Transactions.

New Specific Names for Austral Mollusca.*


[Read before the Otago Institute, 8th December, 1925; received by Editor, 31st December, 1925; issued separately, 19th January, 1927.]

The present paper may be considered as an extension of one published two years ago—"Some Necessary Changes in Names of New Zealand Mollusca" (Proc. Mal. Soc. Lond., vol. 16, pt. 2, pp. 99-107, 1924), and deals with about 200 additional names. Most of these, of course, are of Australasian shells, with which I am more directly concerned, but there are many others drawn from various sources. Some of the early workers did not realize the vast multitude of molluscan names legally proposed, and the probable insecurity of their simpler combinations; the law of priority unfortunately necessitates the rejection of many of these, and one can make amends only by commemorating the worker in the new specific name wherever possible. If I have not done so in some of the cases to follow, it is because that commemoration has already been made by a previous writer treating of a different species: in a few cases the actual existence of such a combination is not known to me for certain, but is so extremely likely that desire for stability has prompted a less conventional renomination.

The employment of such trivial epithets as rugosa, nodosa, lirata, pliicata, globosa, etc., is nowadays extremely risky, and certain to cause trouble in the case of the better-known and larger genera. Person and place-names are safest, but there are many uncommon adjectives available, which, in these days of split genera, may be used with fair hope of stability. Most of Tate’s names for Australian Tertiary fossils are unassailable on account of wisely chosen appellations; Hutton’s species, on the other hand, have suffered frequent nomenclature revision by every worker who has dealt with them. This causes annoyance and confusion, and regrettable loss of the pioneer’s specific rights, but the matter is quite unavoidable, and can only be deplored. It is even more a pity when fine and exhaustive monographs, which ought to be monuments of stability for future workers, are marred by injudicious selection of specific names† (apart altogether from generic name-troubles), for which substitutes have consequently to be proposed in out-of-the-way reviews and papers such as this. The only

*For sake of brevity the above title has been adopted, but some new genera are also proposed and there are notes on others, while a few Brachiopod items close the paper. I am deeply indebted to Mr. Tom Iredale, who kindly read the MS. and checked references in many works unavailable to me.

†E.g., Harmer’s “Monograph of the English Crag Mollusca,” and K. Martin’s numerous works on the Javan Tertiaries. It is somewhat curious that the trivial names proposed by the latter writer are either almost unpronounceable place-derivatives, or extremely simple—and therefore generally preoccupied—descriptive adjectives.
mitigation of the evil is to collect as many name-changes as possible in the one paper, for handier reference and compactness, and complete the disagreeable task as thoroughly as possible at the one time. Hence the somewhat heterogeneous character of the present paper, and the excuse for it.

As in my previous paper, the name at the left hand side of each note forms the subject of discussion, while that opposite it on the right (if any) is the necessary substitute here proposed or determined. The first reference given under the name discussed is to the place of its proposal.

As it is my desire to present as complete an account as possible of specific alterations relative to Australasian shells, I have endeavoured to incorporate practically all substitutes proposed since the publication of standard lists of the various faunas. These latter have been regarded as follows:

1. New Zealand Recent Mollusca,—
   *Manual of the New Zealand Mollusca*, 1913 (Suter).

2. New Zealand Tertiary Mollusca,—
   *Alphabetical List of New Zealand Tertiary Mollusca*,
   1918 (Suter).

3. Australian Tertiary Mollusca,—

4. Australian Recent Mollusca,—
   The Indexes and Check-Lists of the various States: *Queensland*, 1909 (Hedley); *Western Australia*, 1916 (Hedley); *New South Wales*, 1918 (Hedley); and *Tasmania*, 1921 (May).

5. Javan Tertiary Mollusca,—
   *Unsere Palaeozoologische Kenntnis von Java*, 1919
   (Martin).

It is hoped that the summary of changes is completed up to and including 1926 as regards the first three of these, and probably the fifth, but the Australian Recent mollusca have been discussed less fully, most of the alterations having been noted lately by Iredale (*Proc. Linn. Soc. N.S.W.,* vol. 49, pt. 3, pp. 179-278, 1924). As his account deals especially with the Peronian and Maugean faunas and more particularly with the New South Wales list, there are many points he has left untouched in regard to Solanderian shells, but the only alterations to New South Wales and Tasmanian names here noted are a very few that Iredale overlooked.

The most prolific sources of name-changes already made are two French works by M. Cossmann, the *Essais de Paléoncologologie Comparée*, vols. 1-12 (1895-1921), and the *Revue Critique de Paléozoologie*, vols. 1-28 (1897-1924); these are not readily available to many workers, and as notes on Australasian names are scattered throughout, in footnotes, appendices, buried in the text, etc., a complete list of such alterations is obviously a desideratum. This has been compiled and incorporated in the following notes, reference to
which will give any austral name-change instituted in these two works.

It has been considered unnecessary to give separate notes on the alterations proposed (1) by Harris, in the *Cat. Tert. Moll. B.M.*, pt. 1, 1897, (2) by myself in the *Proc. Mal. Soc. Lond.*, 1924. But, for completeness and handiness of reference, a bare list of these is now given, with the page on which they occur; for original references and discussion the papers themselves may be consulted.

**HARRIS:**

p. 45 *Pleurotoma pagoda* Hutton, 1873 (non Reeve): *Pleurotoma alta* Harris, 1897.

* p. 180 *Murex (Ocinebra) alveolatus* Tate, 1888 (non Sow.): *Murex (Muricopsis) graniformis* Harris, 1897.

p. 225 *Potamides semicostatum* Tate, 1885 (non Desh.): *Cerithium pritchardi* Harris, 1897.

* p. 227 *Cerithium nodulosum* Hutton, 1873 (non Brug.): *Cerithium hectori* Harris, 1897.

* p. 229 *Cerithium rugatum* Hutton, 1873 (non Mart., nec Cpr., nec Desh.): *Batillaria pomahakaensis* Harris, 1897.

p. 241 *Turritella (Zaria) tricincta* Hutton, 1873 (non Borson et auct.): *Turritella kaniieriensis* Harris, 1897.

p. 242 *Turritella gigantea* Hutton, 1873 (non Bell. et Mich.): *Turritella cavershampensis* Harris, 1897.

p. 257 *Natica (Neverita) varians* Tate, 1893 (non Dujardin): *Natica cunninghamensis* Harris, 1897.

p. 360 *Venericardia intermedia* Hutton, 1873 (non Lamk., nec Bast., nec Dubois): *Cardita awamoensis* Harris, 1897. (emended to *awamoensis*, Finlay, *P.M.S.*, 16, 106, 1924.)

**FINLAY:**

p. 99 *Trochus nodosus* Hutton, 1885 (non Meusch., nec Forsk.): *Trochus mutus* Finlay, 1924.

† p. 100 *Nerita nitida* (Hutton, 1873) (non Donovan): *Nerita poma-

hakaensis* Finlay, 1924.

p. 101 *Crepidula incurva* Zittel, 1865 (non Broderip): *Crepidula

wilckensi* Finlay, 1924.

* " *Natica australis* (Hutton, 1878) (non d'Orb.): *Natica maoria

Finlay, 1924.

* " *Natica callosa* Hutton, 1873 (non Gabb): *Polinices intracras-
sus* Finlay, 1924.

" * Turritella concava* Hutton, 1877 (non Say, nec Sow.): *Tur-

ritella albolapis* Finlay, 1924.

" * Cassis striatus* Hutton, 1873 (non Meusch., nec Sow.): *Cas-
sidea multisetca* Finlay, 1924.

p. 102 *Latirus dubius* Marshall, 1919 (non Beyrich): *Latirus (?)

marshalli* Finlay, 1924.

" * Vexillum ligatum* Suter, 1917 (non A. Ad.): *Vexillum suteri

Finlay, 1924.

* Further remarks on these occur in this paper.

† See note elsewhere in this volume.
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†p. 102 Buccinum nodosum Martyn, 1784 (non Solander) : Aethocola raphana (Lamk., 1829).

p. 103 Siphonalia turrita Suter, 1914 (non Ten.-Woods) : Aethocola pagoda Finlay, 1924.

" Buccinum carinatum Hutton, 1873 (non Turton) : Cominella errata Finlay, 1924.

" Turris regius Suter, 1917 (non Bolten) : Gemmula waihaoensis Finlay, 1924.

" Turris neglectus Suter, 1917 (non Reeve) : Turris insensus Finlay, 1924.

p. 104 Drilia fusiformis Hutton, 1877 (non Sow.) : Turricula oamarutica (Suter, 1917).

" Pleurotoma sulcata Hutton, 1873 (non Lamk.) : Pseudotoma huttoni Finlay, 1924.

" Clathurella corrugata Murdoch, 1900 (non Dunker) : Asperdaphne murdochii Finlay, 1924.

*p. 105 Conus ornatus Hutton, 1873 (non Michelotti) : Hemiconus trailii (Hutton, 1873).

" Conus (Conospira) deperditus Suter, 1917 (non Hwass) : Conospira fracta Finlay, 1924.

" Acteon sulcatus (Hutton, 1885) (non Lamk.) : Acteon praestitus Finlay, 1924.

" Pecten subconvexus Marshall, 1918 (non Tate) : Chlamys kaiparaensis Finlay, 1924.

p. 106 Venericardia pseudes Suter, 1917 : Venericardia awamaoensis Harris, 1879 (emend.).

" Mactra attenuata Hutton, 1873 (non Desh.) : Mactra leda Finlay, 1924.

" Mactra dubia (Hutton, 1873) (non Desh.) : Mactra chrysea Suter, 1911.

p. 107 Nucula semistriata Tate, 1886 (non Wood) : Nucula tatei Finlay, 1924.

* Leda apiculata Tate, 1886, (non Sow.) : Nuculana chapmani Finlay, 1924.

To save much space in the frequent quotation of the same periodical, the following abbreviations have been used throughout this paper:—

T.N.Z.I. Transactions of the New Zealand Institute.
T.R.S.S.A. Transactions of the Royal Society of South Australia.
P.L.S.N.S.W. Proceedings of the Linnean Society of New South Wales.
E.P.C. Essais de Paléonconchologie Comparée.
R.C.P. Revue Critique de Paléozoologie.
M.P.S. Monographs of the Palaeontological Society, London.

*Further remarks on these occur in this paper.
†See note elsewhere in this volume.
The succeeding items have been jotted down during the last two years. Many more notes have been withheld for future investigation, and will appear in a later paper. There are also numerous names about which I have as yet no data, but which are practically certain to be preoccupied; it will be a long time before such troubles can be dissipated altogether, and the best one can do is to avoid proposing simple combinations oneself.

**Haliotis cracherodii** new form **imperforata** Dall, 1920.—

*Haliotis cracherodii* var. *lusus* n. n.


Dall, in employing this name—which appears again in a recent list (*U.S. Nat. Mus. Bull.* 112, p. 184; pl. 21, 1921)—overlooked the fact that both Philippi (*Tert. & Quart. Verst. Chiles*, p. 102, 1887; a synonym of *Crepidula gregaria* Sow.) and Gmelin (in *Linn. Syst. Nat.*, ed. 13, I, p. 3690, 1791) had previously proposed *Haliotis imperforata*. A *Haliotis dalli* already exists, so I rename it as above.

**Trochus conicus** (Hutton, 1883) (*Anthora*):—

*Trochus (Coelothrochus) huttoni* (Cossmann, 1918).

(*T.N.Z.I.*, vol. 15, p. 411.)


**Monodonta lugubris** (Gmelin, 1791) (*Trochus*).

(*Syst. Nat.*, ed. 13, p. 3583.)


**Calliostoma cancellatum** Finlay, 1923:—

*Fautor temporemutata* (Finlay, 1924).

(*T.N.Z.I.*, vol. 54, p. 102.)

Renamed *Calliostoma temporemuta* (lapsus for *temporemutata*). n. n. in *T.N.Z.I.*, vol. 55, p. 509, footnote, 1924, on account of prior employment by Schepman (*Les Siboga Exped.*, Livr. 39, p. 69, 1908), and placed by me* in *Fautor* Iredale.

**Liotia serrata** Suter, 1908.

(*P.M.S.*, vol. 8, p. 23.)

This has been placed in *Angaria* by Iredale (*T.N.Z.I.*, vol. 47, p. 439, 1915), and in this form would clash with *Dolphinsulida serrata* Buvignier, 1914 (*de Lor. Seg. Tonn.*, p. 63). But as the New Zealand shell is now removed from the Trochidae and placed by me* in a new genus of the Liotididae, the danger is averted before any complications have ensued.

*Vide* "A Further Commentary on New Zealand Molluscan Systematics," earlier in this volume.
Pseudoliotia imperforata Suter, 1908.


Cossmann and Pissaro have described a Liotia (Liotina) imperforata (Pal. Indica, vol. 3, N.S., mem. 1, p. 80, 1909), and Iredale has noted that Pseudoliotia is a synonym of Liotia (T.N.Z.I., vol. 47, p. 440, 1915). However, as I have stated that Suter’s shell is merely the juvenile form of Modelia grânosa (Mart.), and the original propositions are not homonyms, there is no need for a change.

Cirsonella laevis (Johnston, 1880) (Adeorbis).

(P.R.S. Tas. for 1879, p. 33.)

Meyer (Notes complem. Alab., p. 15, 1917) has described an American Eocene shell as Adeorbis laevis, which, on account of Johnston’s prior use, I now rename Tornus meyeri n. n. For Tornus Turton and Kingston, 1830 vice Adeorbis Searles Wood, 1842, see Iredale, P.M.S., vol. 11, pt. 3, p. 171, 1914.

Turbo (Marmorostoma) approximata Suter, 1917.


Marwick (T.N.Z.I., vol. 55, p. 555, 1924) has referred this to Natica, subgenus Magnatica nov. In this form it would affect Natica (Lunatia) approximata (Etheridge and Bell, MS.) Harmer, 1919 (M.P.S., vol. 73, p. 695), but by giving Magnatica generic rank, as I have already done (T.N.Z.I., vol. 56, p. 229, 1926), confusion will be obviated, and no name-changes are necessary.

Turbo etheridgei Tenison-Woods, 1877: — Turbo tenisoni n. n.

(P.R.S. Tas. for 1876, p. 98.)


(P.R.S. Vict., vol. 17, N.S., pt. 1, p. 329.)


Fossarus minutus (Petterd, 1884) (Crosseia).

(Journ. Conch., 1884, p. 139.)

Odhner (Pap. Mort. Pac. Exped., 19, p. 21, 1924) has lately reported this from New Zealand, but actual specimens sent by him are referable to Notosetia (s.l.). Petterd’s name cannot be maintained in this form, as there is a Fossarus minutus Michaud, 1827 (Bull. Soc. Linn. de Bord., vol. 2, p. 122). As, however, the Australian shell was described as a Crossea, and is certainly not referable to Fossaridae (May omits the species from his recent catalogue, but in the Addendum suggests that it is the fry of a “ Purpura ”—Check-List Moll. Tas., p. 109, 1922—though this seems unlikely), the matter may be shelved till Petterd’s species is placed on a more satisfactory footing.

*Vide “A Further Commentary on New Zealand Molluscan Systematics,” earlier in this volume.
Genus *Streboramphus* Tate, 1898.— *Sublacuna* Cossmann, 1899.  
(*P.R.S.N.S.W.*, vol. 31, for 1897, p. 401, 1898).

This was published as of "Tate and Cossmann, 1898" by Tate (Lc.), and must therefore be credited to him, as must also be the specific name, *mirabilis*, of the genotype, proposed at the same time. In the *Zoological Record* for 1898, Mollusca, p. 67, the genus is correctly attributed to Tate, as it is also (but with wrong date) by Cossmann (*R.C.P.*, 3, 1899, no. 1, p. 45), who there proposes to replace it by *Sublacuna* nov., *Streboramphus* having been used by Cabanis for a bird genus. Later (*E.P.C.*, vol. 10, p. 112, 1915) he uses this name, but again incorrectly refers the specific name to Tate and Cossmann, as do also Dennant and Kitson (*Rec. Geol. Surv. Vict.*, vol. 1, pt. 2, p. 112, 1903).

Exactly the same remarks apply to *Chileutonia* "Tate and Cossmann, 1898," and its genotype *C. subvaricosa*; both these must, of course, be referred to Tate as author.

*Cocculinella tasmanica* May, 1919.  
(*P.R.S. Tas.*, 1919, p. 67).

Renamed *C. mayi* on account of *C. tasmanica* Pilsbry, 1895, by Finlay (*Austr. Assoc. Adv. Sci.*, vol. 16, p. 343, footnote, 1923), but Pilsbry's shell is a *Notocrater*, and was described as an *Acmaea*, so that May's name must stand.

