MORE MOLLUSCAN NAME-CHANGES, GENERIC AND SPECIFIC.

By Tom Irkdalk.

Read 13th April, 1917.

Summary.

Volena, Bolten, type V. paradisiaca, Bolten, has priority over Melongena, Schumacher, but may be used independently.

Mayena, gen. nov., proposed for Biplex australasia, Perry.

Turrricula, Schumacher, is the correct name for Surcula, H. & A. Adams.

Gelagna, Schaufuss, is equal to and antedates Paralagena, Dall.

Partulida, Schaufuss, should replace Spiralinella, Chaster.

Campanile, Fischer, has for type the recent species Cerithium leve, Quoy & Gaimard, which is here renamed Campanile symbolicum, sp. nov.

Campanilopa, gen. nov., introduced for the fossil Cerithium giganteum, Lam.

Pleurotomoides, Bronn, has priority over Lora, Gistel, and Clathurella, Carpenter, all proposed as alternatives for Defrancia, Millet, preoccupied.

Gabrielona, gen. nov., proposed for Phasianella nepeanensis, Gatiff & Gabriel.

Orbitestella, gen. nov., for Cyclostrema bastowi, Gatiff.

Megathura, Pillsbury, should be used instead of Macrochasma, Dall.

Mitromorpha, auctt., is not Mitromorpha, Carpenter, which was based on Daphnella (?) filosa, Carpenter.

Antimitra, gen. nov., is proposed for Pleurotoma egrota, Reeve, with which A. Adams' Mitromorpha lirata is congeneric.

Loveilona, gen. nov., type Conus atramentosus, Reeve.

Apatyrus, gen. nov., type Mitromorpha expeditionis, Oliver.

Callanaitis, gen. nov., type Venus yatei, Gray, for Salacia, Jukes-Browne, preoccupied.

Anopsis, Gistel, is available for Psych, Rang, preoccupied, and has priority over Verrillopsyche, Cossmann, proposed for Halopsych, Kieferstein, preoccupied, introduced as substitute for Rang's name.

Hydromyles, Gistel, should be used for Euribia, Rang, preoccupied, as it is older than Kieferstein's name Theceurybia, for the same genus.

Once again I offer solutions of some nomenclatural problems for the purpose of criticism, the majority of those which do not invite consideration being withheld. I acknowledge once more such criticism from Dr. Dall and M. Cossmann, but I must complain of each of these writers demurring against my non-acceptance of vernacular names. Each indicates that my rejection of French vernacular names, i.e. "Les Phacoïdes" and "Les Subémarginules", is an instance of hypercriticism, and that I am wasting time on matters not worth questioning. I have often gone over the International Rules, and have been unable to find any item whereby French vernacular generic names are legalized, and so must continue to reject such whenever they have been wrongly used, notwithstanding the adverse criticism of my two famous friends.

P. buccinoides", etc. The "C." might mean "Cerite" or "Cerithium", the "B." "Buccin", or "Buccinum", but the "R." stood for "Rocher" not "Murex", hence all these names are absolutely French vernaculars. I have only instance the above, but I have gone over all Blainville's essay, and my contention is unassailable. Cossmann's further claim that all French vernaculars should be accepted as equivalent to Latin generic names is contrary to facts and usage, as such have been almost consistently ignored, the few instances that have now cropped up being due to the carelessness of recent authors.

**Volema, Bolten.**

When Dall discussed the Boltenian names (Journ. Conch., vol. xi, 1906, p. 289 et seq.) he indicated this name as needing special study, thus:—

"Volema (t. pyrum, Gmel.). Turbinella pars, Lam., 1799, etc."

Then later

"Xancus (t. Voluta pyrum, Gmel.). Turbinella, Lam., 1799. See above, Volema."

Since the name Xancus was absolutely equivalent to Turbinella it has been used to displace it, and it does not seem wise to disturb that usage. However, since Volema has priority it needs settlement. In the same place Dall indicated that Galeodes, Bolten, was equivalent to and should displace Melongena, but Bolten's choice had been anticipated, so that Melongena has been resumed.

