

are represented only by papillæ, each bearing two suckers; the second pair are larger than the third and bear five suckers, while each ventral arm is indicated only by one very minute sessile sucker.

On the tentacles the suckers commence close to the base instead of half way up the stem, whence one would be disposed to infer that the growth of these organs takes place at the base rather than the apex. The club is not in the least expanded, and four rows of suckers are found only at the extreme tip. Below and in front of the eye are two or three minute white shining dots but no swollen mass of tissue. The usual four cartilage-like bands pass down the ventral surface, but the number of papillæ is less than in the adults, being only from seven to nine.

I am unable to refer to this species *Cranchia reinhardtii*, Brock,<sup>1</sup> and *Cranchia cf. reinhardtii*, Pfeffer.<sup>2</sup> The former differs so conspicuously in the form of the body, which indeed is more like that found in *Taonius* than that characteristic of *Cranchia*. It must be remembered, however, that the correct pictorial reproduction of the form of these specimens requires great care for its accomplishment. I distended the mantle-cavity of several specimens by means of a syringe, and only one of them (fig. 4) showed any conical process at the posterior extremity whatever, and that was very different from the form given in Brock's figure. This same specimen had, however, a number of spots, of which several situated on the ventral surface and on one fin are shown; they were not darkly pigmented, but pale, like the rest of the body, from which they seemed to differ in structure rather than colour; a few very faint markings could also be deciphered on the tentacles; there seemed, however, to be no other points indicating that this form was distinct from the others. It would be interesting should there be proved to exist a series of forms with more or less elongated bodies connecting *Cranchia* with *Taonius*.

Dr. Pfeffer's species, with regard to the position of which he expresses great doubt, does not appear to me to be *Cranchia reinhardtii*, Steenstrup; its body-form is quite different, resembling that of Brock's specimen, the web between the arms is present between the third and fourth pairs; the arms are compressed and the third and fourth provided with a fin, the tentacles have two ridges separated by a furrow, one of which expands into a web, and there are other smaller differences which a comparison of the descriptions will disclose.

Whether Pfeffer's specimen belongs to the same species as Brock's, I have of course no better means of ascertaining than had he.

Brock (*loc. cit.*) suggests on the basis of the specimen figured by him that *Cranchia reinhardtii* may be the same as *Cranchia maculata*, Leach; and as I have recently been able to examine the type of that species in the British Museum, it may be well to give some account of it here.

<sup>1</sup> *Zeitschr. f. wiss. Zool.*, Bd. xxxvi. p. 605, pl. xxxvii. fig. 4, 1882.

<sup>2</sup> *Ceph. Hamb. Mus.*, p. 29, fig. 35.