

Off Wexford, H.M.S. "Porcupine" Expedition, 1869. One specimen, ♀.

Britain (Pennant, Forbes and Hanley, Jeffreys); Norway (Lovén, Steenstrup); Mediterranean (as *Eledone aldrovandi*, Vérany).

Of this species I have examined a considerable number from our own coast as well as some from other localities, and feel pretty confident that the table of synonyms above given, though long, is correct. I have compared some specimens of *Eledone aldrovandi* received from the Zoological Station at Naples, with young specimens from our own coast, and can detect absolutely no points of specific importance between them.¹ Older specimens, as compared with the young ones, are proportionately longer in the body, the tubercles on the back are more prominent, and the arms better developed. One or two specimens from the east coast of Scotland are quite smooth, but I am disposed to attribute this to their having been kept some time after death before being placed in spirit, an opinion confirmed by their soft flabby consistency.

The contraction due to this reagent often causes a disposition of the suckers in two series on longer or shorter portions of the arms, and in some cases this is so consistent and regular that it would not be difficult on cursory examination to mistake the specimen for an *Octopus*.

Not having seen a male, I have been unable to confirm Steenstrup's observation regarding the structure of the extremities of the arms in that sex.² He found in a specimen from Bergen that the suckers ceased a little below the tip, and were replaced by pairs of minute cirri; it would be very desirable to repeat this observation because Steenstrup remarks that his specimen was in poor condition, and because the specimens of *Eledone aldrovandi* from Naples disagree in this respect with his description, but resemble *Eledone moschata* in possessing not cirri but cuticular folds at their ends; this structure is figured by Steenstrup,³ and is visible on specimens sent me from Naples. If the male *Eledone cirrosa* really possesses these paired threads it would tend to prove that *Eledone aldrovandi* was not identical with it, but, as above remarked, I have been unable to separate them by any external characters.

What Macgillivray's *Eledone aldrovandi* was it seems impossible to determine with any certainty; it may have been a distorted specimen of the present species, but in any case the name must be dropped.

Eledone octopodia (Pennant) has been adopted by some authors as a name for this species, but even if it could be proved beyond question that Pennant's *Sepia octopodia* is identical with it, then his name would not take precedence of the others, because he did not name the species at all, but merely referred it erroneously to Linné's type, which we now know as *Octopus vulgaris*.

¹ I have just ascertained that the identity of *Eledone cirrosa* (*Eledone pennanti*) with *Eledone aldrovandi* has been already suggested by Dr. Paul Fischer (*Journ. de Conch.*, sér. 3, t. vii. p. 13, 1867).

² Hectoctyl, p. 206, Tav. ii. fig. 6.

³ *Op. cit.*, Tav. ii. fig. 5.