

July the eggs contained embryos ready or nearly ready to break loose as free larvæ, which already have external rudiments of fore limbs. The exact stage at which the larvæ emerge seems to differ slightly in different individuals.

As regards Mr. Hodgart's statement that the newts are able to draw blood by means of their tails from the hand of a captor, I can only say that I failed to observe anything of the kind. The tail is to some extent prehensile, and is curled round the finger when the animal is held in the hand. In the living female the ridge at the base of the tail is soft, only becoming hard when the animal is dead and has been preserved in formalin.

N. ANNANDALE.

### FISH.

THE OCCURRENCE OF *Rhinodon typicus* AT THE HEAD OF THE BAY OF BENGAL.—A specimen of this rare basking shark was recently caught by Captain Gorr of the Pilot's Ridge light vessel at the mouth of the River Hooghly, and presented to the Museum by Mr. W. L. Allnut.

The measurements of the freshly caught fish were as follows:—

	Feet.	Inches.
“ Length from nose to tip of tail ..	14	0
Round the head ..	8	6
„ „ stomach ..	9	6
Across the nose ..	4	0
„ „ mouth ..	3	6 ”

The specimen was harpooned at the surface, over  $26\frac{1}{2}$  fathoms of water (Lat.  $20^{\circ} 51' 30''$  N., Long.  $87^{\circ} 52' 0''$  E.), on March 23rd.

The colour of the skin was dark bluish grey with large, irregular paler blotches. The teeth were very small and numerous, each consisting of a single recurved cusp. They were arranged in a band on the upper and lower jaw, each band extending nearly to the angles of the mouth. Each band contains about 350 rows of teeth, each row consisting of about 10 teeth, making about 7,000 in all.

Although the shark has been recorded from Ceylon and Java, this appears to be the first time it has been met with in the upper parts of the Bay of Bengal.

R. E. LLOYD, *Capt.*, I.M.S.

### SPONGES.

NOTE ON *Ephydatia meyeri* (CARTER).—On page 272, vol. i of these “Records,” it is stated that the presence of vesicular cells in the parenchyma is a recognized character distinguishing *Ephydatia fluviatilis* from *E. mülleri*, and the conclusion is drawn that *E. meyeri*, Carter, is a variety of the former species. This is a serious error, as exactly the contrary is the case. The note was printed during my absence from India, and a printer's error or *lapsus calami* crept in whereby “*fluviatilis*” was printed for “*mülleri*.” The

whole of the passage was then changed, apparently without reference to the literature cited, which is therefore misquoted, and the error was thus perpetuated. The presence of vesicular cells (*Blasenzellen*) in the parenchyma is recognized as being characteristic of *E. mülleri*, distinguishing it from *E. fluviatilis*. Unless, therefore, the three forms are either to be considered distinct or united as races or phases of a single species, the Indian form, *E. meyeri* must be regarded as a sub-species or variety of *E. mülleri*; Dr. Weltner's view, to which reference is made in my note, must therefore stand. I can only offer my sincerest apologies to Dr. Weltner, and to anyone who may have been misled. It was only recently that I had occasion to refer to my note and realised the mistake.

N. ANNANDALE.

