

CORRESPONDENCE.

JUKES ON RIVER VALLEYS, S. W. CORK.

SIR.—In reply to Mr. A. J. Jukes-Browne's letter in the *GEOL. MAG.* for May, 1879, I would point out that the apparent discrepancy between the statements in "Valleys and their Relations, etc.," and in the "Geology of Ireland," is easily explained. In the first, the statement refers to the formation of valleys in any country and in any kind of rocks; while in the second, the statement refers solely to the valleys of S. W. Cork. Such a general statement as the first would not refer to a peculiar country like S. W. Cork, where the Carboniferous slate rocks are as hard and are as capable of resisting denudation as the Old Red Sandstone, while if Coal-measures once existed in the synclinal troughs, they probably were also indurated and similar to the rocks that form the hills immediately north of the Black Water Valley and hills elsewhere in South Ireland.

Jukes distinctly states that the Carboniferous slate was once covered by limestones, while subsequently he relies on the soft nature of the limestone to expedite the formation of his valleys.

I cannot exactly see why this theory has a claim to be called "well considered." When put forward, it was founded on suppositions that were then questioned, and which have since been shown to have been too hastily arrived at. It also ignores all faults and dislocations of strata in the different areas mentioned, while originally it totally ignored ice-action. It was only an afterthought, to bridge over the last, that the statement "a glacier is only a frozen river" was introduced; but this does not meet the objection, as the actions of moving frozen and unfrozen waters are very different.

I do not for a moment presume to say that in no place could rains and rivers produce the effects described; but as the theory was founded in a country and on suppositions which were afterwards found to be erroneous, I think I am justified in saying the general theory "falls to the ground."

G. H. KINAHAN.

FERNs, *May 13*, 1879.

DEVON GEOLOGY.

SIR.—From the Rev. H. H. Winwood's letter, *GEOL. MAG.* May, 1879, it would appear that my statement casts a slur on the Devonshire Amateur Geologists; for this I am extremely sorry, as such was never my intention, the remarks being intended solely to refer to a paper which I believe has been given much more importance to than it merits. I can assure Amateurs that I look on them with great respect, and I sincerely wish there were more of them in Ireland, as they are the only safeguard against the overwhelming vagaries and egotism of the "Trained Geologists"; and I would have much more respect for them if sometimes they were more independent, as they often allow their well-worked-out results to be snuffed out by individuals whose only claim to be heard is that they are officials.

I regret I cannot accept my friend's hospitable challenge for

various reasons; because I have given up "coat streeing," and principally that I cannot devote sufficient time to be such a master of the Devonian sections as would give me a claim "to beard the lion in its den." I must, however, say that if the Devon geologists are satisfied with the evidence brought forward to refute the existence of Jukes's, or rather De la Beche's fault, they are very easily satisfied.

Various Irish geologists have gone to Devon, Cornwall, and Wales, to compare the Irish and the English rocks; yet how many of them have written on the English rocks? I do not know of any English geologists except De la Beche (who we may nearly claim as an Irish geologist) who have examined the Irish rocks, further than taking a hurry scurry on a car through the country, yet we are coolly asked to squash the work of years to suit these ideas. Who therefore,—English or Irish,—take the cross channel view of the rocks?

G. H. KINAHAN.

FERNS, May 13, 1879.

BEEKITE IN THE CHANNEL ISLANDS.

SIR,—Will you allow me to add to Capt. Jamieson's interesting account of his discovery of Beekite in the Punjab, contained in the last Number of the GEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE, that this mineral also occurs in a Triassic conglomerate in Bouley Bay, Jersey, described in Ansted and Latham's "Channel Islands," p. 274.

A year or two ago I picked up several specimens on the beach there in pebbles containing corals and shells. Thus the range of Beekite in Europe is slightly extended beyond the shores of Torbay.

It would be interesting to know if the same conglomerate with Beekite also occurs in Normandy, among the rocks believed by Mr. Ussher to be a south-easterly extension of the Triassic beds of Devonshire (see "On the Triassic Rocks of Normandy, etc.," by W. A. E. Ussher, Esq., F.G.S., Quart. Journ. Geol. Soc., vol. xxxv. p. 245).

J. A. BIRDS.

82, GLOUCESTER TERRACE, HYDE PARK,
June 4, 1879.

P.S.—There is a specimen of Beekite in the British Museum, from Vallecas, near Madrid.

BEEKITE IN FLINTSHIRE.

SIR,—Capt. Jamieson, in his letter on Beekite from the Punjab, in the GEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE of last month, mentions Torbay as the only known locality in Great Britain for this mineral. It occurs also in the Carboniferous Limestone of Flintshire, and in every specimen that I have hitherto met with as a crust replacing the shell of a *Productus*. The siliceous gangue of many of the veins and the silicification of the *Encrinurus* and other fossils in the Limestone in and near such veins is a further indication of the passage of water containing silica in solution.

A. STRAHAN.

HOLYWELL, 18th June, 1879.