

W. E. Logan, James D. Dana, the two Professors Rogers, and C. H. Hitchcock. The part taken by these ~~seven~~ united adversaries of the Taconic system is inexcusable, and even odious. eight.

Incapacity in field stratigraphy and lack of practical knowledge of geology and palæontology on an unprecedented magnitude have never shown a bolder front.

From the beginning, the palæontologist of the state of New York, Mr. James Hall, has been at fault, ignoring the primordial fauna, its value, its true position in stratigraphy, even fifteen years after it had been stated in 1846 by Joachim Barrande; and rejecting the good observations and determinations of Dr. Emmons, when it was he, Hall, who was faulty and incorrect.

The ignorance displayed by all the opponents is startling, and can only be compared with their arrogance and their malicious acts. A few examples will suffice.

1. Disappearance of three thousand copies of the *Agricultural and Geological Map of the state of New York*, by Dr. Emmons, 1844, a large map, in four sheets, showing the extent of the Taconic system in New York, Massachusetts and Vermont.

2. The specimens, illustrating the Taconic system collected and arranged by Dr. Emmons in the State Museum of Natural History at Albany, all taken out, on an *ex parte* statement made by Mr. James Hall.

3. At the meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, at Albany, in 1851, William B. Rogers said in the geological section: "that as for the Taconic system, it

is mainly composed of Englishmen, who will control the decisions and votes of the Congress, and accept the proposition arrived at—If any compromise can be made—between the partisans of Sedgwick and those of Murchison.

A preliminary meeting of the Commission of nomenclature was held lately—Aug. 30 to Sept. 6, 1887—at Manchester (England), in which a Canadian chemist, Mr. Sterry Hunt, representing "the united opposition of Dr. Emmons' contemporaries,"—just as Mr. J. Hall at the Berlin Congress—prevented once more the question of priority, and our just claim from being properly considered.

In the *Compte-rendu des séances à Manchester*, Bologne, 1887, we read at page 10: "M. G. Dewalque asks Mr. Sterry Hunt, if it is not right to consider the name *Taconic* which can be applied to one of the three systems in discussion, and which presents the advantage of giving a place to American Geology." Mr. Sterry Hunt answers "that the Lower Taconic is Archean, and the Upper Taconic is Cambrian. Historically, the last name has superiority over the first. Besides, he does not believe that the American geologists claim its maintenance."

With two such representatives before the International Commission of Nomenclature, the American interest has great danger of being jeopardized, and not properly acknowledged or defended. (See also: *On the use of the name Taconic* by Jules Marcou in *Proceed. Boston Soc. Nat. Hist.*, vol. XXIII, pp. 347, 348, March 2, 1887).