

Daniel); Mediterranean (d'Orbigny, Vérany); Adriatic (Ninni); Ægean (Forbes); Greenland (Steenstrup); Gorée, Senegal (Maltzan); Canaries (M'Andrew in Brit. Mus.).

The name by which this species has long been currently known has been called in question by Tryon (*loc. cit.*), who adopts the term *Sepiola sepiola*. According to the British Association rules, in their present form, there is no doubt that this view is correct, for the Linnean specific name takes precedence of all others, and it is not held to be necessary to change it even though it be erected into a generic name. At the same time it must be remembered that this last principle is only of modern adoption; it was the universal custom, even so lately as the first edition of the British Association rules, for any writer who converted a specific name to generic use to propose a new one in its place, and therefore Leach, when he created the genus *Sepiola*, followed the usual custom in selecting and giving currency to one taken from the pages of Gesner, who wrote in 1558. It must, of course, be understood that Gesner's designation is not a binomial name in the Linnean sense though it happens to consist of two words; it simply means to identify the animal as the one called "Sepiola" by Rondelet.

It seems best, on the whole, to perpetuate Leach's designation, 1st, because it has virtually, if not technically, the claim of priority; 2nd, because it was proposed by Leach in strict conformity with the usage of his time; and 3rd, because it has since found universal acceptance for the commonest of the Mediterranean species. According to Steenstrup¹ and others,² there seem to be about three of these; one of them may be identical with *Sepiola oweniana*, d'Orb.; although Tryon has referred a form from the Fiji Islands to this species.³

Gwyn Jeffreys' assertion (*op. cit.*, p. 137) that "the male (of this species) is *Sepiola atlantica* of d'Orbigny" is absolutely without foundation, and could only have been made in total ignorance of the sexual characters found in this genus, which were clearly set forth so long ago as 1856⁴ by Steenstrup, whom Jeffreys himself rightly describes as "one of the greatest authorities on the Cephalopods." It is parallel to his statement (*op. cit.*, p. 131) that the distinction between *Loligo vulgaris* and *Loligo forbesii* is not valid because it is possibly sexual, being based mainly on the relative sizes of the suckers, although males of both species were described.

For the specimen from Gorée I am indebted to v. Maltzan as well as for some other specimens from the same locality.

¹ Mörch, *Vid. Meddel. nat. Foren. Kjøbenhavn*, p. 101, 1867.

² Targioni-Tozzetti, *op. cit.*, pp. 44, 45.

³ *Man. Conch.*, vol. i. p. 156.

⁴ *Hectocotyl.*, p. 197, and *Ann. and Mag. Nat. Hist.*, ser. 2, vol. xx. p. 91, 1857; see also Steenstrup, *Sthenoteuthis* og *Lestoteuthis*, p. 8.