*Rissoa gradata* Hutton, 1885:— *Linemera gradata* (Hutton).  
(*T.N.Z.I.*, vol. 17, p. 321.)

The same fate must befall my substitute name for this species. I proposed *Linemera interrupta* n. n. (*T.N.Z.I.*, vol. 55, pp. 481, 483, 1924) on account of a prior *R. gradata* Philippi. This, however, was originally described as a *Cingula*, and as the two shells are now referred to quite different genera, Hutton's name must be resumed.

*Rissoa leptalea* Murdoch, 1905:— *Notosetia pupinella* n. n.  
(*T.N.Z.I.*, vol. 37, p. 228.)

In my paper on New Zealand Tertiary Rissoids, under *Notosetia* sp. cf. *subflavescens* Iredale (*T.N.Z.I.*, vol. 55, p. 488, 1924) is the statement, "The name *Notosetia pupa* nov. is suggested in place of *Rissoa lubrica* Suter, 1898; preoccupied by *R. lubrica* Verrill, 1885." This was a most unfortunate slip, there being no such species of Verrill's; what I intended to refer to were his *R. leptalea*, 1885, and *R. leptalea* Murdoch, 1905. For the latter form, since *N. pupa* Finlay must be interpreted as a synonym of *N. lubrica* (Suter), I now therefore propose *N. pupinella* n. n.

*Cerithium abbreviatum* Brazier, 1877:—

*Ataxocerithium brazieri* Cossmann, 1906.

Hedley (*P.L.S.N.S.W.*, vol. 48, p. 310, 1923) has lately discussed this species, noting that Cossmann (*E.P.C.*, vol. 7, p. 92, footnote, 1906) had proposed *Ataxocerithium brazieri* nom. mut. on the ground of preoccupation by Deshayes. Hedley states, "He does not, however, give the original reference on which Deshayes' name depends, and I am unable to recover it. Apparently Cossmann's synonymy is based on *Melania abbreviata* Defrance (*Dict. Sci. Nat.*, 29, 1823), which is
ineffective’; Hedley therefore restored Brazier’s name. Omission of references and erroneous conceptions of original names is usual with Cossmann, but as in many other similar cases, though his data are wrong, his conclusion must stand, for there is a prior *Cerithium abbreviatum* Leckebusch, 1858 (*Quart. Journ. Geol. Soc.*, vol. 15, p. 13; pl. 3, Fig. 12) which Hedley overlooked.

Schaffer has also described an Austrian fossil as *Cerithium (Clava) bidentata* Defr. var. *abbreviata* nov. (*Wien. Abh. Geol. Rchs. Anst.*, vol. 22, p. 150, 1912); this is affected by both Leckebusch’s and Brazier’s previous use, and may be renamed *Clava bidentata schafferi* n. n.

*Cerithium ickei* Martin, 1914:—

*Cerithium nanggulanense* Vignal, 1915.


Vignal, in bestowing this substitute name (*R.C.P.*, 19, 1915, no 2, p. 93), points out that he had used *Cerithium ickei* himself in 1908 (*R.C.P.*, vol. 12, p. 136) to replace *C. boettgeri* Icke and Martin, 1907, *non* v. Koenen, 1882.

*Cerithidea minuta* Marshall, 1919:—

"*Cerithidea* " *marshalli* Cossmann, 1921.

(*T.N.Z.I.*, vol. 51, p. 226.)

Renamed *Cerithidea* (sic) *marshalli* (*R.C.P.*, vol. 25, 1921, no. 4, p. 181), in a paragraph headed ‘M. Vignal nous écrit,’ etc., but signed by Cossmann, who, having published it, must be taken as the authority for the new name. It is stated that Gabb used this combination in 1873 for a San Domingo fossil. I have been unable to check most of Cossmann’s name changes, as the works to which he refers are mostly unavailable to me; many of those I have looked up have been found erroneous, either as to reference or as to reason for the change. It is therefore probable that some of the names here recorded as substituted by him will have to be dropped and the original names reverted to, when verification of the references can be made. This is often rendered extremely difficult by Cossmann’s unscientific habit of rarely quoting references but merely dates, and these are as likely to be wrong as right. The true generic location of the present species is unknown, but it is not a *Cerithidea*; elsewhere in this volume I have doubtfully referred it to my *Zeacumantis*.

*Vermicularia nodosa* Hedley, 1907:— *Vermicularia hedleyi* n. n.

(*Rec. Austr. Mus.*, vol. 6, no. 4, p. 292.)


*Turritella acuticarinata* (Dunker) Martin, 1905.

(*S.G.R.M.L.*, n.f., Bd. 1, p. 226.)

This was renamed *Turritella martini* by Cossmann (*R.C.P.*, 17, 1913, no. 1, p. 63) on account of Dunker’s use of the same name. Later, it is naively noted (*R.C.P.*, vol. 17, 1913, no. 2, p. 128) that his substitute was unnecessary as Martin was merely recording Dunker’s species! Martin has also drawn attention to this (*Pal. Kennt. von. Java*, p. 119, note 77, 1919). Dunker’s species dates from 1847 (*Palaeontographica*, vol. 1, pt. 3, p. 132) and so invalidates *T. acuti-

**Turritella bicincta** Hutton, 1873:—**Turritella huttonii** Cossm., 1912. *(Cat. Tert. Moll., p. 13.)*  

**Turritella elathrata** Kiener, 1843:—**Gazameda iredalei** n.n. *(Spec. Coquiltes, Turritella, 38.)*  
This common South Australian shell must have a new name, as Deshayes had used Kiener’s epithet in this genus ten years before (in Bory de St. Vincent, *Exp. Morée, Mollusca,* p. 148, 1833).

**Turritella difficilis** Suter, 1908. *(Proc. Mal. Soc.,* vol. 8, p. 40.)  
This name cannot be maintained as it has been used before by d’Orbigny, 1842 *(Pal. franc. Terr. cret.,* p. 39) and Zekeli, 1852 *(Abhandl. Geol. Reichs. Anst.,* vol. 1, pt. 2, p. 23). I do not, however, rename it, as I consider it indistinguishable from *T. rosea* Q. & G.; it certainly is of the same type, and I cannot as yet find any character to separate northern and southern forms.

**Turritella ornata** Hutton, 1873:—**Batillon a amara** n. gen. and n. n. *(Cat. Tert. Moll.,* p. 13.)  
Hutton’s name had already been selected by Michelotti, 1847 *(Nat. Verh. Holl. Maat. Wet te Haarlem,* 2, 3, 2, p. 195), while Cossmann *(R.C.P.,* vol. 4, 1900, no. 3, p. 144) makes reference to a *Turritella ornata* Munster and also one of d’Orbigny, 1843, neither of which I have so far come across. Had Suter’s reference of Hutton’s species to the Scalidae *(N.Z. Geol. Surv. Pal. Bull. No. 3,* p. 13, 1915) been correct, the specific name would still have needed amendment on account of *Scalaria ornata* Baily, 1855 *(Quart. Journ. Geol. Soc.,* vol. 11, p. 459). As it is, neither this nor the subsequent reference *(N.Z. Geol. Surv. Pal. Bull. No. 5,* p. 83, 1917) to *Turritella* can be defended; the shell evidently belongs to the Cerithiidae, but cannot be placed in any austral genus already defined. I have a closely related new species from the same locality *(Pomahaka, Southland; records from any other locality, e.g., Hampden, seem to be erroneous), while Cerithium hectori Harris and *Batillaria pomahakaensis* Harris may also be treated as congeneric. *Batillaria* Benson cannot be used for these shells, while they are certainly not classable as *Cerithium s. str.* I therefore provide *Batilla n. gen.*, and name *B. amara* (n. n. for *Turritella ornata* Hutton, preoccupied) as type. These three species, under this generic name, should be added to the summary of New Zealand Cerithiidae given earlier in this volume, and will then complete the list.

**Turritella maculata ornata** Schepman, 1909, n. var. *(Res Exp. Siboga, Livr. 43, Mon. 49b, p. 188), being thus preoccupied several times, may be renamed *Turritella maculata schepmani* n. n.
Turritella simplex Jenkins, 1864:—

Turritella jenkinsi n. n.


Jenkins' species, originally described from Java, has been recorded by Martin in various lists (e.g., Tertiar. auf Java; p. 67, 1879; Pal. Kenat. v. Java, p. 95, 1918) while Noeting has determined it from the Miocene of Burma (Pal. Indica, N.S., vol. 1, pt. 3, p. 273, 1901). There being no synonymy, the species must receive a fresh name, on account of the prior T. simplex d'Orb., 1847 (Voy. Astrol., Atlas Pal., pl. 3, f. 26); it is therefore renamed as above.

Turritella tricincta Morris, 1845:—

Murchisonia bensoni n. n.

(In Strzelecki's Phys. Descr. N.S.W., p. 285.)

Harris (Cat. Tert. Moll. B.M., pt. 1, p. 241, 1897) has already pointed out the early use of this combination by Borson (Mem. R. Acc. Sci. Turin vol. 25, 1820) and others, and named Hutton's T. tricincta on this account. Dun and Benson (Rec. Geol. Surv. N.S.W., vol. 10, pt. 1, p. 53, 1921) have included in a catalogue of Australian Devonian shells the species Murchisonia tricincta (Morris), originally described as a Turritella. This, therefore, also needs alteration, and may bear instead the name Murchisonia bensoni n. n. Ihering (Rev. Mus. Paul., vol. 2, p. 287, 1897) has also used the term Turritella tricincta, but his species is reduced by Ortmann (Rep. Princ. Univ. Exped. Patagonia, vol. 4, pt. 2, p. 195, 1902) to a synonym of T. breamiana d'Orb., so that Cossmann's substitute, Turritella iheringi (B.C.P., vol. 2, p. 109, 1898), was unnecessary.


The similar adjective tricarinata has also been used several times in this genus, although Brocchi had early appropriated the name, his Turbo tricarinata (Conch. Foss. Subap., vol. 2, p. 374, 1814) being a Turritella. Thus Burwash's use of T. tricarinata for a Canadian fossil (Roy. Soc. Canada, Ser. 3, vol. 7, sect. 4, p. 81, 1914) was illegal and his name may be supplanted by Turritella burwashi n. n. In the year following, Dickerson (Proc. Calif. Ac., vol. 5, p. 58) again proposed this name, with another which must also fail: his Turritella uvasana var. tricarinata I rename T. uvasana royi n. n., and his T. uvasana bicornata (not of Eichwald, 1830, Nat. Lithuaen, p. 220; Pusch, 1837, Polens Pal. 2, p. 104; nor G. B. Sow., 1847, Quart. Journ. Geol. Soc., 3, p. 421) I name T. uvasana insula n. n.

Capulus angustus Wanner, 1922.

(Pal. Timor, lief. 11, p. 53.)

This may be in danger from Pileopsis angustus Philipps, 1836 (Geol. Yorkshire, vol. 2, p. 224); but I do not know whether Philipps' shell is really a Capulus.

Calyptreae corrugata Tate, 1893:—

Zegalerus tatei n. n.


This name, employed by Tate for a Muddy Creek fossil, had already been given to a Recent shell by Broderip in 1835 (Proc. Zool.
Soc. Lond., vol. 2, no. 17, p. 35). For the genus Zegalerus Finlay, based on Clypeola tenuis Gray, with which Tate’s shell is undoubtedly congeneric, see antea this volume.

Spengler (Mem. Geol. Surv. India, Pal. Indica, N.S., vol. 8, no. 1, p. 21, 1923) has recently employed the name Helcion corrugatum (Forbes), originally described as a Calyptraea in 1846 (Trans. Geol. Soc. Lond., vol. 8, p. 137). As Broderip’s species invalidates this name also, the substitute Helcion spengleri n. n. is proposed. The generic location is due to Stolickza (Pal. Indica, vol. 2, p. 323, 1868), but is probably incorrect as the form is a peculiar one.

**Natica arata** Tate, 1893:— **Globisimum pritchardi** (Coss., 1907).


On account of Morris and Lycett’s use of this name in their “Monograph of the Mollusca of the Great Oolite” (p. 97, 1854), Cossmann (R.C.P., vol. 11, 1907, no. 3, p. 201) has renamed the Australian Tertiary species *N. pritchardi*. The “N” may stand for either *Natica* or *Narica*, as Cossmann refers to both genera, but reference to the index to 1907, no. 4, p. 279, shows that *Natica* is intended. Marwick, however, has noted (T.N.Z.I., vol. 55, p. 574, 1924) that it probably belongs to his new genus *Globisimum*, and examination of my own specimens confirms this.

**Natica australis** (Hutton, 1879):— **Cochlis australis** (Hutton).

(Journ. de Conch., vol. 26, p. 23.)

On account of the previous *Natica australis* d’Orb., 1842 (Voy. Amer. Mer., Pal., p. 115) Hutton’s species was renamed *Natica maoria* Finlay (Proc. Mal. Soc., vol. 16, pt. 2, p. 101, 1924). It now appears that there is a still earlier *Natica australis*, of Bose (s.a. Deterville ed. Buffon, Moll. 3, p. 292, 1801), but as the American fossil has been reduced by Wilekens (Fauna der Quir.-Schicht, p. 196, 1904) to a synonym of *Natica arauquina* d’Orb., no change is necessary.

The acceptance of *Cochlis* Bolten—to which the New Zealand Recent shell belongs—as a genus enables us to resume use of Hutton’s name, for as his shell was described as a *Lunatia* there is now no clash with the earlier proposals.

**Natica callosa** Hutton, 1873:— **Uber intracassus** (Finlay, 1924).

(Cat. Tert. Moll., p. 9.)

This was renamed on account of the prior *N. callosa* Gabb, 1869, (Pal. Calif., vol. 2, p. 10). Gabb was, however, anticipated by J. de C. Sowerby in 1840 (Trans. Geol. Soc. Lond., ser. 2, vol. 5; pl. 26, f. 3) and his species in turn needs renomination, as Cristofoiri and Jan had appropriated the name in 1832 (Cat. Mus., sect. 2, pt. 1, Conch. Foss., p. 3). As Noetling (Pal. Indica, N.S., vol. 1, pt. 3, p. 283, 1901) has reported Sowerby’s species from the Burmese Miocene (wrongly synonymizing with it the Javan *N. callosior* Martin), the form he had will probably be reported on shortly by the Indian Geological Survey, since accounts of post-Eocene fossils have lately been appearing in their Memoirs. In the meantime, Sowerby’s species may be supplied with the new name *Uber callosi* n. n.
Natica consortis Finlay, 1924:— Cochlis socius n. n.
(T.N.Z.I., vol. 55, p. 451.)

Natica crassa Scheepman, 1909:— Uber scheepmani n. n.
(Res. Exp. Siboga, Livr. 43, Mon. 49b, p. 212.)
Tate having already used this epithet in Natica subinfundibulum var. crassa (T.R.S.S.A., vol. 17, pt. 2, p. 327), I rename the Siboga shell.

Natica gibbosa Hutton, 1886:— Uber huttoni (v. Hering, 1907).
(T.N.Z.I., vol. 18, p. 334.)

Natica ovata Hutton, 1873.
(Cat. Tert. Moll., p. 9.)
Klipstein's use of this name in 1843 (Beitr. z. geol. Kenntniss d. ost. Alp.) has enabled Marwick (T.N.Z.I., vol. 55, pp. 565, 567, 1924) to clear away the confusion surrounding Hutton's name by dropping it altogether and redescribing his complex as two new species, Uber ovuloides and U. obstructus Marwick.

From Hidaka, Japan, Sowerby has named a shell Natica ovata (Ann. Mag. Nat. Hist., ser. 8, vol. 14, p. 35, 1914), which, being doubly preoccupied, may now take the name Natica japovata n. n.

Natica solida Sowerby, 1846:— Uber subsolida (d'Orb., 1852).
(in Darwin, Geol. Obs. S. Amer., p. 255.)
Hutton in 1886 (T.N.Z.I., vol. 18, p. 334) proposed Natica darwini as a substitute name for the South American shell on account of N. solida Blainville, 1825 (Man. Malacol., pl. 36, f. 8), and this name has been used by Wilekins (N.Z. Geol. Surv. Pal. Bull. No. 9, p. 7, 1922), and still more recently by Marwick (T.N.Z.I., vol. 55, p. 560, 1924). But Natica subsolida d'Orb., 1852 (Prodr. de Paleont., vol. 3, p. 39) was proposed for the same purpose, and must be given preference.

