6. Eulimella subtilis, n. sp. (Pl. XXXIII. fig. 5).

September 7, 1874. Torres Strait. 3 to 11 fathoms.

Shell.—Small, thin, acicular, conical, with a smallish half-turned-over subdiscoidal sinistral tip, flat-sided whorls, linear suture, elongate rounded base, and a very small oval mouth. Sculpture: Longitudinals—there are pretty distinct, hair-like, very oblique lines of growth. Spirals—the whole surface is very delicately most superficially and regularly microscopically scratched. Colour glossy milky white. Spire very long, and very slightly subulate. Apex is a very little larger than the top of the spire, and consists of 2½ almost discoidal whorls, which are turned right over on their side; the first one is small, and projects a little, the following enlarge quickly. Whorls (besides those of the embryo) 7 to 8; they are rather long and narrow, hardly conical, flat on the sides, with a very slight tendency to bulge below. Suture linear, barely impressed, rather oblique. Mouth extremely small, narrowly oval, narrowed above. Outer lip very much bent in, and descending above, arched roundly pointed and patulous on the base. Inner lip defined and thickish across the body; its line becomes more curved on the short pillar, where the edge is patulous and prominent, with a minute furrow behind it. H. 0·12 in. B. 0·025. Mouth, height 0·02, breadth 0·014.

This species differs from Eulimella coacta, Wats., in general form, in the shape of the individual whorls of the apex and of the suture.

4. Mathilda, Semper, 1865.

Mathilda (Cingulina) spina (Crosse and Fischer).

Turritella spina, Crosse and Fischer, Journ. de conch., 1864, vol. xii. p. 347.

" Crosse and Fischer, Journ. de conch., 1865, vol. xiii. p. 44, pl. iii. figs. 13, 14.

Cingulina spina, Angas, South Austral. Moll., Proc. Zool. Soc. Lond., 1865, p. 169, No. 84.

" Port Jackson Moll., Additional List, Proc. Zool. Soc. Lond., 1871, p. 91, No. 24.

April 17 and 18, 1874. Port Jackson, Sydney. 2 to 10 fathoms.

Habitat.—South Australia, and Port Jackson, Sydney.

Semper's genus was not proposed when this species was described, so that its classification under Turritella was very natural. Mr Angas would call it a Cingulina. Adams' definition (Ann. and Mag., 1860, vol. vi. p. 414) of that genus omits all reference to the sinistral apex, which is its most distinctive feature. Whether Semper, in defining Mathilda (Journ. de conch., 1865, p. 328), had Adams' Cingulina in remembrance may be doubted, but his phrase, "anfractibus in speciebus typicis cingulis transversis et striis longitudinalibus reticulosis" is not so exclusively applicable to shells having the reticulated sculpture of Cerithium as to exclude shells the interstices of whose spiral bands are "sculptis," as Adams says those of Cingulina are. In these circumstances it seems better either to suppress Cingulina altogether, or to retain it merely as a subgenus of Mathilda.

¹ Fine, with the idea of exact, as if its lines had been artificially smoothed down.