

So, without further ado, let's get on with issue # 2 of *TCC*!



WHO'S WHO IN CONES


It is with great pleasure that I include in this section a short biography of my old friend Mike Filmer. Here we have it, in his own words:

I was born in Ipoh, Malaysia in 1926. I spent my youth in Malaya, Singapore, Lausanne, Capetown and Nairobi. After finishing school I spent three and a half years in the British Army and I was sent to serve in East Africa, Egypt, Palestine, France and England. I joined the Royal Dutch Shell Oil group just after the war and worked in The Philippines, Sarawak, Brunei, Indonesia, Iran, England, Hong Kong, Thailand and Australia before returning to England in 1980.

All my life I have been a collector, as a youngster in Africa, I collected butterflies and birds' eggs, stamps and cigarette cards. My first shells found, before the war, along the Kenya coast but I did not keep these. My real interest in collecting shells began while I was living in Hong Kong in 1967. In the early years I collected all families of marine shells but by the late 1970's I began to specialise in cones, disposing of all other families in my collection by the mid 1990's.



I have had many, memorable shell collecting trips in southern Thailand and Australia. In addition my family and I spent two months travelling round the South Pacific in 1970. We visited Port Moresby, Lau, Rabaul and Bourgainville in Papua New Guinea, Honiara in the Solomons, Port Vila in Vanuatu, Suva and Nandi in Fiji, Papeete in Tahiti, Bora Bora and Noumea and Lifou in New Caledonia. I also joined Alan Hinton in a shell collecting trip to Gizo in the Solomon Islands in 1989. My cone collection currently amounts to just under 10,000 specimens. Don't ask me how many species and sub species I have! There is too much uncertainty as to the validity of some species. My only regret is that I lived in the Philippines, Borneo and Indonesia for over fifteen years and never collected a single shell!



C. filmeri Rolán & Röckel, 2000

Since the early 1990's I have not been able to do much collecting myself and instead spent my time on research on the Genus *Conus*. I have been fortunate to be able to visit most of the world's major museums, with important collections of cone shells, including all those in Japan, Australia, South Africa and the USA and most of those in Europe.

Apart from a number of minor articles published in shell magazines I have named two new *Conus* species - *C. moncuri* in 2005 and, together with Dr, Henry Coomans, *Conus dampierensis* in 1985. I also wrote a book on the Genus *Conus* entitled "A Catalogue of Nomenclature and Taxonomy in the Living Conidae 1758 - 1998" published in 2001.

I live with my wife Hilda and our two cats in a small village in Surrey,

England. We have one son and one daughter both living and working in England.

R. M. (Mike) Filmer




Colour variations of
Conus josephinae Rolán, 1980
(Conidae: Gastropoda)

Carlos M. L. Afonso

Conus josephinae is an insular endemic species found only on Boavista and Maio Islands in the Cape

Verde Archipelago, West Africa. This uncommon species normally measures between 18 and 30mm (adult size) and depending on the location where it is collected, can produce awesome colour forms. PLATE I shows six possible colour variation of this remarkable species.

P.S. I will try to contribute with more plates in future TCC issues... Until then best regards to all and ... enjoy.





CONE BIBLIOGRAPHY (Continued)

It is a well established fact that the Conidae fauna of the American shores needs to be covered in a proper study that will give us an overview of the valid species. We know that work is under way (and as a matter of fact we received the following precision from our friend Mike Filmer: "On page 16 [of TCC # 1] you refer to the work being done by Bill Cargile and Bill Fenzan on a book on American Cones. I should like to point out that I am not involved in this project myself. I have only assisted in introducing the two Bills to some museums in Europe."; thanks for making that point clear, Mike!)

The fauna from the Caribbean region and Gulf of Mexico, south to Brasil is especially complicated and exciting.

While we wait for the future book, a recently published PhD thesis may prove helpful. Here is the reference:

-📖 Renata dos Santos Gomes
Taxonomia e morfologia de representantes da família Conidae (Mollusca, Gastropoda, Neogastropoda) na costa brasileira.
Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro, 2004

This thesis was supervised by Norma C. Salgado and Arnaldo Santos Coelho and includes an extensive study of shells, soft parts and radular morphology of specimens belonging to the following species:

- C. archetypus* Crosse, 1865
- C. cancellatus* Hwass in Bruguière, 1792
- C. carcellesi* Martins, 1945 *

- C. carioca* Petuch, 1986
- C. centurio* Born, 1778
- C. clenchi* Martins, 1943 *
- C. clerii* Reeve, 1844
- C. ermineus* Born, 1778
- C. iansa* Petuch, 1979 *
- C. jaspideus* Gmelin, 1791
- C. lemniscatus* Reeve, 1849
- C. mazei* Deshayes, 1874
- C. mindanus* Hwass in Bruguière, 1792
- C. pusio* Hwass in Bruguière, 1792
- C. regius* Gmelin, 1791
- C. riosi* Petuch, 1986
- C. scopulorum* Van Mol, Tursch & Kempf, 1971 *
- C. selenae* Van Mol, Tursch & Kempf, 1967
- C. villepini* Fisher & Bernardi, 1857
- C. worki* Petuch, 1998

* - only the shell was studied, no soft parts being available

It is a pity that this study did not include several species described after its publication, but even so anybody interested in the Brazilian Cones will do well to look for a copy.



Still on the subject of American Cones, here is another paper of interest:

-📖 Juan Manuel Díaz M., Adriana M. Gracia C. & Jaime R. Cantera K.
Checklist of the Cone Shells (Mollusca: Gastropoda: Neogastropoda: Conidae) of Colombia,
Biota Colombiana 6 (1), 73-86, 2005



Conus ximenes and *C. mahogani*: two similar but distinct species

John K. Tucker

Illinois Natural History Survey, 8450 Montclair Avenue,
Brighton, Illinois 62012 USA

For some reason doubts about the specific distinctness of *Conus ximenes* Gray, 1839 and *C. mahogani* Reeve, 1843 persist. In part this reflects early monographic treatments of the Conidae where they were considered color forms of a single species (Nybakken, 1970; McLean, 1971; Abbott, 1974; Walls, 1979). However, other important works considered them specifically distinct (Hanna and Strong, 1949; Hanna, 1963; Knowlton, 1993; Filmer, 2001).

The two taxa are certainly closely related. However, there are objective differences that can be used to separate these species. Tucker (1985) and Chaney (1987) pointed out these differences but it seems that their papers have been largely ignored. The purpose of the present paper is to re-iterate those distinctions and to reproduce the key first published in Tucker (1985).

All specimens of *Conus mahogani* can be differentiated from all specimens of *C. ximenes* by simple examination of the spire whorl tops (Tucker, 1985; Chaney, 1987). The spire whorl tops of *C. ximenes* have two rows of spots on them. One of these is at the shoulder angle and the other is at the suture with the adjoining whorl (Plate 1, figs. 4, 5; Plate 2, fig. 2). The whorl tops also frequently have brown blotches that cross the entire width of the whorl top. In contrast, *C. mahogani* does not have the row of spots along the suture (Plate 1, figs. 1-3; Plate 2, fig. 1). They may have brown blotches that cross the whorl tops but no row of spots. This difference holds up even in lightly colored specimens of *C. mahogani* (Plate 1, fig. 2).