Natica variabilis Moore, 1870:— Euspirea eyrensis n. n.
This common and well-known Australian Cretaceous species has been referred to in many papers (e.g., Etheridge jr., Mem. Roy. Soc. S.A., vol. 2, pt. 1, p. 42, 1902). Treechmann has identified it from New Zealand (Geol. Mag., N.S., dec. 6, vol. 4, p. 299, 1917), but H. Woods (N.Z. Geol. Surv. Pal. Bull. No. 9, pp. 6, 7, 1922) rejects this record, and supplies two new species instead. None of these writers seems to have been aware of the prior N. variabilis Reeve, 1855 (Conch. Icon., vol. 9—Natica, sp. 104). In the Memoir referred to, Etheridge cites his father's N. lineata (Quart. Journ. Geol. Soc., vol. 28, p. 342, 1872) in synonymy, but this name was anticipated by Bolten in 1798 (Mus. Bolten, pt. 2, p. 147) and others. I therefore
propose to rename Moore’s shell as above, in reference to the Lake Eyre basin, one of the localities where it occurs.

Polyinixs ambiguus Suter, 1913.

(T.N.Z.I., vol. 45, p. 296.)

In his recent revision of the New Zealand Naticidae, Marwick (T.N.Z.I., vol. 55, p. 578, 1924) noted that the type of this species could not be found, and therefore dropped it. This is just as well, as it was unrecognizably illustrated and quite obscurely defined; moreover, shells had previously been described under the name Natica ambiguа, some of which seem referable to Über (= Polyinixs). Meek and Hayden, for example, in 1855 described an American ambiguа, which Cossman (R.C.P., 1899 No. 3, p. 136) renamed N. haydeni on account of Natica ambiguа Morris and Lycett, 1854 (Mon. Moll. Ga. Oolite, p. 44).

It may be noted that Natica incerta Harmer, 1919 (M.P.S., vol. 73, p. 683), proposed in a footnote as an afterthought, is antedated by N. incerta Smith, 1906 (Ann. Mag. Nat. Hist., ser. 7, vol. 18, p. 173), and may therefore take the name Natica suppleta n. n.

Polyinixs planispira Suter, 1917.


As in the case of Turbo approximatus Suter, the acceptance of Magnaticа as a full genus removes the specific stumbling-block otherwise present in Natica planispira Phillips, 1836 (Illust. Geol. York- shire, pt. 2 p. 224). Dr. Marwick, on account of this clash, has renamed the New Zealand shell Natica (Magnaticа) suteri (T.N.Z.I., vol. 55, p. 555, 1924), but reversion to planispira (Suter) will evidently, from the above, become necessary some day, and might as well be made now.

Sigaretus carinatus Hutton, 1877:— Naricava huttoni (Marwick, 1924).

(T.N.Z.I., vol. 9, p. 597.)

Renamed Micrescharа (Macromphalina) huttoni by Marwick (T.N.Z.I., vol. 55, p. 578, 1924), who states that it is preoccupied by Goldfuss in 1837 (Abbild. u. Beschr. d. Petrofakten Deutschlands, vol. 3, p. 13) and by Muenster in 1842 (Beiträge zur Petrofakten- Kunde, vol. 4, p. 93); both these refer to the one shell, and the references are incorrect. The true quotation is:—Sigaretus carinatus Muenster, in Goldfuss, Petref. German., vol. 3, pt. 8, p. 13, 1844.

Hutton’s shell so closely resembles Adeorbis angasi A. Adams, the genotype of Naricava Hedley, that there can be no doubt of its belonging to this genus.

Sigaretus undulatus Hutton, 1885:— Globisinum wollastoni n. n.

(T.N.Z.I., vol. 17, p. 318.)

In the same year as Hutton, Martin (S.G.R.M.I., Ser. 1, Bd. 3, p. 168) described a Javan Miocene shell under the same name. The determination of priority in this case would be a difficult and tedious matter, but fortunately we are relieved from the trouble, as Sigaretus undulatus Lischke, 1872 (Malak. Blatt., vol. 19, p. 103) antedates both names and renders substitutes necessary. Hutton’s shell I
rename as above; Martin’s *S. undulatus* may take the name *Sinum martini* n. n. *Natica (Ampullina) laevis* Hutton, 1885—(*T.N.Z.I.,* vol. 17, p. 317) has been determined by Marwick (*T.N.Z.I.,* vol. 55, p. 575; 1924) as merely a worn state of his *undulatus*, but cannot be used to replace it on account of the earlier *Natica laevis* Weerth, 1884; from Neocomian beds; the latter name has also been used by Coessmann (*R.C.P.,* vol. 6, 1902, no. 3, p. 161) as a reason for renaming *Natica laevis* Kaanhowen, 1898 (*Gastr. Maest. Kreide*).

Hutton’s and Weerth’s proposals also render invalid *Natica levis* E. A. Smith, 1896 (*Ann. Mag. Nat. Hist.*, ser. 6, vol. 18, p. 370). *“Laevis”* may mean either “light” or “smooth,” but that Smith intended the latter is evident from his diagnosis, the shell being characterized as “laevigata,” but there being no mention of lightness; his “levis” therefore equals “laevis,” and so is untenable as a species name. I rename his shell—an Indian Ocean form, obtained by the “Investigator” *Eupryra edgari* n. n.

*Cyprea amygdalina* Tate, 1890—*Cyprea tatei* Coessmann, 1903 (*T.R.S.S.A.,* vol. 13, p. 211).

Not of de Grateloup, 1847 (Atlas to *Conch. foss. tert. Adour, Porcellaines, Pl. 2*). Renamed in *E.P.C.,* vol. 5, p. 160, 1903; in the review of this work in *R.C.P.,* vol. 8, 1904, no. 2, p. 115, the substitute name is correctly noted as *C. tatei* (in which form it appeared when originally introduced, the “C.” standing for *Cyprea*), but in the index for that year, p. 267; it is given as *Luponia tatei*.

*Cyprea ovata* Martin, 1879—*Cyprea bensoni* n. n. (*Tertiar. auf Java,* p. 21).


*Solarium acutum* Tenison-Woods, 1879—


*Architectonica inornata* Marshall, 1917—

*Wangaloa plana* (Marshall, 1917).


*Solarium inornatum* d’Orb., from the Antilles will not affect Marshall’s species as it is not an *Architectonica*, but the genotype of *Episcynia* Mörch, 1878. There is, however, an *Architectonica inornata* Gabb, 1864 (*Pal. Calif.*, vol. 1, p. 116) to which Marshall’s name must yield. At the same time (*I.c.,* p. 453) Marshall described an *Omalaxis planus*, specimens of which in my own collection show it to be the young stage of his *inornatus*. Were the species to remain in *Architectonica*, this name would clash with *Solarium planum* Seeley, 1861 (*Ann. Mag. Nat. Hist.*, ser. 3, vol. 6, p. 287), but as there is no named group of Solaroids which combines the basal and peripheral characters of this species with so planorbid a juvenile stage, the shell in these respects differing widely from all other austral forms, I now dispose of this danger by providing for *Omalaxis planus*.
Marshall, 1917 the new genus *Wangaloa*. It is quite likely, however, that there is a prior use of the combination *Omalaxis planus*, all Omalaxids being plane.

**Strombus spinosus** Martin, 1899 — **Strombus preoccupatus** n. n. (S.G.R.M.L., n. f., Bd. 1, p. 176).

**Scalaria pachypleura** Tate, 1890 — **Scala ralphii** (de Boury, 1913). (T.R.S.S.A., vol. 13, p. 232.)
Renamed by de Boury (*Journ. de Conch.*, vol. 61, p. 65, 1913) on account of prior use by Conrad in 1842.

In conchological work—especially the bibliographical side—humour is infrequent, and thus welcome at any time; no apology therefore seems necessary for the following note.

Harmer, when dealing with the Crag Scalidae, writes under *S. tenuicostata* Michaud, of which he places the prior *S. turtonis* Turton as a synonym: “The specific name of *Turtonae* or Turtonis has been rejected of late years in favour of *tenuicostata*, on the ground that an author has no right to describe a new species under his own name or that of any member of his family.” Five pages before (*M.P.S.*, vol. 72, p. 536, 1918) Harmer himself publishes—and is therefore the author of—a manuscript species of de Boury under the name of *Scala* (*Clathrus*) Harmeri.

**Pyramidella polita** Martin, 1914 — **Pyramidella nanggulanica** n. n. (S.G.R.M.L., n. f., Bd. 2, p. 176.)
Johnston used this name in 1880 (*P.R.S. Tas.*, 1879, p. 34) for a Table Cape fossil which May (*P.R.S. Tas.*, 1918, pp. 73, 116) has referred to *Syrnola*.

**Turbonilla antiqua** Marshall, 1919 — **Turbonilla hampdenensis** n. n. (T.N.Z.I., vol. 51, p. 228.)
Not of Bronn, 1848 (*Index Pal.*, p. 1327). Cossmann (*E.P.C.*, vol. 13, p. 280, 1921) also refers to a *Turbonilla antiqua* Sacco; the complete original reference (for which I have to thank Mr. Iredale) is *Turbonilla costellatooides* var. *antiqua* Sacco, 1892 (*Mem. del. R. Accad. Sci. Torino*, ser. 2, vol. 42, June 30, 1892, p. 78 of reprint).

**Pyramidella sulcata** Johnston, 1880. (P.R.S. Tas., 1879, p. 34.)
A. Adams had appropriated this name in Sowerby’s *Thes. Conch.*, vol. 2, p. 807, 1855, but May (*P.R.S. Tas.*, 1918, p. 73) has stated, after examining the types, that Johnston’s shell is only the juvenile state of his earlier *Ringiuca lactea*, so that the name may now pass into oblivion.

There is a “*Turbonilla sulcata* Edwards MS.” quoted by Bullen Newton (*Brit. Obs. and Eocene Moll.*, p. 182, 1891), which Cossmann (*R.C.P.*, 1899, no. 3, p. 138) has renamed *T. newtoni* on account of previous use of this name by Briart and Cornet; both name and substitute are, of course, *nomina nuda*, as no description or figure of the
species is extant, Newton merely including an MS. term of Edwards as a list name. Such *nomina nuda* of Cossmann are of frequent occurrence owing to his habit of proposing names in private letters, generally without investigating the status of the name he disagreed with (cf. the note on *Sipho asperulus* Tate); such names have often found their way into printed lists and caused much inconvenience. Fortunately, hardly any New Zealand names have suffered this unscientific treatment. The only *nomina nuda* of this kind so far noted are "*Chione suboblonga* Cossm." and "*C. marshalli* Cossm.," and to these I have already drawn attention (T.N.Z.I., vol. 55, p. 505, 1924).

Both names were proposed in a letter to Dr. Marshall (and subsequently recorded in print by him, T.N.Z.I., vol. 49, p. 462, 1917) for shells which had never been described, figured, or previously named. Cossmann gave no descriptions, merely stating that the specimens sent to him differed from the Recent shells with which they had up till then been identified. The species in question are, therefore, rightly being described by Dr. Marwick as new.

**Melongena (Pugilina) ponderosa** (Martin, 1895) (*Pyrola*):—

**Melongena perponderosa** Martin, 1919.

(S.G.E.M.L., n. f., vol. 1, p. 92.)

In recently using the above name, Vredenburg (Mem. Geol. Surv. Ind., vol. 50, pt. 1, p. 185, 1925) has overlooked the renomination of this species by Martin six years ago. The transference of the prior *Trophon ponderosum* Gabb to *Melongena (Pugilina)* (Cossmann. E.P.C., vol. 4, p. 90, 1901) necessitated the bestowal of a new name on the Javan shell, and this Martin has supplied in *Melongena perponderosa* n. n. (Pal. Kennt. von. Java., pp. 31, 119, 1919).

**Sipho asperulus** Tate, 1888:—**Austrosipho asperulus** (Tate, 1888).


In 1901, Cossmann noted (E.P.C., vol. 4, p. 111) that this name would be replaced by his *Siphonalia tatei*. This name, as regards Cossmann himself, is a pure *nomen nudum*, having been proposed, as in the case of *Chione suboblonga* and *marshalli*, in a private letter, and its authorship must be referred to the first legal user. In 1898 both Tate and Cossmann separately reviewed Harris’s *Cat. Tert. Moll. B.M.*, pt. 1; in Cossmann’s review (R.C.P., vol. 2, 1898, no. 1, Jan., p. 16) occur the words, "*S. tatei* au lieu de *Sipho asperulus* Tate, *non* Desh.," while Tate (P.R.S.N.S.W., vol. 31, p. 385, 1898) writes of the "removal of *Sipho asperulus*... to *Siphonalia*... under the changed name of *S. tatei* Cossmann." Reference to Harris (p. 155) shows that he uses the name validly, but quotes two earlier introductions, "1893, *Siphonalia tatei* Cossm., in litt.," and "1893, *id.*, Tate and Dennant, *Trans. Roy. Soc. S.A.*, vol. 17, pt. 1, p. 219." The first of these has, of course, no standing, while in the second case the new name occurs merely in a list of shells, with no information as to what it is or what it supplants. Though this is the first printed introduction of the name, it cannot be construed as a legal proposal, and the first person to state in print that *Siphonalia tatei* equals *Sipho asperulus* Tate is undoubtedly Harris, who must therefore be taken as responsible for the name. But apart from the question of author-
ship altogether, the name seems to be another of Cossmann's needless proposals. Cossmann makes no reference in his "Essais" to a Siphon asperulus of Deshayes, nor can I find one elsewhere. Apparently he had in mind the Fusus asperulus of Lamarck, which, being referred to Coptochetites, is quite ineffective. Basing my action on this interpretation, I now restore Tate's name.

The genus Austrospioho was proposed by Cossmann (E.P.C., vol. 7, p. 229, 1906) for Siphonalia roblini Tate, a Table Cape fossil. As so often occurs, though Cossmann's reasons for proposing the genre were trivial, his name will stand, for this species is representative of a large and well-marked group. This has commonly been called Verconella, but the Australian shells so called must take Cossmann's name, for there is no doubt as to the ancestral relationship existing between A. roblini, A. longirostris, etc. and Recent forms such as Siphonalia maxima Tryon and S. oligostira Tate. But I do not think that Austrospioho should supersede Verconella altogether. Verconella was proposed by Iredale in 1914 (Proc. Mal. Soc., vol. 11, p. 175) to replace Pension Fischer, which was preoccupied; fortunately the type of that genre was the Neozelanica Fusus dilatatus Q. & G., and though at the time Iredale stated that this was absolutely congeneric with Siphonalia maxima Tryon, and that Verco had actually gone so far as to synonymize the two, I think appreciable—even generic—differences are observable when one has long ancestral suites for study. Though the shells are so extremely similar in habit, there are valid and constant differences in the apies of Neozelanica and Australian species, and as these are present throughout the Tertiary, I think distinct lines are represented, and that both generic names should be maintained. Verconella has a tall, pupoid, polygyrate protoconch, with the nucleus small and central, the whole thing being symmetrically wound; Austrospioho has a globular, paucispiral protoconch, quite asymmetrically wound, the nucleus being bulbous and lateral. When one has many ancestral forms for study, other constant differences are also easily observable in the canal, aperture, etc. I have not seen a true Verconella yet from Australia, but Siphonalia excelsa Suter (N.Z. Geol. Surv. Pal. Bull. No. 5, p. 30, 1917) and a new species I have from the Kaipara beds seem to represent Austrospioho in New Zealand. There can be no doubt that Austrospioho must be recognized; even if these differences do not appeal to some as of generic rank, Cossmann's name has eight years clear priority over Iredale's.

Fusus bicinctus Kaunhowen, 1898:— Colus (?) kaunhoweni n. n.

(Gastr. Maest. Kr., p. 32.)

Not of Hutton, 1873 (Cat. Mar. Moll., p. 10), whose use of this name for a New Zealand Recent shell makes it necessary to supply a new one for the Austrian fossil.

Fusinus corrugatus Marshall, 1918.

(T.N.Z.I., vol. 50, p. 264.)

There is a Fusus corrugatus Reeve, 1848 (Conch. Icon., vol. 4—Fusus, no. 84), but as it is certainly not congeneric with the New Zealand fossil, Marshall's name may be allowed to stand.
Fusus exilis (Tate, 1888) (Fasciolaria): — Brochitis exilis (Tate).
(T.R.S.S.A., vol. 10, p. 149.)

Cossmann has renamed this Streptochetus adelmorphus (E.P.C.,
vol. 4, p. 31, 1901) on account of prior use of Fusus exilis by Conrad
for an American Miocene species. Since Tate described his shell as
a Fasciolaria, and the two shells are not congeneric, this is not a valid
reason, and Tate's name must be resumed. There is also a Fusus
exilis Menke, 1843 (Moll. Nov. Holl., p. 26), included by Hedley in
his Queensland list (p. 58, 1916), but I do not know how this is
affected by Conrad's proposal, the date of which is unknown to me.

