

## MANCHESTER GEOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION.

“The Succession below the Kinderscout Grit in North Derbyshire.” By J. Wilfrid Jackson, M.Sc., F.G.S.

The paper contains the results of researches commenced before the war, and continued at intervals during recent years. A detailed account is given of the stratigraphical and palaeontological succession of the beds between the Kinderscout Grit and the Carboniferous Limestone, and special attention is devoted to the Shales with Limestones which overlie the massif. These Shales, called by the author the Edale Shales, have been referred in the past, first to the Yoredale Series and later to the Pendleside Group. Evidence is given to support the view expressed in an earlier paper that the shales in question are not related in any way to the strata just named, but are stratigraphically above them. The fossils are shown to be identical with those occurring in the Sabden Shales of Lancashire and their equivalents elsewhere, and the same succession of goniatite-zones is present. The correct determination of the fauna of the Edale Shales has had an important bearing upon the question of the age of certain beds ascribed to Kinderscout Grit in Lancashire and Yorkshire. The evidence derived from the type area of the Kinderscout Grit has rendered it necessary to discard the term Kinder Grit in the case of the grit overlying the Pendle Grit and underlying the Sabden Shales. On the other hand, it confirms the attribution of the name Kinder Grit to the grit overlying the shales in the Todmorden and Hebden Valleys.

---



---

**CORRESPONDENCE.**

## CRETACEOUS AMMONITES.

STR.—In part ii of the Monograph of the Ammonoidea of the Gault (Palaeontographical Society's volume for 1922) an ammonite (*Leymeriella* aff. *regularis*) figured on pl. viii, fig. 5, was stated to be from the “Shenley Limestone” (Lower Albian *regularis* zone). There is no doubt about the age of this ammonite, but Dr. Kitchin and Mr. Pringle have directed my attention to the fact that by this mode of statement I was conniving at the dating of those limestone lenticles as of *regularis* age. I should therefore be glad if you would give me space in the GEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE to express my regret at not having qualified the statement as to the age of the ammonite by the addition of “(? derived)”, because the limestone lenticles are characterized by an assemblage of fossils (not cephalopods) which Dr. Kitchin, Mr. Pringle, and other palaeontologists consider unimpeachable evidence of a Lower Chalk age. Further, there is good reason to doubt whether the ammonite in question was actually found in one of the limestone lenticles, as pointed out some time ago by Dr. Kitchin and Mr. Pringle (GEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE, Vol. LVII, 1920, p. 102).

L. F. SPATH.