

28. *Archivulus xylobioides*, Scudd., Ib. p. 236.

29. *Euphorberia armigera*, Meek-Worth., Sill. Journ. (2), vol. xlv., p. 26.

30. ? „ *major*, Meek-Worth., Ib. p. 26.

Of these, No. 8 is the only one which has not yet been figured. Of No. 19 I cannot now lay my hand on the paper containing the description. It appeared about seven or eight years ago.

Nos. 5, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 29, and 30 come from the Ironstone nodules of Mazon Creek, near Morris, Illinois.

Nos. 14, 15, 16, come from shale, near Morris, Ill.

No. 1 comes from Frog Bayou, Arkansas.

Nos. 2, 3, 4, 6, 17, and 18, come from Cape Breton.

Nos. 24 to 28 come from Sigillarian stumps at the Joggins, Nova Scotia. No. 8 comes from Tallmadge, Ohio.

BOSTON, U.S.A.

SAM. H. SCUDDER.

NEW ORTHOPTEROUS INSECT IN THE COAL-MEASURES OF SCOTLAND.¹

SIR,—I read with interest Mr. Woodward's paper on an Orthopterous Insect from the Coal (see Quart. Journ. Geol. Soc. Lond., 1876, vol. xxxii. p. 60, pl. ix.), and I take the liberty to direct attention to my paper on *Fossil Blattidæ* (in der Vierteljahrzchrift der tühner Naturfourch., Gesellschaft, vol. ix. 1864, p. 273). In it are several species omitted from Mr. Woodward's list, viz.:

Blattina helvetica, Heer, from Erbignon, Valais.

—— *Fritschii*, Heer, „ Mannebach, Thuringia.

—— *clathrata*, Heer, „ „ „

—— *latinervis*, Heer, „ „ „

all from the Carboniferous period. *Blattina helvetica* is also figured in my "*Primæval World*," p. 20 (English Edition, just published, London, Longmans).

DR. OSWALD HEER, PROF.

ZURICH.

FURTHER DISCOVERIES OF OSSIFEROUS CAVERNS IN NEW SOUTH WALES.

SIR,—I inclose letter from the Editor of the "Bathurst Free Press," and part of a newspaper, relative to the discovery of some caves similar to those of Wellington, N.S.W., which I examined in company with the late Prof. A. M. Thomson with such happy results. I have seen some bones and teeth said to have been found there, and these are all referable to the extinct fauna of the Wellington Valley. I would have gone up; but since the discovery became known, all our *scientific ignoti* are interfering, and have requested the Trustees of the Australian Museum to take the matter in hand! Perhaps I shall have an opportunity to examine more specimens soon, and will let you know the result.

AUSTRALIAN MUSEUM,
CURATOR'S OFFICE, SYDNEY,
August 5th, 1876.

GERARD KREFFT,
Curator Australian Museum.

From the inclosures in Mr. Krefft's letter, we learn that *several*

¹ This note (together with Prof. Scudder's communication) has been unintentionally omitted, the original having been accidentally lost, and only now recovered.
EDIT. GEOL. MAG.

large CAVES containing fossil remains have been discovered in the limestone country between Cowra and Canowindra, on the road between these two places, and between 70 and 80 miles from Bathurst. The description of the caverns differs in no wise from those of other limestone districts where streams have dissolved more or less extensive chambers in the softer limestone, these chambers being connected by narrow passages, and lying at different elevations with regard to each other. The caverns are large, and decorated with stalactites. The roof of one chamber in the principal cave is said to be from 80 to 90 feet high, with some 12 or 14 openings leading into other cavities. They are stated to descend from 300 to 400 feet beneath the surface. Nearly all the caves and chambers have their floors composed of a thick layer of *ossiferous breccia* apparently quite undisturbed. Only one cave seems to have been dangerous from "*choke-damp*." The writers are very enthusiastic as to their discoveries, and propose to explore another cave reached by a shaft 100 ft. perpendicular. We trust that no lives will be lost in this somewhat Quixotic fit of cave-hunting, and shall look forward with interest to Mr. Gerard Krefft's report on the bones from this extensive series of caves and fissures in New South Wales.

—EDIT. GEOL. MAG.

GLACIAL ORIGIN OF LAKE-BASINS.

SIR,—I fear the points of difference between Mr. Hugh Miller and myself are hardly such as can be cleared up in the compass of a letter, but yet I should like to make one or two remarks on his paper, because I still think we are to some extent misunderstanding one another. My letter (p. 376) was chiefly devoted to the reasoning in Mr. Fisher's paper (p. 253); the paragraph alluding to Mr. Miller's letter (p. 287) was simply intended to call attention to a defect in his reasoning (where he now admits that he did himself injustice) and to guard against what seemed to me a misconception of my argument. An unfortunate printer's error, or slip in writing in my manuscript (it was not possible for me to revise a proof), made my meaning less clear than it should have been. Expanded, this is what I intended to imply—"Suppose you prove that a certain number of small-sized sheets of water (to avoid ambiguity we will say such as Grasmere, or less) are most easily explained by the hypothesis of glacial erosion, it does not follow that very large and deep sheets of water (such as Como) are most easily explained by the same hypothesis." The first paragraph of Mr. Miller's letter, and parts of the second and third on page 287, appeared to mean that he claimed to reason from the examples which he quoted to those cases which I have always disputed; and in his paper (p. 453) he seems to still maintain this: "It appears to me that no halting-place can logically be found by those who, with Sir Charles Lyell, allow only some mountain tarns to Prof. Ramsay's demand for lakes." It is this which I dispute. Perhaps the halting-place may not be impregnable to an attack on the destructive 'Sorites' method; but in science and in every-day life, we are constantly obliged to take our stand on