The generic placing of this shell gives considerable trouble. The
first change from the original Fasciolaria was made by Harris (Cat.
Tert. Moll. B.M., pt. 1, p. 137, 1897) who likened the Australian shell,
to Fusus incertus Desh., and therefore referred it to Streptochetus;
in this case he was followed by Cossmann (l.c.). Tate (P.R.S.
N.S.W., vol. 31, p. 384, 1898) rightly objected to this location, and
decided that the species should be referred instead to Latirofusus
Cossmann, 1889. The first introduction of this generic name into
austral lists was made by Tate in 1891 when he described a new
Recent species (T.R.S.S.A., vol. 14, pt. 2, p. 258) from South Aus-
tralia as Latirofusus nigrofuscus nov.; he later (l.c., vol. 17, p. 198,
1893) noted that Tenison-Woods' Fusus spiceri was equivalent to his
shell, but rejected the name on account of inadequacy of diagnosis;
later workers, however, such as Hedley and May, have given prefer-
ence to the earlier name, and as Latirofusus spiceri (Ten.-Woods,
1877) this species occurs in the Check-Lists of Tasmania and the three
south-eastern States. To continue the history of Latirofusus; Tate,
in 1894 (P.R.S.N.S.W., vol. 27, p. 171, 1894) then used it, on Coss-
mann's suggestion, for an Australian Tertiary fossil, his Fusus
aciformis, and subsequently, as noted earlier, also referred to it his
Fasciolaria exilis, chiefly on account of its similarity to L. funiculosus
(Lk.), the genotype, and these have remained there since. Unfor-
nately I have not seen spiceri and aciformis, so cannot say if these
are congeneric, or if not, how many groups are represented;
but exilis seems to me quite distinct from Latirofusus, and very
probably that genus is not represented in austral waters at all; Tate
seems to have been swayed by Cossmann's reference of F. lancea Gm.
and acus Ad. & Reeve to the genus, but it remains to be seen whether
these are really related to the Parisian Eocene genotype, with which
alone comparison should be instituted. Harris (l.c.) in comparing
aciformis with funiculosus (Lk.) states that it is "proportionately
narrower, and does not possess the latiform longitudinal costae so
characteristic of the Paris Basin shell. The protoconch of the latter
is relatively much smaller, and the shell as a whole is more solid."
Written descriptions of the two shells would read much alike, but
would convey a wrong impression, for the whole facies is totally
different; Latirofusus is, as its name implies, a but slightly modified
Latirus, with the characteristic shell-texture and axial ornament of
that genus, while I can read no relation to Latirus into the figures
and descriptions of aciformis and spiceri. With regard to exilis, it
may be noted that neither Harris nor Cossmann thought of referring
it to *Latirofusus*, though they referred other species there at the same
time; the differences in this case seem to be still more marked, and
this suggests that perhaps another group is represented. Not being
able, therefore, to find a satisfactory location for *Fasciolaria exilis*
Tate, I now propose for it the new genus *Brochitas*; if *Fusus spiceri*
T.-W. is congeneric it will take this name also, but if, as seems likely,
it represents a different group, a name other than *Latirofusus* will
be necessary. It is perhaps of interest to mention that Cossmann
many years ago rejected *Latirofusus* (E.P.C., vol. 4, p. 22, 1901) as
a synonym of *Dolicholatirus* Bellardi, 1883 (G.-T., *Turbinella bronni*
Mich., Miocene). This generic name has been used by Marshall for
a Pakaurangi Point fossil (T.N.Z.I., vol. 50, p. 264, 1918), at Suter’s
instigation, but the name must be rejected; the relationships of this
species will be dealt with in another place.

One other genus must be considered before this rather lengthy
note can be concluded, and that is *Exilia* Conrad. This name is well
known to New Zealand students, as Suter has described three Tertiary
species under it. Its use is due indirectly to Dr. Dall, who wrote
to Suter that a shell sent to him resembled *Plicifusus* and *Exilia*;
Suter has quoted his remarks (N.Z. Geol. Surv. Pal. Bull. No. 3,
p. 19, 1915), which, owing to misplacement of the second quotation
mark (it should come after the word "fauna"), appear somewhat
contradictory. Dall draws attention to Cossmann’s error (E.P.C.,
vol. 4, p. 26, 1901) in stating that *Exilia* has two columellar plaits,
and in another place (U.S. Geol. Surv. Dept. Int., Prof. Pap. 59,
p. 37, 1909) says, “The supposed plaits on the pillar mentioned by
Cossmann are due to some misapprehension, as there is not a trace
of any sculpture or plaits on the pillar.” In his remarks on *Exilia
dallii* n. sp., however, Suter says (l.c.), “As stated in the diagnosis,
my specimen has two columellar plaits. However, I must confess I
might not have seen them if I had not especially looked for them in
consequence of Cossmann’s statement.” This is an excellent example
of how one can see what one wishes to see if one looks long enough.
None of the three species Suter described as *Exilia* show any sign of
two plaits in either the adult or the juvenile state; but all have a
blunt subangulate twist on the pillar at the inception of the canal.
In other ways, too, the form of the aperture is different from *Exilia*,
and abundantly so from *Plicifusus*, which seems to be the evolutionary
product of *Exilia*. It is evident that the New Zealand forms are
wrongly referred to this genus, and there does not seem to be a better
one, the *Mitraefusus* of Bellardi being just as inapplicable. I there-
fore now provide *Zeclilia* new genus, with *Zeclilia waihoaensis* Suter,
there also *E. dallii* Suter and *E. crassicostata* Suter. Tate’s figure
of *Fusus aciformis* (T.R.S.S.A., vol. 10, p. 139, pl. 7, figs. 5a, b, 1888)
looks very like a *Zeclilia*, but reference here depends on whether there
are plaits on the pillar; Tate mentions none, but Harris says there are
two, in which case it will be congeneric with either *spiceri* or *exilis*.
*Latirofusus cingulatus* Pritchard, from Table Cape, is almost exactly
like the type of *Latirofusus* (*funiculosus* Lk.) but lacks the two
oblique plications; it may, in the meantime, be referred to Zeuxilia, though the aperture is not in close accord.

**Fusus hexagonalis** Tate, 1888.

*(T.R.S.S.A., vol. 10, p. 139.)*

There is a prior *F. hexagonus* J. de C. Sowerby, 1839 (Trans. Geol. Soc. Lond., ser. 2, vol. 5, pl. 26, f. 15), but the epithets are sufficiently distinct to allow the retention of Tate’s name. It may be noted that Sowerby’s species has recently been renamed *Muricopsis exhexagonus* by Vredenburg, 1925 (Mem. Geol. Surv. India, vol. 50, pt. 1, p. 220), on account of its clashing with *Muricopsis hexagonus* (Lamk.) (*Murex*), when transferred to this genus.

**Fusus plicatilis** Hutton, 1873:—

**Pomahakia aberrans** n. gen. and n. n.

*(Cat. Tert. Moll., p. 3.)*

As a synonym of *Murex turricula* Montfort, Searles Wood has published (Mon. Crag. Moll., pt. 1, p. 62, 1848) *Fusus plicatilis* as a manuscript name of Bean. Under the nomenclatural rules, *Fusus plicatilis* S. V. Wood, 1848 is therefore a valid name and stands as a substitute (synonym) for *Propnebela turricula* (Mont.). It therefore invalidates Hutton’s name, which I replace as above. The peculiar facies and outer-lip sinus of this Pomahaka fossil (of which no allies are at present known) renders necessary the creation of a new name *Pomahakia* for it; the exact value of the group, as also its family location, are at present doubtful; it may be a Turrid, but I would suggest tentative reference to the Neptunidae, perhaps near *Verconella*.

**Fusus spiniferus** Tate, 1888:—

**Columbarium spinulatum** Cossm. 1901.


Renamed by Cossmann (E.P.C., vol. 4, p. 16, 1901) who states that Bellardi had used this name previously for an Italian Miocene species. Mr. Iredale has kindly supplied me with the reference, which is as follows, “*Fusus spinifer* Bellardi, 1873 (I. Moll. Terr. Terz. Piem e Lig., pt. 1, p. 133; Mem. Accad. Sci. Torino, ser. 2, vol. 27):”

**Mitra clathrata** Reeve, 1844.

*(Conch. Icon., vol. 2—Mitra No. 71.)*

This name occurs in Hedley’s Queensland list (p. 59, 1909) but is preoccupied by Defrance, 1824 (Dict. Sci. Nat., vol. 31, p. 493), while both names upset Reuss’s usage in 1845 (Verst. bothm. Kreidefl., vol. 1, p. 44). There are probably available synonyms.

*Mitra cancellata* Sow., 1832 (Trans. Geol. Soc. Lond., ser. 2, vol. 3, p. 419), which has been recently recorded by Spengler (*Pal. Indica*, N.S., vol. 8, Mem. 1, p. 43, 1923) from the Cretaceous of Assam, is invalidated by two previous uses, Swainson in 1821 (Zool. Illust., 1, 1, pt. 5, pl. 29), and Bolten in 1798 (*Mus. Bolten*, pt. 2, p. 138). As Spengler quotes *Rostellaria crebricostata* and *Voluta cristata*, both of Zekeli, 1852, as synonyms, the choice of an alternative will fall on one of these.
Mitra exilis Tate, 1889.

(T.R.S.S.A., vol. 11, p. 140.)

I propose Balcomitra, new genus, for the group represented by Mitra paucicostata Tate, which I nominate as type; this will include most of the Australian Tertiary species referred by Tate to Costellaria, e.g., leptaea, exilis, etc. For the latter, which is preoccupied by Mitra exilis Reeve (P.Z.S., 1845, pt. 13, no. 147, p. 58), I suggest Balcomitra macra n. n. The group is related to Austromitra Finlay,* but as that covers a large and uniform group of late Tertiary and Recent shells, while the Balcombian forms are also numerous and uniformly differ in longer and better-developed snout and keel-like spiral sculpture on base, it is necessary to have a name for each assemblage to avoid confusion and erroneous conceptions of distribution. Balcomitra does not occur in New Zealand; the Recent and Tertiary Egestas* has a similar shape and pronounced snout, but only three pillar-plaits.

Mitra ligata Tate, 1889:—

Microvoluta pentaploca n. n.

(T.R.S.S.A., vol. 11, p. 139.)

Not of A. Adams, 1853 (Proc. Zool. Soc. for 1851, pt. 19, no. 227, p. 134). Tate’s species is essentially the same type of shell as the Recent Microvoluta australis Angas, 1877, having the same characteristic surface, aperture, and twisted beak; it is also quite close to the New Zealand Pliocene and Recent Turricula marginata Hutton, but in the adult state it has five plaits, the fifth being anterior, weak, and evanescent. The species has generally been located in Conomitra by Australian authors, following Harris (Cat. Tert. Moll. B.M., pt. 1, p. 180, 1897), who compared it to the smooth Paris Basin forms such as C. marginata (Lk.); the resemblance is, however, very slight and superficial, the French shell being far more like the New Zealand early Tertiary Mitra inconspicua Hutton, which bears no relation to ligata Tate, but which I have compared to his complanata (T.N.Z.I., vol. 55, p. 468, 1924), and made the type of a new genus Waimatea.*

Iredale has recently shown (P.L.S.N.S.W., vol. 49, pt. 3, p. 269, 1924) that Microvoluta should be transferred to the Volutidae.

Mitra multisulcata Sowerby, 1914:—

Mitra subruppei u. n.


Described from New Caledonia, and compared with M. ruppei Rve., but the name chosen had been appropriated by Harris (Cat. Tert. Moll. B.M., pt. 1, p. 120, 1897) for an Australian Balcombian fossil.

Mitra semilaevis Tate, 1889:—

Mitra ralphi Cossm., 1900.

(T.R.S.S.A., vol. 11, p. 143.)

Renamed “M. tatei” by Cossmann (E.P.C., vol. 3, p. 165, April, 1899) on account of Edwards’s prior use in 1849 (Mon. Eoc. Moll., 153); the “M.” here stands for Mitra, though in his review of this volume of the “Essais” (R.C.P., vol. 3, 1899, No. 4, October, p. 144) the substitute name is given first as Turricula tatei, then later (i.e., p. 193) as Costellaria tatei! Angas, however, had already proposed

*See earlier in this volume

*Mitra uniplica* Tate, 1889:—

*Mitra monoploca*, n. i.

(*T.R.S.S.A.,* vol. 11, p. 138.)

*Mitra ebenus* (? var. *uniplicatus* S. Wood, 1872 *(Mon. Crag. Moll., p. 7)* will dispose of this name. “Uniplica” and “uniplicata” cannot be allowed as distinct epithets, being of the same standing as, for example, “rotunda” and “rotundata,” “planicosta” and “planicostata,” etc., which terms are quite fortuitously used by authors.

*Thala marginata* Tenison-Woods, 1877.

(*P.R.S.Tas.* for 1876, p. 108.)

Some confusion surrounds this Table Cape fossil. Tate *(P.R.S. N.S.W. for 1897, vol. 31, p. 396, 1898)* did not accept the name, but argued for, and proposed, a new one as follows:—

“*Cordieria conospira* spec. nov. (Plate 19, fig. 12.)


The transference of the Table Cape species, described by Tenison-Woods as *Thala marginata*, to either *Borsonia* or *Cordieria* renders a change of specific denomination (“necessary,” omitted inadvertently). *Borsonia marginata* was described by Deshayes in 1864 and was included by Cossmann in his section *Phlyctoenia*, which was subsequently recognized by him to be synonymous with *Cordieria*; in M. Cossmann’s work *(E.P.C., vol. 2, p. 100, 1896)* it is listed as *Cordierio marginata*.”

Now, since Deshayes’s and Tenison-Woods’s names are not homonyms, the preoccupation lasts only so long as both are retained in the same genus, and I have already *(T.N.Z.J., vol. 55, p. 499, 1924)* stated that the Australian shells are congeneric with some New Zealand species, for which I proposed the genus *Rugobela* (l.c., p. 514), widely removed from *Borsonia*. The point now arises,—is Tate’s conospira to be taken as a proposed new species, with which he (rightly or wrongly) synonymizes *Thala marginata* T.-W., or must it be regarded as a substitute name for the latter? If the last view is upheld, the name is unnecessary, for, apart altogether from the validity or otherwise of *marginata*, May *(P.R.S.Tas. for 1918, pp. 72, 113)* has recorded from examination of types that *T. marginata* is synonymous with *Daphnella columbelloides* Ten.-Woods, described three pages earlier. *Rugobela columbelloides* (T.-W., 1877) is, therefore, the correct name for the Table Cape form, whatever one argues in respect to the shells Tate studied. I have been unable to separate a series of Balcombe Bay specimens specifically from four Table Cape topotypes, and if this view is upheld, further discussion is satisfactorily obviated. Were two species represented, the standing and validity of Tate’s name would remain an annoying subject for debate, but fortunately all specimens I have seen so far seem to be referable to *columbelloides* (T.-W.)...
**Buccinum meridionale inflata** Harmer, 1913:—

**Buccinum tumescens** n. n.

(\textit{M.P.S.}, vol. 67, p. 112.)

Invalidated by \textit{Buccinum inflatum} Hutton, 1873 (\textit{Cat. Tert. Moll.}, p.6), while \textit{Buccinum undatum minimum} Harmer, 1913 (\textit{I.c.}, vol. 68, p. 97) must fall before two earlier proposals of the same name, also for British shells, viz., Montague, 1803 (\textit{Test. Brit.}, pt. 1, p. 247), and Turton, 1802 (\textit{Gen. Syst. Nat.}, vol. 4, p. 387); \textit{B. undatum minusculum} n. n. may replace it.

**Tritonidea fusiformis** Verco, 1896.

(\textit{T.R.S.S.A.}, vol. 20, p. 219.)

This was described by Verco from South Australia, with a variety \textit{adcocki}, but his name had already been chosen for a Javan fossil by Martin, 1883 (\textit{S.G.R.M.L.}, ser. 1, p. 206). Hedley (\textit{P.L.S.N.S.W.}, vol. 38, pt. 2, p. 316, 1913) synonymizes Verco’s species with \textit{T. subrubiginosa} Smith, 1879 and \textit{Pisania bednalli} Sow., suggesting that \textit{Purpurina glirina} Blainv., 1832 and \textit{Buccinum discolor} Kiener, 1834 may also refer here. No substitute need therefore be proposed for Verco’s name at present; if the South Australian forms are later racially recognized, they will take the name \textit{adcocki}. These forms seem referable to \textit{Tasmanithria} Iredale, proposed for \textit{Stiphonalia clarkei} Ten.-Woods (Rec. Austr. Mus., vol. 14, no. 4, p. 202, 1925).

