

Tertiär-conchylien), of Semper (Palæontologische Untersuchungen), and of Speyer (who has described and figured a large number of fossils exactly, from these beds in Palæontographica),—that is to say, according to all the important works published on that subject in the last ten or fifteen years. The opinion of Mr. Nyst, who of course is the best judge about Belgian Tertiaries, has been cited against me, but this was his former opinion; it is now quite in conformity with mine after the discoveries of the last few years. Lastly, I must repeat that it *is* possible, and therefore *necessary*, to divide the Tertiary deposits into far more than two, four, or six periods. It is of no consequence which names are adopted for them, whether the names Eocene, Oligocene, Miocene, and Pliocene are associated with Lower, Middle, and Upper, or whether we use the names given by Prof. Ch. Mayer at Zürich to all the different “Etages.”

A. VON KOENEN.

MARBURG, PRUSSIA, 20th Dec., 1867.

---

THE OUSE VALLEY.

SIR,—I am sorry that the mistake into which Mr. Searles Wood has fallen respecting the quarter-sheet 45 N.E., of the map of the Geological Survey of England and the Memoir thereon obliges me to request space for self-defence. Mr. Wood's charge is that I have omitted “*all reference to the Glacial Clay.*” It is true that I have not sub-divided the Drift of that country into an upper clay and a lower gravel, because, as far as I could judge, I did not find evidence to support such a classification; but I have very distinctly stated that Boulder-clay is one of the forms which the Glacial deposits take (p. 53 of the Memoir), and have described sections where the clay is to be seen (p. 57). The Glacial Beds are not laid down on the published map because, as I have mentioned in the Memoir (p. 59), “additional surface maps are in course of preparation, on which the areas covered by superficial deposits will be marked out;” adding, what every one who has tried the experiment knows very well, that “it would be impossible, on the one-inch scale, to show these beds and the stratified rocks on the same map.”

With respect to the sections on p. 34 of the Memoir, and p. 564 of your last volume, which Mr. Wood finds so different, I have only to state that the first has one scale for heights and another for distances, so that the former are exaggerated; the other is drawn to something like a true scale. In the one case too the outline of the supposed ancient valley is rashly drawn hard, and in the other indicated by a dotted line. The facts represented are exactly the same in each case, and I take it rather hard that I should be blamed because four years' experience has made me cautious and, may-be, rather a better draughtsman. I have no wish to set up my own limited experience, which I have urged in the Memoir (p. 58) as a reason for refraining from theorising, against the widespread and long-continued researches of Mr. Wood; but I do expect him, before he criticises, to do me the justice to read my memoir more carefully.

A. H. GREEN.

MONK BRETTON, BARNSELY, January 14th, 1868.