

ing or mining, and that there was sure to be exaggeration. Mr. Smyth quoted likewise a report on the tin-stream district of Tenasserim, which was not likely to increase its production in any material degree. After referring to the Laurium mines, the President concluded by remarking upon the issue of a fourth edition of Lyell's "Antiquity of Man," and to Mr. Borlase's "Nænia Cornubiæ," a work in which the metalithic element was so strong as almost to stamp it as a work of applied geology, whilst the scientific treatment of the details of the sepulchral relics of the county entitled the author to the thanks of all who were not blind to the interest of the early history of the British race.

---



---

CORRESPONDENCE.

---

THE "SUB-WEALDEN" EXPLORATION—IMPORTANT DISCOVERY.

SIR,—I am able to announce to you an important fact in relation to our great "Sub-wealden" exploration. The specimens from the lowest part of the boring are marine deposits; they contain shells; among these are distinct small *Lingula*, which are identical with examples of *Lingula ovalis* from our Kimmeridge Clay in Shotover Hill. Mr. Peyton, to whose care in examining the shale from the boring, I am indebted for the specimens which, with the consent of Mr. Willett, have been placed in my hands for scrutiny, and the result is quite certain. There are other shells, but not sufficiently exhibited in these specimens (*Ostrea*, *Avicula*? Spine of *Acrosalenia*?).

It appears, then, that we have touched the great upper clays of the Oolites, without encountering shore sands or shelly Oolites—no Portlandian rocks have appeared. It is the open sea-bed which we have reached, and may not find other than clay deposits for a considerable depth. There may be no Triassic limestones or sandstones; and we may come on Palæozoic rocks at no enormous depth, and with no unusual difficulty.

JOHN PHILLIPS.

OXFORD, 26th Sept. 1873.

---

ON A NEW METHOD OF WRITING CRYSTALLOGRAPHIC FORMULÆ.

SIR,—In the September Number of this MAGAZINE (p. 428), Mr. Danby does me the honour to criticize my paper on Crystallographic Formulæ (p. 299).

His objections to my proposed system of writing formulæ appear to me to be just; and with regard to the application of the system to the more advanced requirements of the crystallographer, they seem not merely just, but important, and it was from anticipation of such objections that I refrained from making any mention of Professor Miller's system. Upon one point, however, Mr. Danby appears to have put a wrong construction, namely, in crediting me with the presumptuous notion that my method of writing these formulæ should be able "to sweep all others from the field."

I intended my little paper merely as a suggestion, capable of modification and improvement, but, nevertheless—a suggestion which