**Latirus fusiformis** Tesch, 1915:—

**Colus (?) teschi** n. n.


The canal of this Timor fossil seems too long and straight for reference to \textit{Latirus}; in the specific name Tesch had been anticipated by Hoernes and Auinger, 1891 (\textit{Gastr. Meeres-Abl. Mio. Medit.}, etc., lief. 6, p. 270).

**Nassa ovum** Cossmann, 1902.

(\textit{Journ de Conchyl.}, vol. 50, no. 4, p. 138.)

As the Pliocene molluses of Karikal are now being re-examined and Cossmann’s species-names frequently used in recent publications of the Geological Survey of India, it is as well to record here that Martin (\textit{Pal. Kennl. von Java}, p. 119, 1919) has drawn attention to his own previous employment of this combination, and in consequence has renamed the French Indian fossil \textit{Nassa francoindica}.

**Murex alveolatus** Tate, 1888:—

**Murex graniformis** Harris, 1897.


As J. de C. Sowerby had long ago used this name for a British Eocene species (\textit{Min. Conch.}, vol. 5, p. 9, 1823), Cossmann (\textit{R.C.P.}, vol. 11, 1907, No. 3, p. 200) has renamed the Australian shell \textit{Muri- copsis subalveolatus} n. n. He overlooked the fact that Harris had already dealt with the matter (\textit{Cat. Tert. Moll. B.M.}, pt. 1, p. 180) and, on the same grounds, had proposed ten years previously the substitute \textit{Murex (Muri-copsis) graniformis}.

**Murex irregularis** Tate, 1888:—

**Hadriania basedowi** Cossm., 1903.

(\textit{T.R.S.S.A.}, vol. 10, pp. 102.)

Pleading that Bellardi had used this name in 1872, Cossmann (\textit{E.P.C.}, vol. 5, p. 46, 1903) has proposed the above substitute; I give
it as he wrote it, though a different generic location will be required when the group is revised. The correct reference to Bellardi’s name (sent me by Mr. Iredale) is I. Moll. Terr. Terz. Piem. e Lig., pt. 1, p. 128, 1873 (reprint); Mem. del R. Acc. Sci. Torino, ser. 2, vol. 27).

**Trophon crispus** (Gould, 1849) (*Fusus*).


Marwick (T.N.Z.I., vol. 55, p. 199, 1924) has recently renamed the New Zealand shell *Xymene olivari*, stating his reasons as follows: “Cossmann (E.P.C., vol. 5, p. 54, footnote, 1903) changed *Trophon crispus* (Gould) to *Trophon gouldi*, giving as his reason, ‘Cette denomination fait double emploi avec celle d’un *Murex* bien antérieur, dans l’Eocene du Bassin de Paris; l’espèce néozélandaise doit donc recevoir un autre nom.’ Now the shell in question was described originally as *Fusus crispus*, so there is no justification for changing the specific name, as the Parian shell is still retained under *Murex*. *T. gouldi*, however, cannot be applied to the New Zealand shell; it was definitely proposed as a substitute for *T. crispus*, and must be associated with that South American species.”

This solution of the problem cannot stand. First, the combination *Fusus crispus* is itself preoccupied by Borson, 1820, for an Italian fossil (*Oritt. Piedmont*, p. 317; discussed by Michelotti, 1847; *Descr. des Foss. Mioc. de l’Ital.*, p. 272), so Gould’s name must be changed. Secondly, the name *Trophon gouldi* was proposed by Cossmann for the New Zealand species, and not as a substitute for *Trophon crispus* Gould. Cossmann’s own statement is, ‘l’espèce néozélandaise doit donc recevoir un autre nom, et je propose en conséquence: *Trophon Gouldi* nobis,’ while he cites in the passage to which this footnote refers, ‘la Monographie de M. Hutton (loc. cit., Pl. VI., fig. 8).’

This citation of a specific locality and figure fixes the name *Trophon gouldi* Cossmann definitely on the New Zealand species; as Dr. Marwick has shown that the latter differs from the South American form, this is the name it must bear; *Xymene olivari* Marwick thus becomes a synonym. It is evident that Suter also came to this conclusion, from his statement (*Man. Mollusca*, p. 419), ‘Allied to the Pliocene *T. gouldi* Cossm. (=*crispus* Hutt., not of Gould).’

Cossmann referred the species to *Trophonopsis*, but it belongs to the group for which I have (earlier in this volume) proposed *Xymenella*, with *Trophon pusillus* Suter as type, and should, therefore, finally be called *Xymenella gouldi* (Cossmann).

Since the name *crispus* cannot be maintained for the South American species, it becomes necessary to look for a substitute. This appears to be available in *Fusus fimbriatus* Hupe, in Gay, (*Hist. de Chile*, vol. 8, p. 165) which is recorded by Melville and Standen (*Ann. Mag. Nat. Hist.*, ser. 8, vol. 13, p. 119), as a synonym of *T. crispus*; though Smith (P.Z.S., 1881, p. 28) thought it distinct. It is quite likely, however, that there are previous users of this name also, but I have not yet come across one.

The vicissitudes of the New Zealand *gouldi* may be condensed into the following synonymy:—
Transactions.

Xymenella gouldi (Cossmann, 1903).

Thais alveolata (Reeve, 1846).
(Conch. Icon., vol. 3—Purpura no. 6 (=60).)

In the "Index of the Mollusca of Western Australia," Hedley includes (pp. 63, 64) Engina alveolata (Kiener) and Thais alveolata (Reeve). As each of these is based originally on the name Purpura alveolata, they cannot both stand; Kiener's name (Spec. Coquilles, Purpura, p. 42, 1836) has ten years priority, so that Reeve's shell must receive a new name.

Cancellaria neglecta Martin, 1895:—Bivetia martini Cossmann, 1899.
(T.R.S.S.A., vol. 11, p. 155.)

On account of previous usage by Hoernes (no date or reference given), Cossmann (E.P.C., vol. 3, 1899, No. 1, p. 24) renamed Tate's species Aneurystoma tatei, but I have noted elsewhere (T.N.Z.I., vol. 55, p. 501) that this shell and psychotropis Tate are the Australian representatives of Admete suteri Marshall & Murdoch, the genotype of my genus Oamarua (l.c., p. 514). To these may also be added a Recent survival, Cancellaria perigrada Verae, 1905 (T.R.S.S.A., vol. 29, p. 142), described from South Australia as the descendant of gradata Tate, and reported also from Tasmania by May; further Tertiary species of this distinct group are known to me from Australia.

Cancellaria neglecta Martin, 1895:—Bivetia martini Cossmann, 1899.
(S.G.R.M.L., n.f., Bd. 1, pp. 47, 296.)

Cossmann thus replaced Martin's name (E.P.C., vol. 3, p 10), stating that Michelotti had previously used it in 1861.

Voluta alticostata Tate, 1889:—Livonia alticostata (Tate, 1889).
(T.R.S.S.A., vol. 11, p. 122.)

In Demant and Kitson's "Catalogue of the Described Species of Fossils, etc." (Rec. Geol. Surv. Vict., vol. 1, pt. 2, p. 100) appears the name Voluta validicostata Tate, with a footnote, "Nom. mut., V. alticostata Tate." The substitute name must, of course, be credited to Demant and Kitson, but no reason is given for the change, nor does any seem to be mentioned elsewhere in Australian literature. Pritchard (P.R.S. Vict., vol. 26, pt. 1, p. 199, 1913) and May (P.R.S. Tas., 1918, p. 112), when recording the Table Cape species, seem not to have noticed the substitute name, as alticostata is included without remark. As a matter of fact, they are correct in retaining
the original name, for Tate's reason for rejecting his name seems to have been the discovery that White, two years previously, used the same specific name for a Senonian Brazilian Volute (Arch. Mus. Nac. Rio Janeiro, vol. 7, p. 127). White, however, proposed Volutilithes alticostatus, and this does not clash with Tate's name, which I now restore. In placing the species in Livonia Gray, I would remark that though Hedley synonymized Pterospira Harris with this genus, it seems distinct enough to be used at least as a subgenus, the rather numerous Tertiary forms all having much stronger ornament than L. mamilla, the type of Livonia, and a rather different facies.

Voluta capitata Tate, 1889:—

Scaphella macrocephala n. n.

(T.R.S.S.A., vol. 11, p. 127.)

Not of Ferry; 1811 (Conchology, Pl. 17.)

Voluta (Lyria) corrugata Hutton, 1873.

(Cat. Tert. Moll., p. 7.)

This is a very unsatisfactory species. Marwick, who has just lately dealt with it (T.N.Z.I., vol. 56, p. 299, 1926), refers it to Alcithoe, near A. solida Marwick, but remarks that, "Until some toptotypes have been secured, however, the best course is to ignore the species." This indeed must be done, as there is a prior Voluta corrugata Binkhorst, 1861 (Monogr. Gastr. et Ceph. Craie de Limbg., p. 14). This conveniently solves the problem, and allows us to describe the species as new when better specimens are collected.

Voluta elongata Swainson, 1821:—

Alcithoe swainsoni Marwick, 1926.

(Exot. Conch., pl. 20, f. 21.)

I have noted at least four users of this name. The first was Solander, 1786 (Cat. Port. Mus., p. 30), the next Swainson; as above; for his shell Marwick has supplied the substitute Alcithoe swainsoni nov. (T.N.Z.I., vol. 56, p. 294, 1926). D'Orbigny then employed the name for a Cretaceous fossil (Pal. Franc. Cret., vol. 2, p. 323, 1843); as Fulguraria elongata (d'Orb.) this has been recorded from the Cretaceous of Southern India by Stolickza (Pal. Índica, vol. 2, p. 87, 1868), who reduces Voluta trichinopolitensis Forbes, 1846 (Trans. Geol. Soc. Lond., vol. 7, p. 133) to a synonym; if his action is correct, this is the name to be adopted for the species. Lastly, Pease in 1867 (Am. Journ. Conch., vol. 3, p. 281) described a fourth Voluta elongata, but I do not know its present status.

Fulguraria morgani Marshall and Murdoch, 1920:—

Alcithoe gatesi Marwick, 1926.

(T.N.Z.I., vol. 52, p. 133.)


Voluta polita Tate, 1889.

(T.R.S.S.A., vol. 11, p. 129.)

Cossmann (E.P.C., vol. 3, p. 127), stating that Conrad had previously used this name, renamed the Australian fossil Scaphella victoriensis. It may be noted that Pritchard (P.R.S.Vict., vol. 26,
pt. 1, p. 196, 1913) does not regard this species as distinct from V. maccoyi Ten.-Woods, but, from what I have seen, several species seem to be lumped under this name. The genus name Scaphella has been indiscriminately applied to many diverse groups of Australian Volutes. Harris (Cat. Tert. Moll. B.M., pt. 1, p. 111) included under this name the Australian maccoyi, politea, and ancilloides, but as he used it also for the New Zealand Alcithoe, one cannot trust his grouping. Cossmann (E.P.C., vol. 3, p. 127, 1899) placed maccoyi, victoriensis (=politea), protorhysa, and ellipsoidae in this genus, using Alcithoe for ancilloides. The latter may be disposed of at once by stating that it is evidently an Ericusa, quite like fulgêtrum and soverbyi, but with a larger embryo than usual. From the other species mentioned above we may eliminate ellipsoidae as foreign to the assemblage, but the remainder—maccoyi, victoriensis, and protorhysa, form a very natural group. Scaphella, of course, cannot be used for these, that genus name being applicable to quite a different American group, typified by Voluta junonia Hwass (vide Iredale; in Marwick, T.N.Z.I., vol. 56, p. 264, 1926). The apical characters of junonia differ considerably from those of maccoyi, etc., the nucleus being large, subpointed, inrolled, and strongly granulate; the protoconch in the Australian shells is much smaller, polished all over, only faintly roughened initially, almost flat on top, the tiny early whorls showing distinctly through the glaze. Dall distinctly says junonia has no surface polish, while these fossil shells are the most highly glossy of all the austral Volutes. There being no other group at all comparable, I now propose for the three fossil species mentioned, and Voluta lirata Johnston (P.R.S. Tas. for 1879, p. 37) (united to maccoyi by Pritchard, but apparently a distinguishable form, from the specimens I have seen), the new genus Notopeulum, naming as type Scaphella victoriensis Cossmann. Victorian shells differ somewhat (as Pritchard himself noted) from the Table Cape maccoyi and lirata in texture, fragility, embryo, and columella, so that possibly two groups (let alone species!) are represented. The true status of Tate’s polite needs investigation, but I am accepting Pritchard’s union of it with the Victorian maccoyi auct., not of Ten.-Woods; i.e. I have taken victoriensis as the name for the common Balcombian form. As the distinction and description of Notopeulum is based on the latter, I prefer to nominate victoriensis rather than maccoyi as type, in spite of this obscurity. Typical Notopeulum also occurs with maccoyi at Table Cape. A fifth described species and Recent representative exists in Voluta translucida Verco, 1896 (T.R.S.S.A., vol. 20, p. 217), described from South Australian waters—where the fossils also lived.

**Voluta ringens** Noetling, 1901:—

**Plejona risor**, n. n


Many of Noetling’s species have recently been critically revised by Vredenburg (Mem. Geol. Surv. India., vol. 50, pt. 1, 1925). The above name cannot stand, on account of Voluta ringens Turton, 1819 (*Conch. Dict.*, p. 250); the aperture remains unknown, and the generic position is therefore quite doubtful, but *Plejona* is somewhat suggested, so I rename Noetling’s shell as above, there being already

"Voluta strombiformis Johnston."

Cossmann, stating that Deshayes had used this name for a Paris Basin Eocene species renamed the Australian shell Vespertilio johnstoni n. n. (E.P.C., vol. 3, p. 119, 1899); and continued this usage in 1909 (Pal. Indica, N.S., vol. 3, mem. 1, p. 26), where he says "A. (ulicina) Johnstoni Cossm. (V. strombiformis John. in, non Desh.)."

No such species was ever described by Johnston; Pritchard, in his revision of the Table Cape Volutas (P.R.S. Vict., vol. 26, pt. 1, pp. 192-201, 1913) makes no mention of such a name or of Cossmann's substitute for it. There is a Marginella strombiformis Tenison-Woods, and this was figured by Johnston (Geol. Tas., pl. 31, figs. 4, 4a). If it is to this that Cossmann refers, no comment is needed.

Oliva angustata Tate, 1889:—Oliva praenominata Cossmann, 1912. 
(T.R.S.S.A., vol. 11, p. 144.)

Cossmann states that Marratt used this name in 1870 for a Recent species, and proposes the above substitute (R.C.P., vol. 16, 1912, no. 3, p. 215).

Marginella brevispira Marwick, 1924:—Marginella marwicki n. n. 
(T.N.Z.I., vol. 55, p. 201.)

Cossmann (E.P.C., vol. 3, p. 84, 1899) mentions a Marginella brevispira Bellardi, but this is a slip, the name being due to Sacco, 1890 (I moll. dei. terr. terz. d. Piemont, etc.); this invalidates Marwick's name which I alter as above. It is also invalidated by M. (Volvarina) brevispira Oppenheim, 1906 (Palaeontographica, vol. 30, p. 324), for which Tomlin (Proc. Mal. Soc., vol. 13, 1919) has substituted M. trochiscus.

Marginella ovata Harris, 1897:—Marginella harrisi Cossmann, 1899: 
(Cat. Tert. Moll. B.M., pt. 1, p. 88.)


Although this substitute name has become familiar to New Zealand workers, and occurs in many lists, Suter never drew attention to the change or to the reason for it, and the only published note citing the equivalence of the two names seems to be in a list of fossils from Awamoa by Marshall and Uttley (T.N.Z.I., vol. 45, p. 300, 1913).

Pleurotoma clarae Hoernes and Auinger, 1891:—

Clavatula auingeri n. n. 
(Gastr. Meeres-Abl. Mic. Medit., etc., lief. 6, p. 320.)

This name is already in use for a well-known Australian Tertiary fossil, Pleurotoma clarae Tenison-Woods, 1880 (P.L.S.N.S.W., vol. 4, p. 11).

Pleurotoma coronifer Martin, 1879. 
(Tertiars. auf. Java, p. 61.)

Not of Bellardi, 1877 (Moll. Terz. Piem. e Lig., pt. 2, p. 34). The preoccupation has been noticed by Vredenburg (Mem. Geol. Surv.
Ind\(\text{ia},\) vol. 50, pt. 1, p. 54, 1925), but Martin’s shell is not renamed as it is referred instead to a north-west Indian fossil described by Vredenburg as Pleurotoma (Gemmula) congener E. A. Smith var. mekraniu nov.

