

the different fins (pectoral, dorsal and anal) correspond to the numbers given in Yarrell's well-known 'History of British Fishes,' except that those of the thick caudal fin were so indistinct that I could not detect them by external examination. The fish was of a dingy bluish or dark leaden colour on the upper parts, mottled with a lighter colour on the sides, and of a light gray approaching to a silvery white on the abdomen, the "hinge-like" portion of the fins, especially of the caudal, having a reddish or dark flesh-coloured tinge; round the eye the colour was paler, and the eye itself was of a dark bluish-gray colour, with a bright "silvery ring round the pupil." The flesh felt soft and flabby, the fish being apparently in bad condition, and weighing only 11 lbs. avoird. The skin was slightly wrinkled, and was rough all over like a shark's.

I remain, Gentlemen, yours very respectfully,

JOHN ALEX. SMITH, M.D.

P.S. I may mention that the skin of a specimen of this fish, much about the same size as the one I have described, was exhibited to the Royal Physical Society here last winter, having been captured by one of the members while dredging in Loch Ryan.

#### CARCHARIAS VULPES.

*To the Editors of the Annals of Natural History.*

Cork, September 20, 1851.

GENTLEMEN,—An example of the Fox Shark (*Carcharias Vulpes*) occurred in Ringabella Bay, close to the mouth of Cork Harbour, on the 31st of last month. It got entangled in a net and was secured by the fishermen. It was considerably smaller than the individual lately recorded in your Magazine by Mr. Thomson; the whole length of the animal being 7 feet 4 inches, and that of the upper segment of tail 3 feet 9 inches nearly. Owing to the ignorance of the person to whom the skinning was entrusted, the specimen has unfortunately not been saved. The fish was a male.

Yours respectfully,

J. (R.) HARVEY, M.D.

#### *On the Arrangement of Fossil Animal Remains in Collections.*

By J. E. GRAY, ESQ., F.R.S., V.P.Z.S. &c.

There appears to be considerable difference of opinion among geologists and fossil collectors respecting the manner in which fossil specimens of animals should be arranged. I have therefore been induced to put together the following notes:—

1. Some agree with Cuvier, Lamarck, Fleming, and other zoologists, that they should be arranged with and in the same series as similar specimens of the recent animals.

2. Others, that they should be first divided according to the strata in which they are found, and the specimens of each stratum arranged in a zoological method.

3. Others, that they should be simply arranged zoologically in a collection by themselves.

I have long been of opinion that no collection of zoology can be con-



1851. "Carcharias vulpes." *The Annals and magazine of natural history; zoology, botany, and geology* 8, 347–347. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03745486109496231>.

**View This Item Online:** <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/item/19557>

**DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.1080/03745486109496231>

**Permalink:** <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/partpdf/7372>

**Holding Institution**

Natural History Museum Library, London

**Sponsored by**

Natural History Museum Library, London

**Copyright & Reuse**

Copyright Status: Public domain. The BHL considers that this work is no longer under copyright protection.

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>.