

THE IN A HURRY SERIES

Octopuses *in a Hurry*

The closest thing to alien intelligence

Max Brocklesby

BOOKSINAHURRY.COM

Contents

The Whole Thing in One Page 4

Why You Should Care 6

The Core Ideas 8

How It Actually Works 21

What People Get Wrong 31

Use It 35

Terms 40

Go Deeper 46

Notes and Sources 48

Bibliography 54

The Whole Thing in One Page

The popular octopus is an aquarium burglar with three hearts, a talent for jars and a wardrobe controlled by thought. None of that is wholly false. It is also a poor model. The animal is treated as a bag of marvels because its organising problem is easy to miss.

An octopus has to control a body with almost no fixed shape.

Its lineage traded the protection and constraint of an external shell for eight arms that bend anywhere, a mantle that changes volume, skin that alters colour and texture, and a body able to pour through spaces that would stop most animals of similar mass. Freedom creates work. A jointed limb offers a limited menu of movements. An octopus arm has no joints and no single correct way to reach the same point. Hundreds of suckers must grip, release, feel and sample chemicals while the rest of the animal crawls, hunts, hides or flees.

The nervous system answers by dividing control. A central brain integrates vision, memory, motivation and broad action. Large nerve cords and local circuits in the arms organise much of the detail. In well-studied species, the arm systems contain a larger share of neurons than the brain around the oesophagus. That does not give the animal nine brains. It gives one animal several levels of decision, with local machinery reducing the burden on the centre.

The same arrangement reaches the skin. Chromatophores expose pigment under direct neural control. Reflective structures alter brightness and sheen. Muscles raise papillae that roughen a smooth surface. The result can match a background, break up an outline, startle a predator or signal to another octopus. Commonly studied octopuses do not appear to use conventional colour vision, which makes their colour control more interesting and less magical. They rely on brightness, contrast, pattern, polarisation and other information, while isolated skin from one studied species can respond locally to light.

Then comes intelligence. Octopuses learn associations, remember places, reverse choices, explore objects and alter tactics. Veined octopuses have been observed carrying coconut-shell halves across open seabed and assembling them later as shelter. Captive individuals differ, and some repeatedly manipulate objects in ways researchers classify as play-like. Yet an escape is not an IQ test, a jar is not a universal measure, and flexible behaviour does not establish human-like thought or conscious experience.

Their intelligence belongs to a predator. Arms probe crevices. Suckers taste what they touch. A beak and radula process prey, while venomous saliva helps subdue it. Camouflage buys approach and escape. Ink, jetting and arm loss buy another chance. Every ability is attached to a life under pressure.

The final pressure is time. Many familiar shallow-water octopuses grow fast, reproduce once and die after a short adult life. Females often brood without feeding as endocrine changes drive senescence. Exceptions include a deep-sea female observed brooding for fifty-three months and a captive species with repeated clutches. Across many studied species, little parent-offspring contact removes one clear route for passing acquired behaviour between generations. That is a constraint, not proof that social learning or culture is absent.

That is why the octopus feels alien. It is not from elsewhere. It is intelligence reached by another route, built for another body, sensing another world, and bounded by another kind of life.

That is the book.

Why You Should Care

On silty seabed off Indonesia, divers watched veined octopuses do something awkward. An animal gathered discarded coconut-shell halves, carried them beneath its body while moving across exposed ground, then fitted them together as shelter when needed. The transport made the octopus slower and more conspicuous. The shells were useful later, not during the journey. That combination is why the observation mattered. A wild invertebrate had selected, moved and retained objects for a future defensive use.

The finding did not prove that an octopus plans like a person. It did something better. It supplied a documented behaviour whose parts could be inspected: cost now, benefit later, an object detached from its original setting, and deployment in a new place. The animal becomes interesting when admiration gives way to analysis.

That matters because complex behaviour evolved far from the route that produced us. Humans, other mammals and birds inherited centralised nervous systems from vertebrate ancestors. Octopuses are molluscs, closer to snails and clams than to any vertebrate. Their common ancestor lived long before either branch possessed a large modern brain. Whatever capacities now overlap were assembled largely independently.

This makes an octopus a natural test of assumptions disguised as laws. Intelligence need not be built around hands attached to bones, a face looking forwards, a warm body, a long childhood or a stable social group. Control can be spread through a soft body. Touch can blend with chemical sampling. Skin can become both display and disguise. Many species learn within short, largely solitary lives, but that fact does not by itself explain why their nervous systems evolved or what information can pass between individuals.

The body also matters beyond zoology. Engineers trying to build soft robots face a diluted version of the octopus problem: how to control a flexible structure with many possible shapes without calculating every movement

from a central processor. The animal does not offer a blueprint that can be copied. Its arms are living tissue with distributed sensing, changing stiffness and local feedback. It does offer a better question. How much control should be settled near the point of action, and how much should be reserved for the system directing the whole?

There is a second reason to care, and it is corrective. People keep asking whether an octopus is as intelligent as a dog, a young child or a primate. The comparisons sound scientific because they invite ranking. Usually they compare performance on tasks shaped for different bodies, motives and senses. An octopus may fail to look where a human expects, solve a problem by touching rather than seeing, lose interest after one trial, or dismantle the apparatus. The result can expose the test as readily as the animal.

A third reason is ethical. Octopuses are kept in laboratories, displayed in aquariums, caught in fisheries and proposed for intensive farming. Evidence of flexible behaviour does not by itself establish suffering. Separate work on injury, avoidance, relief-seeking and lasting behavioural change gives stronger grounds for concern. European Union law protects live cephalopods used for scientific purposes, while the United Kingdom's 2022 sentience law includes cephalopod molluscs in a policy-scrutiny framework. Neither provision proves subjective experience or creates blanket welfare protection. Both record a precautionary judgement. Housing, handling, enrichment, killing methods and species differences still demand evidence.

The word alien should therefore sharpen attention, not end thought. It names distance in ancestry, anatomy and sensory life. It does not mean unknowable, supernatural or superior. Octopuses obey physics, inherit molluscan structures and leave measurable traces in behaviour and nervous tissue. They are strange enough without invention.

By the end of this book, you will know how the body works, why control is distributed, what the skin is doing, which claims about intelligence survive testing, how an octopus passes through its life, where the famous stories overreach, and what this animal changes about the question of what a mind

can be.

The Core Ideas

The Bargain of a Body Without Armour

The octopus story begins with a shell it no longer carries.

Early cephalopods were molluscs organised around chambered external shells. A shell supplied protection and, when gas-filled chambers evolved, control of buoyancy. It also imposed a geometry. The animal had to live at the mouth of a rigid structure and move the structure with it. Nautilus retain a version of that arrangement. The coleoid line, which includes squid, cuttlefish and octopuses, reduced the shell, internalised it or lost most of it. Modern octopuses are the furthest familiar result: an animal whose outline is negotiable. The order includes bottom-living hunters, open-water drifters and finned deep-sea forms. Female argonauts even secrete a delicate eggcase that looks like a shell, but it is a reproductive structure made by the arms, not the return of ancestral armour.

That freedom is easy to romanticise. It is a bargain, not a free gift. The external shell had been armour. Without it, an octopus became edible from almost every direction. Its soft tissues could be seized, bitten and swallowed. The body therefore had to make exposure useful. It could enter dens, press beneath stones, wrap around irregular prey, change direction without turning a rigid trunk and alter its outline against a background. Flexibility became defence, access and capture at once.

The main body is the mantle, a muscular bag containing the gills and most organs. The head carries large eyes and a ring of eight arms surrounding the mouth. At the centre sits a hard beak, backed by a toothed radula and feeding structures. Cartilage supports parts of the head and eyes, so the animal is not liquid. Yet there is no bony spine, no rib cage and no articulated limb. Most of what a predator sees can change shape under muscle control.

This explains the famous squeezing without supporting the slogan that the beak alone determines every passable opening. The beak is the main rigid obstacle in many species, but eyes, supporting tissues, recent feeding, willingness, surface friction and the shape of the opening also matter. A capability is not a universal engineering specification.

Shell reduction also changed movement. Water drawn into the mantle can be expelled through a funnel, producing jet propulsion. Arms can crawl, anchor and steer. Webbing between them can spread over prey or help shape the body. Some deep-sea octopuses use fins and broad webs more than the familiar reef species do. There is no single octopus design, only a family built around soft control.

The tempting causal story is that losing the shell made the octopus intelligent. Evolution rarely offers such clean invoices. Shell reduction, active predation, richer senses, camouflage, manipulative arms and nervous expansion developed across long, branching histories. Squid and cuttlefish made different bargains; nautilus retained shells and still behave adaptively. The defensible claim is narrower. Once an exposed animal could take many shapes and use eight flexible arms, selection had an unusually difficult body to control and unusually rich opportunities to exploit.

That is the condition from which the rest follows. The octopus did not first acquire a mind and then receive an exotic body to operate. Whatever intelligence it has is the working intelligence of that body.

Eight Arms With No Joints

A human elbow removes possibilities. It bends mainly in one plane, within a limited range, and that restriction makes control manageable. An octopus arm removes the restriction.

Each arm is a muscular hydrostat. Its tissues contain fluid and resist large changes in volume. When transverse muscles contract, the arm becomes narrower and lengthens. Longitudinal contraction shortens and thickens it. Oblique fibres contribute twisting, and different regions can stiffen or bend while neighbouring regions do something else. The structure works without

bones because muscles supply both movement and temporary support. Stiffness is variable rather than given. One region can become a brace while another remains compliant, so the same arm can probe delicately, pull hard, form a temporary elbow or spread force across a surface.

The price is an immense number of possible configurations. A hand reaching for a cup follows joints with knowable angles. An arm reaching into a crevice can form a bend almost anywhere, send that bend along its length, wrap around three surfaces and change stiffness as suckers attach. Calculating every muscle fibre from the centre would be slow and wasteful.

Octopuses reduce the problem by using patterns. During a reach, a bend can form near the base and travel towards the target while the arm extends. During crawling, one or more arms push against the ground in a chosen direction. The animal does not need a fixed front pair of legs and rear pair of legs. It can recruit arms according to position and task, though individuals and species may show preferences. Flexible hardware is made usable by repeatable control strategies.