Volema, however, has priority over Melongena, and the species are often considered as congeneric, so that I think it best to definitely fix Volema with a type species. Upon investigation I found that Gray in 1847 did not know Bolten's name, but Mörch in 1852 included it as a sub-genus of Cassidulus, Humphrey, citing as equivalent Pugilina, Schumacher, and naming under it the species pugilinus, Born, and paradiisiacus, Mart. = nodosa, Lam. The latter species has been commonly associated with Bolten's name, and since Bolten included Martini's species under a binomial name Volema paradiisiaca I here designate that species as type. This will leave Melongena to the other species, which I do not consider congeneric. I might state that it is possible that distinct sub-species of V. paradiisiaca, Bolten, will later be recognized, as the nodose forms seem constant according to locality, and so are the smooth ones. At any rate I have thirty-two specimens collected by Mr. Robin Kemp, near Mombasa, British East Africa, which in every growth stage show perfect constancy, not one of them developing nodulous sculpture after the first three whorls. These are obsoletely nodulose, showing that the smooth shell has developed from a nodule-bearing ancestor.

This note serves only to draw attention to the genus name, for I observe that Volema pyrum, Bolten, has been indicated by Dall as being equivalent to Pyrula nodosa, Lamarck, and it has precedence in Bolten's arrangement. Consequently if it be proved that these are conspecific, the names would be Volema pyrum, Bolten = Pyrula
nodosa, Lamarck, and var. paradisiaca, Bolten = citrina, Lamarck (fide Dall) = paradisiaca, Reeve. I will deal with this later.

**Mayena, gen. nov.**

I propose this name for *Biplex australasia*, Perry. In these Proceedings (vol. xi, 1915, p. 284) the late Mr. E. A. Smith, after relating the peregrinations of this species from one genus to another, citing *Biplex*, *Ranella*, *Triton*, *Bursa*, *Gyrineum*, *Apollon*, *Lotorium*, *Argobuccinum*, and *Septa*, and rejecting all these, placed it in Charonia. Privately he admitted this was only a tentative location, but conservatively declined to propose for it a new generic name, though not adverse to such a suggestion. Simultaneously Bartsch, dealing with South African shells, classed the South African representative in still another genus, viz. *Eugyrina*. The species have a peculiar facies, and, as can be guessed from the above résumé, do not correlate well with any named group. Since Smith's account we have benefited by the publication in these Proceedings (vol. xii, 1916, pp. 5 et seqq.) of a valuable paper entitled "On the Operculum of *Bursa*", by the Rev. Dr. Cooke. After discussing this point, Dr. Cooke added, "The evidence of the radula . . ." and from this it is easily seen that the radula of the present group is as discordant as the shell characters. "Unlike both *Bursa* and *Triton* proper" are Cooke's words, and figures are given to prove this statement. Had this evidence been available to Smith his doubt would have been dissipated and he would have certainly proposed a generic term for the species. I state this because I often discussed the matter with him, and now remedy the matter by introducing the above name, in honour of Mr. W. L. May, the Tasmanian conchologist, to whom all students are indebted for many valuable items. Only two species are known, *australia*, Perry, and *geminifera*, Euthyme.

**Tu'rricula, Schumacher, vice Surcula, H. & A. Adams.**

In the consideration of molluscan generic names some extraordinary cases bewilder the student. The present is one of these. *Tu'rricula* was proposed by Schumacher in the Essai Nouv. Syst. Test., 1817, pp. 66, 217, for the species *Tu'rricula flammea* alone, based on Chemn., iv, p. 172, tab. 143, figs. 1336–8. In the Gen. Rec. Moll., vol. i, 1853, p. 88, H. & A. Adams introduced *Surcula* for "*Tu'rricula*, Schum. non Klein". Adams' name has continued in usage ever since, though it was early recognized that Klein's names had no effect upon present-day nomenclatorial use. I noted that there was a *Tu'rricula*, Hermann, which was not nomenclatorially valid, and therefore the first user after Hermann's time had a perfect claim. This proves to be Schumacher, and at the present time I know of no reason why his name should not be resumed vice *Surcula*.

