

pit; the limbs extend halfway along the striated area. The *spine* is long, tapering, and curves gently upwards.

*Dimensions.*

Length, total, . . . . .	119	mm.
End of body to mantle-margin, . . . . .	70	"
End of body to eye, . . . . .	70	"
Breadth of body, . . . . .	35	"
Breadth of head, . . . . .	30	"
Eye to edge of umbrella, . . . . .	20	"
Breadth of fin, . . . . .	10	"
Diameter of largest sucker on sessile arm, . . . . .	1	"
Length of shell, <sup>1</sup> . . . . .	84	"
Breadth of shell, <sup>1</sup> . . . . .	30	"
	Right.	Left.
Length of first arm, <sup>2</sup> . . . . .	24 mm.	24 mm.
Length of second arm, . . . . .	25 "	25 "
Length of third arm, . . . . .	26 "	26 "
Length of fourth arm, . . . . .	32 "	32 "
Length of tentacle, . . . . .	...	72 "
Length of tentacular club, . . . . .	...	18 "

The shell of this species somewhat resembles that of *Sepia aculeata*, but the animal has no suckers on the buccal membrane; it is also like d'Orbigny's figure of *Sepia indica*, but it has a shallower groove along the middle of the ventral surface, and the striations are less wavy than his description would appear to indicate; in addition to which the teeth on the suckers of the sessile arms are different.<sup>3</sup>

The body of one specimen had a lank, lean appearance as compared with the others, suggesting the idea that it might be a male; on examination, however, it proved to be a female which had recently deposited its eggs.

*Sepia papuensis*, Hoyle (Pl. XVI. figs. 13–23).

1885. *Sepia papuensis*, Hoyle, Diagnoses II., p. 197.

1885. " " Hoyle, Prelim. Rep. II., p. 301.

*Habitat*.—Station 188, in the Arafura Sea, south of Papua, September 10, 1874; lat. 9° 59' S., long. 139° 42' E; 28 fathoms; green mud. Two specimens, ♀.

*The Body* is elongated, broadest about one-third back, pointed behind: the *fins* extend the whole length of the body and are one-third of its breadth, a little wider

<sup>1</sup> From a larger specimen.

<sup>2</sup> Measured from the margin of the mouth.

<sup>3</sup> It is proper to mention here that, as Steenstrup has already pointed out, a confusion apparently inexplicable exists between d'Orbigny's species, *Sepia rostrata* and *Sepia indica*; the descriptions given by him disagree in many points with the figures on his plates, and there is no evidence to show whether plates or text should be accepted as the ultimate criterion; Dr. de Rochebrune in his recent Memoir has not touched upon these discrepancies.