

above all, he mentions the fact that Gray gives no locality for his species. Had Gray stated that it came from Japan, Lischke would probably have felt his other difficulties vanish. I need hardly discuss minutely Weinkauff's somewhat confused note (*loc. cit. supra*). He seems to find Philippi (Abb. und Besch., *loc. cit.*) not quite satisfactory, and for that reason suppresses the species of Gray (!).

In regard to Gray's species, which I had examined in the British Museum, I wrote to Mr E. A. Smith, who is always as obliging as he is accurate. My object was to learn whether the shells in the British Museum are the type of the species. Mr Smith replies:—"We have Gray's type of *Litorina granularis*. It is in his own private collection, which he gave to the museum. Reeve has figured a youngish specimen, Conch. Icon., fig. 68 a, b." He then goes on to say that it is the adult of this species which Reeve has figured as *Litorina nodosa*, fig. 13 (the true *Litorina nodosa*, Gray, being quite different; see Philippi, Abb. und Besch., vol. ii. p. 160, pl. xxxiii. of the volume, iii. of the genus, figs. 6, 7), and adds that Philippi (vol. iii. p. 63, pl. xv. of the volume, vii. of the genus, fig. 7) gives a figure (not a good one) of the true *Litorina granularis*, Gray.

9. *Litorina (Hamus) nodulosa*, d'Orbigny.

Chemnitz, Conch. Cab., vol. v. p. 42, pl. clxiii. fig. 1546 (not 1545).

Litorina nodulosa, d'Orbigny, Moll. Cuba, vol. i. p. 205, pl. xiv. figs. 11-14.

September 1, 1873. St Michael's Rocks, Fernando-Noronha. Shore.

Habitat.—West Indies (d'Orbigny).

I have adhered simply to the name as given in the British Museum to the species with which the Challenger specimens agree. The only difference these offer is that the basal spirals have a feeble tendency to become tuberculated beyond what I could find in the British Museum shells, but this is always a variable feature in the nodulous *Litorinas*, and the figure in d'Orbigny exhibits a tubercled base, though he does not refer in the text to this characteristic. In order to escape the confusion which surrounds this species, and which seems only to be increased by each fresh attempt to clear it up, I have not quoted other authorities above, but subjoin here such as I suppose to refer to this species. In quoting the Conch. Cab. above, I have excluded fig. 1545, because it is obvious that Chemnitz united two species; one obtained "durch die Cookischen Seereisen aus den Südländern," and another "die kleinere," which, he says, is frequent in the West Indies. Between the figures size will not serve to distinguish, for they are equal in this respect, but of the two fig. 1546 is a very fair representation of the West Indian species of d'Orbigny. Dillwyn (vol. ii. p. 826, No. 26, *Turbo trochiformis*), refers apparently to Captain Cook's species, for he attributes it to the Southern Ocean. Gmelin (p. 3582, No. 98) had seemingly done the same. Wood (Ind. Test., p. 150, pl. xxx. fig. 25, *Turbo trochiformis*) intended, I suppose, his figure to represent the West Indian species, as that is the habitat he assigns it. What species Deshayes had before him I am not able to say (see Lamarck, Anim. s. vert., ed. Desh., vol. ix. p. 205, No. 4, *Litorina nodulosa*, Desh.), most probably the West Indian. Philippi (Abb. und Besch., vol. ii. p. 143, pl. ii. [of the genus, but pl. xxviii. of the vol.] figs. 12, 14, 15, *Litorina trochiformis*, Dill.) certainly represents the West Indian species of d'Orbigny. Further, a note on the back of one of the British Museum tablets expresses what is, I think, a pretty general opinion, viz., that the *Litorina dilatata*, d'Orb. (Moll. Cuba, vol. i. p. 207, pl. xiv. figs. 20-23, Philippi, Abb., &c., vol. ii. p. 145, pl. xxviii. [or *Gen.* pl. ii.] fig. 13), is also this