**Gelagna, Schaufuss, vice Para'lagena, Dall.**

In 1869 a Catalogue of the Paetel Collection was published, and a systematic synopsis given, the whole prepared by Schaufuss. A few of the names were altered by Schaufuss, and most have been
noted and some are in use. I note a couple of omissions which necessitate changes. Thus on p. 3 Schaufuss proposed Gelagna for Lagena, Klein, as a sub-genus of Tritonium, Lm. On pp. 28 and 29 the species referred to this group are chemnitzii, Gray, cingulatum, Lm., and clandestinum, Ch. The last-named has been regarded as the Kleinian species, so I designate it as type of Gelagna. Unfortunately this discovery will necessitate the rejection of Paralagena, Dall, proposed (Smithson Miscell. Coll., vol. xlvii, 1904) for the same group. Although clandestinum, Dillwyn, 1817, ex Chemnitz, has been used for the species name, I note that Hedley preferred succinctum, Linn., and followed Dall in placing the species in Argo bucicum. I might point out that clandestinum had been used by Lamarck in 1816, and that there is apparently also a Boltenian name available. I will treat these items later.

Partulida, Schaufuss, vice Spiralinella, Chaster.

On p. 6 of the Paetel Catalogue, Schaufuss proposed the above name for "Parthenia, Adams, not Lowe", the latter being also utilized. In the Gen. Rec. Moll., vol. i, 1853, p. 233, H. & A. Adams used Parthenia (as of Lowe), giving as members decussata, Mont., excavata, Phil., interstincta, Mont., and spiralis, Mont. These writers always gave their species in alphabetical order, so that the first species might not even be typical. We know, however, that they made use, to a great extent, of J. E. Gray’s systematic work, and in the Proc. Zool. Soc. Lond., 1847, p. 159, Gray gave as type of "Parthenia, Lowe, Turbo spiralis, Mont." This was not one of Lowe’s species, as Schaufuss recognized, so that I here designate as type of Partulida, Schaufuss, the species Turbo spiralis, Mont. This course will necessitate the acceptance of Schaufuss’s name in place of Spiralinella, introduced by Chaster for this species, and accepted with generic rank in the British List.

Campanile, Fischer, and Campanilopa, gen. nov.

The former name was introduced by Fischer in the "Manuel de Conch.", p. 680, June 30, 1884, as of Bayle, with a diagnosis, "S.g. Campanile, Bayle, 1884. Coquille très grande, etc. ... Opercule typique (C. lève, Quoy et Gaimard, Australia) ... Les espèces fossiles de ce groupe sont nombreuses dans l'Eocène (C. giganteum, Lamarck) ... ."

The description of the operculum and the direct nomination of C. lève, Q. & G., indicates that species as the type. If the fossils differ they must bear another name. Cossmann later named giganteum as type, and this was accepted by Bullen Newton, but the latter agrees with me that the living shell has the best claim on the name. As a matter of fact C. giganteum, Lamarck, cannot be regarded as congeneric, because it is much more like Terebralia in every essential shell-character. As the living shells cover different animals it seems inaccurate to associate the fossils with them, except in direct lineage, and certainly C. giganteum cannot be classed in the
recent genus *Terebralia* without causing serious confusion. I therefore propose the new generic name *Campanilopa* for the species *Cerithium giganteum*, Lamarck (Ann. Mus. Hist. Nat. Paris, vol. iii, March, 1804, p. 439). It does not seem necessary to discuss the relationships of this species since Cossmann has dealt so ably with these in his memorable "Essais".

With regard to the specific name of the sole species of *Campanile*, I again find confusion. In 1834 Quoy & Gaimard introduced a *Cerithium leve* (Voy. Astrol. Zool., vol. iii, pt. i, p. 106, pl. liv, figs. 1–3, West Australia), and at the same time Griffith & Pidgeon figured the shell under the name *Cerithium truncatum*. This was due to a careless slip which was corrected in the Index to *C. leve*, Gray. Thus it would seem a question which name has priority, but there is on record an earlier use of the same name. Mathews and myself in the *Victorian Naturalist*, vol. xxix, 1912, p. 11, noted the introduction of *Cerithium levis* by Perry in the *Areana*, pt. xv, 1810. I have been unable to discover any synonym of the West Australian shell, and therefore propose for it the name *Campanile symbolicum*. Since Gray apparently proposed his name simultaneously with that of Quoy & Gaimard I select as the shell requiring the new name that specimen in the British Museum which was figured in Griffith & Pidgeon, *Animal Kingdom* (Cuvier), vol. xii, Moll., pl. xiii, fig. 1, with the name on plate *Cerithium truncatum*. In the Index, p. 596, 1834, is written pl. xiii, fig. 1, *Cerithium leve*, Gray, with a note "Erratum in the plate, Del. truncatum, lege leve", while lower down is "pl. xiv, fig. 4, *Cerithium truncatum*, Lam." While Verco used *Campanile* generally for this shell Hedley has more recently adopted *Ceratoptilus*, Bouvier (Bull. Soc. Philom. Paris, ser. vii, vol. xi, p. 36, 1887), but the latter is later in date and must fall as an absolute synonym of *Campanile*.

