

ANNOUNCEMENTS AND INQUIRIES.

AT the Centenary Meeting (1931) of the British Association for the Advancement of Science a committee was appointed to "examine and report upon Petrographic Classification and Nomenclature". Many outside the few appointed are interested in the problems that will be examined, and the Committee therefore invites readers of the GEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE to forward their views to the Secretary.

In the first place the Committee is attempting to evaluate the data available for establishing a sound classification of igneous rocks, and invites replies to the following questionnaire:—

(1) Do you agree that classification should be based upon chemical and physical characters (i.e. composition, both mineral and chemical, texture, and geological occurrence), as distinct from hypotheses of origin, etc.

(2) To what extent should the classification be based upon chemical composition as expressed in percentages of specific oxides?

(3) How far should the classification be based upon facts of geographical distribution, i.e. upon the recognition of petrographical provinces?

(4) Are you in favour of the separation of igneous rocks into three divisions, plutonic, hypabyssal (dyke rocks), and extrusive (lavas), following Rosenbusch and others; or into two divisions only, following Zirkel, Iddings, and others?

(5) If in favour of three divisions would you base the separation of the second from the third upon (a) texture, or upon (b) actual geological occurrence?

(6) Should the naming of a rock be determined by the nature of the eruptive rocks with which it is associated, e.g. trachybasalts (trachydolerites of Rosenbusch) only distinguished from normal basalts by their association with other alkali-rocks.

(7) In aiming at a complete classification for general acceptance by petrographers, are you in favour of retaining time-honoured rock names, with meanings probably different in many cases from those originally given to the names; or of introducing a new nomenclature?

(8) Do you think that the requirements of field geologists should be allowed to influence the classification and nomenclature of rocks; or should there be a simple classification with "field-names" for general use, and a more complete classification with more exact names for use in accurate petrography?

W. CAMPBELL SMITH,
Chairman.

A. K. WELLS,
Secretary.

KINGS COLLEGE,
LONDON, W.C. 2.