Moreover, these two species differ in aperture coloration as noted long ago by Hanna and Strong (1949). Specimens identifiable as *C. mahogani* by spire coloration have the interior of the aperture colored white or blue-white. In contrast, specimens of *C. ximenes* have the aperture colored purple or lavender (Tucker, 1985; Chaney, 1987). McLean (1971) dismissed this trait as unreliable. However, it seems constant in the specimens that I examined and in those examined by Chaney (1987)..

These two species also differ statistically in shell parameters (Chaney, 1987). I compared 38 specimens fitting the definition of *C. mahogani* to 35 specimens of *C. ximenes* from my collections. I measured maximum shell length, maximum shell width, and spire length (see Röckel *et al.*, 1995 for methods). I performed an analysis of covariance using shell length as the covariate and compared widths and spire lengths of the two species adjusted for shell length. As is apparent from examination, *C. mahogani* is narrower bodied than is *C. ximenes*. Least squares means (= lsmean) for shell width of *C. mahogani* was 15.5 mm, whereas it was 16.5 mm for *C. ximenes*. These values differ significantly ($F_{2, 70} = 24.09, p < 0.0001$). In contrast, *C. mahogani* has a relatively higher spire (lsmean = 6.06 mm) than does *C. ximenes* (lsmean = 5.08 mm). Again these values were statistically significant $F_{2, 70} = 28.31, p < 0.0001$. These differences may seem minute but they do provide statistical support for the

more elongated looking *C. mahogani* and are consistent with Chaney's (1987) observations. Fortunately, shell characters along with spire and aperture coloration work well.

Nybakken (1970) noted that the two species are similar in radular morphology (Plate 2, fig. 5). This similarity in radular morphology caused Nybakken (1970) to suggest that the two were the same species. Despite Nybakken's (1970) claim, Chaney (1987) demonstrated that relative to shell length, radular teeth from *C. mahogani* were significantly shorter than those from *C. ximenes*. His sample sizes were small (10 teeth for each species) but the interspecific differences were remarkable.

Regardless, radular morphology likely reflects similarity in ecology as well as phylogeny and often may not be helpful at the species level. Radular morphology readily separates other Panamic spotted cones (Plate 2, figs 6, 7). I do not include species related to *C. gradatus* Wood, 1828 or *C. regularis* G. B. Sowerby II, 1833. Their radular teeth have serrations and terminating cusps (Nybakken, 1970), which do not occur in the species discussed herein.

Finally, Chaney (1987) found that *C. ximenes* has no operculum, whereas *C. mahogani* does. This trait appears to be reliable in identifying specimens with the animals preserved. However, despite all the differences reported in the past some continue to list the two as synonyms. Likely this reflects the lack of familiarity with the technical literature and dependence on older monographic references published prior to Tucker (1985) and Chaney (1987).

Although it is not difficult to objectively identify *C. ximenes* and *C. mahogani*, some still confuse these with other spotted cones from the Panamic region. The primary problems concern *C. perplexus* G. B. Sowerby II, 1857 (Plate 1, figs. 11, 12; Plate 2, fig. 4), *C. baccatus* G. B. Sowerby III, 1877 (Plate 1 figs. 6, 7), and *C. tornatus* G. B. Sowerby II, 1833 (Plate 1, figs. 8-10; Plate 2, fig. 3). Wolfson (1962) pointed out simple ways to separate *C. perplexus* and *C. ximenes*. Tucker (1985) presented a key to these species (excepting *C. baccatus*). However, this key was published in an outlet of limited circulation. I repeat it here and add *C. baccatus*.

1A. Posterior notch or anal sinus is shallow or absent...2.

1B. Posterior notch is deep and C-shaped...3.

2A. Two rows of small black or brown spots on the whorl tops, one bordering the suture and one along the shoulder angle (Plate 2, fig. 2); the aperture is purple or lavender in coloration...*C. ximenes* Gray, 1839.

2B. Only one row of small spots on the whorl tops that borders the shoulder angle (Plate 2, fig. 1); the interior of the aperture is white to blue white in color...*C. mahogani* Reeve, 1843.

3A. An anterior notch is present (Plate 1, fig. 11); spire is not scalariform (Plate 2, fig. 4)...4.

3B. Anterior notch is absent; spire is scalariform and conical in profile (Plate 2, fig. 3)...*C. tornatus* G. B. Sowerby II, 1833.

4A. Body whorl usually with pustulose ridges that reach the shoulder; color markings are orange brown; the protoconch is large and swollen looking (Plate 1, fig. 7)...*C. baccatus* G. B. Sowerby III, 1877.

4B. Body whorl may be pustulose in small specimens but smooth in larger ones (> 15 mm); color markings are dark brown or black; protoconch is small...*C. perplexus* G. B. Sowerby II, 1857.

Acknowledgements: I thank James Nybakken and the American Museum of Natural History for permission to reproduce the radular drawings. I appreciate Hank Chaney's comments on the manuscript.

Literature cited

- Abbott, R. T. 1974. *American Seashells. Second Edition.* Van Nostrand Reinhold Company, New York, 663 pp., 24 pls.
- Chaney, H. W. 1987. A comparative study of two similar Panamic cones: *Conus ximenes* and *Conus mahogani*. *Veliger* 29:428-436.
- Filmer, R. M. 2001. *A Catalogue of Nomenclature and Taxonomy in the Living Conidae 1758–1998.* Backhuys Publishers, Leiden, 388 pp.
- Gray, J. E. and Sowerby, G. B., I. 1839. Molluscos animals and their shells. Pp. 105-155, pls. 33-44 in Beechy, F. W. (ed.), *The zoology of Captain Beechy's voyage; compiled from the collections or notes made by Captain Beechey, the officers and naturalist of the expedition during a voyage to the Pacific and Behring Straits performed in H. M. ship Blossom, under the command of Captain F. W. Beechy ... in the years 1825, 26, 27, and 28.* London: Bohn. xii + 186 pp., 44 pls., 3 maps.
- Hanna, G. D. 1963. West American mollusks of the Genus *Conus*- II. *Occasional Papers of the California Academy of Sciences* 35:1-103, 11 pls.
- Hanna, G. D. and Strong, A. M. 1949. West American mollusks of the genus *Conus*. *Proceedings of the California Academy of Sciences*, fourth series, 26(9):247-322, pls. 5-10.
- Knowlton, N. 1993. Sibling species in the sea. *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics* 24:189-216.
- McLean, J. H. 1971. Family Conidae. In Keen, A.M. (Ed.) *Sea Shells of Tropical West America. Marine Mollusks from Baja California to Peru. Second Edition.* Stanford University Press, Stanford, California, pp. 658-670.
- Nybakken, J. 1970. Radular anatomy and systematics of the West American Conidae (Mollusca, Gastropoda). *American Museum Novitates* 2414:1-29.
- Reeve, L. A. 1843. Monograph of the Genus *Conus*. *Conchologia Iconica, or Illustrations of the shells of molluscous animals.* London: Reeve Brothers. Vol. 1, 47 pp., 9 pls.
- Röckel, D., Korn, W. and Kohn, A. J. 1995. *Manual of the Living Conidae Volume 1: Indo-Pacific Region.* Verlag Christa Hemmen, Hackenheim, Germany, 517 pp.
- Sowerby, G. B., II. 1832-1841. *The conchological illustrations, or coloured figures of all the hitherto unfigured Recent shells.* London. [Parts and their dates for *Conus* are: parts 24, 25, 28, 29, 32, 33 = 1833 (figs. 1-41); parts 36, 37, 54-57 = 1834 (figs. 42-91); parts 147, 148 = 1838 (figs. 92-111); parts 151-158 = 1839 (figs. 112-137).
- Sowerby, G. B., II. 1857-1858, 1866. *Thesaurus conchyliorum, or monographs of the genera of shells.* London: G. B. Sowerby. Volume 3(*Conus*) part 17, pp. 1-24, pls. 187(1)-195(9) = 1857; part 18. pp. 25-56, pls. 196(10)-210(24) = 1858; Appendix to monograph of the genus *Conus* part 24-25, pp. 327-331, pls. 286(25)-289(28) = 1866.
- Sowerby, G. B., III. 1877. Descriptions of six new species of shells from the collections of the Marchioness Paulucci and Dr. Provost. *Proceedings of the Zoological Society of London* 1876:752-755, pl. 75.

