

"The additions which must be made to Sars' description are in the direction of further detail, for the expressions used in characterising the structure of the arms and tentacles of this remarkable form are too general and undecided. It is not mentioned that the median suckers on three pairs of arms bear true hooks, nor that in this respect the ventral arms differ from the others, nor that the tentacles are provided with a connective apparatus both on the stem and on the club. Nevertheless, figs. 10, 11 leave no doubt that they were drawings from a *Gonatus* whose characters were not sharply perceived, while fig. 5, part of an arm with its four series of suckers, figs. 6, 7, 8, a sucker from the middle, and fig. 9, one from the lateral series, show clearly that there were two series of hooks and two of true suckers."

In 1880, Professor Verrill,¹ misled no doubt by Gray's errors and Sars' omissions, made *Onychoteuthis kamtschatica*, Middendorff, the type of a separate genus under the name *Lestoteuthis*, without recognising its identity with *Gonatus*, including also in it Dall's *Onychoteuthis robusta* (since made the type of a genus *Moroteuthis*, and since shown by Steenstrup to belong to *Ancistroteuthis*). Verrill's paper was followed by that of Steenstrup,² from which the above quotations have been made, but whilst it was passing through the press Verrill published the second part of his monograph,³ in which he described a specimen of *Gonatus fabricii*, taken from the stomach of a cod, but still without recognising it as identical with *Onychoteuthis kamtschatica*, Middendorff (his *Lestoteuthis*), and in his Report on the "Blake" Cephalopods, 1881, published the genus *Cheloteuthis*, which, however, he speedily abandoned as synonymous with *Lestoteuthis*.⁴

In the appendix to his Monograph,⁵ Verrill introduces another Cephalopod from Cumberland Gulf, which is said to have "four rows of true suckers on all the arms, and no hooks." This he is disposed, still misled by Gray's inaccurate description, to regard as doubtless "the *real Gonatus amœnus*, Gray." Steenstrup in a second paper⁶ has pointed out the untenability of this view, and having recently examined Gray's types of *Gonatus amœnus* in the British Museum, I can quite corroborate all his statements regarding their absolute identity with *Gonatus fabricii*. What this Cumberland Gulf specimen really was has never transpired, as no further information about it has been published, but seeing the ease with which the hooks of *Gonatus* are overlooked, it is not impossible that it may also be referable to that genus.

Owenia, Prosch, which appears in the list of generic synonyms above, demands merely a few words of explanation; the Danish naturalist received along with his *Cranchia megalops* some small Cephalopods, which he wrongly regarded as being identical with it, and he was induced to separate his new species as a subgenus of *Cranchia* owing to the mantle not being directly continuous with the head dorsally, a character

¹ Ceph. N. E. Amer., p. 250.

³ Ceph. N. E. Amer., pp. 259-446.

⁶ Notæ Teuthol., I.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, p. 388.

² *Sthenoteuthis* og *Lestoteuthis*.

⁶ *Op. cit.*, p. 188.