

I lately observed the "bone breccia" or "osseous conglomerate" of the Upper Keuper Sandstone, which I described some years since in a paper read before the Geological Society of London.

It is exposed in a railway cutting at the village of Ripple, between Upton-on-Severn and Tewkesbury, and contains the remains of spines of *Lophodus (Acrodus) minimus* in great abundance. I also recognized portions of *Ceratodus cloasinus*, of Quenstedt, with scutes and other fragments of the bones of *Labyrinthodon*. It is the richest Keuper-bed I know of in England, and well worthy the attention of all collectors of fossils. Henry Brooks, of Ledbury, would be a good guide to the place, and knows the bed which is so fossiliferous.

I am, Sir, yours obediently, W. S. SYMONDS.

Pendock Rectory, near Tewkesbury, Feb. 26, 1863.

Holoptychius v. *Glyptolepis*.

SIR,—Mr. Powrie, in his communication in the last number of the 'Geologist,' says:—"The only species of *Holoptychius* on which I have never yet been able to detect scales showing the crescent of points is *H. Andersoni*." It may interest Mr. Powrie and others also, concerned in the question of *Holoptychius* v. *Glyptolepis*, to learn that the typical specimen of *H. Andersoni* described by Agassiz, and figured in his 'Vieux Grès Rouge,' pl. 22, f. 3, now in the British Museum collection, has the sculpturing of points, which Mr. Powrie has failed to detect in other examples of this species.

In confirmation of Mr. Powrie's statement that he has detected them on scales of all the other species which he has examined, I can state that they are present, and well developed, on the posterior scales of the fine typical example of *H. nobilissimus* from Clashbennie, and also on scales of most of the specimens in the national collection, referred to this genus, from Dura Den, Nairn, etc.; and they are discernible on one or two of the scales of the fragment of *Platygnathus* in the same collection.

So far as my own observation goes, the "crescent of points" is entirely absent on the scales of the anterior portion of the body, but becomes more and more developed as the scales recede backwardly—dorsal, lateral, and ventral—towards the posterior portion. But this particular sculpturing is by no means a new discovery; it was observed by the earlier describers of the genus; and among others Hugh Miller, in his 'Old Red Sandstone,' describes them as "an inner border of detached tubercles." And M'Coy, in his description of *H. Andersoni*, says that in all cases, the anterior part "of the scale" "is occupied by a patch of rather coarse radiatingly disposed granules, from whence the ridges arise that go to the free edge." He intimates, also, that they are present in his *H. Sedgwickii*.

Without offering any opinion as to the distinctive generic value of this sculpturing, there is one noticeable character, which is mentioned by Mr. Mitchell,—the much less degree of imbrication of the scales of *Holoptychius* compared with those of *Glyptolepis*; the scales of the former consequently exhibit a greater exposed surface, and are not so numerous as in the latter genus. And whilst the scales of *Glyptolepis* are so very variable in form and sculpturing, according to their position on the body, "whence," says Professor Huxley, "arises such an amount of unlikeness, that different species might readily be founded on scales from different regions," the scales of *Holoptychius*, on the contrary,—with the exception of the presence or absence of the lines of points, and minor differences of sculptur-

ing and size,—bear, in the general style of the bold wavy ridges of their exposed overlying portions, a character which there is no mistaking, no matter what their position.

Yours truly,
W. DAVIES.

March 12, 1863.

The Rev. W. Allen's Letter on Portland Fissures.

SIR,—Will you allow me to say a few words on the subject of Mr. Allen's letter in your last number? If his suggestion be correct, how is it that animals of distinct *genera*, if not *species*, from any known to have inhabited Britain in historic times are found in the Middle and Upper Oolite? And, again, if he be right concerning the "Upper Oolite" of Portland, why may not the same have taken place with other geological formations *after* the Oolitic series? And this we know cannot well be, as those succeeding it must be far older than 6-7000 years. Is it not more likely that during the Pliocene period (when man is supposed to have existed), the "Upper Oolite" of Portland was submerged; and, as the remains of an extensive estuary (in Dorset and Hampshire) exist close at hand, may not the human remains referred to by Mr. Allen have been washed down to the sea and so deposited in the submerged strata, than that a fresh sedimentary deposit has taken place, and the whole formation have been again upraised, and rent almost throughout, perhaps by volcanic action? Hoping you will excuse these perhaps somewhat crude remarks,

I remain, yours truly,

CHARLES JICKS, JUN.

Woodlands, Thorpe, near Norwich, March 23.

Norway Horses.

SIR,—At p. 26 of the 'Geologist' is an inquiry about the teeth of Norway horses. Last autumn, in a Norwegian tour, a friend, Charles Montagu Doughty, Esq., picked up by the sea, and near the North Cape, the tooth of a horse—which molar I have forgotten. It had not the aspect of a fossil, nor was it very recent, but, as Mr. Doughty suspected before I saw it, was certainly *Equus fossilis*. Although I have often found on our own coasts teeth of *Equus caballus* in exactly the same state of preservation, this cannot be regarded as more than suggestive evidence of the existence of the fossil form, since horses are not now kept so far north.

I am, Sir, faithfully yours,

HARRY SEELEY.

Cambridge, March 9, 1863.

PROCEEDINGS OF GEOLOGICAL SOCIETIES.

GEOLOGICAL SOCIETY.—*February 18th, 1863.*—"On the Middle and Upper Lias of the Dorsetshire Coast." By E. C. H. Day, Esq.
The subdivisions of the Lias instituted by Sir Henry de la Beche and