

Habitat.—New Holland (Quoy and Gaimard), New Zealand (Hutton), Port Jackson and all Southern Australia (Angas), Seychelles, Amirante Islands, Mauritius (v. Martens).

Deshayes is responsible for at least some part of the confusion which has gathered round this species. In his edition of Lamarck, vol. viii. p. 603, note to *Nerita atrata*, Chem., an Atlantic species, he says that this is the species to which Quoy and Gaimard, "Astrolabe," vol. iii. pl. lxxv. figs. 41, 42, gave the name of *Nerita punctulata* (*sic*). But there is no such species in Quoy and Gaimard, and the *Nerita punctata*, to which he meant to refer, they distinctly say is a species from New Holland. The species in the British Museum, with which the Challenger specimen agrees, is marked *Nerita atrata*, Chem., but on the back "*N. punctata*, Quoy and G., voy. 'Astrol.' t. 65, f. 41," and this is obviously the name which it should bear. Chemnitz evidently had this species before him as well as that from the Atlantic (which he describes), for he says (vol. v. p. 296) he had seen a black *Nerita* from the South Seas procured in one of Cook's voyages; and in the points he enumerates, both of resemblance and of difference, he makes it obvious that this of Quoy and Gaimard is the species he had in view. Grey in his Fauna of New Zealand (Diffenbach's Travels, vol. ii. p. 240, No. 96) has somewhat added to the confusion by referring to a *Nerita nigra*, Quoy and Gaimard, and by quoting Quoy as his authority for ascribing it to New Zealand; but no such species of Quoy and Gaimard exists, only in the "Voyage de l'Uranie" (Zool., p. 460) mention is made of a *Nérite noirâtre* of unknown locality. All this has been already shown by von Martens (Crit. Reg., *loc. cit. supra*), but has not checked the repetition of the mistake of identifying the New Zealand species with that from the Atlantic, but the reason for this may have been that Professor v. Martens closes his remarks without plainly saying what that species should be called, which he had so clearly proved could not be *Nerita atrata*, Chem. In his Mollusca of Mauritius, &c., he marks *Nerita punctata*, Quoy, as "nicht weiter verbreitet" than the Mascarene group of islands—a statement I do not understand in the face of his "Critical List" as above. Perhaps he had come to doubt his identification of *Nerita punctata*, Quoy, with that from Australia. Altogether, I suspect that Mr Smith's solution of the difficulties, by introducing for our species a quite new name, is the best. Still, the points of divergence in Quoy and Gaimard's description on which Mr Smith dwells hardly outweigh the evidence supplied by the locality to which they ascribe their species.

5. *Nerita tessellata*, Gmelin.

Nerita tessellata, Gmelin, p. 3685, No. 65.

„ *striata*, Chemnitz, Conch. Cab., vol. v. p. 313, pl. cxcii. figs. 1998–99.

„ *tessellata*, Lamarck, Anim. s. vert., vol. vi. p. 194, and (ed. Desh.) vol. viii. p. 609, sp. 16.

„ „ Dillwyn, vol. ii. p. 1006, sp. 65.

„ „ Deshayes, Encyclop. méthod. vers., vol. iii. p. 617, sp. 3.

„ „ Reeve, Conch. Icon., vol. ix. pl. ix. fig. 43.

„ „ Wood, Ind. Test., p. 182, pl. xxxvi. fig. 68.

Station 24. March 25, 1873. Lat. 18° 38' 30" N., long. 65° 5' 30" W. Off Culebra Island, West Indies. 390 fathoms. Pteropod ooze.

Habitat.—West Indies (Chemnitz).

I do not know the *Nerita* from Senegambia which passes under this name, and I have excluded Adanson's le Tadin, p. 190, pl. xiii. fig. 2, from the references, because, though from his quotation for his species of Petiver *Nerita jamaicensis*, Gazophyl., vol. i. p. 581, pl. xiii. fig. 12, it is evident