

The detailed description is as follows:—

Animal (fig. 1)—in spirits, with two small left and right mantle lobes, foot in length the shell's diameter, with pedal line, oblique grooves and caudal mucous pore, apparently surmounted by a horn, sole tripartite.

Genitalia (fig. 2)—penis broad, much twisted, containing a large blunt papilla, epiphallus more than twice the length of penis; vas deferens long, bound to wall of atrium. Spermatheca boot-shaped, duct moderately long. Base of vagina black, lobed, containing no follicles.

Jaw (fig. 4)—rather thin, arcuate, smooth, broad, without central projection.

In a slightly torn radula (fig. 3) I counted $140 = 4 = 12 = 1 = 12 = 4 = 140$ teeth in 103 rows. Rachidian twice as long as wide, basal plate rather hour-glass shaped, central cusp ovate-lanceolate, projecting half its length over the succeeding plate; small side cusps with distinct cutting points arise at two-thirds the length of the basal plate. Immediate laterals have the entocone suppressed, the ectocone appears as a small hook, the mesocone being broadly ovate. For three or four transition teeth the ectocone rapidly ascends the mesocone, till each of equal size form the bifid cusps of the marginals. These are minute, sinuous, and very numerous.

ON A CASE OF PRESUMED PROTECTIVE IMITATION.

BY FREDERICK A. A. SKUSE.

(Entomologist to the Australian Museum.)

[Plate XXII.]

That wonderful Hepialid, *Leto stacyi*, Scott, seems to claim a place among those famous examples of a similar nature advanced by Bates, Wallace, and others. The protective resemblances among animals is an established fact, and it is unnecessary to quote classical instances. But I cannot find any reference to such a protective feature as that of a moth which resembles *in situ* an approach to the head of a reptile known to possess an appetite for birds. In the case under notice it may fairly be claimed that such an example exists in nature.

After consulting my colleagues, by submitting to them photographs of actual specimens in their natural positions—and I am especially indebted to Mr. Edgar R. Waite, whose opinion, from his