

being that "On the Schists of the Lizard District," April, 1890, perhaps the one he likes least.

As to the points in his letter under his figures 1, 2, 3 and 4, I have no doubt but that Prof. Bonney will in good time demonstrate these assertions; but in the meanwhile they are only assertions. I will freely and gladly admit the errors, both in my observations and inductions, when proofs are forthcoming. I was much amused by General McMahon's letter. I am well aware (perhaps before the General was) of the apparent sequence of the various rocks laid down by the masterly mind of De la Beche, and also (perhaps) I have seen more of the true dykes in the Lizard District than has fallen under the observations of General McMahon. There are dykes, however, that I regard as of contemporaneous or segregation origin.

Independent of the sequence of the rocks referred to, I think them the product of eruptions of one geological period, that intermittent action is noticeable, and that there is a decided passage of the main masses into each other, and that the same magma, cooling under different conditions, has given rise to many varieties of rock. My communications were intended to lead up to this point.

As to my theory of the origin of the "banded structure," let it with the others "sink or swim." I care not which survives.

As to the close of General McMahon's letter, I much regret having to say, that I think it is quite uncalled for.

TORQUAY, 9TH December, 1890.

ALEXR. SOMERVAIL.

REPORT OF THE INTERNATIONAL GEOLOGICAL CONGRESS.

SIR,—I am periodically asked by friends who joined the last Geological Congress how it is that the promised report to which each member was said to be entitled has not yet appeared, although some of us paid an additional subscription to expedite its production.

Ought not the eminent geologists whose names appeared on the circular inviting support to that Meeting to be asked to furnish some explanation for this unaccountable delay? (B. V).²

ON DYNAMO-METAMORPHISM.

SIR,—I certainly had no thought of "rolling back the development of chemical theory a few decades at least," when I wrote of energy taking "the molecular forms of heat and chemical action." Dr. Irving in his criticism of this expression leaves out my reference to heat. I conclude therefore that he has no objection to that part of the statement. As to the assertion that part of the energy, which previously existed in the molar form, was converted into the "molecular form of chemical action," I was unable to know whether Dr. Irving's stricture expressed the generally received views upon the subject, owing to my imperfect acquaintance with chemistry. I have, therefore, consulted the highest authority on such questions to whom I could apply and on whose opinion I can place reliance. With respect to Dr. Irving's apparently general statement, that "chemical combination must generate heat," he replies, that, "when