**PLEUROTOMOIDES, BRONN, vice LORA, GISTEL.**

In 1912 I noted in these Proceedings (vol. x, p. 225) that *Lora*, Gistel, was proposed in 1848 for *Defrancia*, Millet, preoccupied, and should therefore supersede *Clathurella*, Carpenter, introduced for the same reason. As Gistel named in connexion with his proposal a species not referable to Millet's group a complication might have ensued. It is obviated in one direction by the discovery that prior to Gistel even, a name had been proposed for *Defrancia* of Millet, for Bronn in the *Ital. Tertiär. Gebilde*, 1831, divided the genus *Pleurotoma* into two sub-genera, *Pleurotoma, s.str.*, and *Pleurotomoides* for "*Defrancia*, Millet, non Brn." This was confirmed by Bronn in the *Lethaia Geognostica*, vol. ii, 1838, pp. 1062, 1064, where he used *Pleurotomoides* (*Defrancia*). While this item disposes of *Defrancia*, Millet, and its substitutes, it interests palæontologists more than recent molluscan students, since I see no relationship between the fossils grouped by Millet and the recent small species classed under *Clathurella*. Melvill has proposed *Clathurina* (antea, p. 185) for a certain recent group, so that we have one name, but Boettger had previously introduced *ParACLathurella*, etc. Hedley is
now engaged upon the Australian forms, and later I hope to develop
some points that have cropped up in this connexion. I might here
note that Jousseaume described in *Le Naturaliste*, 26th year, p. 106,
May 1, 1898, a new species *Otitoma oltitoma* [sic], adding, "J'ai crée
le genre pour . . . Deshayes, dans son catalogue des mollusques de
Bourbon, a décrit trois espèces, *Pl. reeveana*, *Pl. clandestina*, *Pl.
cyclophora*, auxquels on doit joindre le *Pl. vitrea*, Reeve." The
"cyclophora" group needed a name, but *clandestina* might have
been called years ago by Melvill "a typical *Clathurella*".

**Gabrielona, gen. nov.**

I introduce this name for *Phasianella nepeanensis*, Gatilff & Gabriel
(Proc. Roy. Soc. Victoria, n.s., vol. xxi, August, 1908, p. 366, pl. xxi,
figs. 9–10), Flinders, Western Port, Victoria. The describers were
dubious as to the generic location, and I some time ago sorted out
a shell undoubtedly congeneric, from Lord Howe Island. I was
fortunate enough to recover live specimens showing the opercular
characters. Peculiarly enough the operculum is shelly, though of
quite a different nature to that of *Phasianella*, while the animal has
been large and leaves a dead fringe round the mouth. I will return
to this point at a later opportunity, but here propose the above
name since the further account may be much delayed. I have just
received, through the generosity of Dr. W. G. Torr, a parcel of
shell-sand from Port Lincoln, South Australia, from which I have
separated a specimen, apparently *nepeanensis*, G. & G. While the
genus may be classed for the present in the family *Phasianellidæ*,
I do not think it has really any close relationship with *Phasianella*.
The Lord Howe shells are sub-littoral in habit, so that the Australian
shell may be sought for in shallow-water dredgings. The occurrence
of the dead shell in shell-sand from South Australia indicates a sub-
littoral habit there. The recovery of live specimens and examination
of the radula will assist in classifying it, and a Naticoid affinity
suggests itself to me judging from the shell characters and the
operculum and dead animal of the Lord Howe species.

The genus is named in honour of Mr. C. J. Gabriel, whose energy
in connexion with the Victorian Mollusca is well known and
appreciated, and whose assistance to myself in many ways I wish to
commemorate.

