

neither accurate enough, nor distributed widely enough, to establish any such conclusion. This beach has been excluded or destroyed by a glaciation throughout the whole central area. It is known over a relatively narrow belt round about this blank area and its height is not altogether constant even here. Further out it is unknown and nobody has yet been able to offer a reasonable suggestion as to what becomes of it. The belt along which it is known may correspond roughly with the 100 ft. isobase of deformation. Moreover it is patently absurd to say it has suffered no warping, since the later 25 ft. beach is so obviously warped throughout the area occupied by the 100 ft.

The author makes an amazing use of Mr. Hinxman's valuable observations at the head of Loch Torridon. He cites them on p. 406 as proving a readvance of the ice between 50 ft. and 25 ft. times and later, on p. 437, as suggesting an advance subsequent to 25 ft. times. Now Mr. Hinxman only mentions one readvance, and it cannot well do double service as being both pre- and post- 25 ft. An explanation of what is meant would be very welcome in this instance.

Finally, I should like to ask the author if he has guarded against a source of error liable to be introduced by working over old collections of raised beach shells. There is always the possibility that a certain proportion of kitchen-midden material may be included in these, as the early collectors were not always careful to discriminate, and regarded any shells found above sea-level as an indication of change of level.

W. B. WRIGHT.

MANCHESTER.

10th October, 1927.

ERRATUM.

In Fig. 2, p. 68 (February, 1927), the base-line of the section should be horizontal, the stratification-plane dipping to the right.