

5. *Ranella (Lampas) thomæ*, d'Orbigny.

- Ranella thomæ*, d'Orbigny, Moll. Cuba, vol. ii. p. 164, pl. xxiii. fig. 23 (not 24).
 „ „ Fischer, Coq. Guadeloupe, Revue coloniale, 1858, p. 8, sp. 2.
 „ „ Kobelt, Jahrb. malak. Gesellsch., 1876, p. 327, sp. 2.
 „ *cruentata*, var., Tryon, Manual, vol. iii. p. 40, pl. xxi. fig. 25.

February 1873. Rocks off Santa Cruz, Tenerife.

Habitat.—St Thomas, West Indies (d'Orbigny), Madeira (Watson).

D'Orbigny (*loc. cit.*) says, “Cette belle espèce a été pêchée par une grande profondeur près de l'île Saint-Thomas.” His figure has character, but is inaccurately drawn. His type-specimen in the British Museum, though a young and rubbed shell, is unmistakably the same as the Tenerife species of the Challenger. I have dredged it living in Madeira at three different places under 50 fathoms, and there are in the British Museum two unnamed specimens brought by MacGillivray from the Cape Verde Islands which are certainly this species. Have any other specimens been found in the West Indies, or was d'Orbigny's specimen accidentally introduced in ballast or through fraud of some collector? He does not speak as if he had got more than one specimen. That is the one preserved in the British Museum, and it was a dead shell. I have quoted Dr Fischer's Guadeloupe list, but I understand him to mean merely that d'Orbigny had got it in the Lesser Antilles. It is very like the Philippine species *Ranella rhodostoma*, Beck, but that is a hunchier shell, having a lower and less scalar spire, and being shorter and more tumid at the base; the columella is shorter, and instead of being straight, as in *Ranella thomæ*, is strongly curved to the right; the anterior canal, in spite of the thicker lip, is shorter and less projecting. The resemblance which at first sight strikes one as strong utterly disappears on closer study and the examination of additional specimens. Mr Tryon says “they do not differ at all from Philippine and Mauritian specimens;” and this opinion I fear so able a judge as Mörch must have to some extent indorsed, but I have failed to find the reference given by v. Martens in the Meeresfauna der Insel Mauritius, &c., Moll., p. 268 (Mörch, Mal. Blätt., 1877). But, whoever has held the opinion, it is a mistaken one, as any one capable of recognising differences will not fail to see when once his attention has been directed to the subject.

6. *Ranella (Argobuccinum) argus* (Gmelin).

- Chemnitz, Conch. Cab., vol. iv. p. 75, pl. cxxvii. fig. 1223.
Murex argus, Gmelin, Syst. Nat., p. 3547, No. 78.
 „ „ Dillwyn, Cat., vol. ii. p. 694, sp. 26.
 „ „ Wood, Ind. Test., p. 127, pl. xxv. fig. 27.
Ranella argus, Lamarck, Anim. s. vert., vol. vii. p. 151, and (ed. Desh.) vol. ix. p. 543, sp. 4, and
Ranella vexillum, p. 553, sp. 20.
 „ (*Triton*) *ranelliformis*, King, Zool. Journ., 1832, vol. v. p. 347.
 „ *argus*, Deshayes, Encycl. méthod., vers, vol. iii. p. 878, sp. 3, pl. ccccxiv. fig. 3.
 „ „ Kiener, Iconog., p. 31, sp. 23, pl. viii. fig. 1.
 „ *vexillum*, Sowerby, Conch. Ill. (*Ranella*), pl. i. fig. 3.
 „ *Kingii*, d'Orbigny, Amérique mérid., vol. v. p. 451.
 „ *argus*, Reeve, Conch. Icon., vol. ii. pl. iii. fig. 12, and *Ranella vexillum*, fig. 13.
 „ „ Krauss, Südafrik. Moll., p. 113, sp. 1.