True, the "*Upper* and *Lower Bagshot Beds* are not noticed" in my Table; for the simple reason, that they cannot be regarded as good "Marine Types," like the Barton and Bracklesham Clays: one contains only a few vegetable (Terrestrial) remains; and the other rarely any fossils, except in one place, where, however, they are "in too friable a condition to bear transport or examination." (See Jukes's Manual, 1st ed. pp. 527 and 531; also Phillips's Manual, p. 387.)

In placing certain "marine and fresh-water types" on "the same line," the object was to show that they may be *approximately* "of the same age."

When "W. W." takes on himself again

> "To spy into abuses, and shape faults
> That are not,"

or to "point out" the "many other mistakes" which he fancies I have committed, I would feel obliged by his showing the relation between the Lower Green Sand and the Atherfield Clay. At the friendly suggestion of the Editor of the 'Geologist,' I have inserted, in a new edition of the Table, now printing as a separate sheet, the Lower Green Sand, placing it at the bottom of the Cretaceous System.

Permit me to embrace the present opportunity of making a few corrections before closing this letter. The name *Rhyncopora* in my Table (proposed for a genus or sub-genus, typified by De Verneuil's *Terebratula Geinitziana*, the peculiar characters of which were described in my "Notes on Permian Fossils," published in the 'Annals and Magazine of Natural History' for April, 1856) should have been spelled *Rhynchopora*. "Somerset *Teleosaurus* Upper Lias," suggested by my friend Mr. C. Moore, of Bath, was by some mistake placed in the Jurassic instead of the Liassic System.

In my paper "On the Origin of Species," contained in the last number of the 'Geologist,' a slight mistake has occurred. The first line of the sixth paragraph ought to have been—"There is no difficulty in referring *to* instances,' etc.

I am, dear Sir, yours very faithfully,
WILLIAM KING.

*Belmont, near Galway, July* 4, 1862.

---

## *Tertiary Mammalian Remains at Dulwich.*

SIR,—It may be interesting to your readers to know that I have lately found a front tooth (incisor or small canine) of a mammalian animal from the Woolwich Beds, near Dulwich, exposed some time since by the works for the southern high-level sewer. Mr. Rickman has found some bones he calls mammalian, but there is a doubt as to their being such.

Yours, etc.,
A. BOTT.

5, *Hanover Terrace, Peckham*, 11*th July*, 1862.

---

## *Sicilian Bone-Caves.*

SIR,—I hasten to give that explanation of the error or rather confusion in my Table which Dr. Falconer, as the original describer of the Grotta di Maccagnone, has a right to demand.

The column marked "Maccagnone" should have been headed "Maccagnone and San Ciro," and the species inserted therein are those derived from both localities.

The *Felis*, *Ursus*, *Hyæna*, *Bos*, *Hippopotamus*, and *Cervus* have been hitherto not referred to their species by Dr. Falconer. To obviate further mistake, I append a list of the species derived from both bone-caves, as stated in Dr. Falconer's paper (Quarterly Journal, Geol. Soc. vol. xvi. 1860, p. 99 *et seq.*):—

| San Ciro Cave, Two miles from Palermo. | Maccagnone Cave, A mile west of Carini, near Palermo. |
|---|---|
| *Felis*, a large species. | *Felis*, "as large as F. spelæa, but not yet specifically determined." |
| *Canis.* | |
| *Ursus.* | *Ursus.* |
| | *Hyæna.* |
| *Cervus.* | *Cervus.* } two species. |
| | *Do.* } |
| *Bos.* | |
| *Sus.* | |
| *Elephas antiquus.* | *Elephas antiquus.* |
| *Hippopotamus.* } two species. | *Hippopotamus.* |
| *Do.* } | |
| | Bones of Ruminants. |

The liability in a table of this kind to error is obvious, when the exigencies both of space and time are duly considered.

Before the unenviable employment is commenced by me of "a wholesale manufacture of species," I shall wait the further identification of the specimens from the Sicilian bone-caves by Dr. Falconer.

Yours truly,

CHARLES CARTER BLAKE.

---

## *Origin of Species.*

SIR,—In the July number of the 'Geologist' is a letter from Professor King, of Galway, expressing the opinions to which that high authority has arrived, after years of due thought and consideration, on the probable method of operation of continuously-operating secondary laws, which have produced the species of animals successively or progressively throughout geological time. While paying the highest tribute to the candid manner in which this eminent geologist has treated his subject, I am led to suggest that the meaning of one passage in his admirable paper may be liable to misconstruction.

Professor King holds "that an organism, whether it typifies a species, a genus, a family, an order, or a class, is an autotheogen, if it possesses a series of characters which isolate it from other equivalent groups;" and that inherent and external forces may modify such organism, "thereby resulting in geneotheonomous forms." The limits within which autotheogeny can be predicted are, however, left unexplained by Professor King.

A writer in 1830, reasoning from the philosophical standpoint of the state of knowledge in the time of Cuvier, would have confidently pointed