

an "accessory" mineral, and deduct the soda required for its formation, we still have an excess of soda over potash in the rock; the monoclinic felspar present at Scarrupata, Ischia, is, no doubt, as is frequently the case, a soda-orthoclase. Such an analysis must not be regarded as typical of simple trachytes, but of the sodalite-trachytes, which, indeed, approach the phonolites. Judged by the bulk-analysis, then, the rock so clearly described by Mr. Hutchings has an affinity with the nepheline-trachytes (nepheline-phonolites) or the trachytic andesites. I fear any trace of original nepheline will have disappeared.

DUBLIN, 5th Dec. 1891.

GRENVILLE A. J. COLE.

CONCRETIONS IN MAGNESIAN LIMESTONE.

SIR,—If I am correct in thinking that Mr. Jukes-Browne considers that Carbonate of Lime was precipitated on the sea-floor during the formation of the Magnesian Limestone beds, I am inclined to agree with him; but this merely deals with the origin of beds of Magnesian Limestone, and does not account for the formation of the Concretions. If, however, he intended to suggest that the moisture contained in the deposit held the Carbonate of Lime in solution, I think the amount would be quite inadequate to account for the thick beds of concretions, and this method of origin would not explain the bedding planes which pass uninterruptedly through matrix and concretions alike.

E. J. GARWOOD.

THE LATE P. HERBERT CARPENTER, M.A., D.Sc. (CAMB.) F.R.S., F.L.S.

The Editor has received the following note from Mr. FRANK SPRINGER, joint-author with Mr. Wachsmuth of numerous works and memoirs on the N. American Crinoidea. It is a high tribute of regret, regard and esteem from the United States for the loss of one whom we all deeply and sincerely mourn in England.—EDIT. GEOL. MAG.

DEAR DR. WOODWARD,—It is with the most profound regret that I have learned the particulars of the death of our lamented friend Carpenter. It is difficult to aptly express the great loss it is to Wachsmuth and myself. Carpenter's rare scientific attainments and broad learning are known wherever Zoologists exist, but to us, who have been in constant correspondence with him for fourteen years, I think his untimely death brings a keener sorrow than to any outside of the circle of his intimate friends and relations. We had the greatest reason and opportunity to admire and appreciate him. Notwithstanding our many animated controversies in print upon disputed questions of Echinoderm morphology, and still more numerous and earnest battles in private correspondence, in which many a promising theory was warmly advocated, combated, and given up on both sides, our acquaintance long ago assumed the phase of cordial friendship and high personal regard. This was still more firmly cemented by my visit to him, while in England in 1887-8, and we feel his loss now as a personal bereavement. We

were in the most confidential communication relative to our various works on the Crinoids, especially the one now in progress. We always interchanged advance sheets of our publications, and sometimes sent each other manuscript for examination and criticism. Carpenter was always the soul of honour in regard to information derived from these private communications, and was generous to the last degree in giving information from his great store of learning, whose value none could estimate higher than we. I should be very glad to know of any publications in England in recognition of his merits.

Hoping this will find you very well, believe me always, very sincerely yours,

LAS VEGAS, NEW MEXICO,
November 15th, 1891.

FRANK SPRINGER.

“ANNALS OF BRITISH GEOLOGY” FOR 1890.

SIR,—It is not my intention to make any comments on the criticisms which the compiler of the volume bearing the above title has thought fit to introduce into the notices of my papers, as those who have even the most superficial acquaintance with the subject therein treated will be able to appreciate the value of such criticisms. When, however, I am deliberately charged with making a blunder, which exists only in the mind of the compiler, it is time to say something. In noticing the fourth part of my “Catalogue of Fossil Reptilia and Amphibia,” the compiler of the work in question goes out of his way to state that I have changed the names *Orthocorta* to *Orthopleurosaurus* without giving any reason for so doing. Now (without commenting on the circumstance that he had the reason for this change staring him in the face), if the compiler had taken the trouble to look at the notes at the bottom of the page, he would have seen after the reference to the name *Orthocorta*, the word “Hybrid.”

R. LYDEKKER.

UNCONFORMITIES BENEATH THE CAMBRIAN QUARTZITES IN SHROPSHIRE.

SIR,—In the GEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE (1891), p. 485, is a paper by the Rev. J. F. Blake, in which he challenges some of my criticisms on his work in Shropshire. His chief assertions are the following:

(1). That at Pontsford Hill the Longmynd Rocks in contact with the Rhyolite are altered.

(2). That at Narnell's Rock there is an unconformity separating Cambrian from “Monian” rocks.

(3). That at Charlton Hill the conglomerates and grits are superficial, and are not a part of the Uriconian series.

Paper-contests in geology are rather unsatisfactory work, and I therefore propose to attempt a settlement of these disputed points, and any others that may be agreed upon, in the following manner. A competent geologist, to be selected by Mr. Blake and myself, to visit the ground in our company, and to publish his conclusions. The disputant who is convinced of his error to publish his recantation. The disputant against whom the referee decides in the