Tucker, J. K. 1985. *Conus ximenes* Gray, 1839, *Conus mahogany* [sic] Reeve, 1843 and friends. *Shells and Sea Life* 17(6):201-202.

Walls, J. G. [1979]. *Cone Shells a Synopsis of the Living Conidae*. T. F. H. Publications, Neptune City, New Jersey, 1011 pp.

Wolfson, F. H. 1962. Comparison of two similar species of *Conus* (Gastropoda) from the Gulf of California. *Veliger* 5:23-28.

Wood, W. 1828. *Supplement to the Index Testaceologicus; or a catalogue of shells, British and Foreign. Illustrated with 480 figures*. London: Richard Taylor for W. Wood, London. vi + 59 pp., 8 pls.




Plate 1

1. JKT 424 *Conus mahogany* 27.3 mm, Venado Island, W. Panama.
2. JKT 3549 *Conus mahogany* 13.9 mm, Guaymas, Sonora, Mexico.
3. JKT 424 *Conus mahogany* 35.8 mm, Venado Island, W. Panama.
4. JKT 402 *Conus ximenes* 32.1 mm, Puerto Lobos, Sonora, Mexico.
5. JKT 17 *Conus ximenes* 54.9 mm, Guaymas, Sonora, Mexico.

6. JKT 3493 *Conus baccatus* 21.9 mm, Secas Island, Panama.
7. JKT 3493 *Conus baccatus* spire whorls of specimen shown in figure 5.
8. JKT 20 *Conus tornatus* 38.0 mm, Cabo San Lucas; Baja, Mexico.
9. JKT 403 *Conus tornatus* 22.6 mm, off San Carlos Bay, Sonora, Mexico.
10. JKT 403 *Conus tornatus* 20.9 mm, off San Carlos Bay, Sonora, Mexico.
11. JKT 397 *Conus perplexus* 29.4 mm, El Golfo de Santa Clara, Sonora, Mexico.
12. JKT 2273 *Conus perplexus* 31.4 mm, Isla Santa Clara, Sonora, Mexico.




Plate 2.

1. *Conus mahogani* spire of specimen shown in Plate 1, fig. 1.
2. *Conus ximenes* spire of specimen shown in Plate 1, fig. 5.
3. *Conus tornatus* spire of specimen shown in Plate 1, fig. 9.
4. *Conus perplexus* spire of specimen shown in Plate 1, fig. 12.
5. Radular teeth of *Conus ximenes* (14) and *C. mahogani* (15) copied from Nybakken (1970) and used with permission.

6. Radular tooth of *Conus tornatus* (11) copied from Nybakken (1970) and used with permission.
7. Radular tooth of *Conus perplexus* (8) copied from Nybakken (1970) and used with permission.



WHAT AM I?

In our last issue, we presented this photo of a specimen from the collection of Loïc Limpalaër. At the time, we said that “it is obviously a juvenile and it comes from the South coast of Madagascar”, but we omitted the actual size of the specimen. This was totally the Editor’s fault.



Anyway, we have in fact received a few suggestions concerning the identity. This included a possible relation to *C. helgae* Blöcher, 1992 or



C. helgae Blöcher, 1992

a juvenile *C. inscriptus* Reeve, 1843, although it was noticed that juvenile *C. inscriptus* are usually more lightly coloured. another suggestion pointed to an *Asprella*, such as *C. asiaticus lovelreevei* R. Massilia, 1993.



C. inscriptus Reeve, 1843

But most opinions received actually pointed to something else: a juvenile *C. litoglyphus* Hwass in Bruguière, 1792. At least the pattern is quite suggestive...



C. litoglyphus Hwass in Bruguière, 1792


So, it would be very interesting to hear from anyone familiar with young *C. litoglyphus*, in order to try to confirm this.



Also in last issue, there was another photo sent by Loïc, of a “mystery” cone from New Caledonia.



Once again, there was more than one suggestion about its ID, including a form of *C. exiguus* Lamarck, 1810.



C. exiguus Lamarck, 1810

But among other opinions, we must quote at length the comments sent my Vincent Crayssac, which are particularly pertinent:

[...] for the second one, I know what it is and even where it comes from... It is a specimen of a new species we have dredged a few years ago in the south of Suprises Island, North of New-Caledonia, in about - 250/300 m. I have sold most of the

specimens to Bill Cargile except two I kept for myself. But I also know that there is a few others like that one, which were stolen on board by my ex partner and captain, Gilles Grandidier. That crook did not know anything about specimens but he managed to sell indeed some stolen material at a couple of shell shows in Europe (Paris and Antwerp) and that's where and why a guy like Loïc Limpalaer managed to get that rarity. I am even pretty sure he got it for nothing... But this is not the aim of that discussion.



The description of that new species should have been done already for a while, but it seems that Bill Cargile is quite slow doing it as certainly too busy. As a result I have recently informed Bill Fenzan who knows also about that new specie to check out with Cargile what's going on, regarding description, etc...



Regarding the name I chose, I initially asked Bill to name that new cone, "*tuiiensis*", which correspond to the name of my boat (TUI II) from which we have been able to dredge all

that deep water stuff over these past few years. However Bill Fenzan, just told me in his last correspondence that it was not a proper ending as the "ensis" endings are used for the localities only. So, as that specie is not yet described and the name I chose seems to do not fit well, I just told Bill to use my name instead to make things easier. Furthermore I have discovered hundreds of new species in these New-Caledonian deep waters over these last ten years and I still do not have a single shell with my name on it !!! So it is time to change that situation... lol !



So that specie might have my name soon and finally be described , more than 4 years after its first finding !!!

Anyway, Bill Fenzan is now in charge of sorting out that situation with Bill Cargile, so it should be okay soon.

There are about 15 specimens found and Cargile got around 10 specimens.

That cone is really something new and amazing as there is a lot of colour variations among the few specimens we have been able to dredge, like albinistic, yellow, pink, purple, brown, and some with superb patterns. Average size for that specie is 30 to 40mm.

It is obvious that it is linked to the *proximus* complex. It is actually

something in between the *rogmartini* the *proximus* and the *molluccensis*.



