

ART. V.—On *Natica tasmanica*, Tenison-Woods, and
description of a New Species of *Natica*.

BY

G. B. PRITCHARD, D.Sc., F.G.S.,

AND

J. H. GATLIFE.

(With Plate VII.).

[Read 8th May, 1913.]

When making out the Catalogue of the Marine Shells of Victoria we included *Natica tasmanica*, T. Woods,¹ in the synonymy of *Natica didyma* (Bolton m.s.), Chemnitz, and also cited as synonyms *N. ampla*, Philippi, *N. biclor*, Philippi, and *N. chemnitzii*, Recluz (non Pfeiffer), and *N. lamarchiana*, Recluz, and gave other references.

We had previously obtained specimens of *N. tasmanica*, T. Woods, from Dr. J. C. Cox, and Miss Lodder, named *N. didyma*, Bolten, obtained in New South Wales and North-West Tasmania.

The original description of *N. tasmanica* by T. Woods² is as follows:—“*N.* shell, with a somewhat covered umbilicus, depressedly orbicular, thick, with a short but slightly exsert spire; whorls convex, rounded, smooth, or obliquely thickly and most minutely striate, aperture semilunar, horizontal, columella somewhat thin, with a prominent callosity, which is spirally sulcate, umbilicus angularly excavate; with a kind of callosity within the suture at the mouth; pale fulvous or whitish, banded with brownish or orange lines; base white, chestnut or fulvous within.”

In the National Museum, Melbourne, three specimens were set out on a card as *N. tasmanica*, T. Woods, dated January, 1877, and numbered 35315-7 locality, Hobson's Bay, and are duly entered under that name in the museum register. They answer to the above description. The Curator, Mr. Kershaw, informs us that at about that time the Rev. J. E. T. Woods examined their Australian shells and assisted in their identification, and probably the name was furnished by him.

1 Proc. Roy. Soc. Victoria, 1900, vol. xii. (n.s.), pp. 191, 192.

2 Proc. Roy. Soc. Tas. for 1875, pp. 148, 149.

Mr. Whitelegge, in his "List of the Marine and Freshwater invertebrate fauna of Port Jackson and the neighbourhood,"¹ lists the species as *N. didyma*, Bolton, m.s., Philippi.

Messrs. Tate and May, in their "Revised Census of the Marine Mollusca of Tasmania,"² quote the same shell as *Polinices ampla*, Philippi, and give *Natica lamareckiana*, Recluz, as a synonym, and subsequently at page 448 state that *Natica ampla* = *N. didyma*, Bolten. They also³ list as a separate species, *Polinices tasmanica*, T. Woods, and give a figure⁴ of a shell that is not his species; it does not answer to the description, being of a different form, with the umbilical callosity entire, and not spirally sulcate.

Messrs. Pilsbry and Vanatta, in a paper entitled "Notes on *Polinices didyma*, with description of a new Australian species,"⁵ describe and figure *N. tasmanica*, T. Woods, as a new species, under the name of *Polinices aulacoglossa*,⁶ type locality Altona Bay, Williamstown, near Melbourne, Victoria, and remark, "Some specimens received from Dr. J. C. Cox are larger, alt. 41½ diam., 42 mm., otherwise similar. This is apparently the form listed by Messrs. Pritchard and Gatliff as *Natica didyma*, Chemn., It is certainly distinct specifically from *P. didyma*, or any of its sub-species.

Natica chemnitzii, Recluz (not *N. chemnitzii* Pfr., 1840) seems to be identical with this species, though if so it attains a larger size than any examples we have seen. In any case the name is a homonym, and cannot stand.

Natica tasmanica, Tenison-Woods, has been placed in the synonymy of *P. didyma*, by Messrs. Pritchard and Gatliff, but Tate and May, in their Census of Marine Mollusca of Tasmania (1901), have retained it distinct, a decision supported by the figure published by them, it is a far smaller species than *P. aulacoglossa*, alt. 13, diam. 16 mm.

It is unfortunate that Messrs. Tate and May figured the wrong shell. Mr. May's attention was personally drawn by one of us to the matter on 11th May, 1901. On 10th March, 1913, we wrote asking him where the type was. He replied, "There is in this instance unfortunately no type known to refer to, or authentic co-types." and admits that the wrong shell was figured by Prof. Tate and himself.

1 Proc. Roy. Soc. N.S.W., 1889, p. 96, No. 406.

2 Proc. Lin. Soc. N.S.W., 1901, vol. xxvi., 375.

3 Loc. cit.

4 Loc. cit., pl. xxv., fig. 49.

5 Proc. Acad. Nat. Sci. Philadelphia, 1908, vol. lx., pp. 555-559, pl. 29.

6 Loc. cit., pl. 29, figs. 1-3.

We are surprised that Messrs. Pilsbry and Vanatta did not discover this fact, as Tenison-Woods states, amongst other clearly expressed items, "Columella somewhat thin, with a prominent callosity spirally sulcate." In Messrs. Tate and May's figure the callosity is not sulcate.

We adhere to our opinion that the slight differences existing between *N. didyma*¹ and *N. tasmanica* do not warrant the latter being considered a distinct species, and are of opinion that there is a closer resemblance between the two than we can discern between *N. didyma* and *N. bicolor*. The last-named is classed by Messrs. Pilsbry and Vanatta as a variety of *N. didyma*.

Whether the shell be considered to be a distinct species, a variety, or a synonym, the name given to it by Tenison-Woods has precedence, and *P. antlocoglossa*, Pilsbry and Vanatta, becomes a synonym.

***Natica controversa*, sp. nov.** (Pl. VII., Figs. 1-3).

1901. *Natica tasmanica*, Tate and May, (non T. Woods), Proc. Lin. Soc. N.S.W., vol. xxvi., p. 375, pl. 25, f. 49.

Shell rather small, solid, globose, whorls about five, smooth, but for the slightly irregular lines of growth, spire short and slightly exsert, aperture ovate, outer lip rather strong, suture well defined with a strong enamel thickening internally; at the anterior end of the columella there is a narrow but defined tooth-like ridge, umbilicus angled, deep, about one-third of it covered by a semilunate callosity, which is convexly rounded on its surface, and does not bear any trace of a transverse sulcation. Colour light yellowish-white; on the body whorl there are two indistinct, darker encircling bands, the upper one being the broader, and extending from a little below the suture to the periphery; the other is narrow and near the base; there is also a light-coloured band below and adjoining the suture, due to the internal thickening.

Dimensions of Type.—Height, 15; breadth, 17 mm.

Locality.—South Coast, Tasmania.

Observations.—This is the species which was figured in error by Messrs. Tate and May (cited above), as representing *N. tasmanica*, Tenison-Woods, and referred to by us in the foregoing remarks upon that species.

Type in the National Museum, Melbourne; hitherto unnamed specimens No. 36265-6, have been on view since October, 1876. We have chosen No. 36265 as type. We have recently received two

¹ Of this species we have before us an example from Japan, verified by comparison with the shell under that name in the British Museum by Mr. C. J. Gabriel in 1907.

smaller specimens from Mr. May as being the species he figured, and these agree with our present species. Mr. May also states that the operculum is unknown.

EXPLANATION OF PLATE.

Figs 1-3.—*Natica controversa*, sp. nov.

Fig. 4.—*Natica tasmanica*, T. Woods.

All figures are natural size.
