

ice, and maintains that it is equally applicable to pebbles and boulders, instancing the flints on the Irish coast and the constituents of the Chesil Bank as *erratics*, in his sense of the word. If the bulk of geologists agree with Mr. Wynne in this, I confess I shall feel surprised. Mr. Wynne also disputes certain views of mine touching minor details of geology in the Salt Range, but it is not my intention to notice these, as, the ground being unknown to the bulk of your readers, the discussion would be both tedious and unprofitable.

In justice to myself, however, I cannot permit the second paragraph of Mr. Wynne's letter to pass unchallenged, as it contains a complete and incomprehensible misapprehension of my meaning. The passage runs thus: "In these remarks,¹ Mr. Theobald restricts and applies the term '*Erratics*' exclusively to certain blocks supposed to have been ice-transported, advocating the idea also (*vide* foot-note) that the word is *only applicable in describing recent phases of geology.*"

Of course I neither said nor meant any such thing as the extraordinary statement I have italicised above. What I *did* say was: "Under these circumstances, therefore, I do not think that these red granite boulders can be termed '*erratics*,' unless we fall back on the hypothesis that all of them have been erratics during a former and wholly different phase of geological life than that which we at present have to describe and deal with." (*l.c.*)

Now I deny that my words can fairly be twisted so as to yield the extraordinary sense, or rather nonsense, which Mr. Wynne attributes to me; and had my MS. not received some mutilation (unknown to me) in passing through the press in Calcutta, this misapprehension of my colleague could hardly have happened. I originally wrote some such explanatory sentence as the following: "Unless on the principle of once a parson always a parson, we hold that once an erratic, always an erratic." Of course the Chesil Bank boulders may at one time or another have been erratics; but *unless on the principle of the above proverb*, they can, I think, be termed so no longer.

As this is the exact opposite of the ridiculous view Mr. Wynne fathers on me, I wish to repudiate the mistake in the same pages wherein it appears, to my great discredit if uncontradicted.

MARREE, PANJAB, *May 13th*, 1878.

W. THEOBALD.

WHAT IS AN ERRATIC?

SIR,—I should have called attention in the second paragraph of my letter, in your April Number, 1878, p. 185, to the passage in my friend Mr. Theobald's remarks which reads thus: "Under the head '*Erratics*' my colleague describes others, which are not only, in my opinion, not '*erratics*' at all, but belong to diverse geological epochs."

This, together with his footnote, to which I referred, left the impression that, according to him, "*erratics*" must belong to but one and that a recent geological epoch.

A. B. WYNNE.

¹ Records of the Geological Survey of India, vol. x. part iv. p. 223.