To conclude, it is a shame we cannot dredge anymore as I am pretty sure we could have found many more specimens. Unfortunately, that specie will not be available on the market as it is simply impossible to dredge anymore in the New-Caledonian waters. The only opportunities will be from eventual future oceanographic campaigns, where there is always some stolen material.... and as I know all the local crews it can be helpful sometimes... But it is very uncertain anyway, as that area were we found them is very small and there is very few chances Bouchet or some other scientists decide to organize some specific dredgings in that particular area, as bottoms are quite poor also.



Finally, I just know about a couple of stolen specimens so far, including that one. One has been

already bought back by myself and sold to Cargile's collection at the COA this year. And that new one is in Loïc Limpalaer collection, which is very interesting to know about.

Well I reckon that's all,


I have included a few pictures of some of the first specimens we have dredged in 2002. Feel free to use them. However, quality of the pictures is not so good and I do apologize.

So, does anyone have further information to add to Vincent's comment? Our pages will always be open to any ideas that may shed light on the issues raised.



OUR SPECIAL SPECIMENS

In our last issue, we suggested that readers could send us photos of exceptional specimens from their collections, something that we all like to see. As a matter of fact, it has been argued that exceptional specimens are the only true rare shells, and there obviously is some truth in this statement.



C. lishkeanus Weinkauff, 1875

To begin with, we are glad to present you an exceptionally large gem *C. lishkeanus* Weinkauff, 1875.

This magnificent specimen was recently obtained by the Portuguese firm Depp'n Reef Shells, owned by Paulo Granja and Manuel Amorim, well known international shell dealers. It was found in the Nacala Bay area, North Moçambique.



C. lishkeanus Weinkauff, 1875

It must be stressed that no amount of charm from your Editor could persuade Paulo Granja to sell this specimen to him, since it was already reserved for another customer. A great pity, to be sure... Its current owner – whose identification was of course prevented by professional ethics – must be quite proud.



Another eye-catching specimen comes from the vast collection of Alexander Medvedev, from Russia. It represents a common but quite beautiful species, namely *C. ebraeus*, Linnaeus, 1758, but it has a truly outstanding pattern, making it rather unique.



C. ebraeus, Linnaeus, 1758

This specimen measures 23.2 mm and was found in the Philippines. Since *C. ebraeus* is such a variable species, it would be interesting to have a whole gallery of different patterns in our pages. So, take a good look at your drawers and send us photos of your best and most curious specimens, for inclusion in our next issue!




Next, here are a few “specials” sent by Jon F. Singleton, from West Australia:

1 - An Australian Special

I was fortunate in obtaining this small but unique cone through an exchange many years ago. It is a sinistral specimen of *C. rutilus* Mencke, 1843.

It was collected in just one metre of water off Hopetoun, which is on the southern coast of Western Australia. Size 9.1 x 5.3 mm.



2 - A Special from the Cocos Islands

The Cocos Islands are situated some 3000 kilometres to the N. W. of Australia, and today are mainly visited by tourists. My only visit was some 20 years ago, and naturally I took the opportunity to do some shelling.

Amongst the shells found was just one solitary specimen of *Conus bandanus*. It is by no means a gem specimen, being heavily encrusted, and took a lot of patient cleaning. The effort was well worthwhile, as it has the least black colour in the pattern I have seen amongst the many specimens sighted of this common species.

This remains the only *C. bandanus* I have seen from the Cocos Islands, so I do not know if it is the normal local form, or just an oddity.



3 - A Special from Borneo

Conus coccineus is an easily identified species. The colour ranges from a dark brown to orange, and the mid-body band can vary in the pattern. The only variation I have seen which differs, is a slightly more slender form which is found in southern New Guinea.

Last year I obtained a cone from the Perth diver and dealer Hugh Morrison, following a trip to Borneo. This specimen was live taken off the Investigate Reef, S. W. Sabah from 40 metres.

At first glance at this cone with the periostracum still intact, I thought it was a colourful *C. artoptus*, purely by the shape. After cleaning I realised this was an exceptionally thin specimen of *C. coccineus*. A brilliant deep orange and a contrasting mid-body band of black marks. The shoulder is also more strongly tuberculated than in normal specimens.



LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

We have received many letters (electronically speaking) and of course they all deserved some reply. But there are a few points that deserve mention in our pages.

✍ From Guido Poppe:


[...] nice number. One remark: the article on the new *Conus* is very nice, but it should be great to have a number with all new Conidae since RKK figured. Thanks so much.

Ed.: Yes, that would be a great idea and we will certainly try to illustrate most of the new species so that in due time we will have all of them. We will even try to get permission to reproduce full original descriptions.

✍ From Bruce Livett:

[...] I greatly enjoyed your article. It occurred to me that another cone honouring royalty is the cone I work on, *Conus victoriae*, named after Queen Victoria. (Common Name: Victoria Cone; Queen Victoria's Cone). *Conus victoriae victoriae* Reeve, 1843, Reeve, L.A. 1843. p. 172 (Mouth of the Victoria River, New Holland).

Ed.: Thanks, Bruce, that one had indeed slipped my mind!



Conus victoriae Reeve, 1843

✍ From Bruce Livett:

Cone Shells of the World: I must look at my copy. You list the publisher "The Jacaranda Press, from Brisbane, New South Wales, Australia". However, Brisbane is in Queensland, not New South Wales. So there is something not quite right about that. I will check and let you know.

Ed.: About Jacaranda Press, you are quite right: they have in fact three addresses: "73 Elizabeth Street, Brisbane", "142 Victoria Road, Marrickville, N.S.W." and "337 La Trobe Street, Melbourne". For some unknown reason I copied "Brisbane" and "N.S.W." together!! So, I stand corrected!

✍ From Andre Poremski:

By the way... I made mistake with the *curassaviensis* pictures... I forgot to request credit given to the photographer, my good friend Afonso Jorio of Guarapari, Brazil. I did not know that the publication was going out so quickly and with no review, I was caught by surprise. I feel bad about this.

Ed.: No harm done. I have also received a letter from Afonso Jório and Luiz Couto, from the Brazilian firm Mar a Mar indicating that the photos of live *C. curassaviensis* and *C. regius* were in fact theirs. They were quite understanding and readily accepted the sincere apologies from Andre and also from the Editor.

✍ From Giancarlo Paganelli:

I received with a great pleasure the #1 Cone Collector and I read the articles with much interest.

By the way, I think the cone image at page 4 doesn't represent *C. ciderryi* but *C. guidopopei*. About a month ago I had some doubt on the correct ID of *ciderryi* and I had an exchange of views with Paul K. Later I asked Dr. Yves Finet for a picture of the holotype of *ciderryi* that is at Geneva Museum and he kindly sent me the image in attachment. Unfortunately I didn't find other images; all show the same specimen (the holotype).




Image 1 Holotype in Geneva Museum MHNG 984/636



Image 2 Holotype from Kohn (Conus biodiversity)




Image 3 Holotype from da Motta, 1985. (Five new Taxa for the Genus *Conus*. Publicações Opcionais da Sociedade Portuguesa de Malacologia, 4:1-8.)

I should be very glad to receive your opinion.

Ed.: I am very glad to know that you have enjoyed TCC #1.

You may in fact be right about the *ciderryi/guidopoppei* question.

