

This is *not* the *Natica mahesiensis*, Dufo, Ann. Sc. Nat., ser. 2 (1840), vol. xiv. p. 193, nor (?) of Philippi, Conch. Cab. (ed. Küster), p. 121, sp. 142, pl. xvii. fig. 7. Did Reeve mean to reproduce Dufo's species, which, as well as Reeve's, comes from the little island of Mahé, one of the Seychelles, in the Indian Ocean? The resemblance of the name would seem to imply that he did. It is evident he did not consult Philippi's monograph, published in 1852, three years before his own. Where then did he get the name? He quotes it from "Recluz MS., Mus. Cuming," and seems to have copied, with addition, the error Recluz had made in spelling.

The three specimens bearing the name "*N. Mahesense*" (*sic*) on the back of the tablet are in the British Museum, and answer perfectly to Reeve's figures. These constitute the types of the species, and it is with them the Challenger specimen agrees. The name as pre-occupied by Dufo has necessarily been changed.

I have not quoted v. Martens, Moll. Mauritius, &c., p. 276, because he seems to have mixed up Recluz's and Dufo's species.

7. *Natica variabilis*, Recluz.

Natica variabilis, Recluz MS.

" " Reeve, Conch. Icon., vol. ix. pl. xxiii. fig. 104.

" *labrella* (not of Lamarck), Philippi, Conch. Cab. (ed. Küster), pl. xi. fig. 3 (not the description p. 68, nor pl. xi. fig. 17, nor pl. xix. fig. 1).

" *marmorata*, H. Adams, Proc. Zool. Soc. Lond., 1869, p. 274, pl. xix. fig. 8.

" *variabilis*, Sowerby, Thes. Conch., pts. 39, 40, p. 95, sp. 123 (ix. *Gen.*), pl. cccclxii. fig. 135.

" *marmorata*, Gwyn Jeffreys, Moll. "Lightning" and "Porcupine," Proc. Zool. Soc. Lond., 1885, p. 36, sp. 18.

Station 75. July 2, 1873. Lat. 38° 38' N., long. 28° 28' 30" W. Fayal, Azores. 450 fathoms. Volcanic mud.

Habitat.—(?) (Reeve), Canaries (H. Adams, and Rev. R. T. Lowe's dredgings), Madeira (Watson).

I suppose that this is one of the species covered by Linne's name of *Natica glaucina*. Mr Hanley admirably describes it at p. 394 of his *Ipsa Linn. Conch.* Philippi (pl. xi. fig. 3) figures and (at p. 68 of his Monograph) refers to a species which I have no doubt is the *Natica variabilis*, Recl., but he considers it a var. of *Natica labrella*, Lam., which he also describes (p. 68, sp. 79) and figures (pl. xi. fig. 17, and pl. xix. fig. 1). These latter figures and the description agree perfectly with Lamarck's description (*Anim. s. vert.*, vol. vi. 2 p. 201, and ed. Desh. vol. viii. p. 639, sp. 17), and with Delessert's figure (pl. xxxii. fig. 12), from which indeed Philippi says he took his figure, but belong evidently to a species distinct from the *Natica variabilis*, Recl., and to this conclusion Philippi himself came, for, at p. 133, he says that Delessert's fig. and his own represent *Natica gambiæ*, Recl., Proc. Zool. Soc. Lond., 1843, p. 207, which must therefore be reckoned as a mere synonym for *Natica labrella*, Lam., and he adds: "Dagegen sind mir jetzt sehr grosse Bedenken aufgestiegen, ob die Tafel xi. fig. 3, abgebildete Form wirklich zu *Natica labrella* gehört und nicht viel mehr eine eigne Art bildet. Leider erlaubt mir meine nahe bevorstehende Abreise nach Südamerika nicht, diese Frage weiter zu untersuchen." As I have said, I have no doubt that the species to which Philippi's