**Turriss neglectus** Suter, 1917: — **Gemmula insensa** (Finlay, 1924)


I renamed this species *(Proc. Mal. Soc., vol. 16, pt 2, p. 103, 1924)* Turriss insensus on account of the earlier Pleurotoma neglecta Reeve, 1842. It could probably be successfully argued that modern classification would not leave these shells in the same genus, and that the names therefore do not interfere. However, the existence of a *Turriss neglectus* Lesson, 1837 *(Prodr., No. 38, and Hist. Nat. des Acad., p. 284, 1843)* renders debate unnecessary. Lesson’s *Turriss* was not a gasteropod but a hydroid.

**Pleurotoma laevis** Bell, 1890: — **Raphitoma belliana** n. n.


This Crag species has been recorded by Harmer *(M.P.S., vol. 72, p. 523)*, but the name had already been used by Hutton for a New Zealand Recent species *(Cat. Marine Moll., p. 12, 1873).* Both these propositions will upset *Pleurotoma selwyni* var. *laevis* Pritchard, 1904 *(P.R.S. Victoria, vol. 17, N.S., p. 328)* which may therefore be renamed *Epideira selwyni* suppressa n. n.

**Turriss reticulatus** Marshall, 1919.

*(T.N.Z.I., vol. 51, p. 231.)*

The trivial description “reticulate” has been frequently used for Turrids. Brown, 1827 *(Illustr. Conch. G.B., ed. 1, p. 8)* proposed a *Pleurotoma reticulata* which will invalidate Philippi’s proposal in 1844 of the same name for a Sicilian fossil *(Enun. Moll. Sicil., vol. 2, p. 165);* Harmer has noted the latter species from the English Crag *(M.P.S., vol. 68, p. 239),* but another name must be used. *Pleurotoma reticulata* Garrett, 1857 *(Proc. Cal. Acad., vol. 1, p. 102)* is stated by Tryon *(Man. Conch., vol. VI, p. 298, 1842)* to be a synonym of *P. pygmaea* Mighels. All these names will interfere with *Pleurotoma* *(Drillia) reticulata* Tesch, 1915 *(Pal. Timor, vol. 5, p. 32),* which may therefore be renamed *Melatoma teschi* n. n.—and this in turn will invalidate *Drillia reticulata* Vredenburg, 1921 *(Rec. Geol. Surv. India, vol. 53, p. 111),* for which I now substitute *Inquisitor vredenbourgi* n. n. Not one of these names is strictly homonymous with *Turriss reticulatus* Marshall, proposed for a Hampden fossil; it is a *Gemmula,* and as none of the forms mentioned can be included in this genus, Marshall’s name must be allowed to stand.

**Pleurotoma sulcata** Hutton, 1873: — **Austrotoma suteri** *(Cossmann, 1916).*

*(Cat. Tert. Moll., p. 4.)*

For this and other New Zealand species I have proposed the group name *Australotoma*, with *Bathyotoma excavata* Suter as type (*T.N.Z.I.*, vol. 55, p. 515, 1924).

**Pleurotoma optata** Smith, 1899:— **Gemmula indagatoris** n. n.


Figured by Alecock and McArdle in 1901 ("Investigator" Illustrations, Mollusca, pt. 3, pl. 9, figs. 1, 1a). The specific name had been used two years previously by Harris (*Cat. Tert. Moll. B. M.*, pt. 1, p. 44, 1897) for an Australian fossil.

**Sactula obliquecostata** Suter, 1917.


Invalidated by *Pleurotoma (Sactula) obliquecostata* Martens, 1901 (*Ges. naturf. Berlin*, p. 16). No new name is imposed, as Suter's shell is evidently a synonym of his previously described *Pleurotoma pareoenaesis* (*Proc. Mal. Soc. Lond.*, vol. 7, p. 208, 1907), from the same locality, the latter being described from a senile abraded specimen, and the former from a clean juvenile.

**Drillia laevis parva** Suter, 1908:— **Splendrillia debilis** n. n.

*(Proc. Mal. Soc., vol. 8, p. 185.)*

*Pleurotoma (Drillia) parva* Tokunaga, 1906 (*Tokyo J. Coll. Sci.*, vol. 21, p. 16) makes necessary this renomination. I also rename Tokunaga's shell *Inquisitor (?) tokunaga* n. n. as there is a prior *Pleurotoma (Drillia) parva* Smith, 1888 (*A.M.N.H.*, ser. 6, vol. 2, p. 303), which, in turn, has been renamed by Dall (*Proc. U.S. Nat. Mus.*, vol. 54, p. 333, 1919) on account of Conrad's use of the name in 1830.

**Bela robusta** Hutton, 1877:— **Australotoma minor** Finlay, 1924.

*(T.N.Z.I., vol. 9, p. 595.)*


**Conus affinis** Martin, 1879:— **Conus sannio** n. n.

*(Die Tertiars. auf Java, p. 15.)*


**Conus australis** Lamk., 1810.


Hedley (*Ind. Moll. West Austr.*, p. 56, 1916), following E. A. Smith, has recorded *Conus australis* Chemnitz, 1795 from West Australia. Chemnitz's names, however, are now rejected, so that *Conus australis* must date from 1810, being first legally introduced by Lamarck at the reference above quoted. And this will necessitate its rejection for seven years previously Schroeter (*Archiv. Zool.* (Wiedemann), vol. 3, pt. 2, p. 71, 1803) had employed the same combination. Smith (*Ann. Mag. Nat. Hist.*, ser. 6, vol. 14, p. 158, 1894) cites *Conus gracilis, duplicatus*, and *laterculus*, all of Sowerby, as synonyms of this species, so several names are available to fill the vacancy, and I leave the selection of the correct one to local workers who know the actual shells.
Conus convexus Marshall, 1918.—Conospira thorae n. n.
(T.N.Z.I., vol. 50, p. 270.)

Not of Harris, 1897 (Cat. Tert. Moll. B.M., pt. 1, p. 31), for an
Australian Tertiary shell, referred to Leptoconus, and reduced by
Tate (P.R.S.N.S.W., vol. 31, p. 382, 1897) to a synonym of his Conus
(Leptoconus) acrotholoides (T.R.S.S.A., vol. 13, p. 199, 1890); from
my own specimens this seems fully justified.

Conus deperditus Suter, 1917:—Conospira suteri (Cossmann, 1918).

When I altered this to Conospira fracta n. n. (Proc. Mal. Soc.
Lond., vol. 16, pt. 2, p. 105, 1924) on account of preoccupation by
Brugiére (Encycl. Meth., p. 691, 1798), I was unaware that in the
Rev. Crit. de Palézool. (1918, No. 4, p. 113) Cossmann had already
renamed the New Zealand shell Conus suteri, on account of prior use of
the name deperditus by Lamarck (Ann. Mus., vol. 1, p. 387, 1802)
who, however, is referring to Brugiére's shell, and not to a new
species. Conospira suteri (Cossmann, 1918) will thus supplant C.
fracta Finlay, 1924.

Conus fasciatus Martin, 1884:—Leptoconus jocus n. n.
(S.G.R.M.L., Ser. 1, Bd. 3, p. 50.)

Vredenburg has recently reported this as a fossil from north-west
India (Mem. Geol. Surv. India, vol. 50, pt. 1, p. 74, 1925), but the
name has been proposed for several different species of Conus before
Martin thought of it. Tryon (Man. Conch., vol. 6, pp. 32, 51) places
Kiener's Conus fasciatus, 1848 (Ceq. Viv., p. 311) under C. lignarius
Reeve, and A. Adams' shell of the same name (Proc. Zool. Soc., 1853,
p. 119) as a synonym of C. bifasciatus Sow., but both these proposals
are antedated by Conus fasciatus Meuschen, 1787 (Mus. Gevers., p.
354).

Conus (Leptoconus) lyratus Marshall, 1918.—Conospira marshalli n. n.
(T.N.Z.I., vol. 50, p. 270.)

and Conch. Icon., vol. 1,—Conus no. 268). It is questionable whether
this species is really distinct from C. armoricus Suter (N.Z. Geol.
Surv. Pal. Bul. No. 5, p. 61, 1917), described from the same locality,
but as Marshall records both species, neither of which I have seen, I
leave them as distinct.

Conus ornatus Hutton, 1873:—Conospira huttoni (Tate, 1890).
(Cat. Tert. Moll., p. 10.)

I have dealt with this elsewhere (Proc. Mal. Soc. Lond., vol. 16,
pt. 2, p. 105), showing that ornatus Hutt.—trailli Hutt., and that
both names were preoccupied. My substitute Conospira bimutata,
however, must fall before C. huttoni Tate, proposed amongst some
remarks on an Australian Tertiary species for C. trailli Hutt., non
Adams. The full synonymy stands as follows:—
Conospira huttoni (Tate, 1890).

(incorrect type for Conospira).

Conus ornatus Maury, 1919 (Bull. Amer. Pal., vol. 5, p. 206), invalidated by both Hutton’s and Michelotti’s names, may take the new name Conus mauryi n. n.

Conus parvus Pease, 1868: — Lovellona peaseana n. n.
(Am. Journ. Conch., vol. 4, p. 126.)

Pease proposed this as a new name for Conus fusiformis Pease, 1860 preoccupied, and Iredale has compared the species with Hedley’s Conus micrurus (Rec. Austr. Mus., vol. 8, p. 147, 1912), described from Queensland, noting that both species belong to his new genus Lovellona (Proc. Mal. Soc. Lond., vol. 12, pt. 6, p. 329, 1917) proposed for Conus atramentosus Reeve. As the specific name cannot be maintained, on account of Conus parvus Lea, 1833 (Contrib. to Geol. Alabama) I rename the species as above.

Terebra bicincta Martin, 1879: — Terebra martini Vredenburg, 1925.
(Die Tertiars. auf Java, p. 33.)


Terebra costata Hutton, 1885.
(T.N.Z.I., vol. 17, p. 315.)

Borson in 1823, and Lea ten years later (Contrib. to Geol. Alabama, p. 166, 1833) have both used this name. It does not seem wise, however, to rename Hutton’s species at present; it appears inseparable from the Recent T. tristis Deshayes, and Hutton’s name may be dropped in the meantime, final judgment being suspended till the New Zealand Terebridae are revised as a group.

The names of Hutton, Lea, and Borson, however, are all effective in disposing of two varietal names given to Crag Terebras by Harmer: Terebra canalis var. costata (M.P.S., vol. 68, p. 53) which Harmer says is characteristic of the Belgian Crag, I rename T. canalis wouwieri n. n., while for Terebra inversa var. costata (i.e., p. 54) I propose T. inversa oakleyana n. n.
Terebra simplex Tenison-Woods, 1876:— Terebra tenisoni n. n.
(P.R.S.Tas. for 1875, p. 21.)

This combination has been used many times. Tenison-Woods proposed it for a Table Cape fossil, and Tate (T.R.S.S.A., vol. 11, p. 162, 1888) adopted the name, with the remark, ‘‘The specific name given to this fossil is preoccupied by a Californian shell described by P. Carpenter; but as that ‘is very probably a minor variety of T. variegata (Gray),’ Tryon, there is no need to apply a new designation.’’ This is, of course, illegal, and as May (P.R.S.Tas., 1918, p. 113) and Iredale (Rec. Austr. Mus., vol. 14, no. 4, p. 268, 1925) have continued the usage, I now rename the Table Cape fossil as above. Carpenter proposed his name in 1865 (Ann. Mag. Nat. Hist., ser. 3, vol. 15, p. 394), but he in turn was anticipated by Conrad, who used this name in 1830 for a Miocene fossil from Maryland; Dall has lately called attention to this, and renamed the Recent shell (U.S. Nat. Mus. Bull. 112, p. 67, 1921). Still another user of this name is Roth v. Telegd (Geol. Hung., vol. 1, p. 33, 1914); for his shell the name Terebra teleldi n. n. may be substituted.

Pupa affinis (A. Adams, 1855) (Solidula).

There are two previous proposers of the name Pupa affinis, viz., Rossmaessler, 1839 (Incones L. u. S. Mol. Europ., vol. 2, pts. 3 and 4, p. 26), and Aradas and Maggiore, 1843 (Atti. Acc. Gioenia, vol. 17, p. 88), but, as their Pupa was not the Boltenian one, and the names are not homonyms, Adams’s name is not affected by these.

Cossmann (R.C.P., 1902, No. 3, p. 160) has, however, provided the substitute Actaeon pilsbryi, on the plea of preoccupation of Adams’s name by Sowerby, 1836. But Sowerby’s shell was described as a Tornatella (Trans. Geol. Soc. Lond., vol. 2, pt. 4, p. 343, 1836), and was only referred to Actaeon by d’Orbigny (Pal. Franc. Cret., vol. 2, Gastr., p. 117, 1843); it does not clash with Pupa or Solidula, and Adams’s name must stand, Cossmann’s being relegated to synonymy. It may be noted that Cossmann, apparently overlooking his earlier action, decided later, when noting four users of the term Actaeon affinis (R.C.P., 1920, No. 2, p. 82), that caution was preferable, and that Adams’s shell and A. affinis Muller should not be renamed till their synonymy had been investigated. Second thoughts seem to have been better in this ease.

Retusa decapitata (Suter, 1909) (Tornatina):— Retusa suteri n. n.
(Proc. Mal. Soc. Lond., vol. 8, p. 256.)


Tornatina voluta (Q. & G., 1833) (Bulla):— Retusa gaimardi n. n.
(Voy. Astrol., vol. 2, p. 359.)


Haminoea ambigua (A. Adams, 1850) (Bulla):—

Haminoea arthuri n. n.
(Thes. Conch., vol. 2, p. 582.)

This species, described from New Ireland, is included in Hedley’s West Australian list (1916, p. 72), but there are two previous pro-
posals of Bulla ambiguа, viz., Gmelin, 1791 (Linn. Syst. Nat., ed. 13, p. 3431), and d'Orbigny, 1842 (Amer. Merid., Pal., p. 113).

**Atys elongata** (A. Adams, 1850) (Bulla):— *Atys extensa* n. n.

(Thes. Conch., vol. 2, p. 587.)

A parallel case to the preceding; the prior Bulla elongata being of Phillips, 1835 (Illust. Geol. Yorkshire, pt. 1, p. 102).

**Succinea aperta** Cox, 1868:— *Succinea coxi* n. n.

(Monog. Austr. Land Shells, p. 90.)


**Dentalium huttoni** Bather, 1905:— *Dentalium batheri* n. n.

(Geol. Mag., dec. 5, vol. 2, p. 532.)

This name has already been used by T. W. Kirk, 1880 (T.N.Z.J., vol. 12, p. 306) for a New Zealand Recent shell.

**Dentalium solidum** Hutton, 1873.

(Cat. Tert. Moll., p. 2.)

In *N.Z. Geol. Surv. Pal. Bull. No. 8*, p. 3, footnote, 1922, it is noted that there is also a Dentalium solidum Verrill, the date of publication of which was unknown to the writers. It dates from 1884 (Trans. Conn. Acad., vol. 6, p. 215), and so is invalidated by Hutton's name, but as Dall (Bull. Mus. Comp. Zool., vol. 12, no. 6, p. 422, 1886) has indicated that it is a synonym of *D. candidum* Jeffreys, no change need be made.

**Cadulus compressus** (Martin, 1886) (Dentalium):— *Cadulus martini* n. n.

(S.G.R.M.L., ser. 1, bd. 3, p. 189.)


**Cadulus laevis** (Brazier, 1877) (Dentalium):— *Cadulus brazieri* n. n.

(P.L.S.N.S.W., vol. 2, p. 59.)

Not Dentalium laeve Turton, 1819 (Conch Dict., p. 256), nor D. laevis Schlotheim, 1820 (Die Petrefackten), nor D. laevis Hutton, 1873 (Cat. Tert. Moll., p. 2), which Pilsbry and Sharp (Man. Conch., vol. 17, p. 211, 1897) have renamed *D. pareoraensis*. Brazier's shell was described as Dentalium laeve from North Australia, and appears in Hedley's Queensland list (1909, p. 371).

**Nucula arcaeformis** Chapman, 1908:— *Nucula chapmani* Cossmann, 1920.

(Mem. Nat. Mus., No. 2, p. 30.)

Renamed by Cossmann (R.C.P., 1920, No. 1, p. 38) on account of prior use of the name by Philippi, 1887, for a Cretaceous Chilian shell.

**Nucula acuta** Sowerby, 1840.


This English Cretaceous species is mentioned merely to note that both Wood (M.P.S., vol. 58, p. 167) and Wheelton Hind (id. vol. 51,
Nucula simplex A. Adams, 1856.


