

Powell's remark that the species listed in my paper as occurring in the *Patella* Beach constitute an almost, if not quite, impossible ecological assemblage, would suggest that he is under the impression that they lived where they are now found, which of course they did not: they occur as washed-up debris in a shore shingle, and precisely the same assemblage of dead shells may be found near high-water mark in many of the Gower bays at the present day.

I am in no confusion concerning the "30 foot" beach of southern England, which was in 1927 and 1928 of Neolithic age, according to Mr. Baden Powell, but which is now probably Mousterian, according to the same authority. I was not concerned with that beach, I did not discuss it in my paper, and I have not attempted to affirm or deny its contemporaneity with any of the Gower beaches. Its correlation with the "30 foot" beach of Gower (the *Patella* Beach) is Mr. Baden Powell's, not mine. On the other hand, Mr. Baden Powell reached the conclusion in 1927 (*GEOL. MAG.*, LXIV, 436), reiterated in 1928 (*ibid.*, LXV, 48), that the "30 foot" beach in Gower (correlated with the beach at the same height in Scotland and the south of England) is of post-Glacial age. The remarks in my paper were supplementary to those of Tiddeman, Wright, and Charlesworth in attempting to show that it is nothing of the kind. For the stratigraphical evidence in Gower is abundant and overwhelming that the "30 foot" beach (the *Patella* Beach) of that district is older than the oldest neighbouring Glacial drift, which is the Older Drift of South Wales; it is therefore pre-Glacial so far as concerns the local application of that term. This was all I wished to assert, and I did not also desire to imply that it is necessarily pre-Pleistocene. It is, however, at least older than the *Neritoides* Beach and the *Rhinoceros hemitoechus* fauna associated therewith, which are of Late Acheulean or Early Mousterian age.

T. NEVILLE GEORGE.

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY OFFICE,  
28 JERMYN STREET,  
LONDON, S.W. 1.

5th May, 1933.

---

#### THE ICE AGE AND EARLY MAN IN YORKSHIRE AND NORTH LINCOLNSHIRE.

SIR,—I have read with the greatest pleasure Professor P. G. H. Boswell's masterly Presidential Address delivered to Section C of the British Association at York this autumn. To the archaeologist it is an epoch-making paper, and perhaps it will not be amiss for me to animadvert upon his references therein to my work conducted in Yorkshire and in north Lincolnshire. Dealing with north Lincolnshire, Professor Boswell states (page 75): "The correlation of the

Kirmington Series with our standard succession will be open to doubt until the laminated silts or associated beds yield implements." In this connection I would remind geologists that I have described and illustrated implements recovered in situ from the upper gravels of the Estuarine Series at Kirmington; and, further, that I have found a few artifacts of Upper Palaeolithic type in the overlying Brown Boulder Clay.<sup>1</sup>

On the same page Professor Boswell says that my "recent discovery of Early Mousterian (Clactonian) implements in the 'Hessle' Boulder Clay (equals? the Upper Purple Boulder Clay) of Kirmington is of great interest . . ." The implements in question, however, I found in the "Cannon-shot" Gravels at Kirmington,<sup>2</sup> and *not* in the "Hessle" Boulder Clay. Moreover, these "Cannon-shot" Gravels, which I equate with the Upper Purple Boulder Clay, antedate the Estuarine Series, which latter may be observed banked against them.

After proceeding to record my discoveries of stratified Aurignacian implements in a late-glacial deposit near Flamborough<sup>3</sup> and Early Mousterian artifacts in the *Corbicula fluminalis* Gravels of Kelsey Hill and Burstwick,<sup>4</sup> Professor Boswell writes (page 76): "Moreover, recent work by Mr. W. S. Bisat shows that both Upper Purple Boulder Clay and Hessle Clay overlie the Kelsey gravels." In the interest of strict accuracy I have to point out that, in 1930, I published two fully documented and illustrated papers<sup>5</sup> in which I demonstrated this fact both upon archaeological and geological evidences. Mr. Bisat has informed me that at the time he was undertaking his examination of the deposits on Flamborough Head and at Kelsey Hill and Burstwick he was unacquainted with my published results, so that it gives me considerable satisfaction to realize that he has arrived, independently, at similar geological conclusions.<sup>6</sup>

J. P. T. BURCHELL.

30 SOUTHWICK STREET,  
HYDE PARK,  
W. 2.

<sup>1</sup> *Antiq. Journ.*, 1931, July, xi, No. 3, 262-272. *Proc. Prehist. Soc. East Anglia*, 1931, vi, pt. 4, 261-5. *Nature*, 20th August, 1932.

<sup>2</sup> *Antiq. Journ.*, 1931, July, xi, No. 3, 262-272.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, 1930, Oct., x, No. 4, 371-383.

<sup>4</sup> *Proc. Prehist. Soc. East Anglia*, 1930, vi, pt. 3, 226-233.

<sup>5</sup> See notes 3 and 4.

<sup>6</sup> *Naturalist*, 1932, July, 215-19.