

cannot find any certain evidence of them. Mr. Frederick Chapman, A.L.S., favours me with the following list of Foraminifera, which he has determined on the weathered surface of the flint on one of the Somali implements:—

Operculina, sp. with rib-like septa, common.

Heterostegina depressa, D'Orbigny, a very good specimen.

Cristellaria, two species, frequent.

Pulvinulina, one specimen.

I agree with Mr. Chapman in regarding the rock as being probably of Miocene or Pliocene age. T. RUPERT JONES.

NOTE ON *DINOCYSTIS BARROISI*.

SIR,—Please allow me a few words in reply to the valuable paper of Mr. F. A. Bather on *Dinocystis Barroisi*.¹ In his paper “Sur l'étage devonien des psammites du Condroz en Condroz” (Bull. Acad. des Sci. de Belg., 1875, 2^e sér., t. xxxix, pp. 658–9), Mr. M. Mourlon mentions, from Mr. Malaise's collection, an “astérie” found near Walcourt in an indeterminate “assise” of the “psammites du Condroz.” This fossil is no longer quoted in the list of the fossils of this series, given by the same author in his “Géologie de la Belgique,” but it is replaced (t. ii, p. 23) by *Agelacrinus*, very rare, in the “assises” of Montford and Évieux, the two upper assises of our Psammites du Condroz, and this is supposed by Mr. Bather to be the same as his *Dinocystis Barroisi*. Now the “astérie” of 1875 is the species found by Mr. L. Bayet, and described by me in my “Fragments paléontologiques” (Ann. Soc. géol. de Belg., 1881, t. viii, Mém., pp. 52–54, pl. iii, figs. 1 et 2), under the name of *Protaster Decheni*, and for important reasons I believe that the *Agelacrinus* of 1881 is the same species. Recently, I have learned from Mr. L. Bayet that his fossil was found in the “assise d'Évieux.” G. DEWALQUE.

LIÈGE, January 9, 1899.

THE SUBMERGED PLATFORM OF WESTERN EUROPE.

SIR.—In your January issue Dr. J. W. Spencer takes up the cudgels for Professor Hull on this subject, and treats your readers to a display of quarter-staff argument, by which he seems to hit me very hard, but is really cudgelling figments of his own too fervid imagination, fabrics which have far less substance than the windmills on which the renowned Don Quixote exercised his arms.

Dr. Spencer's communication may, indeed, be described as consisting in part of a discussion of points which I did not call in question and in part of denials of statements which were never made.

He says first that I denied the great subsidence of the continental margins, and a few lines lower (p. 18) that I denied their recent

¹ See GEOL. MAG., Dec. IV, Vol. V, December, 1898, p. 543.