

by Koenig in 1818, and therefore is not preceded by *Proteosaurus* Home, 1819.

J. ALLAN THOMSON.

DOMINION MUSEUM, WELLINGTON, N.Z.
October 3, 1919.

THE SGURR OF EIGG.

SIR,—My attention has been called to this time-honoured controversy by the contributions to the subject by my friends Dr. Harker and Mr. E. B. Bailey.

In 1898 I mapped the Sgurr very carefully on the scale of 6 inches to the mile, and obtained a good deal of evidence that has not yet been published.

For instance, there are pebbles of granite in the Bidein Boidheach conglomerate, granite of a Tertiary type and resembling none of the older granites in Scotland. This certainly suggests that the conglomerate or breccia is of late date and not of pre-dolerite age.

The dolerite sill (if it be a sill at all) at Bidein Boidheach does not turn upwards at the junction, but is cut off abruptly. The basalt dyke at the same place is also cut off, in my opinion. I have never seen any fragmental deposit that could stop a basalt dyke that had pierced through a succession of lavas.

I made many observations of the inclination of the base of the pitchstone, and there is no doubt that rock occupies a very distinct and deeply cut groove in the basalt lavas and dolerite sills. Incidentally I may mention that in my opinion the sills are far fewer than Dr. Harker would suggest.

The bottom breccia at the base of the Sgurr (eastern end) I took to be, as Dr. Harker says, part of the pitchstone, but not intrusive. As I read the evidence, it is the brecciated base of the flow over which the rest flowed. It has picked up fragments of basalt, sandstone, wood, etc., and rolled along under the main mass. A coating of glass round basalt fragments is quite to be expected. I have never seen any intrusion that acted in quite the same way, though I have seen igneous breccias formed at the edges of intrusions.

I left Eigg quite convinced of the general accuracy of Sir Archibald Geikie's theory, and nothing that I have read since has induced me to change my opinion.

Dr. Harker's theory rests on too many theoretical considerations; Sir Archibald Geikie's theory, especially as championed by Mr. Bailey, rests chiefly on field evidence. In such cases, from a long and very varied experience of field-work all over the world, I naturally give the greatest weight to field evidence, and though I do not wish to belittle any of the microscopic evidence that Dr. Harker has brought forward nor to disregard any of the arguments he has advanced, I cannot accept his theory.

E. H. CUNNINGHAM-CRAIG.