

Accounts of an attack made upon two men by another specimen, in Conception Bay, Oct. 27, 1873, have been published in the *NATURALIST*,⁸ and in many other magazines, as well as in the newspapers. In the encounter the monster lost two of his arms by amputation with a hatchet. A portion of one of these arms, measuring nineteen feet in length, was preserved by Rev. M. Harvey and Mr. Alexander Murray for the museum at St. John's, Newfoundland. It has been photographed, and cuts copied from the photograph have been published in some of the English magazines.⁹

It is stated that six feet of this arm had been destroyed before it was preserved, and the captors estimated that they left from 6 to 10 feet attached to the creature, which would make the total length between 31 and 35 feet. According to Mr. Murray the portion preserved measured but 17 feet in length, when he examined it, Oct. 31, 1873, after it had been a few days in strong brine; the circumference of the slender portion was 3.5 to 4 inches; of the enlarged sucker-bearing part, 6 inches; length of the part bearing suckers, 30 inches; diameter of largest suckers, 1.25 inches. Calculating from the photograph, the portion bearing the larger suckers was about 18 inches in length, and about 2.4 inches broad, across the face; distance between attachments of large suckers, 1.68; outside diameter of larger suckers, 1.16 to 1.28; inside diameter, .74 to 1 inch; diameter of small suckers of the outside rows, .40 to .48 of an inch. Comparing all these dimensions with those of the Logie Bay specimen, and calculating the proportions as nearly as possible, it follows that this specimen was very nearly one-third larger than the latter, but the large suckers appear to have been relatively smaller, for they were hardly one-twelfth larger than in the Logie Bay specimen. As the relative size of the large suckers is a good sexual character among squids, it is probable that this individual was a *female*. In form, proportions and structure, it agrees very closely with the specimen first described, and therefore I do not hesitate to refer it to the same species. The lack of denticles on the margins of the large suckers is probably due to accidental injury, either before or

⁸ Vol. viii, No. 2, p. 120, February, 1874, in a letter from Mr. Alexander Murray.

⁹ See "Annals and Magazine of Natural History," vol. xli, p. 68; and "The Field," Dec. 13, 1873. The central line of this photograph is reduced four and a quarter times, while the front part is reduced about four times.