

have always found it rather difficult to prove to a student that the Lower and Upper Carboniferous beds really belong to one formation at all, so great is the contrast between the “essentially” marine aspect of the lower, and the essentially lacustrine aspect of the upper division. If this be so, is it not “philosophical” to suppose that there is a middle group, between these extremes, “essentially” marine, yet less oceanic than the lower stage of the Mountain Limestone?

Meanwhile, allow me to ask my colleague to defer his opinion on the views I have stated in my paper till he has had an opportunity of reading it.

EDWARD HULL.

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY OF IRELAND,  
*Office, 14, Hume-street, Dublin.*

#### THE RELATION OF THE PERMIAN TO THE TRIAS.

SIR,—Mr. Irving appears to have quite mistaken the purport of my communication on the relation of the Permian to the Trias in the neighbourhood of Nottingham.<sup>1</sup> I understood it had been stated by geologists of Nottingham, that not only a perfect conformity existed between the Permian and the New Red Sandstone near that town, but there was a passage upwards from one formation into the other.

I merely wrote to say this could not be, for the reasons I gave. But I never intended to imply there was not a general conformity between the two formations, for this general conformity must be apparent to any one on looking at a good geological map, whereon these formations are laid down. Neither did I intend it to be understood that I considered that the break between the Permian and the New Red Sandstone was greater than between some of the subdivisions of these formations. As, for instance, the break between the Middle Marls and Lower Magnesian Limestone of the Permian, or that between the Keuper and the Bunter of the Trias. I gave no opinion one way or the other on these points.

The point of my communication was this. The relation of the Permian to the Trias I considered an important problem yet to be worked out. If a perfect passage from the one up into the other was found, it would go far to settle the question. As far as I know, that passage has not been found, and, I contend, it does not exist in the neighbourhood of Nottingham.

Some personal remarks in Mr. Irving's communication I shall not reply to, they have nothing to do with the question, and were wholly uncalled for. I do not consider the pages of a scientific magazine the place for that kind of bantering.

W. TALBOT AVELINE.

#### HURONIAN VOLCANIC ROCKS.

SIR,—In an able paper in your last issue, Mr. George M. Dawson publishes the results of his study of the “Porphyrite Formation” of British Columbia, and applies these results to the explanation of the origin of the Huronian series of Eastern North America. I am particularly pleased to find so good an observer as Mr. Dawson not

<sup>1</sup> GEOL. MAG. Dec. II. Vol. IV. p. 155.