

marginal) portions of certain of the Permian sub-divisions owing to the minor oscillations, resulting in partial failures of deposition and paltry denudations, to which all shallow-water deposits of limited thickness are liable. These were, however, probably mostly inter- rather than post-Permian. Such, for instance, are the cases mentioned in the Survey Memoirs, near Mansfield and Tadcaster, where Middle Permian Marls rest on an eroded surface of the Lower Magnesian Limestone, which at the former place is full of false bedding, and at both exhibits signs of having been sufficiently close to the surface to have locally curtailed or even entirely excluded the deposition of the Middle Marls. I would insist on the importance of discriminating between what is the result of contemporaneous influences (great and small), and what of subsequent causes, in limiting the extension of the Permian formations. If we consent to exclude all evidence that is not provably post-Permian, I think we have yet to learn the grounds for considering that there was in the above district any "considerable break" between the Permian and the Bunter.

It is with no small gratification that I find so eminent a Government Surveyor as Mr. Aveline is willing to admit that the great break in this district is, as I have laboured in my paper to show, at the bottom and not at the top of the Permians, and that he has become converted to the opinion that the "Lower Red Sandstone" is a myth.

E. WILSON.

NOTTINGHAM, 15th April, 1877.

MONOGRAPH ON BRITISH CARBONIFEROUS GANOIDS.

SIR,—Will you kindly permit me, through the medium of your Journal, to correct and apologize for a very awkward blunder, which occurs in the first part of my monograph on British Carboniferous Ganoids, recently published by the Palæontographical Society? In the Introduction I have advocated the retention of the *Dipnoi* as a distinct order of fishes; but at p. 41, in a manner unaccountable to myself, for I certainly did not mean it, I have included them as a suborder of the *Ganoidei*. That this "slip of the pen" was not detected in the revision of the proofs must have been due to an amount of carelessness, of which I am justly ashamed.

April 2.

R. H. TRAQUAIR.

CARBONIFEROUS GANOID FISHES.—ERRATA.

Page 7, line 24,	delete "which."
" 12 "	11, for "Egerton" read "Agassiz."
" 14 "	3, for "interclavicular" read "infraclavicular."
" 16 "	28, insert a "(" before " <i>Elonichthys</i> ."
" 28 "	34, for "or" read "on."
" 38 "	31, for "centre" read "centra."
" 41 "	34, delete "Suborder I. <i>Dipnoi</i> ."
" 41 "	35, for "II." read "Suborder I."
" 41 "	36, for "III." read "II."
" 42 "	4, for "IV." read "III."
" 42 "	5, for "V." read "IV."