

by a relatively narrow isthmus of sand which is never below high-water mark in any part of its length. The size of the areas of land may vary to any extent, but the highest points in both must rise higher above sea-level than any part of the isthmus. The best example is that known to English residents in Hong-Kong as Dumb-bell Island, which consists of two granite hills, each about 300 feet high and  $1\frac{1}{4}$  miles long, connected by a low sandy isthmus 170 yards wide, rising 10 feet above normal high-water mark. The Portuguese colony of Macao is, perhaps, the most typical example of a dumb-bell peninsula.

There are several varieties of dumb-bell islands, and their origin is ascribed by Mr. Schofield to (1) decay of rocks, (2) partial submergence of the land, (3) rainstorms, (4) destruction of vegetation, (5) marine action, and these causes are examined and explained in detail. Nearly all the dumb-bell islands and peninsulas are composed of granite, generally partly decayed, and their evolution can be followed through all its stages in the examples near Hong-Kong. The paper concludes with a list of the islands and peninsulas of this type near Hong-Kong, to the number of forty-six.

---

## CORRESPONDENCE.

### THE SGÛRR OF EIGG.

SIR,—I have no wish to enter into a controversy upon the subject of the Sgùrr of Eigg with Dr. Harker, whose letter, I may be pardoned for suggesting, savours rather more of the “Don” than of the “Survey man”. I may remark, however, that I have read Dr. Harker’s paper carefully, and did not find it convincing. The occurrence of granite pebbles in the conglomerate may not be new now; I believe it was new when Mr. A. S. Reid and I made the discovery—in 1898. I have never seen any of the older granite fragments that Dr. Harker mentions, the granites “that are not exposed at the surface”; possibly they may be of Old Red Sandstone age. The granite pebbles we discovered in the conglomerate are certainly not of Old Red Sandstone age. In any case, this point concerning granite pebbles is arguable, but is not vital.

The question at issue between Dr. Harker and myself is something much more important, namely, the relative values of theoretical and field evidence. I bow to Dr. Harker’s knowledge of microscopic petrology, but in matters of field evidence each man must rely on his own observation. It is possible to argue at any length about possibilities, probabilities, and theoretical matters, but there should be no possible mistake about facts as observed in the field. I cordially agree with Dr. Harker that a little knowledge is dangerous, but, on the other hand, assurance as to facts is very safe. Anyone who has a lengthy experience of economic geology—the kind of geological work that is practically useful, as distinguished from that which

is more purely academic—will realize that absolute assurance as to facts in field evidence is essential. Less than absolute assurance may be interesting but is economically useless.

Dr. Harker and I, from our respective experiences in various parts of the world, obviously take different points of view, and therefore I suppose must agree to differ upon this problem of the Sgùrr of Eigg.

E. H. CUNNINGHAM-CRAIG.

THE DUTCH HOUSE, BEACONSFIELD.

March 1, 1920.

[The foregoing letter was submitted to Dr. Harker in MS.; his reply is printed below.—ED. GEOL. MAG.]

SIR,—I am sorry if the tone of my former note on this subject was unsuitable. It is no doubt a Don's failing to dislike being patronized, even by an old student.

I should not trouble you again were it not that Mr. Cunningham-Craig persists in representing that I stand for "theory" while he is the champion of "field evidence". I must point out once more that my theory was the same as his until I came to survey the ground, when the field evidence compelled me to a different interpretation. There was no question of "microscopic petrology" until Mr. Craig introduced it, when he claimed to decide that the granite fragments in the Eigg agglomerate are of a Tertiary, not a Palæozoic type. It seems that, despite his compliments, he will not allow me the same privilege in respect of the granite fragments in Skye and elsewhere. His experience in many parts of the world may be, like Sam Weller's knowledge of London, extensive and peculiar, but does not seem to have much bearing upon this specific point.

ALFRED HARKER.

PALEONTOLOGICAL ABSTRACTS.

SIR,—Probably most of your readers are by this time aware that the Société Géologique de Belgique has undertaken to publish a "Review of Geology and Connected Sciences", consisting of summaries of recent papers written, so far as possible, by the authors themselves. Further information may be obtained from the Secretary to the Review, Laboratoire de Géologie, Université de Liège.

The object of this letter is to inform British Palæontologists that the new Review, instead of competing with *La Revue critique de Paléozoologie*, which M. Cossmann has been bravely conducting for over twenty years, will take it into collaboration, leaving the direction in the hands of M. Cossmann. All writers on Palæozoology in this country are therefore asked to be good enough to send M. Maurice Cossmann, 110 Faubourg Poissonnière, Paris, Xe., separate copies of their papers, or if that be impossible, at least the title and bibliographic details of each publication.

F. A. BATHER.