

CORRESPONDENCE.

CALAIÏS NEWBOLDI.

SIR,—Since the publication of my paper “On a Fossil Octopus (*Calaiïs Newboldi*, J. de C. Sby. MS.), from the Cretaceous of the Lebanon,” in the Quart. Journ. Geol. Soc., vol. lii, p. 229, 1896, I find that the name *Calaiïs* has been twice used—first by F. L. de Laporte in 1836 (Silbermann, *Revue Entomologique*, vol. iv, p. 9) for a genus of COLEOPTERA; secondly by J. A. Boisduval, also in 1836 (“J. A. Boisduval, Species Général des LEPIDOPTÈRES,” vol. i, p. 584; quoted as a synonym of *Idmais*, Boisd.). Under these circumstances it becomes needful to propose a new generic name for Sowerby’s *Calaiïs*; I would therefore suggest that the name of *Palæoctopus* replace that of *Calaiïs*, which is preoccupied by a genus of COLEOPTERA.

HENRY WOODWARD.

LIFE-ZONES IN CARBONIFEROUS ROCKS: A CORRECTION.

SIR,—I observe that in your last number (p. 519), the British Association Report on Life-zones in the British Carboniferous Rocks is stated to have been drawn up by me, whereas it was the work of the Secretary, Mr. E. J. Garwood.

JOHN E. MARR.

70, HUNTINGDON ROAD, CAMBRIDGE.

LINNÆUS ON THE APPENDAGES OF TRILOBITES.

SIR,—In the May number of the *American Geologist*, Dr. C. E. Beecher has published an article entitled “On a Supposed Discovery of the Antennæ of Trilobites by Linnæus in 1759.” As this article refers to my short communication to the GEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE, p. 142, March, 1896, I shall be glad if you will afford some space for a few remarks in reply to the interpretation of Linné’s figure proposed by Beecher.

To begin with, I regret that, in the introductory words, I have used so inaccurate an expression as to suggest that Linné’s paper had been overlooked ever since its first appearance, while I have only taken into consideration the period which I have spoken of as a time of important researches into the ventral structure of Trilobites.

Beecher sums up his reasoning concerning the organs, regarded by Linné as antennæ, in the following terms: “It necessarily follows that the cephalon of the specimen figured by Linnæus is without free cheeks, and with this interpretation of the figure, the supposed antennæ can only be homologized with the thickened border between the points where the facial suture cuts the anterior margin.” This conclusion is drawn under the supposition that the disputed organs are not antennæ, but no conclusive evidences are adduced that they are not. Before entering upon an examination of Beecher’s arguments, I think it suitable to give a short review of the modes in which the head of *Parabolina spinulosa*, Whalb., is