

This article was downloaded by: [New York University]

On: 29 April 2015, At: 06:59

Publisher: Taylor & Francis

Informa Ltd Registered in England and Wales Registered Number:
1072954 Registered office: Mortimer House, 37-41 Mortimer Street,
London W1T 3JH, UK



Annals and Magazine of Natural History: Series 6

Publication details, including instructions
for authors and subscription information:
<http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/tnah12>

The supposed great Octopus of Florida: certainly not a Cephalopod

A.E. Verrill

Published online: 06 Oct 2009.

To cite this article: A.E. Verrill (1897) The supposed great Octopus of Florida: certainly not a Cephalopod, *Annals and Magazine of Natural History: Series 6*, 19:114, 682-683, DOI: [10.1080/00222939708680668](https://doi.org/10.1080/00222939708680668)

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00222939708680668>

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

Taylor & Francis makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of all the information (the "Content") contained in the publications on our platform. However, Taylor & Francis, our agents, and our licensors make no representations or warranties whatsoever as to the accuracy, completeness, or suitability for any purpose of the Content. Any opinions and views expressed in this publication are the opinions and views of the authors, and are not the views of or endorsed by Taylor & Francis. The accuracy of the Content should not be relied upon and should be independently verified with primary sources of information. Taylor and Francis shall not be liable for any losses, actions, claims, proceedings, demands, costs,

expenses, damages, and other liabilities whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with, in relation to or arising out of the use of the Content.

This article may be used for research, teaching, and private study purposes. Any substantial or systematic reproduction, redistribution, reselling, loan, sub-licensing, systematic supply, or distribution in any form to anyone is expressly forbidden. Terms & Conditions of access and use can be found at <http://www.tandfonline.com/page/terms-and-conditions>

these species these organs are grouped in a small number of bundles (5 or 6), directed, some backwards, some forwards, and covering partly the middle and partly the posterior intestine. In all the Locustidæ the number of the tubes of Malpighi exceeds 100. They are grouped in six bundles, opening at the summit of six cylindrical tubercles, sometimes disposed irregularly, sometimes at equal distances one from the other, at the origin of the terminal intestine (*Locusta*, *Decticus*, *Salomona*, *Pseudorhynchus*, *Platycleis*, &c.). In the Ehippigerinæ there are only 3 or 4 of these conical tubercles, with 110 to 120 urinary tubes. Lastly, through *Gryllacris*, which has, as a rule, but one collecting-tubercle, fairly short, on the summit of which 80 to 100 Malpighian tubes open, we pass to the Gryllidæ. The number of tubes in various Gryllidæ is very considerable, and exceeds 100; 100 to 120 may be counted in *Gryllus* and *Gryllotalpa*. These organs are long, tortuous, and open at the widened end (pan-shaped) of a single cylindrical collecting-canal (ureter). This last, after a course of 9-12 millim., penetrates a little below the origin of the terminal intestine, and there opens on the summit of a conical or dolioform tubercle, with a blunted point and armed with four valves bounding a star-shaped orifice (*Gryllotalpa*).—*Comptes Rendus*, tom. cxxiv. pp. 46-48.

The supposed great Octopus of Florida: certainly not a Cephalopod.

By A. E. VERRILL.

Additional facts have been ascertained and specimens received that render it quite certain that this remarkable structure is not the body of a Cephalopod. It was described by me, in the January number of this Journal [also 'Annals,' Feb. 1897], as the body of an Octopus *, from the examination of a number of photographs and the statement made to me that, when it was first cast ashore, stumps of arms were found adherent to one end, one of which was said to have been 36 feet long †. Subsequently, when it was excavated and moved, this statement proved to be erroneous. Apparently nothing that can be called stumps of arms or any other appendages were present. Folds of the integument and mutilated and partly detached portions may have been mistaken for such structures. No bones or other hard parts were found in it.

* Many other zoologists who examined the photographs held the same opinion. Some of those who have seen the samples of integument sent to me still believe that the specimen may be the body of some unknown genus of Cephalopods, allied to *Octopus*. But the thick integument of a Cephalopod is necessarily muscular and highly contractile, while in this creature it is elastic and resistant, and not at all contractile. Therefore I cannot refer it to that group, after having examined this structure.

† The following is the written statement made by Mr. Wilson to Dr. Webb in regard to the "arms" that he found when it first went ashore:—"One arm was lying west of body, 23 feet long; one stump of arm west of body, about 4 feet; three arms lying south of body, and from appearances attached to same (although I did not dig quite to body, as it laid well down in the sand, and I was very tired), longest one measured over 32 feet; the other arms were 3 to 5 feet shorter." Soon after this examination the specimen went adrift in another severe storm and was again cast ashore two miles further south, which will probably account for the loss of these supposed arms.

Dr. Webb has recently sent to me several large masses of the integument of the creature, preserved fairly well in formalin. These masses are from 3 to 10 inches thick, and, instead of being muscular, as had been thought, they have a structure similar to the hard elastic variety of blubber-like integument found on the head of certain cetaceans, such as the sperm-whale. They contain very little oil and cannot be called true blubber. They are firm, very tough and elastic, and composed mainly of much interlaced fibres and large bundles of tough, fibrous, white connective tissue. They are difficult to cut or tear apart, especially where indurated by partial drying. Some large irregular canals permeate the inner and less dense portions of the thick masses. These may have contained blood-vessels originally. From the inner surface of some of the pieces large cords of elastic fibres proceeded inward. These now hang loosely from the masses of integument. Dr. Webb states that these were found attached on all sides to a long saccular organ, which occupied most of the central cavity of the great mass. No muscular fibres were present in the specimens sent. Perhaps the muscular tissues of the inner surfaces, if any were present originally, have decayed, but the tough fibrous mass does not show much decomposition. The outer surface shows in some places a tough, thin, grey, rather rough skin-like layer, that may be the remains of the outer skin. It looks a little like the skin of some fishes from which the scales have been removed. From these facts I am led to believe that the mass cast ashore is only a fragment, probably from the head, of some huge vertebrate animal covered with a blubber-like layer of great thickness.

Although such an integument might, perhaps, be supposed compatible with the structure of some unknown fish* or reptile, it is certain that it is more like the integument found upon the upper part of the head of a sperm-whale than anything else that I know. If we could imagine a sperm-whale with the head prolonged far forward in the form of a great blunt saccular snout, freely projecting beyond the upper jaw, and with a great central cavity, it might, if detached and eroded by the surf, present an appearance something like the mass cast ashore. It hardly seems possible, however, that the abruptly truncated and narrow snout of the common sperm-whale could take on, even after being long tossed about by the waves, a form like this. No whaler who has seen it has recognized it as any part of a whale. It does not seem possible to identify such a large, hollow, pear-shaped sac, 21 feet long, with any part of an ordinary sperm-whale unless its nose had become enlarged and distorted by disease, or possibly by extreme old age. No blowhole was discovered.

The specimen has now been moved several miles nearer to St. Augustine and enclosed by a fence to protect it from the drifting sand. It is likely to remain in nearly its present state for several months more.—*Amer. Journ. Sci.*, April 1897, pp. 355, 356.

* The integument of *Orthogoriscus mola*, the great sun-fish, is very thick and elastic, but unlike this in structure.