I wanted to show a photo of *C. ciderryi*, so I think I simply took the one I found in Paul Kersten's site and did not bother to check it any further than that.

Now that you raise the question, here are my views on this issue:

1) *C. ciderryi* was described by Bob da Motta in the publications of the Portuguese Malacological Society, just like you say. In his paper Bob illustrated only the holotype (the specimen shown in the photos you now sent) and mentioned 3 other paratypes, presumably kept in his collection (hence currently in Stuttgart)

2) I have never seen any actual specimen of *C. ciderryi*. This species was described from Australia.

3) When I saw the first specimens of *C. guidopoppei*, which seems to be rather common in the Philippines, I immediately thought that it could be conspecific with *C. ciderryi*. Yes, I know that the shoulder and spire look a bit different, but could not the holotype of *C. ciderryi* be slightly abnormal?

4) Supposing that *ciderryi* is in fact distinct from *guidopoppei*, I would agree with you that the figured specimen seems closer to *guidopoppei* than to the holotype of *ciderryi*.

5) The relationship of several of these "needle cones", including *C. hopwoodi*, etc., must really be studied in depth (ADN studies could be really helpful here, I guess).

Well, that's all I can say. Does anyone have further comments on this matter?



They Are Out There Somewhere

Jon F. Singleton

As well as collecting cone shells, I have a keen interest in conchological history. Part of this entails seeking out information on previous generations of collectors, even the pre-Linnean naturalists.

With the cone nomenclature I like to track down all the descriptions of recognised species along with the mass of synonyms. Also the story behind the name of the species can be interesting. With modern descriptions one usually finds this within the etymology paragraph, but it is missing in many of the older namings.

For cone researchers the missing Fenaux types are a frustration. Although all his new species are now regarded as synonyms, they remain a part of the cone nomenclature. I have never seen an original copy of either of the two Fenaux papers, just possessing early xerox copies which do not have the finer tones of black and white now available in the more modern machines.

During the final months of his life, Bob da Motta gave away parts of his cone material such as old papers, illustrations, etc., to various sources. He sent a packet of miscellaneous cone photographs to a friend of mine in Australia, who sadly has since passed away. These consisted of odd pictures of various cone species, including a lot of spare type photographs he had accumulated. I was able to view these during a visit, and made copies of some which were of interest to myself.

One of these photographs showed a *C. richardi*, one of the Fenaux namings, illustrated in his first paper at Fig. 11. On comparing Bob's

photograph with my black and white illustration, I came to the conclusion they were likely identical, and Bob's photograph was the Fenaux holotype.

I did write to Bob inquiring as to the source of the photo, and whether he had originally possessed any more of the Fenaux types. Sadly I received no reply likely due to his declining health.

C. richardi is considered by most cone workers to be a synonym of *C. fumigatus* of Hwass in Bruguière, 1792. The white and pink colouration of Bob's photograph is likely unnatural when reading the colours mentioned in the Fenaux text. However this is not needed when just comparing the cluster of markings on the illustrations.



The whereabouts of the Fenaux cone specimens remains a mystery, as will the provenance of Bob's photograph as to whether he took the photograph himself, or was given to him by an unknown source.

Since coming to live in Australia some 35 years ago, I have naturally been studying the species from our waters. One of my on-going projects is a study of the *C. anemone* complex, and I would dearly love to obtain colour photographs of the Fenaux *C. incinctus* and *nitidissimus*, both considered synonyms of *C.*

anemone. I am always optimistic, but "Father Time" may have broken the chain of memories.

Reference

1942. A. Fenaux, *Bulletin de l'Institut Oceanographique*, No. 814, 10th Jan.



Kaicher's cards

Inevitably, the opinions already expressed about the validity of the names used by Sally Diane Kaicher in her shell cards, and the decisions of the ICZN on the subject still elicit some discussion. Here are two further comments on this theme:

1) From Mike Filmer:

I would like to clarify my opinion on the status of the Kaicher names (page 6).

Although the ICZN Code Article 13.1.1. does not specifically require a comparison with other *taxa*, Recommendation 13A. (Intent to Differentiate) states: "When describing a new nominal *taxon*, an author should make clear his or her purpose to differentiate the *taxon* by including with it a diagnosis that is to say, a summary of the characters that differentiate the new nominal *taxon* from related or similar *taxa*".

In my opinion, Kaicher did not differentiate her *taxa* from other similar *taxa* and clearly did not herself intend to introduce new *taxa* but merely to illustrate *taxa* introduced by others which were themselves unavailable names.

Therefore I prefer to consider the Kaicher names unavailable or

nomen nudum. The one name from the Kaicher cards which remains a problem is *C. nasui* (Kosuge) There is a question as to whether Kosuge's *taxon* is available or not which needs to be resolved.

2) From John Tucker:

I do not mean to belabor a point but I completely disagree with Filmer's interpretation of the code and of opinion 1905. The cards are available and the names are available. There is no requirement for a comparison by the code. The requirement is for characters. Kaicher gave characters.

The names are validly (but obviously poorly) proposed. All four names have brief descriptions and a figure of the species. If Filmer believes the name should be rendered invalid, then he should propose that to the Commission. I doubt that the commission would agree because the scientists understand that a comparison with other species is not required for availability. Once the publication was ruled available so were the contained names.

I do wish that the Commission would clearly state that a comparison is not a requirement and Filmer's use of "indicated" in the sense of comparison is incorrect. The code requires only CHARACTERS that purport to ...

If I say this is a blue shell and that is the full extent of the description, I have given a character that purports to differentiate the species. At least it is differentiated from all species that are not blue. If I follow all other requirements of the current code, the name would be available. One must remember that the code is a living document and must take the past into consideration as well as the future.

It really does not matter in the long run because these Kaicher species

are all variants of *Conus bulbus* in any case.


Editor:

Whereas I do not wish to comment on whether Kaicher's names are valid, available, or anything else, I must beg to differ from my old friend John Tucker, insofar as I do not by any means consider that all of the Cones illustrated by Laicher are mere forms of *C. bulbus* Reeve, 1843.



What am I?

Here is yet another mystery specimen begging for a proper identification. It is in the collection of Paul Kersten.



This specimen comes from the Andaman Sea, where it was taken at a depth of about 1m. It measures 31.2mm.

Suggestions, anyone?



New logotype

As our keen-eyed readers will have noticed, we now have a logotype for *The Cone Collector*. The author is Luís Ambar, a well-known Portuguese shell collector.

Luís actually specialized in Volutes, but since he is a gifted artist I have asked him for a logo for our publication. He used the two letters "C" from "Cone Collector" to mark the spire of a stylized Cone shell and there you have it.



Perhaps one of these days this logo can be converted into a badge or a pin that will identify our subscribers, for instance in international Shell Shows.

For now it will simply grace the first page of each of our numbers.




Shell Art


Alfred J. Spoo

Once again, our friend Al Spoo has chosen to delight us with his art. We already knew that he was quite a gifted watercolourist and now he decided to work a bit more on Cones. For one thing, he has kindly supplied a cover for the first issues of *The Cone Collector*, which I am sure many of us will be proud to use. Moreover, he has supplied a few plates of different Conidae species.