Hedley (P.L.S.N.S.W., vol. 38, pt. 2, p. 263, 1913) once concluded that simplex, strangei A.Ad., and antipodum Hanley were synonyms, and that the first named should be used on the score of priority. Long ago, however, Stoliczka (Pal Indica, vol. 3, p. 326, 1871), when recording a Nucula simplex Deshayes, 1842 (Mem. Soc. Geol. de France, vol. 5, p. 7), wrote, "Non simplex A.Ad., 1856, a recent shell, the name of which must be changed." However, this does not now seem necessary, for N. obliqua Lamk. is now used as the earliest name for the Australian shell, and there are plenty of synonyms—antipodum Hanley, 1860, tumida Ten.-Woods, 1877 (non Hinds, nec Philippi), grayi Ten.-Woods, 1877, dulecta Smith, 1891, and tenisoni Pritchard, 1896; though some of these are for fossils, which may later prove trimonially separable. The New Zealand N. strangei A.Ad. is now regarded as distinct from the Australian shells.

Nucula truncata Moore, 1870.


This combination has been even more favoured than Terebra simplex. Brown proposed the name in 1827 (Ill. Conch. Gt. Brit., pl. 25, f. 19) and Searles Wood has used his name as Leda truncata (Brown) (Mem. Crag Moll. p. 94, 1848) while Dall (Proc. Cal. Acad. Sci., 1874) refers to it as Yoldia truncata. Nilsson, however, in the same year also proposed a Nucula truncata (Petref. Suec., p. 16, 1877); I do not know which has priority. Gabb then used the name in 1864 (Pal. Calif., vol. 1, p. 198); his shell is referable to Acila, and as such is recorded, e.g., by Packard (Bull. Dept. Geol. Univ. Cal. vol. 9, no. 12, 1916); I now rename it Acila demessa n. n. Then comes Moore's name, as given above; Etheridge jr. (Mem. Roy. Soc. S.A., vol. 2, pt. 1, p. 24) records both this species and N. cooperi Moore (Quart. Journ. Geol. Soc., vol. 26, p. 254, 1870) from the Cretaceous of the Lake Eyre Basin, but expresses doubt as to their distinction, saying, "The brevity of Moore's descriptions has rendered it almost impossible to recognise some of his species, this amongst the number"; as the name truncata cannot be maintained, it may therefore be dropped altogether in the meantime, and N. cooperi Moore used to cover all such forms, pending future decision on the distinctness of his species. The last user of the name seems to be Muller, 1898 for a species from the lower Senonian of Brunswick; this was renamed N. mulleri by Cossmann (R.C.P., vol. 7, 1903, No. 3, p. 142) on account of Moore's use.
Nuculana alata (Martin, 1887) (Crassatella):—

Nuculana martini n. n.

(S.G.E.M.L., Bd. 3, p. 228.)

Leda apiculata Tate, 1886:—

Nuculana chapmani Finlay, 1924.

(T.R.S.S.A., vol. 8, p. 131.)

On the ground of preoccupation by Nucula apiculata J. de C. Sow., I renamed this Nuculana chapmani (Proc. Mal. Soc. Lond., vol. 16, pt. 2, p. 107). Some modern writers retain Sowerby's shell in Nucula, but there is also a Nucula apiculata Reuss, 1844 (Geogn. Skizz Boehmen, vol. 2, p. 191), which is allowed to be a Nuculana. Dennant and Kitson (Rec. Geol. Surv. Vict., vol. 1, pt. 2, p. 122, 1903) state that Leda acuticauda Pritchard, described from the Balcombian clays of Mornington, is probably a synonym of L. apiculata Tate, in which case this name would claim preference. But Pritchard amply distinguished his shell from Tate's at the time of description, and from examination of my own specimens, I can affirm that the two are very distinct, apiculata being larger, with different shape, and much coarser ornament. It must bear my name chapmani, and as Tate gave several localities, but designated none as typical, and as the species has therefore been given an extensive and quite erroneous range by later writers, I now nominate the Turritella-clays of the lower Aldinga beds (Aldingan stage—Eocene) as type locality. N. chapmani does not occur at Balcombe Bay (nor probably in the Balcombian at all), being represented by N. acuticauda Pritch. and a variety of it.

Malletia elongata Marshall, 1917.

(T.N.Z.I., vol. 49, p. 458.)

Etheridge jr. (Mem. Roy. Soc. S.A., vol. 2, pt. 1, p. 26, 1902) has referred Leda elongata Etheridge senr. to Malletia, and this would clash with Marshall's name; but fortunately we are able to conserve the latter, as Nuculanas had been described before under the name elongata. Sowerby's Nucula elongata (Proc. Zool. Soc., 1832, p. 197) is the type of the group, Adriana, while Dandin and Valenciennes both described Nuculanas under the name Nucula elongata. Etheridge has noted Sowerby's use (Geol. Surv. Qnsld. Bull. 13, p. 26, 1901), but proposed no new name; this was fortunate, since he decided later that his Nuculana (?) Yoldia) randsi (Geol. Pal. Qnsld., etc., p. 566, 1892) was a synonym. Neilio randsi (Eth. fil.) will therefore become the correct name for the Australian Cretaceous fossil, leaving Neilio elongata (Marshall) secure; the reference of both species to Neilio A. Ad., rather than to Malletia Desmoulins seems necessary (vide Marwick, Trans. N.Z. Inst., vol. 56, p. 329, 1926).

Anomia undata Hutton, 1885.

(T.N.Z.I., vol. 17, p. 324.)

The name Anomia undata also appears in Brown's Illust. Rec. Conch. Gt. Brit., 2nd edit., p. 267; expl. to Pl. 59, f. 14, but as it is obviously a misprint for the well known Anomia undulata of Gmelin, 1791, it can hardly be regarded as upsetting Hutton's later name.
Arca clathrata Reeves, 1844.  
(Conch. Icon., vol. 2—Arca No. 48.)

Noeling (Pal. Indica. N.S., vol. 1, No. 3, p. 134, footnote, 1901) has already pointed out that Reeves's name is antedated by Arca clathrata De France, 1816 (Dict. Sci. Nat., ed. 2, vol. 2, Suppl., p. 115), so that another name must be sought, but as the Philippine species is a doubtful one, the matter may be left over. Lamarck also described an Arca under this name (Anim. s. Vert., vol. 6, pt. 1, p. 46, 1819), which writers have referred to De France's species. Byssolarca clathrata M'Coy, 1844 (Syn. Carb. Foss. Ireland, p. 73) is an unsatisfactory form; Hind (M.P.S., vol. 51, p. 153, 1897) states that the type is lost, and the species probably a synonym of Parallelopodon reticulatus (M'Coy). One other user of the name is Leckenby, 1858 (Quart. Journ. Geol. Soc., vol. 15, p. 15), but his Arca clathrata is stated (Ann. de Pal., Tome 8, fasc. 2, p. 153, 1913) to be practically identical with Arca euryta d'Orb. (Prod. Pal., no. 272, p. 311).

Cucullaea minuta Johnston, 1880.  
(P.R.S.A., for 1879, p. 40.)

Tate, when describing Lienea transennia (T.R.S.S.A., vol. 8, p. 119, 1886) placed Johnston's shell doubtfully as equivalent. Were this so, Johnston's name should claim usage, but there is considerable diversity of opinion as to what this unfigured Table Cape shell really is. Iredale (P.L.S.N.S.W., vol. 49, pt. 3, p. 186, 1924) refers to it when treating of Bathyarca, but decides that it looks more like a Limopsis, and this seems the most reasonable interpretation of the diagnosis. May, however, when criticising the Johnston types (P.R.S.S.A., 1918, p. 73), wrote of this form, 'Type crushed; probably a young shell. I advise its abandonment also.' Fortunately we are relieved from argument on this point, as there is an item that will dispose of the whole matter, and that is the proposition of a Cucullaea minuta Sowerby long anterior to Johnston's (Min. Conch., vol. 5, p. 68, 1824).

Pectunculus globosus Hutton, 1873:—Glycimeris huttoni Marwick, 1923.  
(Cat. Tert. Moll., p. 28.)


Glycimeris halli var. intermedia Pritchard, 1903:—G. hallii mistio n. n.  
(P.R.S. Vict., vol. 15, N.S., pt. 2, p. 90.)

Chapman and Singleton (P.R.S. Vict., vol. 37, N.S. pt. 1, p. 41, 1925) have lately recorded this form in their revision of the Australian fossil species, but there is a prior Pectunculus intermedius Broderip, 1832 (Proc. Soc. Zool. Soc., 1832, p. 126). Both are true Glycimeris, i.e., have obscurely-defined primary ribs over-run by numerous well-developed secondary striations, a subovate form, narrow hinge-line, etc., so Pritchard's varietal name needs alteration.
Axinacea orbicularis Martin, 1887:—Glycimeris martini n. n. (S.G.R.M.L., ser. 1, Bd. 3, p. 234.)

This again is a true Glycimeris, and the name is therefore invalidated by Glycimeris orbicularis Da Costa, 1778 (Brit. Conch., p. 168). Had Martin’s species belonged to the group having broad, strong, non-striated ribs, his specific name would still have had to be rejected, as Pectunculus orbicularis Angas, 1879 (Proc. Zool. Soc. Lond., 1879, p. 420) is a member of this series; Australian writers regard it as a synonym of P. flabellatus Ten.-Woods, the latest to do so. Iredale (P.L.S.N.S.W., vol. 49, pt. 3, p. 189, 1924).

A nomenclatural decision given on an English Cretaceous species must be reversed. Woods (M.P.S. vol. 53, p. 55, 1899) placed Pectunculus obliquus Keeping, 1883 (Foss. etc. Neoc. Upware & Brickhill, p. 116) in Cucullaea (Dicranodonta), with the remark, “The specific name given by Keeping is preoccupied as shown above, but since the species is now removed from Pectunculus, the specific name can be retained.” This is against present-day rules, and as Woods indicates no synonyms, Keeping’s shell may be renamed Cucullaea keepingi n. n. His specific name had been proposed at least four times before he used it, viz., Defrance, 1826 (Dict. Sci. Nat., vol. 39, p. 224); Lea, 1833 (Contrib. to Geol., p. 78); Munster, 1835 (Neue Jahrb fur Min., etc., p. 438); and Reeve, 1843 (Conch. Icon., vol. 1—Pectunculus No. 33), the last species being now considered a synonym of G. striatularis Lamk.

Exactly the same remarks apply to Cucullaea obesa (Pietet & Roux) 1852 (Arca), which Woods (l.c., p. 61) records without synonymy, though preoccupied by Arca obesa Sow., 1833.

Mytilus inflatus Moore, 1870:—

Mytilus linguloides Huddleston, 1884.


Not M. inflatus Muller, 1849 (Amt. Ber. Vers. deutsch Nat. u. Aestete for 1847). Jack and Etheridge jr. (Geol. Pal. Qnsld & N. Guinea, p. 467, 1892) remark that, “The specific name of this species was preoccupied by Muller before it was made use of by Mr. Moore, but the species described by the former is referable to another pre-existing species, wherefore the name ascribed by Mr. Moore to the Australian shell will probably stand.” This is, of course, contrary to present rules, and Cossmann has accordingly renamed Moore’s species M. moorei n. n. (R.C.P., vol. 11, 1907, no. 3, p. 201). Etheridge jr., however, had already stated (Mem. Roy. Soc. S.A., vol. 2, pt. 1, p. 18, 1902) that Modiola linguloides Huddleston, 1884 (Geol. Mag., no. 1, pt. 3, p. 341) was a synonym, and as this course has been generally followed by Australian writers, Huddleston’s name should come into use, Cossmann’s being unnecessary.

Musculus elongatus (Hutton, 1873) (Crenella).

(Cat. Tert. Moll., p. 25.)

This proposal will invalidate Crenella elongata Stanton, 1920 (U.S. Geol. Surv., Prof. Pap. no. 128 p. 25), which may therefore take the new name Crenella stantoni n. n.
Genus *Pachydomella* Etheridge fil., 1907:— Genus *Barcoona* n. n.  
*(Rec. Austr. Mus.,* vol. 6, no. 5, p. 325.)*

Proposed for an edentulous Queensland bivalve, the type and sole species being *P. chutes* n. sp. The name is preoccupied by Ulrich, 1891 for a Silurian Ostrocod (*Journ. Cincinn. Soc.*, vol. 13, p. 198), so I rename the Australian genus as above (from the Barcoo River, the approximate locality).

**Pecten costato-striatus** Marshall, 1918.

*(T.N.Z.I.,* vol. 50, p. 273.)*


**Pecten deformis** Tate, 1887:— *Hinnites tatei* Cossmann, 1907.  
*(T.R.S.S.A.,* vol. 9, p. 185.)*

Stating that Gabb had used this name in 1864, Cossmann (*R.C.P.* vol. 11, 1907, no. 3, p. 201) renamed Tate’s shell as above. This makes three described species of *Hinnites* from the Australian Tertiaries, viz., *H. corioensis* McCoy, 1879 (*Prod. Pal. Vict.*, Dec. 6, pl. 58), from Corio Bay (Janjukan); the present species, from the Upper Beds of Muddy Creek (Kalimnan); and *H. muldertii* Chapman, 1922 (*P.P.S. Vict.*, vol. 35, N.S., pt. 1, p. 5), from the Batesford limestone (Janjukan).

**Pecten (Camptonectes) hectori** Woods, 1917:— *Camptonectes selwynensis* n. n.  

Woods was forestalled in his compliment to Sir James Hector by Hutton, who had already proposed a *Pecten hectori* in 1873 (*Cat. Tert. Moll.*, p. 30). His shell was identified by Suter as *Pecten yahlnensis* Ten.-Woods, but Marwick (*Rep. Austr. Ass. Adv. Sci.*, vol. 16, p. 326, 1924), in dissenting from this conclusion, has revived Hutton’s name, noting that the species is apparently restricted to the Chatham Islands.

**Pecten pulchellus** Reeve, 1853:— *Chlamys moretonicus* n. n.  
*(Conch. Icon. vol. 8—Pecten no. 142.)*

Described from Moreton Bay, Australia, and included by Hedley in his Queensland list (1909, p. 345). The specific name, however, had been previously used by Nilsson in 1827 (*Petref. Suecana*, p. 22).

**Pecten sectus** Hutton, 1873:— *Pecten wollastoni* n. n.  
*(Cat. Tert. Moll.,* p. 30.)*


**Pecten semiplicatus** Hutton, 1873:— *Pallium mariae* n. n.  
*(Cat. Tert. Moll.,* p. 30.)*

Not of Alth, in Favre, 1869 (*Moll. foss. de Lemberg*, p. 150).
Pecten undulatus Sowerby, 1842:—Chlamys anguineus n. n.
(Thes. Conch., vol. 1, Pecten, p. 60.)

Iredale has recently added this species to the New South Wales fauna from a valve dredged at Twofold Bay, and recorded its distinctness from tasmanicus Ang. The trivial name must be altered, however, as there is a prior Pecten undulatus Nilsson, 1827 (Petref. Suecana, p. 21), which name was later used by d'Orbigny, 1845 (in Murchison, de Vern. de Keys. Geol. Russ. d'Europe, vol. 2, p. 490) for a shell now placed by Woods (M.P.S., vol. 56, p. 175, 1902) as a synonym of Chlamys cretosus Debr., 1822. McCoy's Pecten undulatus (Synops. Carb. Foss. Ireland, p. 101, 1844) is regarded by Wheelon Hind (M.P.S., vol. 57, p. 70, 1903) as a doubtful synonym of Aviculopecten dissimilis Fleming, 1828.

Pecten zitteli Hutton, 1873.
(Cat. Tert. Moll., p. 32.)

This invalidates P. zitteli Woehrmann and Koken, 1892 (Z. geol. Ges., vol. 44, p. 173), which may be renamed Pecten scholernica n. n.

Plicatula imbricata Menke, 1843:—Plicatula menkeana n. n.
(Moll. Nov. Holl., p. 35.)

This species is recorded from the Tertiaries of Java by Martin (Pal. Kennt. von Java, p. 57, 1919) and from Queensland and West Australia by Hedley (Mar. Moll. Qnsl., p. 345, 1909; Check-List Moll. W.A., p. 9, 1916). There is, however, an earlier Plicatula imbricata Koch and Dunker, 1837 (Beitrag zu K. d. Nordd. Oolith., p. 50), so that a fresh name is needed.

Lima alata Hedley, 1898:—Lima ales n. n.
(Rec. Austr. Mus., vol. 3, no. 4, p. 84.)


Lima (Limatula) huttoni Woods, 1917:—Limatula woodsi Suter, 1922.
(N.Z. Geol. Surv. Pal. Bull No. 4, p. 27.)


Lima laevigata Hutton, 1873:—Lima levitesta n. n.
(Cat. Tert. Moll., p. 33.)


