Coombs' Cove, Newfoundland. The following account has been extracted from a newspaper article of which I do not know the precise date, forwarded to me by Professor Baird, together with a letter, dated June 15, 1873, from T. R. Bennett, Esq., of English Harbor, N. F., who states that he wrote the article, and that the measurements were made by him, and are perfectly reliable.

"Three days ago, there was quite a large squid ran almost ashore at Coombs' Cove, and some of the inhabitants secured it. The body measured 10 feet in length and was nearly as large round as a hog'shead. One arm was about the size of a man's wrist, and measured 42 feet in length; the other arms were only 6 feet in length, but about 9 inches in diameter, very stout and strong. The skin and flesh were 2.25 inches thick, and reddish inside as well as out. The suction cups were all clustered together, near the extremity of the long arm, and each cup was surrounded by a serrated edge, almost like the teeth of a hand-saw. I presume it made use of this arm for a cable, and the cups for anchors, when it wanted to come to, as well as to secure its prey, for this individual, finding a heavy sea was driving it ashore, tail first, seized hold of a rock and moored itself quite safely until the men pulled it on shore."

It would appear from this description, that one of the long arms had been lost before the capture. The large diameter of the short arms, compared with their length, and with the size of the long arms, is the only point in which this specimen apparently differed essentially from those described above. Possibly the *circumference* was intended,¹¹ which would make the proportions agree well with those of the other specimens.

In a letter from Mr. Harvey, dated Dec. 10, 1873, he says that

¹⁰The photograph shows that the suckers had been much injured, and only six of the larger ones remained.

¹¹A similar mistake actually occurred in the description of the long arms, in the letter from Mr. Murray, published in the AMERICAN NATURALIST for February, 1873, p. 122, referred to above, but in that instance the error was very obvious.