

sharp and wrinkled on the edge, patulous, with many small, close-set, deep-stretching, ridge-like teeth within; it is straight above, angulated at the keel, convex in the middle, concave as it approaches the canal, along which it is straight. *Inner lip*—a thick patulous glaze with a sharp and prominent edge, behind which is a long narrow umbilical chink; close to the upper angle of the mouth is a long feeble tooth, and in the front of the mouth and deep within are three very slight pillar-folds; the beginning of the canal is defined by a sharp little tubercle, answering to which is the lowest of the outer-lip teeth. *Operculum* thick, horny, dark brown, claw-like, with curved lines of growth; on its inner face are many concentric fine lines, with a broad, thick, rounded, polished, exterior border. H. 1.7 in. B. 0.95. Penultimate whorl, height 0.3. Mouth, height 1, breadth 0.5.

This species of Adams seems to have fallen into utter oblivion, to which the strangeness of the habitat he ascribed to it has doubtless contributed. The type specimen, however, is preserved in the British Museum; and on Mr Edgar Smith's calling my attention to it, I found it impossible to doubt that the two species were identical, and that the locality of Adams is a mistake. I have therefore suppressed the name I had given to the Challenger shell and to the numerous specimens of it I had dredged in Madeira.¹ The species is not at all uncommon in museums under the name of *Fasciolaria* (or *Turbinella*) *carinifera*, Lam., and is the species figured by Reeve as that of Lamarck, which is from the Pacific, and, though similar, is certainly different. In spite of the absence from the Geneva Museum of Lamarck's own specimens, of which (*teste* his own entry on the margin of his copy of the "Animaux s. vert," 1st ed., vol. vii. p. 108, sp. 16, preserved at Geneva) he had three, and in spite of his omitting to mention the strong basal carina of *Turbinella carinifera*, I am persuaded that Lamarck had before him the Pacific species. That species differs from *Fasciolaria armata* in being ruddy inside and outside; it lacks the two little teeth on outer and inner lip at the origin of the canal; the junction of snout and base is much more strangulated; there is a much stronger basal carina; the mouth is more open, the outer lip being much more patulous; the snout is not so regularly attenuated; the longitudinal ribs are more numerous and rise broadly and roundly, instead of being flattened out horizontally and on the crest pointed; the shoulder below the suture is less drooping, and the outer lip joins the body at the third, not at the second carinal spiral, thus leaving two, not merely one, spiral threads on the earlier whorls.

Fasciolaria lignaria, Linne, a Mediterranean species, is a much narrower form, of stouter build, broader in the snout, and quite differently ribbed and spiralled. *Turbinella recuvirostra*, Wagner, is obviously different. I am not quite sure whether *Chascax maderensis*, Wats., is not a very aberrant variety. The enormous umbilicus of that species is certainly very striking; and the total absence of teeth, not only on the outer lip, but even on the pillar, is a further notable feature of difference—a feature so notable that I think my friend Dr Kobelt, had the shell itself been before him, would hardly have suppressed *Chascax* as a mere *Fasciolaria*. Still, withal, while protesting against hasty judgment, I feel it is possible that *Chascax maderensis* and the present form may ultimately

¹ I raise no question here about the specific value of *Turbinella armata*, Broderip (Proc. Zool. Soc. Lond., 1833, p. 7), believing that the generic difference between *Fasciolaria* and *Turbinella* makes good Adams' species as above, and gives it priority to the name I had chosen.