

The numbers of Sir Joseph Prestwich's specimens are not stated, but the above table is probably the order of frequency of occurrence.

Mr. E. R. Sykes, F.L.S. (President Conchological Society), has found *L. truncatula* in a deposit on the east side of the Isle of Portland. He considers this latter deposit as comparatively recent, and derived from a marshy tract which still exists south of Southwell. If this be so the deposits are not synchronous, inasmuch as the geological conditions of the deposit at the Bill are well defined as of late Pleistocene age, not only from the stratigraphical evidence, but from the abundant occurrence of so characteristic a Pleistocene form as *S. oblonga*. Mr. Sykes (Proc. Dorset Field Club, vol. xvi, p. 171) records *L. truncatula* from the 'Bill' deposit. On referring to Prestwich's paper on the raised beaches (Q.J.G.S., vol. xlviii, 1892, p. 278) *L. truncatula* is determined from the occurrence of opercula only. Probably *Bythinia tentaculata* is meant, as it occurs also at Chesilton at the north-west of Portland, and is an operculate mollusc, whereas *Limnæa* is non-operculate (Reeve, "British Land and Fresh-water Mollusca," 1863, p. 154). This inadvertence may be a *lapsus calami*, either on the part of our author or of Dr. Gwyn Jeffreys, who generally determined doubtful or critical species for him.

Limnæa truncatula is therefore still a new record from this interesting Pleistocene deposit. R. ASHINGTON BULLEN.

AXELAND, SURREY.

THE CENOMANIAN OF BAHARIA OASIS, EGYPT.

SIR,—I have to thank Dr. Max Blanckenhorn for his letter in the GEOL. MAG., April, 1900, p. 192, disclaiming to have himself "discovered the existence of rocks of Cenomanian age in Baharia Oasis." As Dr. Blanckenhorn maintains that he cannot be held responsible for the abstract report which appeared in the *Zeitschrift für praktische Geologie*, I should like to point out that the copy of this abstract report was sent to the Survey by Dr. Blanckenhorn himself, and although it contained numerous corrections in ink of the type matter, the paragraph to which exception was taken, and which I quoted in my letter of December 7, 1899, was not in any way corrected or explained; I could therefore only come to one conclusion.

As I have already stated my opinion as to the age of the series of beds under discussion, both in my letter of December 7, 1899 (GEOL. MAG., January, 1900), and in a paper read before the Cairo Scientific Society in October, 1899, it is not necessary to discuss Dr. Blanckenhorn's assertion that I did not "know the meaning" of the fossils collected, especially as this has nothing to do with the question in dispute. Moreover, as the examination of these fossils has not yet been completed by the palæontologists of the British Museum, the exact horizon or horizons to which they should be referred cannot possibly be indicated with certainty.

CAIRO, April 14, 1900.

HUGH J. L. BEADNELL.