The suckers add another layer. An octopus arm usually carries rows of them along much of its length. This is why the appendages are arms, not tentacles. In cephalopod anatomy, the specialised longer feeding tentacles of squid and cuttlefish bear enlarged clubs towards their ends. Octopuses have eight sucker-bearing arms and no separate tentacle pair.

A sucker is not a passive cup. Its outer disc forms a seal while a muscular chamber changes pressure and adhesion. It can conform to rough surfaces, regulate force and release rapidly. Because each sucker is richly supplied with nerves and sensory cells, the same structure grips, touches and samples chemicals. The arm does not wait for the mouth or nose to learn what it has found.

This arrangement creates problems that a skeleton would prevent. Arms can tangle, obstruct one another or attach to the animal's own skin. Chemical recognition helps suppress self-attachment: experiments show that suckers behave differently towards octopus skin and towards extracts

associated with it. The mechanism does not amount to a philosophical self-concept. It is a local solution to a body that constantly encounters itself.

The eight arms are therefore neither ropes controlled from a cockpit nor independent animals attached to a head. They are flexible effectors with local sensing and patterned control. Their range makes the octopus look unconstrained. Underneath the performance is relentless simplification, because a system with too many possible movements survives by avoiding the need to choose among all of them.

One Animal, Distributed Control

The phrase nine brains survives because it is vivid, countable and wrong.

An octopus has one integrated nervous system. A brain mass wraps around the oesophagus, large paired optic lobes process vision beside it, and extensive nerve cords run through the arms. In commonly studied species, order-of-magnitude estimates place the total number of neurons in the hundreds of millions, with a larger share in the arms than in the central brain mass. Counts depend on species, tissue definitions and method. The important fact is the distribution, not a competition with dogs, cats or children. The central system is not a miniature vertebrate brain. Its lobes follow another arrangement while still supporting integration, memory and behavioural choice.

Each arm contains axial nerve cords, local ganglia and repeated neural organisation associated with suckers and musculature. Recent anatomical work shows segmentation within this peripheral system rather than one undifferentiated cable. Local circuits can coordinate sucker activity, reflexes and parts of movement. Classic experiments on arm extension found that a stereotyped motor programme could organise a reaching movement without the brain specifying every changing angle. This division also limits what must travel through the narrow connections at the arm bases. The centre can request a reach or withdrawal without receiving a running report on every sucker and muscle. Local feedback keeps the movement fitted to the surface while broader information remains available to alter the plan.

That evidence is often inflated into a story in which each arm thinks for itself. Local competence is not an extra personality. Your spinal cord can organise withdrawal from a hot surface before a considered response, yet nobody adds one mind for each limb. The octopus carries the division much further, because its limbs are more flexible and more sensory, but the logical caution remains.

Central control is visible whenever the task requires information to cross systems. Octopuses can use visual cues to direct an arm through an apparatus towards a goal that the arm itself cannot see. They learn associations, retain spatial information and alter choices after outcomes. The vertical lobe system is strongly involved in learning and memory, while optic lobes perform extensive visual processing. Motivation, internal state and broad behavioural selection are properties of the integrated animal.

Communication also runs back towards the centre and across the body. An arm encounters texture and chemicals; the result can alter approach, feeding or rejection. Vision detects a predator; arms and skin reorganise. Locomotion requires several arms to push without cancelling one another while mantle, funnel, eyes and balance organs preserve orientation. Distribution works because information and control are connected, not because they are separate.

The architecture is best understood as levels of authority. Local circuits settle fast, repeated details near the suckers and muscles. Higher centres select goals, combine senses, learn from consequences and coordinate the animal's state. The boundary is not fixed. A novel obstacle may demand more central involvement than a familiar reach. Practice and context can change which details need attention.

This is the octopus's deepest challenge to familiar ideas about intelligence. We tend to place the mind where the skull is and treat the body as equipment. In an octopus, much of the equipment is neural and much of the neural work concerns the body at close range. The control system still belongs to one animal even when much of its neural work occurs inside the machinery that acts.

A Skin That Becomes the Scene

For most animals, skin is a boundary. For an octopus, it is also a fast visual surface under neural command.

The best-known components are chromatophores. Each is a small elastic sac of pigment surrounded by radial muscles. When those muscles contract, they pull the sac open and expose more colour. When they relax, it contracts. Dense fields of chromatophores can therefore be expanded in combinations, producing spots, bars, dark patches and broad changes in tone within fractions of a second.

Pigment is only one layer. Iridophores reflect light through microscopic structures and can create shifting, angle-dependent colours. Leucophores scatter available light and help produce pale areas. Muscles in the skin raise papillae, turning a smooth surface into bumps, ridges or branching textures. Posture and arm placement change the outline as well. Camouflage is an integrated motor performance, not a colour filter placed over the animal. Researchers describe recurring components and whole-body patterns, but the repertoire is compositional rather than a set of photographic costumes. Small local units can be recruited into larger displays as posture and background change.

The patterns do several jobs. Background matching reduces obvious contrast with sand, rock or rubble. Disruptive patterns break the body into false edges so that a predator fails to group it as one object. Masquerade makes the animal resemble something unprofitable or ordinary, such as algae, a rock or a drifting shape. High-contrast deimatic displays can startle or warn. During courtship or conflict, changing patches and postures can carry information between octopuses, although the meaning and importance of signals vary by species.

The mimic octopus supplies the most theatrical example and the easiest route to exaggeration. In the Indo-Malayan region it has been documented altering posture, movement and pattern in ways that resemble several other animals. The evidence supports dynamic mimicry. It does not support a

fixed catalogue in which every photographed pose proves conscious impersonation of a named species. Resemblance must be tested against context, predator response and repeated observation.

A deeper puzzle is that many studied octopuses appear to have one main visual pigment and perform poorly on conventional colour-discrimination tests. Calling them colour-blind is defensible if it means no established human-like comparison among wavelengths. It does not mean they see a grey blur. They detect brightness, edges, spatial scale, motion and polarised light, and their unusual pupils create optical possibilities still under investigation. A proposed use of chromatic blur remains a hypothesis rather than the settled explanation for camouflage.

The skin adds another source of information. Experiments on *Octopus bimaculoides* show that isolated skin can expand chromatophores in response to light and expresses parts of a phototransduction system. This local response may help regulate brightness or pattern. It is often described as skin that sees. That phrase outruns the result. No evidence shows detached skin analysing a scene or selecting a whole camouflage pattern.

Pattern control is hard because the animal has no permanent outfit to retrieve. The same individual must convert a changing visual field, its own posture, threat level and intended action into coordinated output over a flexible surface. It must also choose when concealment is no longer the right strategy. A predator that has detected the animal may require a sudden display, ink and flight instead of a better match.

The skin reveals the book's central model in public. Distributed machinery settles local detail, while the whole animal selects a usable state. The result looks like disappearance. What has happened is control.

Intelligence Without a Human Template

Intelligence is easiest to recognise when another animal solves a problem in the way we would. That is also when the evidence is least demanding. A hand opens a lid, an eye follows a pointer, a subject chooses the symbol the experimenter intended. Octopuses force a harder question because their bodies, senses and motives do not line up with the apparatus.

The safest starting definition is flexible control of behaviour using information and past outcomes. Under that description, octopuses show substantial capacities. They learn visual and tactile discriminations, remember locations, alter choices when reward rules reverse and find routes through barriers. They explore unfamiliar objects and differ consistently in activity, boldness and response. Some can learn that a previously rewarded cue no longer pays and switch to its alternative, a useful test because persistence can no longer masquerade as success. Spatial, visual and tactile tasks need not draw on one common capacity, so a profile is more honest than one score. None of these abilities is unique to them. Their importance lies in the combination and in the evolutionary route by which it arose.

The coconut-shell observation is strong because it occurred in the wild and contains a delayed function. Veined octopuses carried shell halves across exposed ground, then assembled or used them as portable shelter. The behaviour fits a practical definition of tool use: an external object was transported and deployed to alter the relationship between animal and environment. It does not establish foresight in the autobiographical human sense. It does show that present inconvenience can be accepted for later protection.

Captive object manipulation supplies weaker but suggestive evidence. In small studies, some common octopuses repeatedly released floating objects into water jets and interacted with them after food value had disappeared. Researchers classified a subset of the behaviour as play-like because it was repeated, varied and not tied to an immediate survival function. The label should remain attached to its criteria and sample. It is not proof that the

animal was amused.

Famous escapes require the same discipline. An octopus can exploit a loose lid, a drain, a neighbouring tank or a gap because exploration, flexibility and sucker control make such routes available. A documented repeated solution may demonstrate learning. A single disappearance may demonstrate that the enclosure was poorly designed. Stories improve in aquariums because the witness already knows the ending and the subject cannot correct the narration.

Cross-species ranking makes the problem worse. There is no neutral ladder on which opening a jar, following a human gaze, remembering a maze and coordinating a hunt become units of one quantity. Human intelligence tests work because they are standardised within a target population and validated against defined outcomes. No equivalent octopus IQ exists. Performance changes with temperature, handling, hunger, prior experience, age, arm condition, species and whether the task engages the senses the animal trusts.

Evolutionary independence strengthens the inference without making it mystical. Vertebrate and cephalopod lineages separated deep in animal history, before either possessed its present nervous architecture. Large nervous systems and flexible behaviour were assembled on both sides from different inherited parts. Octopuses therefore show that elaborate cognition can arise without a backbone, mammalian childhood or routinely stable group life. They do not identify one cause. Body control, predation, foraging, habitat and mating pressures vary together across species, and brain size cannot be read as intelligence.

It does not settle consciousness. Learning, avoidance and flexible action are evidence relevant to experience, especially when combined with injury-related behaviour and relief-seeking. They remain public indicators. The private presence and character of feeling cannot be read directly from clever performance. The octopus deserves better than both denial and projection: testable respect for capacities that need not resemble ours to be real.

A Predator That Tastes What It Touches

An octopus is often introduced through defence because camouflage photographs are irresistible. Its body makes more sense when viewed from the other side of the hunt.

Most octopuses are active predators of crabs, shrimps, bivalves, snails, fish and other available animals, though diet varies with species, size and habitat. Large eyes detect motion, edges and likely targets. Arms spread across the bottom, enter holes and turn surfaces into searchable space. Each sucker adds contact and chemical information. The animal can inspect several crevices at once without bringing every sample to a central nose.