Dr. Marwick informs me that this species is in some obscurity, as the type is lost, and he has seen no authentic specimens; I had, therefore, at first decided that the name might be ignored altogether. However, Hutton gave as localities, "Waikaloa Gorge" and "Cobden," and there are in the collection of the Otago School of Mines several large
specimens from the Milburn limestone which agree perfectly with Hutton’s description. It is practically certain that these specimens are topotypes, and the species must apparently be recognized. I therefore rename it as above, and have selected and marked the most perfect of the specimens mentioned as neotype of the species.

**Ostrea incurva** Hutton, 1873:—

*Ostrea wollastonii* n. n.

(Cat. Tert. Moll., p. 35.)

Not of Nilsson, 1827 (Petref. Suecana, p. 30); a well-known European Cretaceous species.

**Pinna semicostata** Tate, 1886:—

*Atrina tateana* Hedley, 1924.

(T.R.S.S.A., vol. 8, p. 122.)


**Avicula alata** Etheridge, 1872.


This was referred to *Pseudavicula* by Etheridge jr. in 1892 (Geol. Pal. Qnsld. & New Guinea, p. 563), but in choosing a trivial name Etheridge was anticipated by Kloeden, 1884 (Verst. Mark Brandenburg, p. 198), while d’Orbigny also placed McCoy’s *Cypricardia alata* in this genus (Prodr. Paleont., vol. 1, p. 136). However, Etheridge jr. decided later (Mem. Roy. Soc. S.A., vol. 2, pt. 1, p. 11, 1902) to place the species as a synonym of Moore’s *Avicula barklyi* (Quart. Journ. Geol. Soc., vol. 26, p. 245, 1870), so no substitute need be proposed.

**Crassatella astartiformis** Tate, 1886:—

*Salapitium communis* (Harris, 1897).

(T.R.S.S.A., vol. 8, p. 147.)

Noting the preoccupation of this name by Nyst, 1847 (Bull. Ac. Roy. Brux., vol. 14, pt. 2, p. 117), Cossmann (B.C.P., vol. 17, 1913, no. 1, p. 64) proposed to substitute for it *C. tatei* n. n. But Tate and Dennant had long ago become aware of the invalidity of the name, and omitted *astartiformis* from their lists, replacing it by *Crassatella communis* (T.R.S.S.A., vol. 17, pt. 1, p. 224, 1893). It is here, however, like *Stiphonalia tatei*, a pure list-name, introduced for the first time into print, but without any definition or standing, and cannot be legally recognized as a substitute name. The first published notice that *communis* is in lieu of *astartiformis* is that of Harris (Cat. Tert. Moll. B.M., pt. 1, p. 364, 1897), who must, therefore, be credited with the rectification and the name. The only other printed statement of the equivalence of the two names seems to be by May (P.R.S. Tas., 1918, p. 104). This species is undoubtedly congenereic with *C. fulvida* Angas, the genotyope of *Salapitium* Iredale, 1924 (P.L.S.N.S.W., vol. 49, pt. 3, p. 204).

It may be mentioned that *Crassatella sowerbyi* var. *obesa* S. V. Wood 1871 (Mon. Pal. Soc., 1871, p. 169), proposed for a British Eocene species, and recorded under this name by Newton (Brit. Olig.,

**Crassatella parva** Martin, 1879:— **Salputium martini** n. n.

(Tertiars. auf. Java, p. 109.)

C. B. Adams (Panama Shells, etc.) proposed this name in 1852.

**Cardita scabrosa** Tate, 1886.

(T.R.S.S.A., vol. 8, p. 152.)

This invalidates *C. scabrosa* Noetling, 1901 (*Pal. Indica*, N.S., vol. 1, no. 3, p. 162), a Burmese Miocene species, which I now rename **Cardita fritzi** n. n.

**Venericardia ponderosa** Suter, 1913.

(T.N.Z.I., vol. 45, p. 295.)

In 1913 both Suter and Cossmann used the specific name ponderosa for a *Venericardia*, but Suter’s name has priority by about three weeks, Cossmann’s description (*Conch. Neo. de L. Aquit.*, Tome 2, livr. 1, p. 77) being published on the 1st July, while Suter’s appeared on the 9th June. The French shell may be renamed *V. jouanneti titan* n. n. Both species belong to the section *Megacardita* Sacco, 1899, characterized by very large and very inequilateral shell, large and smooth ribs which are frequently effaced, and absence of lateral dental lamellae. Suter’s shell is a magnificent species, unfortunately not at all well illustrated in the paper referred to.

**Lucina affinis** Tate, 1887:— **Lucina balcombica** Cossmann, 1912.

(T.R.S.S.A., vol. 9, p. 143.)

Not of Eichwald, 1830 (*Nat Lithuanae*, p. 206); on this account renamed by Cossmann (*R.C.P.*, vol. 16, 1912, no. 3, p. 214).

**Lucina anomala** Moore, 1870.


*L. anomala* Hoernes, 1848 (*Verz. Fossil-Reste Wien*, p. 26) is a nomen nudum and so will not affect Moore’s name. The species is the type of *Pseudavicula* Etheridge jr., 1892.

**Lucina oblonga** Hedley, 1899:— **Lucina funafutica** n. n.

(Mem. Austr. Mus., vol. 1, p. 34.)

The name for this Funafuti species is preoccupied by *L. oblonga*. Philippi, 1836 (*Enum. Moll. Sic.*, vol. 1, p. 34).

**Montacuta triqueta** Suter, 1913:— **Parvithracia suteri** n. n.

(Mem. N.Z. Moll., p. 915.)

Not of Verrill and Bush, 1898 (*Proc. U.S. Nat. Mus.*, vol. 20, p. 782). For *Parvithracia* Finlay, of which this species is the type, see earlier in this volume.
Diplodonta suborbicularis (Tate, 1887) (Saccia).
(T.R.S.S.A., vol. 9, p. 147.)

R. B. Newton (Brit. Olig. and Eocene Moll., p. 48, 1891) has recorded, as an MS. name of F. E. Edwards, the same combination for a British Eocene fossil. Tate's name having six years' precedence, the British shell will need to be renamed when it is given standing by a description or figure.

Diplodonta subquadrata Tate, 1887:—
Diplodonta balcombensis Pritchard, 1906.
(T.R.S.S.A., vol. 9, p. 147.)

This was the fourth proposal of this name. Carpenter appropriated the name in 1855 (Proc. Zool. Soc., 1855, p. 230), so Pritchard rightly renamed the Australian fossil (Vic. Naturalist, vol. 23, p. 119, 1906). D. gabbi Dall has been substituted for D. subquadrata Gabb, 1873. Lastly, Edwards proposed the same name in MS. for a British Eocene shell (see Newton, Brit. Olig. and Eocene Moll., p. 48, 1891), for which Cossman has proposed the substitute D. newtoni (R.C.P., vol. 11, 1907, No. 2, p. 118); neither name, of course, can be recognized, both being nomina nuda.

Tellina aequilatera Tate, 1887:—
Tellina balcombensis Pritchard, 1906.
(T.R.S.S.A., vol. 9, p. 166.)

Not of Koch and Dunker, 1837 (B. z. K. d. Norddeutsch Oolith., p. 30).

Tellina (Arcopagia) inconspicua Marshall, 1918:—
Pseudarcopagia (?) marshalli n. n.
(T.N.Z.I., vol. 50, p. 272.)

Stolickza (Pal. Indica, vol. 3, p. 129, 1870) has referred Sowerby's Psammobia-inconspicua (Trans. Geol. Soc. Lond., vol. 7, p. 142) to Tellina (Palaeomoea), but the acceptance of Palaeomoea as of generic rank would remove any clash here. There is, however, a species described as Tellina inconspicua by Broderip and Sowerby, 1829 (Zool. Journ., vol. 4, p. 363) which is sufficient to invalidate Marshall's name.

Tellina rotunda Martin, 1887:—
Tellina mutata n. n.
(S.G.R.M.L., ser. 1, bd. 3, p. 203.)

Not Tellina rotundata Montagu, 1803 (Test. Brit., p. 71), nor of Boettiger, 1875 (Palaeontographica, Suppl. 3, lief. 1, p. 29), nor of Sowerby, 1867. The addition of "ta" to an adjective such as rotunda does not produce a word which can be considered as a diminutive or other derivative, the two adjectives must be considered as substantially the same, and therefore conflicting with each other. In this connection, it may be noted that the following entry occurs in Woods' Monograph of the Cretaceous Lamellibranchs of England, vol. 2, pt. 3, p. 102 (in M.P.S., vol. 60, 1906):—

Woods therefore rejects *oblongata* and uses *A. elongata* d’Orb., 1844 as the name for the species. Another case is that of *Cardita planicostata* Noetling, 1901 (*Pal. Indica*, N.S., vol. 1, no. 3, p. 170) which cannot be considered a distinct name from the well-known *G. planicosta* Lamarck, 1806 (*Ann. Mus.*, vol. 7, p. 55); I therefore rename the Burmese Miocene shell *Venericardia noetlingi* n. n.

**Mactra crassa** (Hutton, 1885) *\( (\text{Hemimactra}) \) (T.N.Z.I., vol. 17, p. 322.)**

*\( Mactra crassitesta \) n. n.


**Venus pulcherrima** Martii, 1883:—

*\( \text{Chione martini} \) n. n.

*\( S.G.R.M.L., \) ser. 1, bd. 1, p. 250.*


**Chione halli** Tate, 1900:—

*\( \text{Chione roberti} \) Pritchard, 1906.


Pritchard, having previously used this name himself (*P.R.S. Vict.*, vol. 7, N.S., p. 229, 1895), renamed Tate’s species in *Vict. Naturalist*, vol. 23, p. 119, 1906.

“\*Chione multitaeniata* Tate.’”

This occurs first as a list name (*T.R.S.S.A.,* vol. 17, pt. 1, p. 225, 1893), and was apparently intended to replace *C. multilamellata* Tate, 1887 (*I.c.,* vol. 9, p. 154), for it occurs again in place of this name in *Rec. Geol. Surv. Vict.*, vol. 1, pt. 2, p. 125, 1903. It is, of course, still a *nomen nudum.*

**Cytherea tenuis** Tate, 1887:— *\( \text{Notocallista tatei} \) (Cossmann, 1920).\)

*\( T.R.S.S.A., \) vol. 9, p. 159.*


**Dosinia tumida** Marshall, 1918.

*\( T.N.Z.I., \) vol. 50, p. 271.*

Were this a true *Dosinia* it would clash with *Artemis tumida* Gray, 1838, a Queensland *Dosinia*, but Dr. Marwick shows that it does not belong here, being referable to one of his new genera of the *Antigonidae.*

**Solecurtus ellipticus** Tate, 1887:— *\( \text{Solecurtus murrayvianus} \) n. n.\)

*\( T.R.S.S.A., \) vol. 9, p. 182.*


**Corbula compressa** Verco, 1896:— *\( \text{Corbula verconis} \) n. n.\)


Transactions.

Panope angusta Hedley, 1915:—Panope hedleyi n. n.

(P.L.S.N.S.W., vol. 39, p. 705.)


Cuspidaria inflata Martin, 1886:—Cuspidaria martini n. n.

(S.G.R.M.L., ser. 1, bd. 3, p. 195.)

Bullen Newton (Brit. Olig. & Eocene Moll., p. 90, 1891) has referred Nucula inflata J. de C. Sowerby, 1827 (Min. Conch., vol. 6, p. 103) to Neaera, and later to Cuspidaria (Addenda, l.c., p. 295). This would interfere with Neaera inflata Jeffreys, 1882 (Proc. Zool. Soc., 1881, p. 942), but it is better to drop Jeffrey’s name altogether than to supply a substitute, for Dall has shown (Bull. Mus. Comp. Zool., vol. 12, no. 6, p. 301, 1886) that it covers several species, all of which had apparently been previously described. Both Jeffrey’s and Sowerby’s proposals, however, will render a substitute name necessary for the Javan fossil.

In passing, it may be noted that Edward’s MS. name Neaera lamellosa, also listed by Newton, cannot be validated on account of the prior Cuspidaria lamellosa Sars.

BRACHIOPODA.


(Geol. Mag., N.S., Dec. 6, vol. 2, no. 615, p. 389.)

This is preoccupied, as Aethia, by Huebner, 1826 (Verz. bekannt. Schmett., p. 346), and by Merrem, 1788 (Tent. Nat. Syst. Av., p. 7). Cossmann has noticed Huebner’s use (though he wrongly gives the date as 1816), and has provided as a substitute Thomsonica n. n. (R.C.P., vol. 24, 1920, no. 8, p. 137.)

Genus Clavigera Thomson, 1913.


This has been productive of some argument, and the matter is by no means settled yet. Originally proposed as a genus caelebs by Hector, the name was first validated by Thomson at the reference above given. Trechmann (Quart. Journ. Geol. Soc., vol. 73, p. 216, 1918) rejects the name, saying, “I have considered it advisable to rename this group, and have called it Hectoria. Hector’s description was published without any illustrations, and his subgeneric name closely resembles that of Claviger, given to a group of the Melaniads.” Thomson (Geol. Mag., Dec. 6, vol. 6, no. 663, pp. 411, 412, 1919) reopened the discussion, and, quoting Buckmann’s acceptance of Cryptoporaria and Cryptoporaria as distinct generic names, argued for the retention of Clavigera Thomson vice Hectoria Trechmann. This will not hold. Under the international rules, masculine, feminine, and neuter endings to a generic name are considered equivalent and interchangeable. The only exception to this rule—acquiresed in and practised for long past by Cossmann, Dall, Hedley, Iredale, etc.—is the case where such endings signify words of different meaning, e.g., Clava Martyn, 1784 (a club), and Clavus Montfort, 1810 (a nail);
while Clavis (a key) would also stand as distinct. There is no such distinction, however, in the terminations "ger," "gera," and "gerum," and, in the absence of statement as to what meaning was intended by the stem "clav," anyone who wishes to abide by the rules must admit the equivalence of Clavigera and Claviger. That being the case, Thomson's name is antedated by Agassiz, 1846 (Nomen. Zool. Index Univ.; emend for Clavifer Laporte, 1835), for a beetle; Haldeman, 1842 (Amer. J. Sci., vol. 42, pt. 1, p. 216), for a Gasteropod—the Melania group mentioned by Trechmann; and Preyssler, 1790 (Verz. Bohm. Ins., p. 68), for another beetle. Rovereto (Atti. Soc. Igust di Sc. natur. e geogr., vol. 10, 1899) has already called attention to the preoccupation in the case of Haldeman's name, and provided the substitute Hemipirena. Hectoria Trechmann must, therefore, be considered as correctly substituted for Clavigera Thomson. Unfortunately, it must itself be also rejected, as Hectoria had been used earlier for a locust by Tepper (T.R.S.S.A., vol. 12, p. 21, 1890). I therefore now supply Hectoria n. n. for Hectoria Trechmann, of which Thomson (Geol. Mag., N.S., Dec. 6, vol. 6, p. 412, 1919) has selected as the genolectotype Hectoria cuneiformis Trechmann, 1918 = Clavigera cuneiformis Thomson, 1913. I apply Hectoria at present as also covering Clavigera bisulcata Thomson, the genolectotype of his Clavigera; should, as he suggests, any subsequent author consider that these are not congeneric, a new genus will be necessary for the latter.

Dielasma sacculum var. amygdala (Dana, 1847) (Terebratula):—

D. sacculum bensoni n. n.

(Amer. Journ. Sci., vol. 2, no. 4, p. 152.)

Dun and Benson have included this in their "Census of the Lower Burindi Fauna" (Mem. Geol. Surv. N.S.W., vol. 10, p. 37, 1921), but the combination Terebratula amygdala had been previously used by Catullo, 1846 (Giorn. di Fisica, vol. 2, no. 5, p. 90), so I rename the species as above.

Terebratulina cancellata (Kuster, 1843) (Terebratula):—

Terebratulina hedleyi n. n.

(Conch. Cab., vol. 7, p. 35, as of Koch, Ms.)

This well-known species (which, though generally referred to Koch, should be credited to Kuster) is recorded from South Australia by Veree (T.R.S.S.A., vol. 34, p. 95, 1910), from Tasmania by May (Check-List Moll. Tas., p. 106, 1921), and from New South Wales by Hedley (Check-List Mar. Moll. N.S.W., p. 113, 1918), but apparently the name must go, as there is a prior Terebratula cancellata Eichwald, 1829 (Zool. Spec., vol. 1, p. 276). It is curious that only this name, and not Koch's, is recorded by Sherborn (Index Anim., 2, pt. 5, p. 1034, 1924). For T. cancellata Kuster I therefore propose Terebratulina hedleyi n. n.