

presented by the Governors of the New Zealand Institute," or by the Science Library of the Education Department, which has been attempting to procure it through the usual agents. My attention was drawn to it by Dr. Wilckens' excellent abstracts in *Neues Jahrbuch für Mineralogie*, 1905, II, which reached England after my paper had gone to press. It is intelligible that Professor Park should send his fossils to Freiburg for determination; but it is hard that British palæontologists, who at least try to do their best, should have to learn of the admirable work of their New Zealand brethren from a German publication.

F. A. BATHER.

December 5th, 1905.

---

THE SEPARATE EXISTENCE OF GEOLOGY AS A SCIENCE.

SIR,—I observe in the Anniversary Address of the President of the Geological Society (John Edward Marr), 17th February, 1905, p. xi, the following paragraph:—"It is not wonderful that in these circumstances there appears to be a feeling among some that geology as a separate science will become extinct." I have met with statements somewhat akin to this which have drawn my attention to the subject. Geology is the history of the earth, and therefore includes all other sciences and all natural knowledge (except the abstract sciences). Therefore, if geology as a science is to become extinct it can only be as regards the name (unless, indeed, it is meant that the human race is to become extinct), for as long as a reasoning being exists on the earth there must be some kind of a history of the earth. Astronomy, biology, mineralogy, etc., are merely branches of this science.

I would remark also on a statement in the Address of H. A. Miers to the Geological Section of the British Association in South Africa, wherein he says he has no claim to be called a geologist. If a man who has a profound knowledge of some departments of geology, and, it may be presumed, a good general knowledge of geology likewise, is not to be called a geologist, then who is?

R. J. LECHMERE GUPPY.

PORT OF SPAIN, TRINIDAD.

---

MESSRS. HATCH & CORSTORPHINE'S "GEOLOGY OF S. AFRICA."

SIR,—It may prevent some confusion subsequently, to point out that in Hatch & Corstorphine's recently-issued work on "The Geology of South Africa" there is an error in the naming of one of the fossils from the Umtamvuna Series (Pondoland) depicted in fig. 71 on p. 259. Fig. 71b should have been described as *Ammonites gardeni*, and not *Ammonites soutoni*, the figure having evidently been copied from one of Baily's original figures of that species (Quart. Journ. Geol. Soc., vol. xi, 1855, pl. xi, fig. 3a).

BRITISH MUSEUM (NATURAL HISTORY).

G. C. CRICK.