It was unfortunate that Philippi did not know the habitat of his species; still more so, that D'Orbigny failed to recognise that the species he got at Rio de Janeiro was Philippi's species, and quite distinct from Lamarck's Fusus multicarinatus. That absence of information in the first instance, and the mistake in the second case, has resulted in confusion, which has gone on increasing till a whole multitude of species really quite distinct have been hopelessly mixed together. With the kind and able help of Mr E. A. Smith of the British Museum, I have gone over the whole of the group as represented in the national collection. Of course it would be out of place to take up that general subject now, the more so as Mr Smith will probably publish the results of our study; all that need be done here is to offer some notes on the species which have been mixed up with that of Philippi.

As to Fusus multicarinatus, Lam. (Anim. s. vert., vol. vii. p. 125, sp. 9), under which D'Orbigny classes his shells from Bahia, it would be very difficult to say what that species was. It has been attributed by von Martens (Moll. Mauritius, &c., p. 244) and Dufo (Moll. Seychelles, p. 49) to the Indian Ocean, and by Menke (Spec. Moll. Nov. Holl., p. 25, No. 121) to Western In any case it is a Red Sea species (Lamarck, loc. cit. supra; Potiez and Mich., Moll. Douai, p. 438, No. 12, but not pl. xxxiv. fig. 5; Kiener, Iconog., p. 17, sp. 12, pl. x. fig. 1, but not pl. i. fig. 1, nor pl. xiv. fig. 2; Tapparone-Canefri, Muric. Mar rosso, p. 62; Issel, Malacologia Marrosso, p. 138), and is not that from South America. In regard to Fusus verrucosus, Gmelin (Syst. Nat., p. 3557, figured by Wood, Ind. Test., p. 126, pl. xxvi. fig. 77), to which Kobelt unites Fusus marmoratus, Phil., it is the shell figured by Chemnitz (Conch. Cab., vol. iv. pp. 148, 189, pl. cxlvi. figs. 1349, 1350), and ascribed by him to the Red Sea. It is also the species given by Savigny in his Description de l'Egypte, hist. nat., Planches, vol. ii. 1817; Zoologie, Coquilles, pl. iv. fig. 18 (1 and 2). That figure is fairly good, but rather gives the impression of a stumpier shell; the upper whorls are too heavy, broad, and flat; the suture is not deep enough, and the snout is too Fusus verrucosus comes very near Fusus marmoratus, but is quite certainly different, and when once recognised can easily be distinguished. Compared to it, Fusus marmoratus is rather more brightly coloured; the columella in both is twisted, but in Fusus marmoratus the twist occurs much lower down; both have the inner lip detached, but in Fusus verrucosus it projects across the whole body whorl as a sharp-edged, prominent, slightly patulous, strongish lamina, behind which is a deep narrow furrow; whereas, in Fusus marmoratus, the inner lip is on the body thin and closely appressed, and only in front towards the canal does it begin to detach itself as a prominent lamina; the mouth is shorter in proportion to breadth, and thus is more roundly oval; at the beginning of the canal the opening is narrower, the outer lip being pinched in here so as to be roundedly indeed, but yet distinctly angular, and the edge has at this point a slight tendency to be introverted; the whole snout is shorter, stumpier, and altogether stronger, the outer lip is stained brown on the edge, the teeth are small, sharply prominent, are connected with long sharp threads which score the throat and have a distinct tendency to run in pairs; while in Fusus verrucosus they are larger but feeble tubercles. In Fusus marmoratus the spire is slightly stumpier, the whorls a very little broader, and the suture hardly so deep as in Fusus verrucosus. Mr Angas (Proc. Zool. Soc. Lond., 1865, p. 158) quotes Fusus marmoratus, Phil., as from Port Lincoln, "a single specimen." There has probably been an error of identification here. But for the confusion which

¹ A valuable note on this species will be found in Philippi, Abb. und Besch., vol. iii. p. 119, note to the monograph on Fusus.