Enjoy:



Conidae Indo-Pacific Region



1. *Conus aulicus*, 2. *C. figulinus*, 3. *C. generalis*, 4. *C. mustelinus*

The Cone Collector

by Antonio Monteiro
Volumes 0 - 1



January 2007

AUSTRALIA CORNER

We are proud to have with us Jon F. Singleton, a well-known Cone collector from Australia. Jon has sent us a number of short notes concerning Australian Cones, so I thought it would be appropriate to create a whole section devoted to the Australian fauna. We could have similar sections about other regions, such as West Africa, or the Caribbean, etc., provided a significant number of contributions came in.

For now, let's have some

Cone News from Australia

Jon F. Singleton

Cone News from Australia - 1


Conus kimioi was named and described from Japanese waters by Habe in 1965, and quickly became a well known distinctive species. The range has since extended south to the Philippines and New Caledonia, and east to Futuna Island. The colour and pattern of two-tone brown horizontal banding, shows little to no variation throughout the range.

Several deep water cone species from the China Seas also range south, and odd specimens are found off the Queensland coast of Australia; *C. kimioi* would not be a too unexpected discovery had one been found in the region.

I can now report *C. kimioi* has been found in Australian waters, but rather unexpectedly from off Western Australia in the Indian Ocean. A research vessel doing exploration

surveys off the western side of the North West Cape trawled a specimen from a depth of 400 metres.

This Indian Ocean specimen of *C. kimioi* was brought up dead but in good condition and is illustrated below. Size is 14.9mm x 7.3 mm and now part of the West Australian Museum collection.



Cone News from Australia - 2

The earliest named cone which is endemic to Western Australia is *Conus dorreensis*. It was named by Peron in 1807, for the type locality of Dorre Island which is 80 kilometres off the mainland coast, and just north of Shark Bay.

C. dorreensis seems unique in that the vast majority of specimens within collections are displayed with their periostracum intact. Amazingly the 1995 *Manual of the Living Conidae* showed all three specimens in this manner. The periostracum is a greeny-brown, thick and dense, totally obscuring the usual all-white shell beneath.

C. dorreensis has a lengthy range up the west coast of W.

Australia, rounding the N. W. Cape and east to Roebourne. It is generally considered a common species, and living shells can be found within the inter-tidal zone.

The question is: “How well do specimens found today compare with the Perron type?” The answer, if one reads the Peron description, is “Not too well!”. Sadly, the holotype was destroyed during World War II and it seems no photographs exist, or up to now have never been found. So one wonders if the Peron type was cleaned, or still had an intact periostracum.

The Peron description is taken from his published *Voyage of Discovery* from 1801 to 1804. It is on page 120, and the English translation reads:


“A Cone or Rouleau (*Conus dorreensis*, N.) about an inch and a half in length, of a light orange colour, and distinguished by a narrow stripe which winds round each of the spiral turns, and which when quite fresh is of the brightest blue”

Unfortunately this specimen was not illustrated, despite the strong friendship between Peron and the artist Lesueur. The words “when quite fresh” seem to indicate Peron possessed more than one specimen.

To anyone looking at *C. dorreensis* either with or without the periostracum, the colours “light orange” and “brightest blue” seem to have no relation to this species. The greeny-brown periostracum does tend to lighten in colour to a more gold-brown at the northern half of the range, but still could not be considered orange. The narrow black stripe referred to by Peron outlines the limits of the periostracum horizontally, but can be absent in some specimens. So, it seems a puzzle that the Peron description does not match the standard *C. dorreensis*. Yet surprisingly, I do possess two

specimens which come close to the Peron colours.

Some years ago I collected a few live *C. dorreensis* off an inshore reef near Port Gregory, which is some 400 kilometres south of the type locality of Dorre Is. After noticing some discolouring within the aperture, I cleaned off the periostracum, and was surprised to uncover some colour and pattern. The orange colour is not any residue periostracum stain, and I gave a smaller specimen many cleans to see if it would eventually fade, but it remains fast. Certainly these specimens matched Peron’s “light orange”, though his “brightest blue” on mine has faded to a bluey-grey colour.



Sadly we are likely never to know if the Peron type which survived for 140 years until destroyed, had a periostracum intact, or a clean shell. If it was an orange specimen similar to my pair, then it was a very atypical specimen, and a form rarely seen.

References


- 1807. *Voyage de Découvertes aux Terres Australes*, F. Peron
- 1995. *Manual of the Living Conidae*, D. Röckel, W. Korn & A. J. Kohn

Cone News from Australia - 3

Like most cone collectors I have a drawer full of *C. magus*, and delight in the multi-coloured and variety of patterns within the complex.



C. magus is found in Australian waters, predominantly along the northern half of the Queensland coast and inshore islands. Throughout a 1000 kilometre range these *magus* show little variation in their colour and pattern, though of course the odd mutant is always occasionally found as in most species. However, it must be unique for a *magus* colony to show such stability in colour and pattern over such a lengthy range.



I have never sighted any *C. magus* from along the top end, Northern Territories. There is only one record known to me from an old 1964 paper which illustrated *C. magus* from Yirrkalla, and was a match for the Queensland form. The whereabouts of this specimen is unknown to me, and a search amongst the collections in Australian Museums was unsuccessful.

C. magus does occur in West Australian waters, but only on a couple of N. W. off-shore reefs near the edge of the N. W. Shelf, to the north of Broome. These *magus* are broader and heavier than the Queensland form, and differ in colour and pattern.



In 2005 I obtained two specimens of a cone collected from an off-shore shoal, some 120 kilometres N. N. E. of Cape Londonderry, at the far N. W. of West Australia. These were collected by a dive in 20 metres depth, and were not readily identifiable to me at first sight. I finally decided these were an odd form of *C. magus*, and resemble a pair of much larger specimens I have from Trangan Island in the Aru Group, Indonesia.

The illustrations show the standard Queensland and West Australian forms, and the two odd forms from West Australia. The two W.A. *magus* locations are 500 kilometres apart.

Reference

1964. R. C. Cotton, *Records of the American-Australian Scientific Expedition to Arnhem Land*, Vol. 4

Cone News from Australia - 4

Conus suturatus is a well known species which is common in Australian waters, less so in New Guinea, and scarce in Indonesia. There is also the very different looking “*sandwichensis*” form from Hawaii.


The shallow water West Australian form is usually plain, from near all white to pale pink with a lavender anterior. Over on the other side of the continent, specimens are better marked with orange or light brown dots, dashes and bands.

During research expeditions off the N. W. coast of West Australia over a period of twenty years, the W. A. Museum has obtained a number of deep water cones which look not too unlike *C. suturatus*. These are smaller, and have the body whorl sculptured with distinct horizontal grooves. Tentatively I considered these to

possibly be a different un-named species, but was not able to obtain any private specimens.

In 2005 I was fortunate in obtaining two specimens similar to the W. A. Museum cones which were collected off the N. W. Cape from a depth of 30 metres by a diver. The body whorl grooving is much finer than on the museum specimens, and on one only half the body whorl is grooved. I have now revised my opinion, and consider the museum specimens and mine, a deeper water form of *C. suturatus*. The illustrated specimen is 30mm x 19 mm.

