

BADEN POWELL AND CHARNWOOD FOREST.

SIR,—The posthumous paper in your March number, by Baden Powell, appears out of date. More than half of its material had appeared in print before it was written in 1859; and the few new points it contains have been told over and over again during the last decennary. But what I wanted especially to note was a correction of the opening statement in the article, "That the Geology of Charnwood Forest was first systematically investigated by Professors Sedgwick, Whewell, and Airy in 1833." Your readers will find in the *Annals of Philosophy*, Jan., 1824, an elaborate memoir, with a good geological map and woodcuts, by William Phillips and S. Luck Kent, "Observations on the Rocks of Mount Sorrel, Charnwood Forest, and Grooby." This memoir is 20 pages long, and excepting the antiquated nomenclature, is as sound in its principles, accurate in its details and classification of the rocks, as are any of the recent Memoirs of Charnwood Forest, the Geological Survey, Mr. Jukes, or the recently published memoir by Professor Ansted.

From another remark in Mr. Baden Powell's paper, anyone would suppose that the district of Charnwood Forest had been a neglected field, whereas for many years past, and remarkably so of late, the local geologists of Leicester, of whom I am proud to be one, have explored every yard of its area, and are well acquainted with every geological feature to be found about its rocks. Their labours may not find a place in the *Quarterly Journal of the London Geological Society*, but they are to be found in the memoirs and transactions of several local societies.

JOHN PLANT.

PEEL PARK, SALFORD,
5TH FEBRUARY, 1868.

CLASSIFICATION OF GRAPTOLITES.

SIR,—I must ask you for leave to say a few words in reply to Dr. Nicholson's in your last.

1. The Graptolites have been supposed to be related to the Ctenostomatous Polyzoa—the Ctenostomata have corneous polyparies like the Graptolites. Dr. Nicholson dismisses the question of their Ctenostomatous affinity, because the Polyzoa "as a rule" have Calcareous tests; a "summary" process indeed. Dr. Nicholson has yet to make the acquaintance of the Ctenostomata, for the "free and corneous Polyzoa," of whose existence he is "*perfectly aware*," are a novel group of real or imaginary animals very different from the fixed Polyzoa to which Busk gave the name.

2. Dr. Nicholson changed his views *after* I pointed out, in the *GEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE*, his errors, and his progress in knowledge followed step by step my corrections. Your readers will form their own estimate of that "honesty" which accepts these corrections and publishes them without acknowledgment.

3. I ventured to suggest that somehow Dr. Nicholson had confounded gonophore with gonotheca, but such an error was so gross and so fundamental, that I suggested it with diffidence. Now Dr.

Nicholson says plainly that he used "gonophore instead of gonotheca, to signify the external bell-shaped ovarian vesicle of the Sertulariadae." He also quotes Greene¹ in support of his position, and triumphantly adds that his quotation is but one of many similar statements! Had he pursued his examination of Greene's Manual a little further, he would have found, at page 47, that in the Sertulariadae "gonophores, protected by the gonotheca, are borne along the sides of the gonoblastidium." Ignorant of the difference between a "reproductive body" and an "ovarian vesicle," that is, between a gonophore and a gonotheca, and consequently of all the remarkable phenomena connected with the development of the Hydrozoa, of which these terms are the exponents, Dr. Nicholson has discarded before learned societies and to the readers of scientific journals, on the relation of an obscure group of fossils to recent animals from these organs of reproduction! I may as well here give the reason why I have come to the rescue of a set of animals in which I have long been greatly interested. More than two years ago, when Prof. Wyville Thompson, who had promised a monograph of them to the Palaeontographical Society, pressed me to undertake it instead of him, I refused, because I had resolved to confine myself to botanical researches; and to this resolution I would have adhered had I not been constrained to rescue my old friends from the hands of a man who, from the first, appeared to me to be, as he has now declared himself, imperfectly acquainted alike with the fossils and their living representatives.

4. A perusal of the laws of scientific nomenclature (British Association or M. De Candolle's) will enlighten Dr. Nicholson as to his *Pleurograpsus*.

5. It is not pleasant to be personal, but it is often necessary—scientific precision and truth require it. Dr. Nicholson has another method. In the first part of his letter in your last number, he says the error (introduced by Mr. Jenkins into the abstract of his paper?) in the generic character of *Dichograpsus*, "has been reproduced in a recent paper on Graptolites." Would it not have been better to have been personal here, and said, reproduced by Mr. Carruthers? But what is the truth? This *erroneous* character was published by me in June, 1867 (did Mr. Jenkins make by mistake his abstract from my paper?), in a paper which Dr. Nicholson has read, for he has quoted from it. If there is any plagiarism, it is Dr. Nicholson who has stolen from me. But if he prosecutes his enquiries a little further, he will find that this character was not published even then for the first time.

And now, sir, I have done with Dr. Nicholson, and I trust he has for some years done with Graptolites. Let Dr. Nicholson lay aside his honours for a little, and become a *scholar* in natural science, and no one will more heartily welcome him as a worker when he has somewhat mastered his subject, than—WM. CARRUTHERS.

¹ Prof. Allman (whose terminology Greene adopts) and Prof. Huxley did me the favour to read and approve my proof.—W.C.