

The brain-case is one third the length of the skull. The baleen slightly longer than broad, black on outside edge, shading to pure white inside the mouth. Width of base 2 feet 6 inches.

The following measurements were obtained :—

	ft.	in.
Total length	70	0
Total length of skeleton	67	3
Length of head	19	0
Lower jaw	17	0
Occiput to last rib	14	0
Last rib to first caudal (<i>i. e.</i> vertebra with chevron bone)	16	0
Caudal series of vertebræ	18	3
Length of bones in the paddles, from the glenoid cavity	8	6
Width across phalanges	1	3
Distance from anus to tip of tail	17	0
(Penis 3 feet in front of anus.)		
Tip of tail to hump	18	0
Height of hump	2	0
Length of base of hump	1	0
Length of shoulder-blade	5	9
Height	2	10

Fifteen ribs, longest 10 feet.

Stomach contained a quantity of stones. Colour black above, and yellow on the belly.

Note by Dr. J. E. GRAY, F.R.S. &c.

This is evidently not only a whale that has not yet been described, but it is also the type of a new genus, peculiar for the shortness of its pectoral fins, its plaited belly, and low recurved and pointed fin placed over the vent, and very peculiar among all whalebone-whales for the form of its bladebone (*see figure*).

The sulphur-bottom of New-Zealand is very distinct from the sulphur-bottom of California, which is named *Sibbaldius sulphureus* by Cope. It is evidently the type of a new genus, and may be entered in the catalogues as *Stenobalæna xanthogaster*.

XXXVII.—*On Priority in the Discovery of the Canal-System in Foraminifera.* By Messrs. PARKER, JONES, and BRADY.

To the Editors of the Annals and Magazine of Natural History.

GENTLEMEN,

That portion of Mr. Carter's communication to your August *Ann. & Mag. N. Hist.* Ser. 4. Vol. xiv.

number, which is entitled "Reply to Criticism," does not need any notice at our hands in so far as it affects the *facts* of the letter "On Priority in the Discovery of the Canal-System in Foraminifera," which you were good enough to publish in July. Mr. Carter, however, accuses us, by implication, of *suppressio veri*; he also practically charges us with ignorance in not finding out his misquoted reference, and he reiterates his claim of prior discovery, inconsistent with his own early recognition of the results arrived at by Williamson and Carpenter.

Mr. Carter had stated (we regret to have to copy the paragraph again), "Before Schultze's or Carpenter's books were published, I had described and illustrated, in the 'Annals,' the canal-system, 'nummuline' tubulation, and general structure of the Foraminifera, both in the recent *Operculina* and in the fossilized *Nummulite* ('Annals,' 1852, vol. x. p. 161, pl. iv.). Even Schultze in his book, as well as I can remember (for I have not the work by me to refer to), gives me the credit of having discovered the 'canal-system,' which at least proves the priority of my publications; and since then up to the present time I have more or less occupied myself with the structure of the Foraminifera, as my papers in the 'Annals' will show."

Our letter was little more than a statement as to the course of discovery in respect to Foraminiferal structure up to the time of Mr. Carter's paper on *Operculina arabica* in 1852. It was written in the most friendly tone, and was intended only to counteract the serious injustice of the paragraph in question to at least two previous observers. We gave a brief summary of the contents of four papers earlier than Mr. Carter's, and left the readers of the 'Annals' to draw their conclusions from them. To this, the only essential portion of the letter, Mr. Carter replies that, besides Prof. Williamson's and Dr. Carpenter's memoirs, we ought to have mentioned that by MM. Joly and Leymerie. If these observers really understood the "canal-system," to them also his paragraph was unjust. But for the desire not to impart controversial matter, we might have said a good deal about MM. Joly and Leymerie's results.

Mr. Carter in quoting Max Schultze refers pointedly, though from memory, to his "book." The only "book," so far as we know, that the learned German Professor ever published on the Foraminifera is the beautiful folio "Ueber den Organismus der Polythalamien." We therefore searched this work for the passage alluded to, and quoted the only sentence we could find bearing upon the question. In the paper on *Polytrema*, now referred to by Mr. Carter, Prof. Schultze certainly expresses his own opinion that Mr. Carter first described the system of ramified tubes in Foraminifera.

The final paragraph of the "Reply to Criticism" requires a word of comment. We are first charged with imputing blame to the author for the non-insertion of detail which he had given elsewhere. We can only reply, that we did not blame him for it; all we did was to deny his right, however freely he may have acknowledged the labours of others twenty years ago, to claim their results as his own now.

The last sentence runs thus, "That they [*i.e.* ourselves] should have commenced the second paragraph of their letter with 'The question has nothing to do with the *Eozoon* controversy,' is therefore, to say the least of it, 'most significant'!" If this means any thing, it conveys an insinuation which is as false as it is uncalled for. If Mr. Carter wishes an explanation of our unwillingness to join in the *Eozoon* controversy he need not look beyond his own "Reply to Criticism" for our reason. A simple statement verified at every point by accurate references to authorities, drawn up in a friendly spirit, and with no object except the desire to correct an injustice which we believed the author to have committed unconsciously, and a reference to a quotation which, owing to his own misdirection, was not the passage he intended to allude to, have brought down upon us not merely a taunt of ignorance, but the serious charge of "suppressing the truth." Under these circumstances your readers will not wonder at our unwillingness to enter into the discussion of a confessedly difficult and complicated subject, with one so ready in the denunciation of those who do not happen to agree with him in the reading of evidence and the correlation of facts. We may, however, say this much, that our individual views as to the structure of *Eozoon* have not been affected by Mr. Carter's additions to the literature of the subject. Declining further correspondence on the subject of this letter,

We have the honour to be, Gentlemen,

Faithfully yours,

W. K. PARKER,
T. RUPERT JONES,
HENRY B. BRADY.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTICE.

The Birds of Shetland, with Observations on their Habits, Migration, and Occasional Appearance. By the late HENRY L. SAXBY, M.D., of Balta Sound, Unst. Edited by his brother STEPHEN H. SAXBY, M.A. Edinburgh: 1874. 8vo, pp. xviii, 398, pls. 8.

SHETLAND from its geographical position deserved the devotion of a volume to its ornithology. Thirty years have passed since any



Parker, W K, Jones, T. Rupert, and Brady, Henry Bowman. 1874. "XXXVII.—On priority in the discovery of the canal-system in Foraminifera." *The Annals and magazine of natural history; zoology, botany, and geology* 14, 305–307.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/00222937408680970>.

View This Item Online: <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/item/63340>

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/00222937408680970>

Permalink: <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/partpdf/58755>

Holding Institution

University of Toronto - Gerstein Science Information Centre

Sponsored by

University of Toronto

Copyright & Reuse

Copyright Status: NOT_IN_COPYRIGHT

This document was created from content at the **Biodiversity Heritage Library**, the world's largest open access digital library for biodiversity literature and archives. Visit BHL at <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org>.