Chemotactile receptors help explain the phrase tasting by touch. Work on California two-spot octopuses identified receptor families in sucker sensory cells that respond to poorly soluble compounds found on surfaces. Water does not carry such chemicals far in the way air carries many odours. Direct contact supplies information about what is present where the sucker lands. The animal's sensory world is therefore mapped across its arms. A den or hunting ground is encountered as a field of contacts as well as a view. That helps explain why an octopus may appear inattentive to a visual object while examining its base, edges and chemical traces through touch.

Capture tactics exploit the whole design. An octopus may stalk, pounce and spread the web between its arms over prey. It may probe a refuge until a crab bolts, pull shells apart or drill a small hole into hard prey and introduce secretions. The beak cuts and crushes; the radula scrapes and helps process food. Salivary secretions include compounds that immobilise or begin breaking down prey. Blue-ringed octopuses are exceptional in the medical danger their tetrodotoxin poses to people, and their fame should not turn every octopus bite into the same event.

Feeding is tied to circulation and respiration. A pair of branchial hearts drives blood through the gills, while a systemic heart sends oxygenated blood through the body. The oxygen carrier is copper-based haemocyanin, giving oxygenated blood a blue appearance. Haemocyanin performs

differently from vertebrate haemoglobin and helps set limits on sustained oxygen delivery. Jetting is fast and energetically expensive, so many benthic octopuses use crawling for routine movement and reserve jetting for brief bursts.

The predator is also prey to fish, eels, sharks, marine mammals, birds and other octopuses. Defence therefore runs as an escalation. Avoid detection through pattern, texture and stillness. If noticed, alter outline or produce a startling display. If approached, crawl or jet away, sometimes releasing ink that obscures, distracts or interferes with chemical sensing. If seized, an arm may be damaged or lost and later regenerated, although regrowth costs time and energy and may not restore an identical structure.

Hunting and hiding select for different uses of the same machinery. A flexible arm reaches prey and enters shelter. Chemotactile suckers inspect food and recognise unsuitable surfaces. Pattern change conceals an approach and breaks pursuit. Learning allows a predator to remember profitable areas, refine handling and abandon an unproductive tactic. Intelligence is not an ornament placed on the animal after anatomy. It is one part of making an exposed, short-range hunter work.

This also explains why laboratory puzzles can mislead. A food box engages manipulative skill and appetite but removes currents, competing prey, hiding places, predation risk and the need to coordinate camouflage with movement. The task may isolate one capacity. It should not be mistaken for the whole intelligence that exists to keep a predator fed and uneaten.

Brilliance on a Deadline

Many octopuses live as though evolution has spent heavily and declined the maintenance contract.

The familiar coastal species often hatch small, grow quickly, mature within months or a few years, reproduce and enter senescence. Males transfer packets of sperm using a modified arm called the hectocotylus. Females attach eggs in strings or clusters, clean them and move water over them. In many species, a brooding female sharply reduces or stops feeding and

remains with the eggs until they hatch. She then dies, while males commonly decline after mating as well.

This is not a voluntary sacrifice narrated by the animal. Endocrine control is central. In classic experiments, removing the optic glands from brooding female common octopuses interrupted the usual decline: feeding resumed, activity increased and lifespan extended. Later molecular work found several signalling pathways changing across brooding and senescence. The sequence is a regulated life-history programme, although its exact chemistry and variation across species remain active subjects.

Short life does not mean a simple life. Development also varies. Some species hatch as benthic juveniles resembling small adults, while others produce tiny planktonic paralarvae that travel and feed in open water before settling. The sensory and motor problems encountered early in life are therefore not uniform. Fast growth and exposed hunting can reward rapid learning, but the evolutionary link cannot be read from lifespan alone. Octopuses acquire useful information within the lives they have. Comparing that performance with long-lived mammals can fail because the relevant bodies, development, rewards and testing histories differ. A capacity used over months may be organised differently from one built through years of parental dependence; difference does not supply a ranking.

The broad story needs its exceptions. At cold deep-sea temperatures, development can be extraordinarily slow. One female *Graneledone boreopacifica* was observed on repeated submersible visits guarding the same clutch for fifty-three months. The record lengthened what counted as a plausible octopus lifespan through direct observation. Cirrate deep-sea octopuses also differ in body, locomotion and life history from shallow incirrate models.

Reproduction varies too. The larger Pacific striped octopus has been observed in captivity sharing dens, tolerating close neighbours, mating beak to beak and laying repeated clutches over an extended period. Other species gather at rich sites or maintain den neighbourhoods where interaction is common. These cases do not make octopuses secretly social

in one universal way. They show that solitary and semelparous are dominant descriptions of well-known patterns, not definitions of the order.

The evidence for individual learning is much stronger than the evidence for learning from others. One famous observational-learning result in common octopuses has not been robustly replicated and has been criticised for inadequate controls. Reports of social tolerance, observation and local behavioural regularity deserve testing, but none yet establishes cumulative culture. In many species, parents do not survive to teach hatchlings, so stable intergenerational transfer lacks an obvious route. That is a plausible constraint, not a demonstrated explanation for the size or organisation of the octopus nervous system.

This is the causal loop. The soft, exposed body of the first idea gains extraordinary access and behavioural range. Distributed control, sensitive arms, rapid patterning and flexible learning make that bargain viable. Yet in many studied species the package operates within a short, semelparous life with little parent-offspring contact. The body creates demands that can reward rapid individual learning, while the life history may restrict some routes by which acquired solutions accumulate beyond one animal. The first link is well supported; the second remains a bounded inference.

That limit helps explain the force, but not the biology, of the alien comparison. An octopus can appear newly invented because its intelligence is embodied, species-specific and often rebuilt within one lifetime. The strongest comparison is architectural. The weakest is the fantasy of boundless intellect or a civilisation prevented only by early death. This is intelligence under ecological and temporal constraint: capable, uneven and costly.

How It Actually Works

From a shell to the seafloor

The first cephalopods were not soft-bodied masters of concealment. They carried external shells and moved through ancient seas more like nautiluses than modern octopuses. Their fossil record is therefore abundant where hard parts survive and frustrating where the lineage becomes soft. Shells leave architecture in stone. Arms, nerves and chromatophores usually leave nothing.

Across the coleoid line, the shell moved inside the body, shrank or disappeared. Squid retain an internal pen, cuttlefish a cuttlebone. In most octopuses only reduced internal elements remain, while the body is organised around a muscular mantle and an arm crown. Molecular comparisons and fossils agree on the broad branching pattern even when the timing and appearance of early soft-bodied forms remain harder to reconstruct.

Octopuses then spread into almost every marine setting available to them. They live on coral reefs, rocky coasts, mud, sand, polar shelves, the open ocean and the deep seafloor. Some are smaller than a hand; the largest species can span several metres across the arms. Some crawl and jet. Cirrate deep-sea forms carry fins and webbing and may move with slow, economical strokes. The common body plan is remarkably adaptable because it contains fewer fixed commitments than a skeleton does.

Soft bodies also changed what could be built around the head. Cephalopod eyes and vertebrate eyes arrived at camera-like solutions independently, with a lens focusing an image on a retina. Their detailed construction differs because each lineage began with different tissue. The resemblance is useful evidence for convergence: similar physical problems can pull remote ancestors towards comparable functions without making the resulting animals close relatives.

That does not make it unrestricted. All living octopuses are marine animals.

Their gills require water, their skin loses moisture and their circulation is fitted to seawater conditions. A few intertidal species can cross wet rock or survive short exposure, which produces excellent footage and bad claims about land animals. The evolutionary achievement is not freedom from environment. It is an unusual range within the sea.

Building an octopus

An octopus begins inside an egg supplied with yolk and attached, in many species, to a den wall or sheltered surface. The mother cleans the egg strings, removes fouling and directs oxygenated water over them. Development speed depends strongly on species and temperature. Warm-water eggs may hatch within weeks. Cold deep-sea eggs can take years.

The hatchling does not have one standard childhood. Species with large eggs may produce benthic young that settle and behave like reduced adults. Species with many small eggs often produce paralarvae that enter the plankton, swimming, feeding and dispersing before adopting a bottom-living existence. Mortality can be severe and the skills needed in open water differ from those needed in a den. The label baby octopus hides several developmental strategies.

Growth can be rapid, especially in species with short life cycles and abundant prey. The mantle houses the gills, digestive tract, reproductive organs and three hearts. Water passes into the mantle cavity and over the gills, then can be expelled through the funnel. Gentle contractions ventilate the gills. Strong contractions create a jet.

The systemic heart supplies the body after two branchial hearts move blood through the gills. Haemocyanin carries oxygen using copper rather than the iron in vertebrate haemoglobin. Its performance changes with temperature and oxygen conditions, helping shape where a species can live and how hard it can work. Jet propulsion gives rapid acceleration but carries a high energetic cost. Crawling keeps the body close to cover and lets arms do much of the work.

The mouth sits where the arms meet. The beak is hard enough to cut and crush, and food passes through the brain's central ring because the oesophagus runs through it. Oversized pieces are therefore a bad idea. The radula and salivary apparatus reduce prey before swallowing. Anatomy has wrapped the central brain around the road taken by dinner, one of evolution's less elegant inheritances.

By the time the young animal begins independent feeding, its effectors and sensors are already densely coupled. A sucker can seal, pull, detect contact and sample surface chemicals. Chromatophore muscles can expose pigment while deeper reflectors change returned light. The eyes, statocysts, skin and arms do not wait for a later intellectual stage. The octopus grows by using a control system that is functional from the start and refined through experience.

Leaving the den

A benthic octopus often begins from a shelter: a crevice, hole, bottle, shell pile or excavated space. The den is not a permanent home in every species, but it creates a defended centre from which the animal can forage. Shell fragments and prey remains may accumulate nearby as middens, giving divers clues to diet and occupancy. A heap outside a hole is evidence of repeated use, not proof that the owner has decorated its garden.