The same year another possible form of *C. suturatus* came to me from Indonesia. A diver collected a few at a depth of 20 metres from the Aru Island Group. These have a distinct shape, pale pink spiral whorls, body orange with two darker orange horizontal bands, and the characteristic lavender anterior. The illustrated specimen is 29mm x 18 mm.



Cone News from Australia - 5


Just *Conus viola* in Australia

W. Cernohorsky introduced the *C. viola* as a replacement name for *C. violaveus* of Reeve, 1844. A lectotype was designated from three *violaceus* sotypes within the BMNH, a 41 mm x 15 mm specimen. Within this paper,

the author also illustrated an Australian specimen from off Melville Island, just north of Darwin in the Northern Territories.

Within Australia today, the main source of *C. viola* is the Darwin region, where the species is not uncommon. It has also been found off Cassini Island in the N. W. of Western Australia, and at several locations off the northern Queensland coast as far south as Townsville. The mature specimens have a fairly standard pattern of brown broken horizontal banding of light and darker brown, while the sub-adults are usually darker and with a high gloss which disappears on maturity.

Specimens of *C. viola* matching Australian cones are known from off Singapore, New Guinea and Indonesia. The Singapore specimens are usually a lighter shade of brown, and the New Guinea and Indonesia specimens similar and generally slightly smaller in length.



C. viola is not uncommon around the islands of Cebu and Bohol in the Philippines. These are better known to most collectors, being pale lavender to violet with brown markings, and rarely exceeding 40 mm in length. *C. viola* is rarely collected in the Solomons, and I only possess one

slightly sub-adult specimen which matches the synonym *C. blatteus* in colour and pattern. An attractive pinkish specimen is illustrated within the *Cone Manual* from New Caledonia.

The introduction of the *C. austroviola* name was a surprise to Australians. Despite the well chosen name, I feel it should be regarded as just a synonym of *C. viola*. The thought that this species was confined to the Darwin region was erroneous, even at the time of publication. Likely the reason is that despite an 1800 kilometre coastline, well over 90% of all shelling activity is confined to a 50 kilometre radius of Darwin. Vast stretches of Northern Territories coastline are inaccessible to vehicles.

The three illustrated specimens are all Australian.

References

1977. Cernohorsky, W. O., *Nautilus*, Vol. 91(2)
 1992. Röckel, D. & Korn, W., *Acta Conchyliorum*, No. 3
 1995. Röckel, D., Korn, W. & Kohn, A. J., *Manual of the Living Conidae*



Sinistral *C. ventricosus*

Benito Muñoz Sánchez

On the beginning of January, during a brief walk on the beach of La Cruz del Mar, near the port of Chipiona (Cádiz, Spain), I was lucky to find a sinistral specimen of *C. ventricosus*.



Regrettably, it is a beached specimen, but still quite collectable, since it is not actually broken and of considerable size, 32.0 mm.



Here it can be seen together with a normal 33.6 mm specimen, with typical attachments.



Editor:

C. ventricosus Gmelin, 1791 seems to be one of the species more prone to the phenomenon of sinistrality. In this issue of *TCC* you will also find an example of a sinistral *C. rutilus* Mencke, 1843 and sinistral *C. furvus* Reeve, 1843 are also known (I have one in my collection).

It would be interesting to build a list of the species for which the same phenomenon has been registered. Do let me know if you have any such specimens in your collection, if possible with an accompanying photo.



Conus peli Moolenbeek, 1996

Piet (Peter) van Pel

To my surprise I found in the first issue of *The Cone Collector* pictures of the two paintings of *Conus peli*, hanging in my room. I understood that the artist, Boet van Heugten, who painted them for me, forwarded them to the editor.



Conus peli Moolenbeek, 1996

This cone shell occurs in the Sultanate of Oman and particularly on Masirah Island.



Conus peli Moolenbeek, 1996
(holotype)

Most of the shells are washed ashore in dead condition and to my knowledge only one specimen was collected alive and is in the alcohol collection of the Zoological Museum Amsterdam. It was found at a depth of 20 m in sandy bottom and I photographed the shell immediately after the catch (see the remarkable periostracum!).



Conus peli Moolenbeek, 1996

I have four specimens in my collection, one measuring 85 mm; none of them are in gem condition.



Recently described species

We have been trying to keep our readers up to date with recently described species for the genus *Conus*. Naturally, it is not easy to keep track of everything, so any contributions from our readers will be much appreciated.

Now, according to Paul Kersten, who has been in charge of this particular section of our newsletter, only one new *taxon* was described since our last issue:

Conus olgiatii Bozzetti, 2007
(in *Malacologia* No. 54)

On the other hand, the previous list needs a few corrections.

To begin with, Jon Singleton noticed that the authors and date for *C. sartii* were not correct. The entry should read *Conus sartii* Korn, Niederhöfer & Blöcher, 2001 (not *Conus sartii* Korn, Niederhöfer & Röckel, 2004).

Next, John Tucker sent in the following list of additions and corrections (Jon Singleton had also spotted the omission of the taxon "*C. rufoluteus* Bozzetti and Ferrario, 1995"):

alisi Moolenbeek, Röckel, and Richard in Röckel, Richard and Moolenbeek, 1995. *Conus*. *Mém. Mus. Natl. Hist. Nat.* 167:559, figs. 2, 4, 5. 330-367 m, Norfolk Ridge, 23°18'S, 168°05'E. (Note the correct authorship for this)



C. alisi Moolenbeek, Röckel, 1995

bellocqae van Rossum, 1996. *Conus*. *World Shells* 16:59, 7 figs. 50-60 m, off Conakry, West Africa. (Note correct spelling, I checked the original.)

coriolisi Moolenbeek and Richard in Röckel, Richard and Moolenbeek, 1995. *Conus orbignyi* Audouin, 1831, subspecies. *Mém. Mus. Natl. Hist. Nat.* 167:578, figs. 12, 13. 240 m, Lord Howe Rise, Capel Bank, Coral Sea, 25°29'S, 159°46'E. (Note the correct authorship for this)

estivali Moolenbeek and Richard in Röckel, Richard and Moolenbeek, 1995. *Conus*. *Mém. Mus. Natl. Hist. Nat.* 167:571, figs. 6, 7. 400 m, Coral Sea, 19°53'S, 158°38'E. (Note the correct authorship for this)



C. estivali Moolenbeek and Richard, 1995
(image from gene Mallory's site through Paul Kersten's Checklist of the Living Conidae)

futunaensis Moolenbeek and Röckel, 1996. *Conus neptunus* Reeve, 1843, subspecies. *Bull. Mus. Natl. Hist. Nat.*, sér. 18, sect. A, 3/4:392, figs. 1-3. 355-369 m, Futuna Island, 14°19.6'S, 178°04.8'W. (Omitted)

gondwanensis Röckel and Moolenbeek in Röckel, Richard and Moolenbeek, 1995. *Conus*. *Mém. Mus. Natl. Hist. Nat.* 167:572, figs. 8, 9, 54. 240 m, south New Caledonia, 23°41'S, 168°01'E. (Note the correct authorship for this)

grondini Larue, 1995. *Conus*. *Xenophora* 69:19, fig. 60 m, near Bourail, New Caledonia. (Omitted)

ignotus Cargile, 1998. *Conus*. *Siratus* 2(14):9, figs. 1-4. 25-35 m, west side of Quito Sueno Bank, east coast Nicaragua. (Omitted)

immelmani Korn, 1998. *Conus*. *La Conchiglia* 30(288):11, figs. 1-6, 12, 13 right. (Omitted)



