

the lowest rocks of the Silurian ; in the strata of the Old Red Sandstone the schists are marked with the little microscopic spots where they have been. In many limestones they are well preserved ; in the Coal-series they are so abundant that they make up massive layers, and so through all the groups, as plentifully in the marine as in the fresh-water beds. Existing as they did in such vast numbers in the waters and muds of the ancient seas and rivers, it necessarily follows that the accumulated shells of the dead specimens should far outnumber the living ; and when we examine our ponds, etc., at the present day, and find them teeming with this form of animal life, we may understand how largely these minute crustacea have contributed to form the carbonate of lime in the various rocks above mentioned. The speaker explained how new forms had been discovered in the mud of foreign countries, and requested his hearers to induce any of their friends who might be going abroad to bring or send home pill-boxes filled with the dried mud of any of the rivers or lakes they might pass in their travels. By keeping these carefully separated, and putting them in distilled water on their arrival in this country, he said that many new and interesting species might be developed. *Land and Water*, January 18, 1868.

CORRESPONDENCE.

DR. T. STERRY HUNT'S GEOLOGICAL CHEMISTRY.

SIR,—In the last number of the “*Chemical News*”¹ (Jan. 17), Dr Sterry Hunt has inserted a reply to some remarks of mine contained in No. 409 of that Journal, but which, in reality, is in great part a criticism on the contents of my communication to the GEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE for October last, the substance of which Dr. Hunt accuses me of having, “for some unknown reason, withheld from the readers of the ‘*Chemical News*.’” The absurdity of this accusation is self-evident, as in the “*Chemical News*” the reader is distinctly given to understand that the communication was but a supplement to the previous one in the GEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE of October 1st ; and, as you are aware, in the GEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE of that date, special attention is directed to this forthcoming supplement. I would, therefore, ask the favour of your inserting in your forthcoming number the enclosed communication, which, by also appearing in the next number of the “*Chemical News*,” will, I hope, satisfy Dr. Hunt that it is not my wish to withhold any of the points of this controversy either from the readers of the “*Chemical News*” or of the GEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE.

20th December, 1868.

DAVID FORBES.

¹ If the reader will compare the article by Dr. T. Sterry Hunt, in the *Chemical News*, here referred to, with that contained in our present Number, p. 49, he will perceive, that, to a great extent, they are the same ; this letter is therefore capable of being treated as a reply, *in part*, to both of Dr. Sterry Hunt's communications ; but there are several points discussed by Dr. Hunt in this MAGAZINE which are not entered upon in the *Chemical News*. To these Mr. Forbes will no doubt reply after he has seen and compared the two articles.—ED.