

the knowledge already gained. Out of doors the student should attempt the mapping of a district by himself. It will be well, if there is any choice in the matter, to select one in which the physical features are strongly marked.

This sketchy outline must serve to indicate the notions that have grown up in my mind on the subject now before us, and the methods I have been led to adopt in the teaching of geology. I trust that they may be suggestive, and may call forth that kindly and genial criticism with which the brotherhood of the hammer are wont to welcome attempts, however feeble, to strengthen the corner-stones and widen the domain of the science we love so well, and to enlarge the number of its votaries.

CORRESPONDENCE.

PRIORITY OF NOMENCLATURE.

SIR,—May I ask your opinion on a question of nomenclature? About 15 years ago I discovered in Shropshire the formation which Phillips had previously found in the Malvern Hills, and had called the Hollybush Sandstone. Quite recently, Prof. Lapworth, writing in this MAGAZINE, referred to this rock as the "Comley Sandstone," taking the name from the locality where my typical section is seen, and Prof. Blake has adopted the new nomenclature. Is this change of name in accordance with usage? We call the "Wenlock Limestone" by that name, whether it occurs in Shropshire or the Malvern Hills, and why should we not call the "Hollybush Sandstone" by Phillips' name, whether it is found in the Malvern Hills or in Shropshire?

CH. CALLAWAY.

WELLINGTON, SHROPSHIRE, *August 22nd*, 1890.

THE ELEVATION OF THE WEALD.

SIR,—In the rapid increase of geological literature, some of our early papers may easily be overlooked, and facts unwittingly repeated as novel which had already been noticed; but it may not often happen that the first observer is made the disciple of the second. I have no objection to legitimate criticism; but there is an objection to this obliteration of landmarks, otherwise I should not now care to address you. In Dr. Irving's note "On the Elevation of the Weald," in this month's number of your MAGAZINE, he draws attention to the fact that in 1883 he pointed out that there was evidence of the encroachment of the sea upon the Upper Chalk in Eocene times, and that *this conclusion is accepted by Professor Prestwich*. This might lead the reader to suppose that I had overlooked this point, and that my notice of it in my paper "On the Westleton Beds" (1889), to which he refers, was in consequence of his 1883 paper. Had that been the case, I should not have failed to acknowledge, and that most willingly, my authority for so leading a fact. If, however, Dr. Irving will kindly refer to my paper "On the Thanet Sands" in Q.J.G.S. for 1852, pp. 256-260,¹ or to "The Ground Beneath Us," pp. 70-79, 1847, he will find the question discussed at some length, and *facts and sections* given to show that the dome of the Weald was raised after Cretaceous times, and that the Chalk

¹ Mr. Irving will find this reference in the paper which is the cause of his remarks.