

*Sepiadarium*, Steenstrup, 1881.1. *Sepiadarium kochii*, Steenstrup.1881. *Sepiadarium Kochii*, Stp., *Sepiadarium* og *Idiosepius*, p. 214, pl. i. figs. 1-10.

## Subfamily IDIOSEPII, Steenstrup, 1881.

*Idiosepius*, Steenstrup, 1881.1. *Idiosepius pygmæus*, Steenstrup.<sup>1</sup>1881. *Idiosepius pygmæus*, Stp., *Sepiadarium* og *Idiosepius*, p. 219, pl. i. figs. 11-22.*Spirula*, Lamarck, 1801.<sup>2</sup>1. *Spirula peronii*, Lamarck (p. 122).1822. *Spirula Peronii*, Lmk., *Anim. s. vert.*, t. vii. p. 601.

## Subfamily EUSEPII, Steenstrup, 1881.

*Sepia*, Linné, 1766.

<i>Rhombosepion</i> ,	<i>Lophosepion</i> ,	} de Rochebrune. <sup>s</sup>
<i>Spathidosepion</i> ,	<i>Doratosepion</i> ,	
<i>Ascarosepion</i> ,	<i>Acanthosepion</i> ,	

1. *Sepia officinalis*, Linné.1761. *Sepia officinalis*, Linn., *Fauna Suecica*, No. 2106.1839. " " d'Orb., *Céph. acét.*, p. 260; Seiches, pl. i., pl. ii. figs. 4, 5, pl. iii. figs. 1-3, pl. xvii. figs. 1, 2.2. *Sepia filliouxii*, Lafont.1839. *Sepia officinalis*, d'Orb., *Céph. acét.*; Seiches, pl. ii. figs. 1, 2, 3.1851. " " Vér., *Céph. médit.*, pl. xxv.1868. " *Filliouxii*, Lafont, *Bull. Assoc. Sci. Franc.*, No. 81 (*vide* Laf.).1869. " " Lafont, *Journ. de Conch.*, sér. 3, t. ix. p. 11.<sup>1</sup> Steenstrup (*op. cit.*, p. 224) suggests the possibility that *Oranchia minima*, Fér., and *Loligopsis peronii*, Lmk., may be allied to this form.<sup>2</sup> There are great differences of opinion as to the number of species that should be referred to this genus, and there seems to be as little agreement regarding the names which they should bear; under these circumstances I refrain from giving any opinion, but content myself with placing one species on the list, and using the name adopted by Prof. Huxley in his Report on the genus to be published in the present series.<sup>3</sup> Dr. de Rochebrune has recently published a memoir (*Bull. Soc. philom. Paris*, sér. 7, t. viii. pp. 74-122, pls. iii.-vi.) in which he has divided the *Sepia* of previous authors into a number of new genera; most of these seem to me to be at most of subgeneric value, and there are so many points in which I find myself unable to follow Dr. de Rochebrune that I have only given references to his paper in the case of his new species.