

Tafel xx.). My attention has been directed to this fact by a newspaper report of a paper, recently read before the Geological Society of Glasgow, by Mr. John Young, in which he identified, as one of these "Kammlatten," an apparently allied relic from the Airdrie district, and which, judging from that report, must either be the same as Barkas's "*Ctenoptychius unilaterialis*, or closely related to it. The two specimens, from which I drew up my description of "*Euctenius*," have no elongated process or "handle," but in other respects there is an obvious general resemblance.

I may take this opportunity of mentioning that within the last few days I have obtained from the same ironstone a portion of a small Labyrinthodont mandible, set with teeth which have the same general configuration and markings as those of Messrs. Hancock and Atthey's *Batrachiderpeton*.

R. H. TRAQUAIR.

THE HUTTON COLLECTION OF FOSSIL PLANTS.

SIR,—It has only within the last few days come to my knowledge (indeed only to-day authoritatively), that the Hutton Collection of Fossil Plants, at present deposited in the Museum of the Natural History Society of Northumberland and Durham at Newcastle, had been named by the Curator, Mr. Richard Howse, prior to the compiling by myself of a Catalogue of the Collection, published in 1878 by the North of England Institute of Mining and Mechanical Engineers. The labels on the specimens, referred to in the Catalogue, were therefore Mr. Howse's, and not, as I until now imagined, either William Hutton's original ones or mere copies of them.

Moreover, an unsigned MS. List of the specimens in the Collection, agreeing with the labels, with which I was furnished by the Mining Institute, and which was used freely by me in drawing up the Catalogue, must now be regarded as the result of much time and labour spent by Mr. Howse in identifying and naming the whole of the Hutton Collection.

I trust you will allow me space in your MAGAZINE to hereby redress an injustice of which I was unaware at the time of its commission.

G. A. LEBOUR.

COLLEGE OF PHYSICAL SCIENCE,
NEWCASTLE-UPON-TYNE, May 18, 1881.

SUBSIDENCE AND ELEVATION.

SIR,—Mr. Starkie Gardner, in his paper on the above subject, in the June Number of your MAGAZINE, says (p. 245):—"The records of the Palæozoic rocks point to a comparative uniformity in the earth's surface in remote times, there being neither evidence of *great depths in the sea*, nor of mountainous elevations of the land."

The latest calculation of the average depth of the sea is a little over two miles. The area of land being, roughly speaking, about one-third of that of the oceans, it follows that if the solid part of the earth were a perfect spheroid, having neither depression nor elevation, it would be covered by an universal ocean nearly one and a half miles deep. Is there, therefore, any meaning in saying that there ever was a time when great depths of the sea did not exist?