

The date of the original Supplement is given as 1840, but was more probably 1841, since it must certainly have been published after the Congress was held at Turin, although it may have appeared before the actual publication of the *Atti*.

De Koninck (1841, Descrip. Anim. foss. terr. houiller . . . Belg., p. 22) did not accept *Caninia*, and made *C. cornucopia* a synonym of *Cyathophyllum mitratum* (Schlotheim). Since *C. cornucopia* had not then been published, De Koninck must have obtained his information from Michelin's letters or MS. This is further proved by the fact that De Koninck (loc. cit.) quoted the unpublished *Caninia cornu-bovis* as a synonym of *Cyathophyllum plicatum*. He may have got the name from the legend to the unpublished plate, since he quotes Dict. Sci. Nat., Suppl. II (not I). Anyhow, this citation gave *C. cornu-bovis* no validity.

The date of page 81 of Michelin's "Iconographie Zoophytologique" was probably about 1842. The species *Caninia gigantea* there established is said to be the only species common at Sablé, one of the localities ascribed to *C. cornucopia*, although erroneously, in the paragraph of Gervais.

As Mr. Carruthers points out, Michelin, when establishing *Caninia cornu-bovis*, referred to "Michelin, in P. Gervais, ASTRÉER, Dict. des Sci. nat., Suppl. tome I, p. 485 (pour le genre)." By the last words Michelin seems to imply that the description published in Gervais gives the characters of the genus, but not those of the species *Caninia cornu-bovis*. Mr. Carruthers admits the possibility of an alternative interpretation, namely, "that the generic description in the Supplement should be regarded as a specific description of *C. cornu-bovis*." Such a weakening of his case seems to me quite unwarranted.

The reason for taking *C. cornucopia* as genotype is briefly that this species was definitely selected as "espèce type" in the Supplement (1840 or 1841); and although *C. cornucopia* was not fully described till 1846, no other species was proposed as genotype by Lonsdale or any other intervening writer. In such a case, the rules of the International Zoological Congress leave no room for doubt.

It is hoped that the few notes here given will complete Mr. Carruthers' account, without affecting its main conclusions.

April 7th, 1908.

F. A. BATHER.

#### CHANGES OF LEVEL AND RAISED BEACHES.

SIR,—In the May number of this Magazine Dr. Jamieson suggests that the elevation of raised beaches is caused through the lightening of land areas by the ordinary denudation constantly going on. That this denudation may be a *vera causa* of elevation to re-establish equilibrium is highly probable. But there must be counteracting agencies at work, because the elevation of the beaches has been followed by a certain amount of depression, as shown by the submerged forests on our coasts. Denudation has been going on all along, and the land is now at its lightest, and consequently ought to be at its highest, yet on the contrary what was lately dry land is now below high water.

O. FISHER.

May 11th, 1908.



**ROUGH SKETCH-MAP**  
OF THE  
**FEDERATED MALAY STATES.**

The shaded area in Pahang marks approximately the main outcrop of the Tembeling Series.

Scale: 20 miles to an inch.

The main features of this map are taken from a sketch-map lithographed for the Federated Malay States Railways.

To illustrate Mr. J. B. SCRIVENOR's paper on "The Sedimentary Rocks of Singapore."