

for the publication. In the paper on the classification of the Dinosauria, I do not adopt the names given on p. 562; but use the name *Ormithischia* for the order of which Omosaurus is an example, there named Omosauria; while the name *Saurischia* is used for the order comprising allies of Cetiosaurus, there named Cetiosauria. I shall be glad if this erratum is corrected on p. 562, so that the names which appear there may not be quoted, and may be considered not to have been published.

THE VINE, SEVENOAKS, Dec. 3, 1887.

H. G. SEELEY.

---

DIMETIAN OF ST. DAVIDS.

SIR,—Mr. Mellard Reade in his paper "On the Dimetian of St. Davids" does not state whether the rock which he found included in the "Dimetian," and which he calls a "green shale," has been proved to be such by microscopic examination. Will he kindly supply the omission; because, without such an assurance, his proof of the intrusive character of the "Dimetian" has no more validity than an arch without a keystone.

T. G. BONNEY.

---

PROF. BONNEY ON BANDED GNEISSES AND THE METAMORPHIC ROCKS OF SOUTH DEVON.

SIR,—Would you kindly allow me space for reply to Professor Bonney's letter in your issue for December, on the above subjects, more especially the latter, which directly affects myself. This portion of his letter forms a marked contrast to the other, and at the outset I beg to protest against its style and tone, which I shall not condescend to imitate in this reply.

It is possible or even probable that I may be wrong in my interpretation of these South Devon rocks, and if so, on further and better proof I shall be as happy in the opposite conclusion, as I earnestly trust that I follow science or truth for its own sake.

With regard to the use of the microscope in geology, let me respectfully remind Prof. Bonney that it is not everything. It so happens that I too have a stake in the "banded gneisses" of the Lizard district, and my field-work there showed me that the whole of his "granulitic" group of schists were rocks of true igneous origin, a fact forced upon me without the aid of the microscope; and further, that the other schists in which the Professor describes current-bedding and ripple-drift, etc., etc., I strongly suspected to have had also an igneous origin, and these appearances due to very different causes, facts which have since been corroborated by a high authority. So much for the use and non-use of the microscope, an instrument in research which I do not undervalue, and which I mean to become better acquainted with.

It is, however, against the tone of the Professor's letter that I complain, and I would invite him (and the rest of your interested readers) to compare the portion of it relating to myself with the last paragraph of his own article in "Nature" for November 10th.

59, FLEET STREET, TORQUAY, Dec. 15, 1887.

ALEX. SOMERVAIL.

---