Before moving into the open, the octopus controls what can be seen. Its eyes collect the scale, contrast and orientation of the surroundings. Skin patterns change with background and behaviour. Arms pull the body over the substrate while suckers attach and release in sequence. The animal can move in almost any direction without rotating into a forward-facing posture, and its eyes can remain oriented while the arms reorganise below.

Crawling looks improvised but follows useful regularities. Several arms can push while others explore or stabilise. Direction emerges from the combined forces rather than from a fixed gait. On open ground, an octopus may flatten, elongate or carry objects beneath the web. If speed matters, the mantle fills, contracts and sends water through the funnel. The funnel can

point the jet, while arms trail, steer or alter drag.

Every route is also a sensory survey. Vision reaches ahead. Suckers inspect the immediate surface through pressure, texture and chemical contact. Balance organs called statocysts register orientation and acceleration. The body receives a dense flow of local information, much of which never needs to become a detailed central picture. An arm adjusts to a stone because the arm has encountered the stone.

This is where a rigid idea of command fails. The central nervous system need not describe the desired position of every sucker. It selects an action, such as approach, search, retreat or enter, and peripheral machinery solves much of the changing geometry. When circumstances demand integration, information moves across the system. A visual target can guide an arm. A chemical contact can end an approach. A shadow can transform movement, posture and skin at once.

Pattern selection also changes with scale. On fine gravel the animal may produce mottling; beside strong edges it may use larger contrasting components; against open sand it can flatten and reduce texture. These categories describe recurring strategies, not a lookup table with one correct costume for each photograph. Movement matters because a perfect still match can fail as soon as the outline slides across the background. The animal continually trades concealment against speed, view and access.

The hunt

The prey may be hidden before the octopus leaves its den. Crabs shelter under stones. Bivalves close. Shrimps detect approaching water movement. A hunter built for close contact must avoid announcing its arrival and then solve whatever protection the prey carries.

One method is the pounce. The octopus spreads its arms and web over an area, forming a temporary enclosure. Arms probe beneath the web while escape routes narrow. Another is speculative searching, with several arms inserted into cracks as suckers sample surfaces. A shrimp may be stalked and seized. A crab can be enveloped before its claws find useful purchase.

Fish require quicker timing and are not equally important to every species.

Hard-shelled prey presents a mechanical problem. An octopus may pull valves apart, chip an edge or drill a small hole. Drilling combines abrasion with secretions delivered through specialised mouthparts. Venomous saliva can immobilise prey and assist feeding. The word venom should not collapse distinct chemistries and risks into one category. The bite of a common octopus can injure; the tetrodotoxin associated with blue-ringed octopuses can cause paralysis and death in humans. The exceptional danger belongs to a small group, not to the order as a whole.

Once captured, prey is manipulated through coordinated local action. Suckers grip at many points, arms reposition the body and the beak works at the centre. A task that looks like hand use is distributed across dozens or hundreds of contacts. The animal can learn efficient handling, reject unprofitable prey and return to productive areas. Memory is useful because the seafloor is patchy and prey renews on different timetables.

Predators interrupt the same sequence. A fish or seal may detect movement despite camouflage. The octopus can freeze, alter contrast, raise papillae or make itself appear larger. Some species produce conspicuous eyespots or bold patterns. If pursuit continues, jetting and ink buy separation. Ink can form a dark cloud or a denser blob that draws attack away from the body, and its chemicals may disrupt sensing in some predators. Species without ink, including many deep-sea forms, rely on other combinations of posture, webbing, colour, transparency and escape.

An arm seized during attack may be sacrificed or damaged. Regeneration restores length and function over time, but the process is not costless and perfect. While regrowing, the individual hunts and controls its body with an altered set of effectors. Flexibility permits compensation, which can make injury less visible to an observer than it is to the animal.

Learning between meals

A successful hunt leaves more than calories. Octopuses learn which cues predict food, which spaces are accessible and which tactics fail. In experiments they can discriminate shapes, textures or brightness, and some can reverse a learned choice when reward switches. Spatial tasks show route learning and memory. Performance varies widely between individuals and can decline when animals are stressed, satiated or uninterested. A discrimination experiment must therefore separate failure to perceive, failure to learn, loss of motivation and refusal to perform the requested action. Reversal tasks are especially informative because the subject must suppress a previously rewarded response, while detour tasks ask whether it can move away from a visible goal to reach it by an open route. Retention tests ask whether success survives a delay rather than one training session.

Exploration is part of the method. Arms and suckers examine openings, edges, movable parts and water flow. In a laboratory this can dismantle equipment or expose a route out. In the sea it can reveal prey, shelter or danger. The same behaviour looks clever when it defeats a human design and ordinary when it finds dinner. Its biological value does not depend on embarrassing the keeper. Objects can also reveal the boundary between exploration and play-like behaviour. Repeated manipulation after food and threat functions have faded is suggestive, especially when the action is varied rather than stereotyped. Yet novelty itself can be rewarding, and an investigator's category must not become an invisible report of the animal's mood. The strongest description says what was repeated, under which conditions, and by how many individuals.

Rest interrupts activity. Common octopuses show quiet states with pale, stable skin, reduced movement and changed responsiveness. Studies have also found brief active states in which eyes and suckers move and skin patterns change rapidly. Neural recordings from freely behaving octopuses and later work on active sleep-like patterning are beginning to link these states to brain activity. The resemblance to vertebrate sleep stages is intriguing but incomplete. Rapid skin changes during rest do not give an

observer access to a dream.

Sleep research also exposes a methodological gift of octopus skin. Internal state can become visible across the body, although interpretation remains difficult. A pattern may reflect motor output without depicting mental content. The animal is not projecting a film. It is cycling through activity in a system whose skin is connected closely enough to reveal it.

Mating, brooding and decline

Reproduction brings two animals close despite predation, cannibalism and conflict. In many species, the male transfers spermatophores with a hectocotylised arm, sometimes while keeping much of his body at a distance. Females can store sperm and fertilise eggs when conditions permit. Work published in 2026 found that the hectocotylus of California two-spot octopuses is sensory as well as reproductive: chemotactile receptors detect progesterone on contact and can guide mating without visual cues. That is one mechanism in a studied species, not a universal account of every mating arm. Courtship patterns, postures and tactics differ, and size can alter risk. Some males approach openly with conspicuous displays; others remain pale, keep their distance or exploit moments when a larger rival is occupied. These labels describe observed tactics rather than fixed personality types, and one individual may alter behaviour with opponent, female and setting.

Egg number and investment vary sharply. Small eggs may be laid in large numbers and hatch into planktonic young. Larger eggs tend to produce fewer, more developed hatchlings. The female guards and ventilates them, often rejecting food. Brooding protects against predators, sediment and fouling, but ties the mother to one place and makes the clutch dependent on her condition.

In many shallow-water species, the optic glands help drive a transition from brooding to senescence. Feeding stops, tissues deteriorate, lesions may appear and behaviour becomes disorganised. Males also enter decline after reproductive maturity. Natural selection can favour this pattern when

resources invested in further maintenance would yield fewer surviving descendants than resources placed into one reproductive event. That explanation describes selection across generations; it does not claim the individual seeks death.

The deep sea stretches the sequence. At low temperatures, embryos develop slowly, and large yolk reserves can support advanced hatchlings. The female *Graneledone boreopacifica* followed for fifty-three months remained with her eggs through repeated visits to the same site. Researchers could identify her by scars and position and watched the eggs enlarge until hatching. The case replaced inference with a measured minimum and warned against making warm, shallow species stand for all octopuses.

Other species loosen the one-clutch rule. The larger Pacific striped octopus has produced repeated clutches in captivity and tolerated densities and pair interactions unusual among well-known octopuses. The observations matter as counterexamples, though the species should not be made the new universal model. Evolution has varied the timing, social environment and reproductive bargain around the same broad body plan.

The hatchlings then inherit no general nursery. In many species the mother is dead or dying by the time they emerge, and the father has no continuing role. Young animals may encounter conspecifics and react to them, but evidence for observational learning in octopuses is limited and contested. Individual learning clearly does much of the work. Whether information also travels through social contact, and how often, remains a question rather than a missing chapter already filled by analogy with vertebrates.

Many ways of being an octopus

A common octopus on a Mediterranean reef, a blue-ringed octopus in a tide pool, an argonaut in open water and a finned octopus above the abyss do not meet the same problems. The reef hunter can depend on dens and complex backgrounds. A pelagic species may use transparency, silvery reflection or carried structures. Deep species operate where light, food and temperature change the value of speed and display.

Sex can reshape the body as well. Female argonauts secrete and occupy an eggcase while tiny males use specialised reproductive structures. Blanket octopuses show extreme size differences between females and males. Some open-water species associate with jellyfish or floating material. These are not decorative exceptions. They prevent the familiar large-eyed animal in a rocky aquarium from becoming the definition of an order containing hundreds of described species. They also alter the evidence available to us. Shallow reef species can be followed by divers, while pelagic and deep forms may be known from brief encounters, trawls or remotely operated vehicles. Behaviour that has never been seen may be absent, rare or merely difficult to observe.

Some differences reach the nervous system. A 2026 analysis across seventy-nine octopus, squid and cuttlefish species found larger brains associated with shallower and benthic habitats, while measured sociality showed no comparable association. The study compared species rather than manipulating environments, and brain size is not an intelligence score, so it cannot prove that ecology caused cognition. It does strengthen a safer conclusion: cephalopod neural investment varies with ecology, and social life is not the only plausible route. Octopus intelligence should be plural before it is compared.

The shared pattern is a soft molluscan body, eight arms and a nervous system fitted closely to action. From that base, species differ in arm proportions, webs, fins, ink, venom, colour, habitat, development, lifespan and social contact. Intelligence must be expected to vary with them. Asking what octopuses can do is useful only after asking which octopus, at what

stage, in what setting and for what problem.

How we know

Octopus knowledge comes through imperfect windows. Field divers and remotely operated vehicles reveal hunting, den use, object carrying, mating and brooding in context, but encounters resist repetition and identification may be uncertain. Captive experiments control cues and outcomes, yet often use few individuals from tractable species, with handling, hunger and enclosure design affecting results.

Anatomy, cell recording, lesion work, gene expression and genome comparison establish mechanisms that behaviour alone cannot. Isolated arms and tissues reveal local capacities, though separation can remove the coordination being explained. Fossils preserve shells far better than soft bodies, so early octopus evolution is reconstructed from uneven remains combined with developmental and molecular evidence.

