

15. *Sepioteuthis brevis*, Owen.1881. *Sepioteuthis brevis*, Owen, Trans. Zool. Soc. Lond., vol. xi. part 5, p. 137, pl. xxvi. fig. 1.16. *Sepioteuthis sinensis*, d'Orbigny.1839. *Sepioteuthis sinensis*, d'Orb., Céph. acét., p. 304.17. *Sepioteuthis arctipinnis*, Gould.1852. *Sepioteuthis arctipinnis*, Gld., Moll. Wilkes Exped., p. 479, fig. 593.*Loligo*, Lamarck, 1799.1. *Loligo vulgaris*, Lamarck.1799. *Loligo vulgaris*, Lmk., Mém. Soc. Hist. Nat. Paris, t. i. p. 11.1823. „ *pulchra*, Blv., Dict. d. Sci. Nat., t. xxvii. p. 144.1833. „ *Rangii*, Fér., Céph. acét.; Calmars, pl. xix. figs. 4-6.1839. „ *vulgaris*, d'Orb., Céph. acét., p. 308; Calmars, pls. viii.-x., xxii., xxiii. figs. 1-12.1849. „ *neglecta*, Gray, B.M.C., p. 72.1851. „ *Berthelotii* (?), Vér., Céph. médit., p. 93, pl. xxxvi. figs. h-k.1869. „ *mediterranea*, Targ., Cef. Mus. Firenze, p. 36.1869. „ *pulchra*, Fischer, Journ. de Conch., sér. 3, t. ix. p. 129.2. *Loligo affinis*, Lafont.¹1871. *Loligo affinis*, Lafont, Actes Linn. Soc. Bordeaux, t. xxviii. p. 273, pl. xiii.

1872. „ „ Lafont, Journ. de Conch., sér. 3, t. xii. p. 22.

3. *Loligo macrophthalma*, Lafont.1871. *Loligo macrophthalma*, Lafont, Actes Linn. Soc. Bordeaux, t. xxviii. p. 274, pl. xv.

1872. „ „ Lafont, Journ. de Conch., sér. 3, t. xii. p. 23.

4. *Loligo microcephala*, Lafont.1871. *Loligo microcephala*, Lafont, Actes Linn. Soc. Bordeaux, t. xxviii. p. 273, pl. xiv.

1872. „ „ Lafont, Journ. de Conch., sér. 3, t. xii. p. 22.

5. *Loligo moulinsi*, Lafont.1871. *Loligo Moulinsi*, Lafont, Actes Linn. Soc. Bordeaux, t. xxviii. p. 274.

1872. „ „ Lafont, Journ. de Conch., sér. 3, t. xii. p. 23.

6. *Loligo breviceps*, Steenstrup.1861. *Loligo breviceps*, Stp., Vid. Meddel. nat. Foren. Kjøbenhavn, p. 289.1871. „ *vulgaris*, Lenz, Jahresb. Comm. Kiel., Jahrg. i. p. 135.1873. „ *brevipes*, Mörch, Nachrichtsbl. malak. Gesellsch., No. 5 (*err. typ.*) (*fide* Lenz).1875. „ *breviceps*, Lenz, Jahresb. Comm. Kiel., Anhang., p. 23, pl. i. figs. 5, 6; pl. ii. figs. 1-9 (pub. 1878).

¹ I am inclined to suspect that some of Lafont's species are mere varieties, but as this opinion is based only on the brief published descriptions I refrain from giving it formal expression. It will be shown in the sequel (p. 157) that the greatest caution must be exercised in accepting distinctions based on the proportionate length of the body and fin.