

the knowledge already gained. Out of doors the student should attempt the mapping of a district by himself. It will be well, if there is any choice in the matter, to select one in which the physical features are strongly marked.

This sketchy outline must serve to indicate the notions that have grown up in my mind on the subject now before us, and the methods I have been led to adopt in the teaching of geology. I trust that they may be suggestive, and may call forth that kindly and genial criticism with which the brotherhood of the hammer are wont to welcome attempts, however feeble, to strengthen the corner-stones and widen the domain of the science we love so well, and to enlarge the number of its votaries.

---

## CORRESPONDENCE.

---

### PRIORITY OF NOMENCLATURE.

SIR,—May I ask your opinion on a question of nomenclature? About 15 years ago I discovered in Shropshire the formation which Phillips had previously found in the Malvern Hills, and had called the Hollybush Sandstone. Quite recently, Prof. Lapworth, writing in this MAGAZINE, referred to this rock as the "Comley Sandstone," taking the name from the locality where my typical section is seen, and Prof. Blake has adopted the new nomenclature. Is this change of name in accordance with usage? We call the "Wenlock Limestone" by that name, whether it occurs in Shropshire or the Malvern Hills, and why should we not call the "Hollybush Sandstone" by Phillips' name, whether it is found in the Malvern Hills or in Shropshire?

CH. CALLAWAY.

WELLINGTON, SHROPSHIRE, *August 22nd*, 1890.

---

### THE ELEVATION OF THE WEALD.

SIR,—In the rapid increase of geological literature, some of our early papers may easily be overlooked, and facts unwittingly repeated as novel which had already been noticed; but it may not often happen that the first observer is made the disciple of the second. I have no objection to legitimate criticism; but there is an objection to this obliteration of landmarks, otherwise I should not now care to address you. In Dr. Irving's note "On the Elevation of the Weald," in this month's number of your MAGAZINE, he draws attention to the fact that in 1883 he pointed out that there was evidence of the encroachment of the sea upon the Upper Chalk in Eocene times, and that *this conclusion is accepted by Professor Prestwich*. This might lead the reader to suppose that I had overlooked this point, and that my notice of it in my paper "On the Westleton Beds" (1889), to which he refers, was in consequence of his 1883 paper. Had that been the case, I should not have failed to acknowledge, and that most willingly, my authority for so leading a fact. If, however, Dr. Irving will kindly refer to my paper "On the Thanet Sands" in Q.J.G.S. for 1852, pp. 256-260,<sup>1</sup> or to "The Ground Beneath Us," pp. 70-79, 1847, he will find the question discussed at some length, and *facts and sections* given to show that the dome of the Weald was raised after Cretaceous times, and that the Chalk

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Irving will find this reference in the paper which is the cause of his remarks.

was largely planed down by the early Tertiary seas, its flints contributing to the pebbles of the Woolwich and Reading beds.

Having pen in hand, I am induced to notice another slight matter in Mr. Irving's paper. He speaks of the Lenham sands as though they were first shown to be of Diestian age in 1888. He will find that that was the conclusion I arrived at in 1857 (Q.J.G.S. p. 328) and repeated in 1872 (Q.J.G.S. pp. 134, 478) and 1886 ("Geology," Vol. I. pp. 141, 303). The article in "Nature," 1888, to which he refers, is a friendly corroboration of the conclusion I had expressed. Nor were the sands on the Downs some miles further westward assumed to be contemporaneous "on the ground of approximate equality of altitude above the sea," but in that of position and structure.

Mr. Irving's observations about the Raised Beaches of Sussex described by me in 1858, and others in the Westleton shingle, might also call for some remarks; but these would lead me too far. I am also unable to follow Dr. Irving in the larger and more theoretical questions on which he enters, and respecting which we shall be better able to judge when he gives us, which I hope he will in some future paper, *in detail the local evidence upon which his views are based.*

JOSEPH PRESTWICH.

SHOREHAM, KENT, *Sept.* 10, 1890.

#### STANDARDS OF MEASUREMENT.

SIR,—Will you kindly permit me to direct the attention of the readers of the GEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE to an objectionable feature in the writings of many of our modern geologists, namely, the use, or rather misuse, of the French metrical standard of measurements instead of the English imperial standard. There are numbers of earnest students of geology who, like myself, read eagerly and carefully, as they are issued, the Quarterly Journal, Proceedings of the Geologists' Association, and the GEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE, but being unacquainted with the French language or their standard of weights and measures, they are unable to grasp the full import of many of the learned and highly instructive papers and articles which adorn the pages of the above-mentioned journals. These students are perfectly familiar with the English standard, and any measurement from 1/16th of an inch to a fathom, or even to a mile, furnishes at once, without any mental effort, a perfectly accurate impression of size or distance, while those given according to the French standard only convey impressions of the most indefinite kind. Moreover, when we take into consideration the fact that the papers and articles referred to are written by Englishmen, published in English journals, and many of them are read before English societies, it is greatly to be deplored, not only that their usefulness is marred, but also that an important part of their contents is rendered practically unintelligible to a very large number of readers by the introduction of foreign measures and quantities. The metrical system of measures may be superior to the English imperial standard in some respects, but it is not likely that the former will ever take the place of the latter, either in England or her numerous and populous colonies, while the use of a dual system must of necessity be a fruitful source of confusion and annoyance. I must state, however, that some of the writers who use the metrical system, take the trouble to add to the measurements given in that standard, their approximate equivalents according to the imperial standard, and if all would adopt that course, or still better, reverse the order, there would be no further cause for complaint.

KESWICK, *Sept.*, 1890.

JOHN POSTLETHWAITE.