

am of opinion that the Bay of Morcamb¹ is a much less ancient inlet than the Frith of Clyde, and the Kyles of Bute, where Mr. Smith, Mr. Sowerby, my revered friend Dr. Landsborough, and numerous acute observers have worked so successfully: the coeval shore line of this part of Britain, viz. Cumberland and Lancashire, doubtless stood a long way further out.

E. HODGSON.

ULVERSTON, 15th March.

“GEOLOGICAL NOTES FROM NORWICH.”

[Proceedings of the Bristol Naturalists' Society, Vol. iii., Nos. 7, 8, and 9, 1868.
Noticed in GEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE for April, p. 177.]

SIR,—Permit me to reply to the somewhat stringent remarks of H. B. W. in your last number, and to suggest that it would have been much kinder if H. B. W. had ascertained whether the short abstract were a correct *resumé* of the original paper.²

The different statements made at Norwich respecting the geology of that county were so conflicting and contradictory as to call forth a remark to that effect from the President of the Geological section (see *Norfolk News*, Aug. 22, 1868). So puzzling were they that I, in common with many others, felt really “out of my element,” and “at sea,” and therefore had recourse to “literature” for information to which also I would refer H. B. W. For instance, I found that the Norwich beds are said to have been seen to directly overlie the Red Crag at Chillesford (*vide Elem. Geol.* pp. 196, 198). Again, the same authority states that the Bridlington beds have about the same age as the Chillesford (*loc. cit.* p. 198).

With regard to my statement respecting the *Potamides*, I still see no reason why they should not be that sub-genus, nor can I discover any difference between the Bramerton shells and many that I obtained from the fluvio-marine beds of the Isle of Wight. The shells of the *Potamides* cannot be distinguished from the *Cerithia* (*vide Wood's Crag Mollusca*, p. 68) in their conchological character, but the former lived in estuarine or freshwater, while the latter lived in marine habitats.

With the Bramerton fossils are found some freshwater shells, and therefore the conclusion that they were *Potamides* is a very likely one.³ Mr. Wood also makes a statement to that effect (*Crag Moll.* p. 68). Sir Charles says (*Elem.* p. 196), “It is clear that these beds have accumulated at the bottom of the sea near the mouth of a river.”

With regard to the antiquity of the Red Crag, I simply stated that the Red Crag was the oldest Pliocene formation, *with which I had then to do*, and H. B. W. may fairly have conjectured this, for, probably, there are few to whom the Coralline Crag is not familiar.

¹ This is written Morcamb in Beck's work “*Annales Furnesiensis*,” the best work we have.—E.H.

² We are exceedingly sorry to learn that the Bristol Naturalists' Society are in the habit of issuing their Proceedings without first consulting authors whose papers they intend to publish, and obtaining their corrections to the same. We would earnestly recommend Mr. Stoddart in future to insist upon seeing and revising his own papers before publication, in whatever Journal they may appear.—EDIT.

³ *Potamides* does not occur in the Norwich Crag.—EDIT.

In conclusion, if H. B. W. should ever visit Bristol, I shall be happy to show him my *Potamides*, and elicit his opinion.

7, KING SQUARE, BRISTOL.

W. W. STODDART.

RUGBY SCHOOL NATURAL HISTORY SOCIETY.

SIR,—In your kind notice of the Rugby School Natural History Society's Reports, there are one or two errors of some importance. Will you allow me to correct them? A quotation is made from a report very much out of date, and it is made to appear as if applicable to the present system. As it is, very nearly the whole school, and not one-tenth only, are at work at Natural Science, and have been so for five years. The central study is Chemistry, this is connected on the one side with Natural History, of which Botany and Geology are selected as types; and on the other side with Physics, that is, with us, with mechanics, and heat, and electricity.

Many of your readers would be interested, I think, in seeing how laborious young observers are in botany, and how much is found to provide them with original work.

I must disclaim the honour of being President. This post is most worthily filled by Mr. Kitchener, M.A., F.L.S., to whom the Society is greatly indebted.

JAMES M. WILSON.

RUGBY, May 8, 1869.

P.S.—One of my young geologists, Mr. H. C. Cholmondeley, tells us of a singular subsidence at Marton, near Northwich, on Lord Delawarr's property. About twelve years ago a circular area, sixty yards across, suddenly sank down, to a depth, as I understand, of a few yards. Two years ago a fresh subsidence took place, sufficient to submerge a poplar tree, which remained standing in the circular lake so formed. Last term the ground again sank, and the sinking was accompanied with much noise, and violent movement of the water. The water was cold. It is four miles to the nearest salt mine, and three to the nearest brine works. He is unable to assign any cause for the phenomena. Perhaps some of your Cheshire correspondents can enlighten us.—J.M.W.

THE GRAVELS OF LOPHAM FORD:

SIR,—I think it important that the phenomena at Lopham Ford should be fully discussed, on account of the light they are calculated to throw upon denudation. I am glad, therefore, that my esteemed friend has not allowed my reply to his query to pass without remark, for I hope the question he raises may induce Geologists to go and see for themselves and report to you. I should not have referred again to the subject, because I have said my say, and stand by my opinion. But Mr. S. V. Wood, jun., has kindly and spontaneously written to me, to tell me that he visited the spot with Mr. Harmer, while they were engaged in mapping the glacial deposits, and that he agrees with me that the gravel south of Lopham Ford is Middle Drift, and not a river-gravel.

O. FISHER.

P.S.—*Erratum* at p. 552, line 42, vol. v. 1868, for "Boulder-clay" read "London clay."

O.F.