

Although well aware of the interesting paper on the Old Radnor district by Professor Garwood and Miss Goodyear, I refrained from alluding to it, because it bears on a different locality, and (to judge by the abstract) deals more particularly with an abnormal facies of the Woolhope Limestone—a matter with which I was not concerned. My reason for quoting the earlier authorities was to show how completely the so-called practical men who promoted the scheme had ignored what was already known about their own neighbourhood.

T. C. CANTRILL.

28 JERMYN STREET, S.W. 1.
December 13, 1917.

THE KYSON MONKEY.

SIR,—In an important paper published recently by Professor Boswell in the *Journal of the Ipswich and District Field Club* ("The Geology of the Woodbridge District, Suffolk"), vol. v, pt. i, pp. 1–12, it is stated (p. 1) in reference to the Eocene sand of Kyson, near Woodbridge, that "Prestwich found the remains of a monkey (*Macacus eocænus*) in this bed". This, however, is incorrect. In Owen's *British Fossil Mammals and Birds* (1846), on p. 3, he wrote: "The fossils manifesting quadrumanous characters were discovered, in 1839, by Mr. William Colchester . . . in the parish of Kingston—commonly called Kyson—in Suffolk."

A further reference is made to this discovery in the *Memoirs of the Geological Survey (The Geology of the Country around Ipswich, Hadleigh, and Felixstowe)*. On p. 26, in describing the Kyson beds, it is stated: ". . . the section was exposed in 1839 at the brick-yard at Kingston or Kyson"; then follow details of the section and a list of the Eocene mammals found. Amongst these is mentioned "*Hyracotherium cuniculus*, Owen (first called *Macacus eocænus*)". Lower down on p. 26 it is stated "The complete section is given by Prof. Prestwich, from whose paper the above details are given". Finally, on p. 143, appears the following: "145. Owen, (Sir) R. 'On the *Hyracotherian* character of the Lower Molars of the supposed *Macacus* from the Eocene Sand of Kyson, Suffolk': *Ann. Nat. Hist.*, ser. 3, vol. x, p. 240."

It thus seems clear (1) that the so-called *Macacus* remains were not found by Prestwich, but by Mr. Colchester; (2) that further examination of these remains established the fact that they were not referable to *Macacus* at all, but to *Hyracotherium cuniculus*; and (3) that Professor Prestwich made the foregoing facts clear in a paper published by him in 1850 (*Quart. Journ. Geol. Soc.*, vol. vi, pp. 272, 273).

As there are apparently some investigators who still believe that quadrumanous remains have been found in the Eocene of Suffolk, I venture to bring this matter before geologists so that the error may be eliminated.

J. REID MOIR.

November 26, 1917.