The evidence is strongest when methods converge. A clever story is weaker than repeated behaviour with alternatives controlled. A neural response is weaker than a complete account of what it causes. No experiment reads private experience directly. Claims about intelligence, pain or sleep therefore depend on defined behavioural and physiological indicators, species-specific replication and language no broader than the test. Social-learning claims also require controls for attention, stimulus enhancement and motivation. The largest remaining bias is taxonomic: a small group of coastal species supplies much of the experimental literature. Every general sentence should therefore be read as a claim about supported patterns across studied octopuses, not a completed inventory of the order.

What People Get Wrong

“An octopus has nine brains”

The arithmetic begins with a sound fact. Octopus arms contain extensive nervous tissue, and in well-studied species the peripheral system holds more neurons than the central brain. Repeated ganglia and axial nerve cords organise sucker sensing and local movement. Popular accounts turn each arm's neural machinery into a brain, then add the central one. Large optic lobes linked to the eyes sit beside the central ring as well, which shows how quickly counting lumps stops describing function.

A brain is not any concentration of neurons. The arm cords lack the architecture and system-wide role of the central brain and optic lobes. They process local information and execute parts of action while remaining connected to one animal's vision, motivation, learning and behavioural state. Calling them eight extra brains makes distribution sound like multiplication.

The correction matters because the true arrangement is stranger and more useful. One integrated nervous system delegates detail close to the muscles and sensors that need it. The centre does not micromanage every sucker, and the arms do not conduct eight private lives. Distributed control is a design principle, not a census of minds.

“Each arm thinks for itself”

An arm can perform more local work than a vertebrate limb. It can coordinate suckers, adjust to surfaces and contribute to stereotyped reaches without receiving a continuous sequence of joint commands. Severed or isolated preparations can still produce organised responses for a time. Those demonstrations made arm autonomy irresistible.

Autonomy is always autonomy over something. Local circuits can settle contact, force and movement detail. They do not choose the animal's feeding ground, identify a distant threat through the eyes or decide that a previously rewarded visual cue has changed meaning. Experiments show central visual information guiding arm action, while signals from arms alter

whole-animal behaviour. Activity in an isolated arm demonstrates retained circuitry, not perception, intention or experience after separation. Those stronger claims require evidence the preparation cannot supply.

The distinction prevents two opposite mistakes. Treating the arms as passive cables misses most of the nervous system. Treating them as separate thinkers mistakes control beneath awareness for a divided identity. The better model is layered authority: local solutions nested inside shared goals, with the division shifting as novelty and risk change.

“Colour-blind animals cannot control camouflage”

Many commonly studied octopuses appear to possess one principal visual pigment and do not show conventional colour discrimination in standard tests. Yet they produce coloured patterns that fit diverse backgrounds. The contradiction disappears once colour matching is separated from human colour naming.

Camouflage depends heavily on brightness, edge, spatial frequency, texture, orientation and outline. Octopuses also detect polarisation, which supplies contrast unavailable to us. Chromatophores expose pigments while iridophores and leucophores alter reflected light. Skin photoreception may contribute local brightness responses. A mechanism based on chromatic blur through unusual pupils has been proposed, but it is not a settled answer. Camouflage success must also be judged through the visual system of the predator, not by whether a photograph looks convincing to a human observer.

The error is to move from no demonstrated human-like colour vision to no usable visual information. The animal may control an effective output without experiencing the hues as we do. Its camouflage should therefore be analysed as a sensorimotor match, not as evidence that it secretly sees a human palette or paints by instinct without feedback.

“Every escape proves genius”

An octopus under a loose lid has three advantages: a flexible body, adhesive arms and a strong tendency to investigate edges and water flow. Those traits can produce an escape without a plan extending beyond the next opening. Human witnesses then supply intention, suspense and a nickname.

A repeated escape after the route has changed is more informative. So is a choice among alternatives, retention after delay or transfer to a new apparatus. The famous stories rarely include controls, failed attempts, prior handling, exact dimensions or the number of animals that did nothing. They are observations selected because the ending was good. The selection effect is severe: ten secure nights leave no story, while one wet floor becomes evidence of a criminal career. Retelling removes the denominator and sharpens the plot.

This does not make escapes uninteresting. They reveal enclosure weaknesses, motivation and exploratory behaviour, and they can generate testable questions. They are poor standardised measures. The correction replaces sneering with discipline: describe the route, repeat the condition, change one feature and see what survives. Cleverness begins where the anecdote becomes an experiment.

“An octopus can pass through any hole larger than its beak”

The beak is the hardest substantial structure in the body of most familiar octopuses, so it sets an important lower bound on compression. The rest of the animal can deform to a degree that seems impossible beside a vertebrate skeleton. The rule has therefore become a promise about any hole and any octopus.

Real passage depends on more than diameter. The opening has shape, thickness, friction and edges. The animal has eyes, cartilage, organs, recent meals, injuries and a behavioural judgement about whether entry is safe. Species differ in proportions and webbing. A soft body can also exert only

so much force while compressed. The rule changes again after feeding, when prey in the digestive tract alters what the body can move safely through. Passage is an interaction between animal and route, not a property of the beak alone.

The myth turns an impressive capacity into a false guarantee. In husbandry, that is dangerous: an opening judged too small from the outside may still permit escape, while a narrow route may injure or trap. Use the beak as the main anatomical clue, then design for uncertainty rather than treating a slogan as a measurement standard.

“All octopuses are solitary and die after one clutch”

The description fits many well-known species. Adults often forage alone, defend dens, reproduce once and decline under endocrine changes after mating or brooding. Because common coastal octopuses dominate experiments and aquariums, their pattern became the definition.

Exceptions are material. Octopuses can gather where dens and food are concentrated, tolerate neighbours and interact repeatedly. The larger Pacific striped octopus has shown den sharing, close mating and repeated clutches in captivity. Deep-sea species can brood for years, and reproductive schedules vary with ecology and temperature. None of this establishes one hidden social system across the order. Crowding can reflect scarce shelter rather than attraction, and tolerance at a food-rich site need not become cooperation. Repeated association, signalling, mating and shared space should be separated before one label is applied.

The correction changes the question from are octopuses solitary to what kind of contact pays here. Sociality is a set of behaviours and relationships, not a switch. Semelparity is also a life-history pattern, not a taxonomic commandment. Even where death follows reproduction, egg size, clutch number, brooding duration and hatchling form vary enough to change the whole timetable. Species, sex, age and setting decide how far the familiar rule travels and where it fails in practice.

“Octopuses came from space”

A speculative paper once suggested that cephalopod complexity might involve extraterrestrial viruses or cryopreserved eggs delivered to Earth. The idea travelled because octopuses already look like illustrations of alien life and because panspermia turns surprise into origin.

No evidence requires it. Octopuses sit inside the molluscan tree through anatomy, development and genomes. Their genes show descent, duplication, rearrangement and innovation within earthly lineages. Fossils are incomplete because soft bodies preserve poorly, not because the animals arrived without ancestors. Unusual traits are the expected result of long evolution under different constraints, not a gap labelled spacecraft. An extraordinary origin claim must explain the nested similarities to other cephalopods and molluscs better than descent does. It does not begin by pointing at whatever looks strange.

The myth damages the best reason to call them alien. Their value lies in being from here. The same planet, chemistry and natural selection produced a complex nervous system through a route remote from vertebrates. Importing space removes the evolutionary comparison and replaces an explanatory achievement with a costume.

Use It

Start with the control problem

When an animal or machine does something impressive, begin one step earlier. What problem has its body and environment created?

An octopus arm looks gifted because it can bend anywhere. The same freedom makes every reach difficult to specify. Distributed nerves, local feedback and repeatable movement patterns become intelligible once the control burden is visible. Camouflage looks like decorative magic until exposure, outline and predation are treated as the problem. Learning looks like surplus cleverness until a flexible predator must exploit changing terrain

during a finite life.

This lens prevents a trait from floating free of its cost. Apply it first to another animal: flight, echolocation, migration or nest building. Then apply it cautiously to a robotic gripper. Ask which constraint the performance solves, what information is available, which errors are expensive and what the solution gives up. The answer will usually explain more than praise does. Capability is shaped by the difficulty it repeatedly has to survive.

Test transfer, not spectacle

A good trick can be produced by a narrow rule. Intelligence becomes more plausible when behaviour changes appropriately after the surface details change.

For an octopus, opening one familiar container may show persistence and manipulation. A stronger test alters the lid, moves the reward, reverses the cue or requires a detour. The question is whether learning transfers, whether an old response can be suppressed and whether the animal selects a new route rather than repeating what once worked. Failure must then be separated from poor vision, low appetite, stress or a task built around the wrong sense.

Use the same standard when reading animal-cognition headlines. Do not ask whether one individual succeeded once. Ask what changed, what was controlled, how many subjects were tested, whether the result transferred and whether a simpler sensory or learned rule survives. Transfer is never all or nothing, and no single task measures a whole mind. It can reveal whether the apparent ability belongs to a usable rule or to one lucky arrangement.

Locate decisions at the right level

The octopus shows why centralised and decentralised are often bad opposites. A local circuit can regulate sucker force while the animal's central system chooses where to forage. Both are control, operating at different scales.

When examining any organisation, find the smallest level with enough

information to settle the decision. Contact pressure belongs near a sucker because delay and data volume make central micromanagement wasteful. Choosing whether to leave the den requires wider information about hunger, threat and location. Local authority without system goals can produce conflict. Central authority over every detail produces delay and brittleness.

Outside zoology, the distinction is most useful in soft robots and distributed software. Frequent, reversible decisions rich in local information belong near the sensor or effector. Decisions that combine competing aims or require system-wide memory need wider control. Distribution works when information moves in both directions, not when every part is declared autonomous.

Reconstruct the sensory world

A human observer sees colour first and touch second. An octopus may obtain critical information through brightness, polarisation and chemical contact across hundreds of suckers. A test that looks obvious to us can therefore be badly posed for the animal.

