

degree erroneous. Some modifications—not affecting, however, the main points of structure—I perceive, will have to be made, especially the absence of the Middle Glacial sands in the north-west part of central Norfolk, and the presence there of extensive Post-glacial gravels; and I think it not improbable that the Till of Cromer, which in the structural section given by me in the 22nd volume of the Quarterly Journal of the Geological Society, is shown as occupying the same position of inferiority to the contorted drift as that possessed by the Chillesford clay, although necessarily for want of connexion along the line of section distinguished by a separate letter, may prove to be an expansion of that clay itself. It is a step, however, gained, that one point, for which I have long contended, is now admitted to be correct by my principal opponent,¹ viz. the superiority of the Chillesford shell-bed to the Fluvio-marine Crag; and that the identity which I pointed out between this bed and the Upper Crag of Mr. Taylor, has now received the assent of Mr. Taylor, Mr. Gunn, and Mr. Maw.

Perhaps you will permit me to observe, in reference to Mr. Dawkins' letter respecting the Boulder-clay of Havering, that if by the phrase, "on the southern side of the range of heights that form the northern boundary of the Thames Valley," he means to imply that the Boulder-clay lies *in* the valley of the Thames, I demur wholly to such an implication. The patch at Havering (as Mr. Dawkins knows) is shown in my survey map, placed in the library of the Geological Society, and its position illustrated by section.² It may be seen from the map and sections that the heights of the north side of the Thames Valley are formed of Bagshot sand and Boulder-clay together (the latter having taken the place of the former, and of the uppermost part of the London clay), and that the northern valley slope has been cut down from these two formations indifferently; so that, instead of the Boulder-clay at Havering lying on the southern side of the heights, it is essentially a part of those heights themselves.—I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

SEARLES V. WOOD, JUN.

BRITISH FOSSIL CORALS.

To the Editor of the GEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE.

DEAR SIR,—The generic name of the Carboniferous corals, formerly confounded with *Aulophyllum*, should be *Cyclophyllum*, not *Cyclocyathus* (see *GEOL. MAG.*, September, 1867, p. 416). There is an error in my monograph of the Liassic Corals, which makes *Trochocyathus Moorei*, Ed. and H., stand in the place of *Theocyathus Moorei*, Ed. and H. As these errors may give rise to much bewilderment will you kindly insert this note.

Yours truly

P. MARTIN DUNCAN.

September 18th, 1867.

¹ Fisher, *Quar. Journ. Geol. Soc.*, Vol. xxiii. p. 175.

² See also Section No. 4 of my paper in the forthcoming number of the Quarterly Journal of the Geological Society, and Vol. III. p. 57, of the *GEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE*.