**Orbitestella, gen. nov.**

I propose this name and designate as type *Cyclostrema bastowi*,
Victoria). I also indicate it as representative of a new family
Orbitestellidæ, which is composed of a series of minute marine
mollusces with the following characters: Shell thin, pellucid, dis-
coidal, dextral, of few whorls and of peculiar sculpture: widely
umbilicate, columella vertical, aperture never variced, irregular in
shape, edges thin.

I had hoped to describe the group, giving figures, but at present
this is impossible. I have species from various parts of New
Zealand, the Kermadecs, Lord Howe Island, Norfolk Island, New Caledonia, Sydney Harbour, New South Wales, north coast of Tasmania, and Port Lincoln, South Australia, in fact every austral locality from which I have received a parcel of fine shell-sand or fine dredgings. Commonly live shells have been secured when live sand was received. All the species are very minute, and I have about a dozen distinct species, divisible into two groups, and I hope later to thoroughly elaborate the family with good figures.

Megathura, Pilsbry, _vice_ Macrochasma, Dall.

In the _Proc. U.S. Nat. Mus._, vol. xlviii, January 19, 1915, Dr. Dall proposed _Macrochasma_ as a new generic name (p. 439) for _Fissurella crenulata_, Sowerby, a Pacific coast American shell. Recently dealing with other Fissurellids, I noted that Pilsbry in the _Man. Conch._, vol. xii, 1891, p. 182, quoted in the synonymy of _Lucapina crenulata_, Sowerby, the name _Megathura californica_ of Nuttall MS. Under the present International Laws governing nomenclature as exposed by the International Commission in Opinion 4, the generic name _Megathura_ will supersede the later _Macrochasma_, unless invalidated by some previous use of it. It should be noted that no author can possibly protect himself against such occurrences as this, as these MS. names have never been recorded, nor previously legally recognized save in rare cases such as the Leach names.

Mitromorpha, _auctt._, _non_ Carpenter.

This genus name has been generally accredited to A. Adams, and has been used recently for a number of diverse species, both recent and fossil, of which possibly not one is congeneric with Adams' species. A peculiar confusion has been noted in connection with this name, and I had intended to define the generic terms I would utilize in connection with recent Australian shells, but since I drew up my notes my friend Mr. Charles Hedley has written me that he is dealing completely with this group as regards Australian species, so I withhold my say until my friend's report has appeared. Nevertheless I have certain information which he may not have secured, and which it seems expedient to make known. In the British Assoc. Report for 1863 (published August, 1864), Carpenter included (p. 658) "_? Daphnella_ † _filosa_, n.s., small, diamond-shaped, but rounded periphery; spirally threaded. † Generic position . . . doubtful: perhaps they belong to genera not yet eliminated; _filosa_ resembling the Eocene forms between _Conus_ and _Pleurotoma._" In the _Ann. Mag. Nat. Hist._ (ser. iii, vol. xv, February, 1865, p. 182), Carpenter fully described _Mitromorpha filosa_, recording that it was the _? Daphnella filosa_ of the above entry, and observing, "Mr. A. Adams obtained two similar species from Japan, and as the shells do not rank satisfactorily under any established group, he proposes the above genus for their reception. M. Crosse suggests that _Columbella dormitor_, Sby., may be congeneric."
In the same place two months later (p. 322) A. Adams introduced the genus *Mitromorpha* with only one species, *M. lirata*, nov., but he referred to Carpenter's usage of the name. This species, which has been commonly cited as the type of *Mitromorpha*, is obviously not generic with Carpenter's shell, but I cannot explain how the mistake arose. The Adamsian shell has not yet been figured, but I hope to remedy this later when dealing more completely with the species names. The two species recorded by Carpenter were only classed as varieties by Adams, but they are apparently valid species. Two congeneric species have been figured, namely, *Pleurotoma egrotia*, Reeve (Conch. Icon., sect. *Pleurotoma*, Dec. 1845, pl. xxxi, sp. and fig. 276, Singapore, 7 fathoms) and *Daphnella crenulata*, Pease (Amer. Journ. Conch., vol. iii, Jan. 2, 1868, p. 221, pl. xv, fig. 20, Paumotus), and I therefore propose *Antimitra*, gen. nov., and name *Pleurotoma egrotia*, Reeve, as type. Adams' *Mitromorpha lirata* is conchologically referable to this genus.