Before interpreting behaviour, list what the subject can detect at the relevant distance and timescale. What counts as a salient edge, odour, vibration, pressure change or social cue? Which signal persists, and which disappears before action is possible? Then ask whether the response the experiment demands is physically natural. An octopus that examines an object's base with its arms may be attending intensely while looking indifferent to the person waiting for a visual choice.

Use this lens before calling an animal inattentive, irrational or unable. A result can diagnose the test as readily as the subject. For any animal, reconstruct the available signals and delays before inventing a motive. Explanation begins with the information the subject could obtain, not what the observer possessed.

Treat anecdotes as leads, not scores

The aquarium escape story has value at the beginning of inquiry. It identifies a possible capacity, a route, a motivation and a failure in the enclosure. It becomes unreliable when the story is repeated as a measurement of genius.

Turn the anecdote into a claim with parts. What exactly happened? How often? Compared with what? Did the route change? Were failures recorded? Could body shape, scent, water flow or prior handling supply a simpler explanation? Which observation would distinguish learning from repeated exploration? This preserves wonder while adding a denominator.

The rule matters wherever wildlife stories outrun samples. One escape, rescue, hunt or tool-use observation can reveal a possibility without showing prevalence. A vivid case can identify a mechanism while hiding failed attempts, ordinary individuals and the conditions that made the event possible. Anecdotes are high-resolution and low-control. Use them to decide what to test, then let repeated evidence determine how much they prove.

Design around agency and welfare

An animal capable of exploration, learning and avoidance can be harmed by more than obvious injury. An enclosure may prevent hiding, offer no controllable novelty, expose the animal to constant disturbance or create repeated failed escape attempts. Good welfare design asks what the species is motivated to do and whether it can exercise meaningful control.

For octopuses, that can include suitable dens, water quality, species-appropriate space, opportunities to forage and manipulate, protection from incompatible tank mates, careful handling and secure barriers that do not create traps. Enrichment is not a pile of puzzles for visitors. It should vary without forcing constant performance, and it must be evaluated through behaviour and health rather than human amusement.

Agency also clarifies welfare. A den is useful partly because the animal can enter or leave it; an object is enriching only if interaction is voluntary; a

secure tank must avoid turning exploration into repeated injury. Ask what the octopus can start, stop, avoid and change, then watch whether those options alter stress, injury and normal behaviour. Welfare design becomes stronger when control is something the animal can exercise, not something the keeper claims to provide.

The limits

The octopus is not a solution to the mystery of mind. Its distributed nervous system shows that complex control can be organised differently, but it does not tell us which organisation is sufficient for subjective experience. Behaviour and physiology support graded inferences about pain, sleep, perception and learning. They do not open a private viewpoint for inspection.

Nor is the animal a universal model of decentralisation. Arms remain parts of one organism with shared metabolism, development and reproductive interest. Human institutions contain people with separate aims, rights and exit options. Copying the language of local control without the underlying alignment can disguise exploitation as elegant design.

Species variation sets another limit. Results from a handful of coastal octopuses cannot be applied automatically to deep, pelagic or polar forms. Captivity changes risk, movement and motivation. Field observation loses control. Neural preparations isolate mechanism by removing context. Every method answers one question and introduces another uncertainty.

Intelligence also carries no moral halo. A capable predator kills, competes and sometimes cannibalises. Flexible learning does not make an animal kind, wise or ecologically harmless. Welfare concern rests on the capacity to be affected, not on passing a puzzle designed to impress us.

The one thing to keep

Keep the body in the mind.

Human language encourages the opposite. We place intelligence behind the eyes, treat limbs as tools and imagine thought as something that could

be lifted from one container into another without changing. The octopus makes that picture hard to maintain. Its arms sense while acting. Its skin displays while concealing. Its suckers grip while sampling chemicals. Its nervous system is spread through the structures that meet the world.

This does not mean every movement is thought or that the animal is divided into arm-sized selves. It means cognition is partly the organisation of perception and control across a particular living body. Change the body, lifespan, habitat and available signals, and the useful forms of intelligence change with them.

The octopus is therefore closest to alien intelligence at the moment it stops serving as a disguised person. Its value is not that it opens jars like hands do or escapes with motives we can narrate. It is that a mollusc, built from another inheritance, solves demanding problems through a combination of central learning, local control, chemical touch and transformable skin.

The permanent change is a question. When behaviour seems mindless because it does not resemble ours, ask what information and control are hidden in the body. When it seems brilliant because it does resemble ours, ask whether the resemblance is doing too much of the proof. Between those errors lies the animal itself: neither machine nor underwater human, but one of Earth's clearest demonstrations that intelligence is a way of being fitted to a world.

Terms

Cephalopod

A mollusc whose body is organised around a head, mantle and arm crown. Living cephalopods include octopuses, squid, cuttlefish and nautilus, with striking differences in shell, movement and behaviour.

Mollusc

A major animal group containing snails, clams, chitons and cephalopods. The relationship matters because octopus complexity arose by modifying molluscan parts, not by following the vertebrate route.

Coleoid

A member of the cephalopod branch containing octopuses, squid and cuttlefish. Coleoids reduced, internalised or lost the external shell retained by nautilus and greatly expanded soft-body control across entirely marine lineages.

Octopoda

The order containing living octopuses and their close fossil relatives. Its members share eight arms and lack the specialised pair of long feeding tentacles found in squid and cuttlefish.

Mantle

The muscular body wall surrounding the gills and most internal organs. It ventilates the gills, continuously changes shape during breathing and active movement and can force water through the funnel for jet propulsion.

Funnel

A steerable muscular tube, also called the siphon, through which water leaves the mantle cavity. Its direction helps control jetting, while expelled water can also clear debris or manipulate objects.

Muscular hydrostat

A flexible structure supported by muscle and nearly incompressible fluid rather than bone. Different fibre directions let an octopus arm lengthen, shorten, bend, twist and change stiffness while keeping similar volume.

Arm

One of the octopus's eight sucker-bearing appendages. Calling it a tentacle obscures a useful distinction: squid and cuttlefish have eight arms plus two specialised feeding tentacles.

Sucker

A muscular adhesive and sensory organ along an arm. It forms seals, controls pressure, detects touch and samples chemicals, making manipulation and perception parts of the same contact.

Haemocyanin

A copper-containing protein that transports oxygen in octopus blood. It is dissolved in the fluid rather than carried inside red blood cells, appears blue when oxygenated and helps set energetic limits as temperature and oxygen availability change.

Optic gland

A paired endocrine organ associated with reproduction, brooding and post-reproductive decline. Experiments removing it from brooding females revealed its control over feeding and senescence. It is distinct from the much larger optic lobes used in vision.

Beak

The hard, paired mouthparts at the centre of the arms. The beak cuts and crushes prey and is the main rigid constraint on compression in many octopuses, though not the only obstacle.

Radula

A ribbon bearing rows of small teeth, common across molluscs. In octopuses it helps scrape and process food and contributes to working on hard-shelled prey before pieces pass through the oesophagus.

Chromatophore

An elastic pigment sac surrounded by radial muscles and controlled by nerves. Expansion exposes colour; coordinated fields of chromatophores create rapid spots, bars, patches and changes in body tone.

Iridophore

A reflective skin structure producing angle-dependent colour or brightness through microscopic organisation rather than pigment alone. It contributes sheen and structural colour beneath or among chromatophores.

Leucophore

A light-scattering skin structure that reflects a broad range of available wavelengths. Leucophores help create pale areas and can borrow the colour character of surrounding light.

Papilla

A muscular skin projection that can be raised or flattened. Groups of papillae change surface texture and outline, allowing a smooth animal to resemble rough rock, coral or algae.

Polarisation vision

Sensitivity to the orientation of light waves. Octopuses can use polarisation contrast that humans do not normally see, adding information about surfaces, prey, signals and water conditions.

Chemotactile sensing

The joint detection of touch and surface chemicals. Octopus suckers contain specialised receptors suited to compounds that do not travel freely through water, making direct contact chemically informative.

Statocyst

A balance organ that detects orientation and acceleration through movement of a dense statolith and sensory cells. It helps stabilise posture and coordinate crawling, swimming and eye position.

Optic lobe

One of the large paired brain regions associated with visual processing. Their size reflects the importance of vision but should not be counted as extra independent brains.

Vertical lobe

A central brain system strongly involved in learning and memory. Lesion and physiological studies link it to storing associations, while its circuit organisation differs from vertebrate memory structures.

Axial nerve cord

The main longitudinal nervous pathway in each arm. It contains repeated organisation linked to suckers and muscles and supports local sensory processing, motor coordination and communication towards the central system.

Autotomy

The controlled loss of a body part, usually during attack. Some octopuses can shed or lose arms and regenerate them, though recovery costs energy and may be incomplete.

Deimatic display

A sudden conspicuous pattern, posture or apparent size change used when concealment has failed. Its function is to startle, warn or delay a predator long enough for escape.

Hectocotylus

A male arm modified for mating. It transfers spermatophores and, in the California two-spot octopus, also contains chemotactile receptors that help identify a mate and locate the reproductive tract. The sensory finding is species-specific; arm shape and use vary across octopuses.

Spermatophore

A structured packet containing sperm and mechanisms for transfer or release. Females of many species can store sperm before fertilising eggs, separating mating from egg laying.

Semelparity

A life-history strategy centred on one reproductive episode followed by death. It describes many octopuses but not every species, and the length and structure of the episode vary.

Brooding

Parental guarding and care of eggs. Female octopuses commonly clean clutches and direct water over them, often reducing feeding while development proceeds from weeks to years.

Senescence

The post-reproductive decline common in many octopuses, involving behavioural and bodily deterioration under endocrine control. It is more specific than ordinary ageing and differs among sexes and species.

Go Deeper

The accessible route into another mind

Peter Godfrey-Smith, *Other Minds: The Octopus, the Sea, and the Deep Origins of Consciousness* (Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2016). Begin here for the philosophical attraction of cephalopods joined to careful underwater observation. Godfrey-Smith uses the octopus to ask how experience and nervous complexity may have evolved along distant lines. The prose is inviting and the evolutionary framing is strong. Its subject is wider than octopus biology, and its treatment of consciousness is an argued position rather than a settled scientific verdict. Read it for the question made vivid, then use experimental work to test how far each inference travels across species, settings and methods.