C. immelmani Korn, 1998

†*kakegawaensis* Nobuhara and Tanaka, 1999. *Rhizoconus hyaena* Hwass, 1792, subspecies. Venus 58(3):135, pl. 1, figs. 1-4, pl. 2, figs. 1-5, 7. Gomyo, Kakegawa City, Shizuoka Prefecture, Japan, 34°47'25"N, 138°0'26"E. Pebble conglomerate, Dainichi Formation, U. Pliocene. (Omitted, a fossil)

†*kendrewi* Petuch, 1997. *Conus (Asprella)*. Nautilus 110(4):135, fig. 72. Terramar pit, western most Polk County, Florida. Suwanee Formation, Oligocene. (Omitted, a fossil)

loyaltiensis Röckel and Moolenbeek in Röckel, Richard and Moolenbeek, 1995. *Conus*. Mém. Mus. Natl. Hist. Nat. 167:577, figs. 1, 10, 11, 55. 480 m, Loyalty Ridge, 21°04'S, 167°32'E. (Note the correct authorship for this)

†*nocens* Garvie, 1996. *Conus (Lithoconus)*. Bull. Am. Paleontol. 111(352):90, pl. 19, figs. 9, 10. Devil's Eye, Colorado River and Smithville, Bastrop County, Texas. Weches Formation, M. Claiborne Group, M. Eocene. (Omitted, a fossil)

pacificus Moolenbeek and Röckel, 1996. *Conus*. Bull. Mus. Natl. Hist. Nat., sér. 18, sect. A, 3/4:395, figs. 4-7. 597-600 m, Bayonnaise Bank, 12°30.8'S, 176°40.3'W. (Omitted)



C. pacificus Moolenbeek and Röckel, 1996
(image from gene Mallory's site through Paul Kersten's Checklist of the Living Conidae)

pineau Pin and Tack, 1995. *Conus*. La Conchiglia 27(276):45, figs. 1, 2, 3a, b, c bis, 4a, 5. 20-30 m, off Cap de Naze, south of Dakar, Senegal, West Africa. [The name was first mentioned in Pin, 1989 (on page 78 in figure caption for fig. 17, and in the caption for figs. 38-5, 38-6), but as a name and figures only, the description was listed as *Conus* sp. with the only reference to the binomen indirect through citation of figure number (i.e., figs. 17, 32, 48).] (Omitted)

rufoluteus Bozzetti and Ferrario, 1995. *Conus betulinus* Linné, 1758, subspecies. Visaya 1(4):54, pl. 3. Toliara, southwestern Madagascar. (Omitted)

vaubani Röckel and Moolenbeek in Röckel, Richard and Moolenbeek, 1995. *Conus*. Mém. Mus. Natl. Hist. Nat. 167:587, figs. 3, 14, 15, 56. 435 m, south New Caledonia, 23°38'S, 167°43'E. (Note the correct authorship for this)



C. vaubani Röckel and Moolenbeek, 1995
 (image from gene Mallory's site through Paul Kersten's Checklist of the Living Conidae)

verhoefti Röckel and Moolenbeek, 1996. *Conus*. Vita Marina 44(1/2):48, pl. 1, figs. 5-6. Pitcairn Islands. Is a *nomen nudum* (Omitted).

Last but not least, Mike Filmer (who also noticed the absence of "*C. rufoluteus* Bozzetti and Ferrario, 1995") indicated that *Conus gabriela* had a wrong date: it should in fact be *Conus gabriela* Rolan & Röckel 2000.

On the other hand, Mike explained the following:

May I point out that the ICZN Code Article 21.3.1 states that the date applicable to a new *taxon* is the last day of the month specified. There are a number of cases in which a magazine or journal is dated in one year but is not issued and available until the following year. In such cases the date should be shown as follows 2001 ("2000"). Article 22A.2. The following should be shown as such:

- C. empressae* 2002 ("2001")
- C. garywilsoni* 2004 ("2003")
- C. gordyi* 2000 ("1999")
- C. guidopopei* 2006 ("2005")
- C. habui* 2003 ("2002")
- C. hayesi* 2001 ("2000")

- C. mcbridei* 2006 ("2005")
- C. patamakanthini* 1998 ("1997")
- C. poulosi* 1993 ("1992")
- C. sagarinoi* 2005 ("2004")
- C. salzmanni* 1997 ("1995")
- C. sartii* 2002 ("2001")
- C. wallacei* 2005 ("2004")



C. gordyi Röckel & Bondarev, 2000 ("1999")
 (image from gene Mallory's site through Paul Kersten's Checklist of the Living Conidae)

Thanks to all!



Request for articles

We have received the following note from Dr. Robert Moolenbeek, which we gladly include in our pages:

Vita Malacologica is a 'yearly' publication from the Dutch Malacological Society. Up to now four issues have been published.

The first issue is on Stromboidea, the second on Dutch marine Mollusca, the third on Opisthobranchia and the fourth on Ellobiidae. The society now would like to dedicate an issue to the family Conidae.

Until now three authors already promised to contribute. Robert Moolenbeek from the

Zoological Museum Amsterdam will publish papers on the French Deep Sea Expeditions to the Fiji (6 new species) and the Marquesas Islands (4-5 new species).

Anyone, who wishes to publish on the family Conidae (taxonomy, systematics, distribution, ecology and/or biology) in VITA MALACOLOGICA is requested to contact Robert Moolenbeek [invited editor] (moolenbeek@science.uva.nl) at their earliest convenience.

Publication of colour plates is encouraged.

The deadline for submission of manuscripts is September 2007, publication is scheduled for December 2007.

We hope that several of our readers submit papers to this excellent publication.



Recent meetings

In the weekend of 17-18 March, the Association Française de Conchyliologie organized the “19èmes Rencontres Internationales du Coquillage”, the well-known international Shell Show held annually in Paris, France.

As always, many dealers and collectors from all over the world got together at the beautiful room of the Bourse du Commerce, close to the Musée du Louvre to spend two days in the midst of the most beautiful seashells. Thousands of species, from the most common to the rarest, could be found on the tables. Among them there were of course many Cones.

But besides acquiring some specimens – budget permitting – the Meeting is also an excellent to meet friends and fellow collectors. Actually, there are several old friends that I get to meet only once a year in Paris!



Left to right: António Monteiro, Andre Poremski, Manuel Jimenez Tenorio
(photo Franck Frydman... with Manuel's camera!)

This year, I had the pleasure of finding several of our subscribers, and being able to talk a bit with everyone, which was a great joy.



On the left, José Rosado; in the blue shirt, Armando Verdasca
(photo Carlos Durães de Carvalho)



Carlos Afonso ("Camané")
(photo Carlos Durães de Carvalho)



Left to right: Loïc Limpaler, Eric Monnier, Antonio Monteiro, Manuel J. Tenorio, Alexander Medvedev
and Miguel Angel López-Verdegay
(photo by Miguel Angel's wife Rosi)

Also at the same occasion, we had the opportunity to examine Eric Monnier's beautiful and exceptional series of *C. taslei* Kiener, 1845. Enjoy:

