If another name is called for, as I think, it is, the form syenoid (derived from felspathoid syenite, but it can also be interpreted literally as "syenite-like") has an advantage over an entirely new name, inasmuch as it preserves the connexion with syenite and so imposes no fresh burden on the memory. Also it is only one of a whole series of terms which are all constructed on the same principle; and finally it is brief and euphonious.

I grant that the matter is a trivial one, yet I am convinced that in the judicious use of prefixes and suffixes we shall find the best solution of the difficulties of nomenclature. If this is "perversity", then I am guilty and unrepentant.

S. J. Shand.
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"THE RELATIVE AGE OF CONCRETIONS."

Sir,—There is one paragraph in the interesting and suggestive paper by Mr. W. A. Richardson (in the March GEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE) over which I feel constrained to join issue with the writer. In the course of arguments in favour of subsequent formation of the concretions surrounded by "conformable" lines of stratification, and against the hypothesis that consolidation pressure produces such effects, he quite rightly assumes that the latter would require the occurrence of similar "conformity" around fossils and other contemporaneous objects offering special resistance. And then he states (p. 118) "But it certainly is not". My experience (and surely that of every worker in the Chalk) would compel me to emend that sentence by omission of its last word. It is hard to find a specimen of Micraster or Echinocorys in the nodular parts of the planus-zone that is not considerably damaged by "slickensiding", precisely similar to that affecting the nodules themselves. While fully prepared to believe that these particular nodules are truly "subsequent" (although the fossils cannot be so), I cannot accept this particular argument. It is always unsafe to be "certain" about a negative.

H. L. Hawkins.

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, READING.
March 9, 1921.