

With the complete inversion of the views of Professor Penck concerning the "glacial" schotter and the "interglacial" loess, our difficulties in correlating the human industries of the Pleistocene are beginning to diminish or disappear. It is in particular most encouraging to observe that the ascertained correspondence of the Mousterian, at least in greater parts, with the Würm glaciation is in complete harmony with the views of Professor Marr and Mr. Reid Moir. The discovery of Mousterian implements in the Chalky Boulder Clay establishes the correlation of this deposit, not with the Riss, to which it is assigned by Professor Depéret, nor to the Mindel, to which it is assigned by Mr. Brooks, but with the Würm; a result perhaps unexpected but by no means surprising.

W. J. SOLLAS.

---

SPEETON AMMONITES.

SIR,—As an old and constant student of the Speeton Clays, I have been keenly interested in the recent capable revision of the Speeton Ammonoidea by Dr. L. F. Spath, and I desire to congratulate him on his results (*GEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE*, February, 1924) which have cleared up many ambiguities and have materially strengthened the bases for correlation. One may perhaps be permitted to growl a little at having to struggle once more with a tangle of new nomenclature and synonymy, the disturbing concomitant of every successive revision; but one must strive to be heedful of the Scriptural monition so aptly quoted on occasion by J. F. Blake: "Thou shalt not muzzle the ox when he treadeth out the corn."

In dealing with the state of our knowledge of the Speeton Clays some months ago in a Presidential Address to the Yorkshire Geological Society (short abstract in *GEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE*, March, 1923), I summed up the evidence regarding the age of the beds so far as it was then known. My conclusions and those of Dr. Spath are in agreement as to the sequence of the deposits, and, broadly, as to their correlation. We tend to differ, however, on certain minor points, as I am still inclined to hold that Dr. Spath, in limiting his investigation to the Ammonoidea, has hardly allowed enough for the fact that fossils of this order are absent or unknown from considerable portions of the sequence.

As it happens that the address referred to has not yet passed the press, I shall be able to add to it a few notes on Dr. Spath's work, bearing in particular on these points of divergence. Therefore, the discussion of detail would be redundant here, and it will suffice if I refer anyone desirous of pursuing the subject to the next issue of the *Proceedings* of the aforesaid Society.

It may be mentioned incidentally that the recognition by Dr. Spath of Lower Gault ammonites in the top beds at Speeton confirms my argument that Dr. Kitchin and Mr. Pringle were wrong in supposing (*GEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE*, May, 1922) that the Lower Gault is absent there.

G. W. LAMPLUGH.

ST. ALBANS,  
6th March, 1924.