

CORRESPONDENCE.

A FOSSIL FISH FROM BARBADOS.

SIR,—Last year Dr. Matley published in your MAGAZINE (pp. 366–373) an article on the stratigraphy of Barbados, in which he discussed the age of the conglomerate of the Scotland Beds. In claiming an Upper Eocene Age for it, he mentioned among the fossils collected from the conglomerate by Mr. Romanes, “A Siluroid fish, *Socnopaea* cf. *grandis* Stromer, . . . represented by two fragments, a part of a cranial bone showing external sculpture markings, and a well preserved, although incomplete, pectoral spine (90 mm. long) with good articular end.” Unfortunately, at the time Dr. Matley was writing his paper, the specimens were not available and the identification he quotes is from the late R. B. Newton’s MS. Lately the specimens have come to hand and, as one might have suspected, I find that they do not belong to *Socnopaea* or any other known fossil Egyptian cat-fish. The cranial bone is a fragment 2·5 cm. by 1 cm. and bears a reticular ornament quite dissimilar from that of *Socnopaea*, and is quite unidentifiable. The pectoral spine is from the left side and differs somewhat in its method of articulation from that of any described fossil Siluroid and most probably represents a new species. It was apparently not found at the same time as the skull fragment, and there is no evidence to show that they belong to the same form.

As cat-fishes do not seem to have a wide range, either stratigraphically or geographically, Dr. Matley was right in emphasizing the importance of the apparent occurrence of a Fayum species in Barbados, and for this reason I think it worth while correcting the identification of the specimens.

ERROL I. WHITE,
ASSISTANT KEEPER.

DEPARTMENT OF GEOLOGY,
BRITISH MUSEUM (Natural History),
CROMWELL ROAD,
LONDON, S.W. 7.
1st March, 1933.