

Beds: a study of the facies—Petrography of the Sediments—The application of Petrographic Methods to the Correlation and Differentiation of beds in the field—Structure of the area—Folding and Faulting—Tectonic relationship of the area to the Central Weald—Some problems in Wealden Geology.

“The Pleistocene Deposits of the Portsmouth District and their Relation to Man,” by L. S. Palmer, M.Sc., Ph.D., and Lt.-Col. J. H. Cooke.

This paper is divided into five sections; the first being a short introductory account of the gravel deposits of the district. Three terraces are distinguished, and various exposures near the coast showed three raised sea-beaches at corresponding levels. The second section deals with the stratigraphy of these terraces. In many respects there are points of resemblance between the terraces, whilst in other details important differences occur, such as an increase in the number of Coombe Rocks with increase of terrace level above O.D. The faunal remains are discussed in the third section and the flint implements in the fourth. Both these sets of evidence indicate that the fluviatile gravels of the uppermost terrace were laid down about the same time as the basal layers of the lowest terrace, and that the climate was not colder than that of the present day. This period was followed by colder periods, during which the later deposits were formed. Unabraded Acheulean implements were found in the lowest deposits, whilst Mousterian and Aurignacian artefacts occurred in the upper layers. In the last section an attempt is made to correlate the data of the preceding sections.

An appendix by Mr. A. S. Kennard gives a list of the molluscan remains found in the Upper Coombe Rocks of the Middle Terrace.

CORRESPONDENCE.

SIR,—In my paper on “Glaciation”, published in your January number under the date 1897, reference is made to conglomerates at Silverwood and Cherry Gully Railway Stations.

Through a communication received from Professor Richards, of Brisbane, I find that I was mistaken in classing them as Glacial conglomerates and of the same age as the Ashford N.S. Wales Glacial conglomerate.

E. J. DUNN.

TOR *v.* INSELBERG.

SIR,—In his letter in the April number, Professor Gregory renews his attack upon the term “inselberg”, but I can think of various objections to his contention. Why, for instance, should one use the provincial term “tor” in place of the international term “inselberg”? Surely the more international terms one can introduce into geological literature the better. Further, the term “tor” does not convey to me the same ideas of magnitude and place

relations as the term "inselberg". Is the converse of Professor Gregory's proposition true, for example? Would Professor Gregory in describing the scenery of Dartmoor to a German-speaking scientist speak of the tors as *inselberge*? An "inselberg" is typically an island mount or mountain, usually under 1,000 ft. in relative elevation, rising abruptly from an extensive plain like a rocky island from the waters of the ocean. The imagination is stimulated by the term "inselberg", but not by the term "tor". It is somewhat far-fetched of Professor Gregory to say that an "inselberg", to deserve its name, should rise out of water or out of alluvium. Even in English, the word "island" is often used as a figurative prefix. We speak of an "island-platform" and of an "island-refuge", though neither of these as a rule rises out of water or out of alluvium. Further, Professor Gregory would appear to be in favour of an author using a term to denote a surface feature which would imply his particular theory of the origin of the feature. This principle, however, is not to be commended, as it would lead to the multiplication of names for any feature of disputed origin. Non-committal terms should be used in all such cases, and it is the great advantage of the term "inselberg" that it is purely descriptive and entirely non-committal in respect of the origin of the feature so described. Thus the term "tor" as a substitute for "inselberg" is completely ruled out, because Professor Gregory has defined tors as "residual hills, left by the denudation of mountain ranges", and again as "fragments of old mountains destroyed by denudation" (*Rift Valleys and Geology of East Africa*, p. 36). Apart from the difficulty of believing that the tors of East Africa are the actual remnants of Eozoic mountains, this is certainly not the origin of many of the *inselberge* of Nigeria, which may be seen in places in process of emergence from the plains under present conditions of erosion. Others again are relics of formerly more extensive isolated masses of rock which have been subdivided and dissected by such processes as those described by Mr. Bain. No single theory, however, is likely to suit all cases, and for this reason the term "inselberg" is in my opinion much too useful to be lightly discarded from geological literature.

J. D. FALCONER.

NIGERIA.

2nd May, 1923.

[This letter is printed exactly as received, as were Mr. Bain's paper and Professor Gregory's letter. The Editor would, however, be glad of an authoritative ruling as to whether the German word "*Inselberg*" is now sufficiently naturalized in English to be written with a small initial letter. The Editor is of opinion that if this is the case the plural should be "*inselbergs*", since "*inselberge*" is neither German nor English. A great deal of editorial time would be saved if authors, reviewers and correspondents would kindly remember that all German substantives begin with a capital letter,