The octopus-centred natural history

Jennifer A. Mather, Roland C. Anderson and James B. Wood, *Octopus: The Ocean's Intelligent Invertebrate* (Timber Press, 2010). This is the most direct next book if you want the animal rather than a general cephalopod survey. It combines anatomy, behaviour, field observation, aquarium experience and cognition in an accessible format, with enough species variation to resist a single cartoon octopus. Some research has advanced since publication, especially genomics, pain and arm neurobiology, so pair it with newer papers. Its great value is sustained attention to how an octopus eats, explores, hides, interacts and differs as an individual across changing environments and stages of life.

The technical synthesis

Roger T. Hanlon and John B. Messenger, *Cephalopod Behaviour*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge University Press, 2018). Use this when the short explanations in this book feel too clean. It covers senses, effectors, brain, body patterning, feeding, defence, reproduction, communication, learning and ecology across octopuses, squid, cuttlefish and nautilus. That breadth is both strength and warning: it is not an octopus-only book, and it reads as a scholarly synthesis rather than narrative science. The photographs, behavioural categories and references make it the best bridge from general interest to primary literature without hiding disagreement or variation.

The deep evolutionary history

Danna Staaf, *Monarchs of the Sea: The Extraordinary 500-Million-Year History of Cephalopods* (The Experiment, 2020). Read this to place the soft modern octopus inside the much longer history of shelled cephalopods, changing oceans and repeated body-plan experiments. Staaf is a biologist and an unusually clear guide to fossils that can otherwise become a march of names. Octopuses share the stage with ammonoids, nautilus, squid and cuttlefish, which is precisely the benefit. The book shows what was inherited, what disappeared and why the apparent oddity of an octopus makes more sense when the vanished shelled majority and its fossil record are restored.

Notes and Sources

Scope, names and the subtitle

This book concerns living octopuses in the order Octopoda, while using other cephalopods only for necessary comparison. The order contains hundreds of described species distributed across shallow, pelagic, polar and deep habitats. Exact species totals change with description and taxonomic revision, so no fixed count is used in the body. Current taxonomy was checked against the World Register of Marine Species on 4 September 2026.

Alien is used as a comparison of evolutionary route, body plan and sensory organisation. It is not a biological category, a ranking of animal minds or a claim of extraterrestrial origin. Vertebrate and cephalopod neural complexity arose after their lineages had separated deep in animal history. Kröger, Vinther and Fuchs review the combined fossil, developmental and molecular account; Albertin and colleagues provide genomic evidence placing octopus novelties within cephalopod and molluscan evolution.

The coconut-shell observation

The opening example comes from Finn, Tregenza and Norman's field report of veined octopuses carrying coconut-shell halves in Indonesia. The animals transported the material in a form that impaired ordinary movement and later used it as shelter. The authors treated the behaviour as defensive tool use because the object was carried for later deployment. The text does not enlarge this into proof of human-like foresight.

Body plan, shell reduction and movement

The broad history of external shells, coleoid shell reduction and the uneven fossil record follows Kröger, Vinther and Fuchs, supplemented by Staaf and Hanlon and Messenger. The argonaut eggcase is secreted by specialised webs on the female's arms and is not the retained ancestral shell. Octopus anatomy, circulation, jetting, feeding structures and developmental variation follow Hanlon and Messenger and Mather, Anderson and Wood.

Muscular hydrostats maintain support through muscle and nearly constant volume rather than rigid joints. Sumbre and colleagues established a peripheral motor programme for arm extension. Kennedy and colleagues quantified the large range of arm deformations. Levy, Flash and Hochner showed that crawling direction can emerge through arm recruitment without a fixed limb sequence. The manuscript treats these results as control strategies observed in particular species and tasks, not as one complete motor programme for every octopus.

The squeezing discussion is deliberately qualitative. The beak is a major rigid constraint in many incirrate octopuses, but supporting cartilage, eye structures, gut contents, opening geometry, friction, force and behaviour prevent an exact universal rule. No numerical hole-size claim is made.

Nervous-system distribution

Neuron totals are order-of-magnitude estimates and vary by species, tissue definition and counting method. Shigeno and colleagues review cephalopod brain organisation and the large peripheral allocation. Olson, Schulz and Ragsdale provide recent anatomical evidence for repeated segmentation and sucker-associated enlargement in octopus arm nerve cords. The integrated central system includes a brain mass around the oesophagus and large paired optic lobes beside it, linked to extensive peripheral arm systems.

Sumbre and colleagues showed organised arm extension after connection with the brain had been severed. Gutnick and colleagues showed that common octopuses could learn to use visual information to direct an arm

through a maze. Neshor and colleagues identified chemical mediation in the reduced attachment of suckers to octopus skin. Together these sources support layered, connected control. They do not support eight additional brains, separate arm consciousness or a fixed line between local and central computation.

Comparative claims about brain allocation and ecology are kept cautious. Ponte and colleagues assemble available cephalopod brain measurements and life-history descriptors, while stressing missing taxa, inconsistent historical measurements and limited phylogenetic coverage. Basava and colleagues compared brain size, ecology, life history and social descriptors across seventy-nine coleoid species. Larger brains were associated with shallow benthic habitats and not with recorded sociality, but the authors did not interpret those associations as causal. The body also refuses to treat brain size as an intelligence score.

Skin, camouflage and vision

Chromatophores are pigment organs expanded by radial muscles under direct neural control. Iridophores and leucophores alter reflected light, while muscular papillae change texture. Pattern categories and their defensive and communicative uses follow Hanlon and Messenger. The mimic-octopus example rests on Norman, Finn and Tregenza's field description of dynamic mimicry. The manuscript avoids assigning a named model to every pose.

Evidence from commonly studied octopuses supports one principal visual pigment and no established conventional colour discrimination. This does not remove sensitivity to brightness, spatial pattern, motion or polarisation. Ramirez and Oakley demonstrated light-activated chromatophore expansion and phototransduction-gene expression in isolated *Octopus bimaculoides* skin. The body calls this local photoreception rather than scene vision. Stubbs and Stubbs proposed chromatic-aberration discrimination through pupil shape; the mechanism remains a hypothesis and is labelled as such.

Camouflage descriptions concern sensorimotor output. They do not claim that an octopus experiences colour as a human does or that a pattern

necessarily depicts a conscious intention.

Learning, object use and individual behaviour

Hanlon and Messenger and Mather, Anderson and Wood synthesise visual, tactile, spatial, reversal and exploratory learning. Gutnick and colleagues provide one tightly controlled example of visual guidance of arm action. Finn, Tregenza and Norman support the coconut-shell case. Kuba and colleagues report repeated object interaction in a small captive study and classify some patterns as play on operational criteria. The body uses play-like and does not infer amusement.

Aquarium escapes are discussed as possible observations rather than high-risk factual anecdotes. No named escape story is presented as reported fact. Cross-species intelligence rankings are rejected because tasks, bodies, senses, motivation and validation differ. The manuscript makes no claim that an octopus has the intelligence of a child, dog or primate. Schnell and colleagues also warn that behavioural flexibility alone does not identify the mechanism beneath it. Their review notes that the famous common-octopus observational-learning result has not been replicated and was criticised for missing controls. The final text therefore treats social learning as plausible but unestablished and makes no claim of cumulative culture.

Complex behaviour and independent neural evolution are relevant to questions about consciousness but do not settle them. That boundary follows the distinction between public indicators and private experience used throughout current comparative cognition and animal-welfare work.

Chemotactile sensing, feeding and defence

Van Giesen and colleagues identified specialised receptor families and sensory-cell types involved in octopus chemotactile behaviour. The receptors respond to poorly soluble compounds encountered on surfaces, supporting the claim that sucker contact combines mechanical and chemical information. Villar and colleagues then showed that the hectocotylus of male California two-spot octopuses contains a contact-dependent sensory system responsive to progesterone and can guide mating without visual cues. Both results are powerful species-specific mechanisms, not complete receptor inventories for all octopuses.

Prey capture, drilling, beak and radula use, salivary secretions, ink, jetting, arm loss and regeneration follow the behavioural syntheses by Hanlon and Messenger and Mather, Anderson and Wood. Diet and tactics vary widely. The body therefore uses examples rather than a universal hunting sequence. Blue-ringed octopuses are separated from the order-wide discussion because tetrodotoxin makes their human risk exceptional.

The circulation description uses the standard arrangement of two branchial hearts and one systemic heart with haemocyanin as the oxygen carrier. Environmental effects are limited to temperature and oxygen conditions; the text makes no broader forecast about climate responses across the order.

Reproduction, brooding and senescence

Wodinsky's optic-gland removal experiments showed renewed feeding, activity and extended survival in brooding female common octopuses. Wang and Ragsdale later identified coordinated changes in several optic-gland signalling pathways across maternal behaviour and death. Wang and colleagues found steroid-pathway changes associated with the post-reproductive sequence. These studies support regulated endocrine control, not one literal suicide hormone and not a claim about conscious self-sacrifice.

Robison, Seibel and Drazen followed one identifiable female *Graneledone boreopacifica* through repeated remotely operated vehicle observations and

documented a minimum brooding period of fifty-three months. It is retained as a setting-specific counterexample to short warm-water schedules, not as a normal octopus lifespan.

Caldwell, Ross, Rodaniche and Huffard reported den sharing, close mating positions, social tolerance and repeated spawning in twenty-four captive adult larger Pacific striped octopuses. The manuscript states the captive setting and uses the species to bound generalisations about solitude and one clutch. Aggregation, tolerance, repeated interaction and stable cooperation are not treated as synonyms.

Rest and sleep

Medeiros and colleagues reported alternating quiet and active sleep states in *Octopus insularis* using behaviour and arousal thresholds. Pophale and colleagues connected active sleep with wake-like skin patterning and neural activity in *Octopus laqueus*. Gutnick and colleagues developed long-term electrical recording from freely behaving octopuses. These results support sleep-state language. They do not establish dream content, so the manuscript explicitly declines that inference.

