

There appears to me little doubt that the above so-called species are but variations of one and the same form. I do not find any distinguishing characters in the outline or the sculpture, all are finely concentrically sulcate-striate towards the umbones, the grooving becoming gradually stronger and further apart as the shell enlarges, especially towards the hinder end of the valves. The posterior dorsal margin is well arched, curving into the lateral outline without any perceptible angle. In addition to the concentric sculpture, there are generally (not always) traces of faint radiating substriæ, more or less visible when the shell is viewed in certain positions. The colour-ornamentation may vary in intensity and definition, but in general arrangement and character it is the same. All the varieties exhibit four more or less well-pronounced and interrupted rays, besides a somewhat zig-zag reticulation of dark lines very indistinct in the type (*Tapes obscurata*), more apparent in the variety *Tapes grata*, and most conspicuous in the form named *Tapes quadriradiata*.

The ornamentation of the lunule is fairly constant in all. It consists of short violet-brown lines crossing transversely to the length. They do not extend beyond the impressed circumscribing line, and consequently the lunule has a very clear definition.

The posterior dorsal area is also somewhat similarly marked, but not so distinctly, the colour of the lineation being rather paler. The dark blotch or stain near the centre of this portion of the surface, mentioned by Deshayes and Römer in their descriptions of *Tapes quadriradiata*, is also traceable in *Tapes obscurata* and *Tapes grata*, although unnoticed by the latter author, and indeed in all specimens there is a second smaller blotch nearer the umbones. *Tapes similis* of Deshayes (= *Tapes grata* of Reeve and Römer) I regard merely as a small, finely sculptured form of the West African *Tapes dura* of Gmelin. The *Tapes obscurata* of Römer does not apparently belong to the present species, nor do I consider his *Tapes similis* the same as *Tapes grata*, Deshayes.

Reeve in his monograph of this genus reversed the names of these two last species, his *Tapes similis* being in fact the type of *Tapes grata*, and his fig. 9 representing the true *Tapes similis*. This confusion has no doubt misled Römer in his identifications.

Tapes (Paratapes) textrix (Chemnitz).

Venus textrix, Chemnitz, Conch.-Cab., vol. vii. p. 48, pl. xlii. fig. 442.

Tapes textile, (Gmelin) Sowerby, Thesaurus, vol. ii. p. 681, pl. cxlvi. figs. 26-28.

Tapes textrix, Reeve, Conch. Icon., vol. xiv. fig. 3.

Tapes textrix, Römer, Monogr., p. 19, pl. v. fig. 1.

Habitat.—Port Jackson, New South Wales, in 4 to 18 fathoms.

Specimens from this part of the coast of Australia differ slightly from Indian Ocean examples in the style and tone of the painting, agreeing better with *Tapes undulata* than with *Tapes textrix*. The upper part of the valves is of a pale yellowish-brown tint