

lectures. I think, for instance, that if Professors Darwin, Osborne-Reynolds, and Fleming, with Dr. Vaughan Cornish and Mrs. S. Ayrton, were to confer and compare experiences a unanimous report might easily be arrived at. Until something of the sort is done the exposition of the subject, as endorsed and supported by the Royal Society and the British Association in their corporate capacities, will either be accepted by the public or cause a great deal of perplexity. The question does not touch my own special work, as all seem agreed as to the ripple-making powers of reciprocal wave-currents.

A. R. HUNT.

November 7th, 1904.

---

*ELEPHAS MERIDIONALIS* AT DEWLISH.

SIR,—I regret that I was unable to be present at the meeting of the Geological Society on the 9th inst., when my paper on the Dewlish elephant trench was read, suggesting human agency. I crave your permission to reply to one or two criticisms as reported in the Abstracts of the Proceedings. It is there said that some 'eoliths' found there were exhibited by me. If what I *did* exhibit is referred to, they were merely shown as geological specimens from the drift of the gravel with which the trench had eventually become filled—not as 'eoliths.' I have seen some 'eoliths' which were collected at Dewlish, but in my opinion (whatever that may be worth) they do not strengthen my hypothesis that the trench is artificial.

Mr. Hudleston remarked that he understood that the remains of only one elephant had been found. There are in existence *nine* well-preserved molars in museums, four at Dorchester, two at Salisbury, two at Cambridge, and one at Manchester. I exhibited at Cambridge all these except the Salisbury specimens. Mr. Pleydell in his paper in the "Dorset Field Club," 1889, mentions seven molars, so that two of the above enumerated must have been omitted in his list. In this paper he gives a list of remains. He says that isolated plates of other molars were scattered in various parts of the deposit, and that in some places fragments of ivory were so numerous as to predominate over other materials. This I think disposes of Mr. Hudleston's objection that the remains of only one elephant had been found.

It is obvious that the trench was not wide enough to contain the carcase of an elephant. But if such a beast once got his fore legs into a narrow trench twelve feet deep, he must have been in the "helpless condition" that Sir Samuel Baker refers to, in which he might have been dispatched at leisure. It is not likely that primitive men would have expended more labour upon their pitfall than was absolutely necessary.

O. FISHER.

HARLTON, CAMBRIDGE,

November 18th, 1904.

---