

to the various divisions of the Cambrian and Lower Silurian systems are nothing but equivalents of the uppermost 1000 ft. of the British Caradoc group. I think that Mr. Hicks himself will shrink from such a conclusion. But, if the conclusion is false, there must be some fault in his own reasoning, on which it is based. We must, therefore, suppose that the depression took place far more slowly in the Swedish area. I think that this must be so, because the Swedish area was more oceanic and more remote from volcanic districts, where it is natural that more sudden depressions take place.

Secondly, Mr. Hicks objects to my proposal to unite the Upper Harlech beds with the Menevian group. As to this, I will not deny that it may be convenient to separate them as local groups, but I still hold the opinion that the difference, in palæontological respect, between the Harlech and the Menevian group, is not comparable, for instance, to that between the Menevian group and the Lingula flags, or to that between the Lingula flags and the Tremadoc group. If the term Menevian were to be transferred to other countries than Britain, I think that it ought to have its range extended so as to comprise all the strata of which Mr. Barrande has formed his *Phases à Paradoxides*.

As to Mr. Hicks' general assertion, in the beginning of the letter, that the facts brought forward by me, far from invalidating any of his views, tend strongly to confirm them, I look forward to the continuation of his paper in the GEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE, where the meaning of these words will probably be more fully explained. At present, I must own that I cannot understand how, for instance, the fact that the lowest Russian beds underlie a horizon which in palæontological and stratigraphical respect corresponds to the British Lower Tremadoc (or, according to the classification of Mr. Salter, to the uppermost Lingula flags) can very strongly confirm Mr. Hicks' opinion that they are of Arenig age, nor how the fineness of the sediment in the Paradoxides and Olenus beds of Sweden can prove them to be shore deposits as they ought to be, at least for a large part, according to Mr. Hicks' views—not to refer to any more examples.

G. LINNARSSON.

STOCKHOLM, May 15th, 1876.

P.S.—ERRATUM.—There is an Erratum in my last communication which appeared in the GEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE for April last at p. 149, 20 lines from foot of page, for "older than any metamorphic rocks of Scandinavia," etc., it should read "older than any non-metamorphic or 'clastic' rocks, etc.—G.L.

CONCHOIDAL FRACTURE OF FLINT.—It may be interesting to notice in connexion with this subject, alluded to in the Report of the Geological Society of Stockholm, (see *ante* p. 281), that the late Mr. C. B. Rose, F.G.S., read a paper thereon at the Meeting of the British Association at Norwich, 1868. The structure is well known in the Chalk Flints of Norfolk, and is developed by hammering. The "dressed" surfaces of old flint walls, Bishop's Palace Garden, Norwich, show it admirably well.—EDIT. GEOL. MAG.