

YORKSHIRE GEOLOGISTS AND RECORDERS.

SIR,—Having a fair knowledge of the names of fossil invertebrata I thought I would have a try at the prize-competition suggested by “Recorder” in your October number (p. 479). Here is my ‘spot’:—

<i>Psil</i> -onotus.	<i>Cor</i> -	<i>Ast</i> -ieria.	<i>Echi</i> -oceras.
<i>Cal</i> -	<i>Agas</i> -sizia.	<i>Nicro</i> -	<i>Der</i> -oceras.
<i>Schlot</i> -heimia.	<i>Arn</i> -ioceras.	<i>Ambly</i> -ceras.	<i>Polym</i> -
<i>Ver</i> -	<i>Arie</i> -tites.	<i>Oxy</i> -otus.	<i>Upt</i> -

I write away from books, but the names seem to be those of AMMONITES, and one is tempted to complete the list by the simple addition of *oceras*; I fear, however, that even so I should not get a place.

As a worker and a recorder myself I have often wondered why some writers should so delight in enigmas; but if the GEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE would start a problem-page for such during the winter months, it might secure fresh subscribers and the wits of the coming generation might be sharpened.

WHAT ?

BEMBRIDGE FOSSILS ON CREECHBARROW HILL, ISLE OF PURBECK.

SIR,—I have just lately received from Mr. Keeping a copy of his paper on the finding of “Bembridge Limestone Fossils on Creechbarrow Hill”, and asking my opinion on his paper. I cannot entirely agree with his conclusions, for the following reasons:—

1. His section (GEOL. MAG., October, 1910, p. 437) appears to be taken from Alum Bay, Isle of Wight, and it seems to me that there is not sufficient space between the Chalk and the top of Creechbarrow for the whole series of beds to fit in.

2. The sand and flints which he regards as “Pleistocene drifts” may be so, but they were seen by the late Mr. Hudleston and myself in a pit (opened under my superintendence) *passing under the limestone*, and referred to by him (see GEOL. MAG., 1902, p. 248). This is a point I desire particularly to call attention to.

3. As regards the piece of limestone mentioned by Mr. Keeping as having been picked up by a workman from among the gravel “at a depth of about 13 feet”, there is considerable room for doubt, bearing in mind the probability of the piece having rolled down into the pit accidentally. It certainly does not disprove Mr. Hudleston’s section showing a layer of flints *beneath the limestone*. The subject is certainly of sufficient interest for some able geologist to take up and investigate independently. Even if the Creechbarrow Limestone fauna and the Bembridge may be identical, they are not necessarily upon the same horizon, and may have existed in Lower Bagshot times. Why not?

A. H. BLOOMFIELD.

ROSE COTTAGES, GRANGE ROAD,
WAREHAM.
October 25, 1910.