

were very helpful in illustrating those of the Start district. So, with a greatly enlarged experience, both in the field and with the microscope, I could now improve my former paper (*e.g.* I could amend the accounts of the "chloritic" rocks; should be more ready to recognise altered basic igneous rocks among them; should say that the mineral, very doubtfully identified with kyanite, and some of the smaller grains of water-clear mineral—thought then to be quartz—were more probably secondary feldspars), but I should express myself, if possible, yet more confidently as to the distinction in lithological characters and geological age of the two groups of rocks, the schists and the slaty Devonian system.

Mr. Hunt, so far as I can judge from internal evidence, has had little experience in dealing with problems such as that which he attempts—perhaps the most difficult presented to petrologists. Possibly his experience may be commensurate with my own, but till I have reason to believe that he has studied such problems in other fields than South Devon, and has ample materials at his command for the necessary research, I must decline to do more than say that my original opinion is not in any way altered by his dissertation.

T. G. BONNEY.

"CONE-IN-CONE STRUCTURE."

SIR,—In the September Number of the GEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE there is a note by W. S. Gresley, on "Cone-in-cone Structure," in which he refers to "Mr. John Young's theory of how the rock was formed." With your kind permission, I beg to state, that I have *no* "theory" on the above subject, and in connection with the explanations that I have given of the cone structure in my paper,¹ the word "theory" is never used in any of my own explanations, but it will be found on p. 25, where I give the opinion of Professor Newberry, who there uses the word "theory" in connection with cone formation, "and the upward escape of gases through a pasty medium." Regarding its formation, all the explanations that I have ventured to give are founded upon what is revealed in the best preserved, and most illustrative specimens of the cone structure that I have found in the carboniferous strata of the West of Scotland, and, I do not think, that in these explanations of the various points of structure, that I have stated anything beyond what the specimens themselves most clearly reveal. I have, in various parts of my paper, pointed out that there are structures which have been referred to "cone-in-cone," but which present appearances so dissimilar to those noticed in my paper, that to them my explanations do not apply, stating, that they will each "have to be described with reference to their external characters and internal structures." JOHN YOUNG, F.G.S.

HUNTERIAN MUSEUM, UNIVERSITY, GLASGOW.

¹ Trans. Geol. Soc. Glasgow, vol. viii.