Pain, welfare and law

Crook found conditioned place avoidance of a site associated with acetic-acid injection, preference for a location associated with local anaesthetic after injury, wound-directed grooming and lasting neural sensitisation in octopuses. The study supports an affective-pain interpretation under stated behavioural and physiological criteria. It remains evidence from a defined experimental species and design, not direct access to feeling. A 2026 multi-criterion review by Schnell, Browning, Crump, Burn and Birch judged the evidence for octopus sentience strong, with high or very high confidence on six of eight criteria, while retaining uncertainty where controls or taxa remain sparse. This supports precaution without claiming direct access to subjective experience.

Directive 2010/63/EU applies research protections to live cephalopods. Its preamble linked inclusion to scientific evidence of capacity for pain,

suffering, distress and lasting harm. The United Kingdom's Animal Welfare (Sentience) Act 2022 includes cephalopod molluscs within its definition of animal for the Act's policy-scrutiny framework. The scopes are different, and neither creates blanket legal protection for every use of an octopus. Legal inclusion records precautionary and political judgement; it is not a new experiment.

Husbandry and enrichment discussion follows Fiorito and colleagues' consensus guidelines for cephalopods in research. Species-appropriate dens, water conditions, handling, environmental control and opportunities for natural behaviour matter, but the evidence base remains uneven and continues to develop.

Panspermia

The extraterrestrial-origin claim is rejected through positive terrestrial evidence rather than ridicule. Octopuses are nested within cephalopods and molluscs by comparative anatomy, embryology, fossils and genomes. Albertin and colleagues document extensive genomic innovation without requiring off-world eggs or viruses. Poor preservation of soft bodies explains gaps more economically than arrival from space. The speculative claim discussed in the misconception section appeared in Steele and colleagues' 2018 review; it is included below because the myth entered public discussion through that paper, not because its octopus-origin proposal is evidentially competitive.

Bibliography

Books and syntheses

Godfrey-Smith, Peter. *Other Minds: The Octopus, the Sea, and the Deep Origins of Consciousness*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2016.

Hanlon, Roger T., and John B. Messenger. *Cephalopod Behaviour*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018.

Mather, Jennifer A., Roland C. Anderson, and James B. Wood. *Octopus*:

The Ocean's Intelligent Invertebrate. Portland, OR: Timber Press, 2010.

Staaf, Danna. *Monarchs of the Sea: The Extraordinary 500-Million-Year History of Cephalopods*. New York: The Experiment, 2020.

Primary research and specialist reviews

Albertin, Caroline B., et al. "The Octopus Genome and the Evolution of Cephalopod Neural and Morphological Novelties." *Nature* 524 (2015): 220-224.

Albertin, Caroline B., et al. "Genome and Transcriptome Mechanisms Driving Cephalopod Evolution." *Nature Communications* 13 (2022): 2427.

Basava, Kiran, Theiss Bendixen, Alexander Leonhard, Nicole Lauren George, Zoé Vanhersecke, Joshua Omotosho, Jennifer Mather, and Michael Muthukrishna. "Ecological Not Social Factors Explain Brain Size in Cephalopods." *iScience* 29, no. 7 (2026): 116324.

Caldwell, Roy L., Richard Ross, Arcadio Rodaniche, and Christine L. Huffard. "Behavior and Body Patterns of the Larger Pacific Striped Octopus." *PLOS ONE* 10, no. 8 (2015): e0134152.

Crook, Robyn J. "Behavioral and Neurophysiological Evidence Suggests Affective Pain Experience in Octopus." *iScience* 24, no. 3 (2021): 102229.

Finn, Julian K., Tom Tregenza, and Mark D. Norman. "Defensive Tool Use in a Coconut-Carrying Octopus." *Current Biology* 19, no. 23 (2009): R1069-R1070.

Fiorito, Graziano, Andrea Affuso, Jennifer Basil, et al. "Guidelines for the Care and Welfare of Cephalopods in Research." *Laboratory Animals* 49, no. 2 Suppl. (2015): 1-90.

Gutnick, Tamar, Ruth A. Byrne, Binyamin Hochner, and Michael J. Kuba. "Octopus vulgaris Uses Visual Information to Determine the Location of Its Arm." *Current Biology* 21, no. 6 (2011): 460-462.

Gutnick, Tamar, Andreas Neef, Andrii Cherninskyi, et al. "Recording

Electrical Activity from the Brain of Behaving Octopus.” *Current Biology* 33, no. 6 (2023): 1171-1178.e4.

Kennedy, E. B. L., et al. “Octopus Arms Exhibit Exceptional Flexibility.” *Scientific Reports* 10 (2020): 20872.

Kröger, Björn, Jakob Vinther, and Dirk Fuchs. “Cephalopod Origin and Evolution: A Congruent Picture Emerging from Fossils, Development and Molecules.” *BioEssays* 33, no. 8 (2011): 602-613.

Kuba, Michael J., Ruth A. Byrne, Daniela V. Meisel, and Jennifer A. Mather. “When Do Octopuses Play? Effects of Repeated Testing, Object Type, Age, and Food Deprivation on Object Play in *Octopus vulgaris*.” *Journal of Comparative Psychology* 120, no. 3 (2006): 184-190.

Levy, Guy, Tamar Flash, and Binyamin Hochner. “Arm Coordination in Octopus Crawling Involves Unique Motor Control Strategies.” *Current Biology* 25, no. 9 (2015): 1195-1200.

Medeiros, Sylvia L. S., Mizziara M. Paiva, João P. Lopes, et al. “Cyclic Alternation of Quiet and Active Sleep States in the Octopus.” *iScience* 24, no. 4 (2021): 102223.

Nesher, Nir, Guy Levy, Frank W. Grasso, and Binyamin Hochner. “Self-Recognition Mechanism between Skin and Suckers Prevents Octopus Arms from Interfering with Each Other.” *Current Biology* 24, no. 11 (2014): 1271-1275.

Norman, Mark D., Julian Finn, and Tom Tregenza. “Dynamic Mimicry in an Indo-Malayan Octopus.” *Proceedings of the Royal Society B* 268 (2001): 1755-1758.

Olson, Cassady S., Natalie Grace Schulz, and Clifton W. Ragsdale. “Neuronal Segmentation in Cephalopod Arms.” *Nature Communications* 16 (2025): 443.

Ponte, Giovanna, Morag Taite, Luciana Borrelli, Andrea Tarallo, A. Louise Allcock, and Graziano Fiorito. “Cerebrotypes in Cephalopods: Brain

Diversity and Its Correlation With Species Habits, Life History, and Physiological Adaptations.” *Frontiers in Neuroanatomy* 14 (2021): 565109.

Pophale, Aditi, Kazumichi Shimizu, Tomoyuki Mano, et al. “Wake-Like Skin Patterning and Neural Activity During Octopus Sleep.” *Nature* 619 (2023): 129-134.

Ramirez, M. Desmond, and Todd H. Oakley. “Eye-Independent, Light-Activated Chromatophore Expansion and Expression of Phototransduction Genes in the Skin of Octopus bimaculoides.” *Journal of Experimental Biology* 218 (2015): 1513-1520.

Robison, Bruce H., Brad A. Seibel, and Jeffrey C. Drazen. “Deep-Sea Octopus (*Graneledone boreopacifica*) Conducts the Longest-Known Egg-Brooding Period of Any Animal.” *PLOS ONE* 9, no. 7 (2014): e103437.

Schnell, Alexandra K., Piero Amodio, Markus Boeckle, and Nicola S. Clayton. “How Intelligent Is a Cephalopod? Lessons from Comparative Cognition.” *Biological Reviews* 96, no. 1 (2021): 162-178.

Schnell, Alexandra K., Heather Browning, Andrew Crump, Charlotte C. Burn, and Jonathan Birch. “Sentience in Cephalopod Molluscs: An Updated Assessment.” *Biological Reviews* 101, no. 3 (2026): 1311-1333.

Shigeno, Shuichi, Paul L. R. Andrews, Giovanna Ponte, and Graziano Fiorito. “Cephalopod Brains: An Overview of Current Knowledge to Facilitate Comparison With Vertebrates.” *Frontiers in Physiology* 9 (2018): 952.

Stubbs, Alexander L., and Christopher W. Stubbs. “Spectral Discrimination in Color Blind Animals via Chromatic Aberration and Pupil Shape.” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 113, no. 29 (2016): 8206-8211.

Sumbre, German, Yoram Gutfreund, Graziano Fiorito, Tamar Flash, and Binyamin Hochner. “Control of Octopus Arm Extension by a Peripheral Motor Program.” *Science* 293, no. 5536 (2001): 1845-1848.

van Giesen, Lena, Peter B. Kilian, Corey A. H. Allard, and Nicholas W.

Bellono. "Molecular Basis of Chemotactile Sensation in Octopus." *Cell* 183, no. 3 (2020): 594-604.e14.

Villar, Pablo S., Hao Jiang, Tatiana Shugaeva, Emma L. Berdan, Arpita Kulkarni, Makoto Hiroi, Giovanni Masucci, Sam Reiter, Erik Lindahl, Rebecca J. Howard, Ryan E. Hibbs, and Nicholas W. Bellono. "A Sensory System for Mating in Octopus." *Science* 392, no. 6793 (2026): 96-101.

Wang, Z. Yan, Melissa R. Pergande, Clifton W. Ragsdale, and Stephanie M. Cologna. "Steroid Hormones of the Octopus Self-Destruct System." *Current Biology* 32, no. 11 (2022): 2572-2579.e4.

Wang, Z. Yan, and Clifton W. Ragsdale. "Multiple Optic Gland Signaling Pathways Implicated in Octopus Maternal Behaviors and Death." *Journal of Experimental Biology* 221, no. 19 (2018): jeb185751.

Wodinsky, Jerome. "Hormonal Inhibition of Feeding and Death in Octopus: Control by Optic Gland Secretion." *Science* 198, no. 4320 (1977): 948-951.

Steele, Edward J., et al. "Cause of Cambrian Explosion - Terrestrial or Cosmic?" *Progress in Biophysics and Molecular Biology* 136 (2018): 3-23.

Law and current authorities

European Parliament and Council. Directive 2010/63/EU of 22 September 2010 on the Protection of Animals Used for Scientific Purposes. *Official Journal of the European Union* L 276 (2010): 33-79.

United Kingdom. *Animal Welfare (Sentience) Act 2022*. 2022 c. 22.

World Register of Marine Species. "Octopoda Leach, 1818." Taxonomic record checked 4 September 2026.