When Pace dealt with Columbelloid shells he considered Carpenter's *D. filosa* as congeneric with *Columbella dormitor*, Sowerby, even as Crosse had suggested, but gave no name to the group. Carpenter's *Mitromorpha* is now available. Pace also added here *Conus atractomosus*, Reeve, and *Conus parvus*, Pease. The former was described (Conch. Icon., sect. *Conus*, Suppt., June, 1849, pl. vii, sp. and fig. 265) from Mindoro, Philippine Islands. I do not consider this congeneric with *Mitromorpha*, and therefore propose *Lovellona*, gen. nov., with this species as type. Several distinct species have been hitherto confused under this name. *Conus parvus* was proposed by Pease (Amer. Journ. Conch., vol. iv, Nov. 3, 1868, p. 126) as a new name for *Conus fusiformis*, Pease (Proc. Zool. Soc. Lond., 1860, p. 398), from the Sandwich Islands. Hedley has recently described *Conus micarius* (Rec. Austr. Mus., vol. viii, 1912, p. 147, pl. xliii, fig. 32) from Cape York, which he compared with Pease's *parvus*. These may both be classed in *Lovellona*.

Oliver named a Kermadec shell *Mitramorpha* [sic] *expeditionis* (Trans. New Zealand Inst., vol. xlvi, 1915, p. 539, fig. 36), which does not appear to be at all closely related to any named Turroid group, so that I propose the new genus *Apaturis* for it. I have evidence of other species in the Indo-Pacific area to be discussed later. I anticipate that Hedley will not deal with the extra Australian fossil species allotted to *Mitromorpha*, nor will I, but I would here note for the benefit of palæontological workers that a heterogeneous assemblage appears also to have been created in connection with the name, and as *Mitromorpha* has now been shown to be untenable in connection with the recent shells commonly so named it would be well to rearrange the fossils without much consideration of the name here given to the group which Adams' species is referred to.

*Callanaitis*, gen. nov. for *Salacia*, Jukes-Browne, preocc.

based on Jukes-Browne’s results. In that place, p. 494, I included with generic rank Salacia, Jukes-Browne, for the two species *disjecta*, Perry, 1811, and *yatei*, Gray, 1835. Unfortunately I overlooked the fact that Jukes-Browne’s name was invalid, having been used several times previously. My mistake led Hedley to accept Salacia in his *List of West Australian Mollusca*, so that rectification is necessary. Jukes-Browne, simultaneously with his proposal of Salacia, added Bassina for *Venus paucilamellata*, Sow. = alata, Reeve. I do not know the exact relationship of this and the preceding, so propose, with *yatei*, Gray, as type, the new name Callananitis.


The name *Psyche* was proposed by Rang, *Ann. Sci. Nat. Paris*, vol. v, 1825, p. 284, but he had been anticipated by Schrank. In Bronn’s *Klassen Ordnungen Thierreichs*, vol. ii, 1862, p. 645, Kieferstein proposed *Halopsyche*, for *Psyche*, Rang, *non* Linn., etc. Verrill accepted Bronn’s correction, but Cossmann (*Rev. Crit. Paléozoool*, 4th year, Jan. 1, 1900, p. 43) introduced *Verrillopsyche*, since he found *Halopsyche* was also invalid. In this innovation Cossmann was unfortunate, for even prior to Kieferstein, Gistel in 1848 (*Naturg. Thierr. Schulen*) had corrected Rang’s error, proposing on p. x *Anopsia* for Rang’s *Psyche*, to make doubly certain, for on p. 174 he had used *Philopseudes* as a suitable emendation. It is noteworthy that Gistel’s second thoughts came first, and that the correct name appears to be *Anopsia*.

**Hydromyles**, Gistel, *vice* Euribia, Rang,

is an exact parallel to the preceding. Rang (*Ann. Sci. Nat. Paris*, vol. xii, Nov. 1827, p. 328) proposed *Euribia*, years later than Mergen (*Nouv. Class. Mouches*, 1800, p. 36). Kieferstein (loc. cit.) corrected to *Theceurybia*, which has been lately used. Gistel (loc. cit., p. ix) had previously introduced *Hydromyles*, and in this case was seemingly content with one choice. His name therefore replaces Rang’s.
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