[FROM THE AMERICAN JOUR. OF SCIENCE AND ARTS, VOL. XXVII, 1859.]

ON

MARCOU'S "GEOLOGY OF NORTH AMERICA."

BY PROFESSOR AGASSIZ.

I have not yet seen Marcou's latest publication on American Geology, but I have now open before me, his paper in the Proceedings of the Geological Society of France, and that in Petermann's "Geographische Mittheilungen," both bearing date 1855, as well as the Geological Map of the United States and British North America by H. D. Rogers, also bearing date 1855, and Hall's and Leslie's Map of the country west of the Mississippi river, published with the 1st vol. of Emory's Report in 1857. I take it that it will be no injustice to either Rogers or Hall to go to an earlier publication of Marcou's, in a comparison of their respective claims to correct illustration of our Western Geology. Let me premise by saying that as far as the geology of the East is concerned, from Iowa to the Atlantic coast, I acknowledge that to Hall is due, unquestionably, the credit of having settled by extensive comparisons, and by personal examinations, the true geological horizon of the vastest extent of our continent, not only by an examination of the superposition of the rocks, but also by the most minute and most extensive study of the fossils.

We all know also how much the Rogerses have done to elucidate the physical geography, the orography, and the order of succession of the formations of Pennsylvania and Virginia, which has thrown much light upon the general geology of the eastern part of the continent. It is equally well known how much the special state surveys have added to the details in this general investigation of the Geology of North America. But when we go west of the Mississippi valley to the Pacific shores the case is very different. The maps of Rogers, Hall and Marcou, are a compilation and an attempt at coordination of surveys which cover only a very small portion of the ground. They are, as it were, the reading of the authors of these different maps, of investigations made by others, though Marcou has here unquestionably the advantage of having gone himself over the ground.

A comparison for instance, of the manner in which the volcanic rocks are dotted over New Mexico, Sonora, and Lower California, as well as in California, Oregon and Washington Territories by Hall and Rogers,

with Marcou's representation of the same cannot fail to show to a geological reader, that they are more natural in Marcou's map than in the two others. When a region is not more minutely surveyed than the whole western half of our continent, of which we have not even accurate geographical maps, it is not possible to expect accuracy in detail, and the critic must consider the general connection rather than special points.

I do not see, for instance, how the omission of State boundary lines which, in a former review of Marcou's map in the Journal, was made a prominent objection to his representation of American geology, can be of any importance in such a general survey of the subject. Rogers in his map does not give these boundaries any more than Marcou.

But I now come to the essential point. What is the true geological character of those five hundred thousand square miles of land, extending between the Mississippi, west of Arkansas and Missouri, and the great Salt Lake Basin? Rogers colors it uniformly with Cretaceous rocks, and the well known Tertiary deposits, adding metamorphic rocks, flanked with Carboniferous in the mountainous tracts. Hall does the same only making in addition, a distinction between the upper and lower Cretaceous, while Marcou distinguishes further between Permian, Triassic and Oolitic beds. I do not suppose that he, any more than Hall and Rogers, imagines that the boundaries he assigns to any of these groups are any more accurate than those assigned by Rogers and Hall to the groups they distinguish. These appear to me simply in the light of the respective readings of isolated facts recorded in the way they have struck the authors of these different maps. When in his paper to the Geological Society of France, Marcou speaks of himself as a travelling geologist who "brings his little stone to the great edifice" (page 3) it does not appear to me as vain-glorious boasting, and we ought to take gratefully the contributions of a Frenchman, using language after the fashion of his nation, even though it be not the way in which we would have expressed ourselves. Now I confess that after reading the condensed Review of American Geology which Marcou has given, in Petermann's Contributions, I find in it a more comprehensive account of the general features of the orography and geology of the Western half of our continent, than in the other representations I have read upon this subject. I think that even now a translation of that paper would be welcome to every English student of American geology, and that far from circulating false impressions, it would greatly contribute to bring before the mind the grand features of that remarkable country, and to connect in an intelligible way the geology of the West with that of the East. The middle tract of our continent is unquestionably occupied by deposits younger than the coal; I do not allude to the Lake Superior Sandstone respecting which I believe Marcou to be mistaken,—but the five hundred thousand square miles of questionable character as to the details, certainly belong to those from recent formations.

Now it appears to me that the geology of our Atlantic States furnishes data upon which theoretical inferences, bearing upon the question which Marcou's assertions call forth, may be founded. We know that the Cretaceous formations extend from the Atlantic slope of the Alleghany range round their southern spur into the great geological gulf

now occupied by the Mississippi valley. We know further that along the eastern slope of the Alleghanies, beginning with the Connecticut valley, there extends, between the axis of elevation of that chain and the Cretaceous deposits at its Atlantic foot, a series of deposits referred respectively to the Triassic and the Oolitic series.

We know also that to the south of North Carolina, these lower secondary deposits are covered over by the Cretaceous. Now, since the upheaval of the Alleghanies is anterior to the deposition of the Trias, does it not appear natural to suppose that Triassic and Oolitic formations must have been deposited at the foot of the western slope of the Alleghanies as well as upon its eastern slope, and that the Cretaceous deposits overlap them in the Mississippi gulf in various ways, as along the Alleghany chain, and that, following various routes, the different geologists who have gone across the continent must have seen, here Trias, then Jura, and then again Cretaceous beds, overlaid by Tertiaries, in a number of points, already determined, though the relative extent of all these beds, over a surface of 500,000 square miles, remains yet to be ascertained.

The circumstance that Marcou has colored in yellow the whole middle tract of the continent, can express nothing but his conviction that the whole Mississippi gulf is lined with Triassic beds, overlaid with more or less extensive Jurassic, Cretaceous, and Tertiary deposits. In such a theoretic representation of the geological features, where the details are wanting, provided the existence of the Trias and Jura is made out somewhere, there is no more inaccuracy than in coloring a map of our eastern geology, where the drift covers the greatest extent of the surface, as if it were altogether occupied by Palæozoic rocks.

I take it that such things are, by this time, understood by all those who examine schematic maps,—at least they should be. Moreover, the discoveries by Professor Swallow and Mr. Meek of Permian beds in Kansas, along the eastern border of the great Mississippi gulf, and by Professor Hall in Iowa, furnish a very unexpected confirmation of the broad statement first made by Marcou, that while the Eastern part of our continent consists of Palæozoic rocks, the middle part is occupied by the Mesozoic series. I truly believe that, at some future period, the general outline of our western geology by Marcou, which by the way, has the priority over the others, will stand before a complete survey of the whole in the same light as Maclure's old map now stands, when compared to the well-known eastern geology.

In this connection, I cannot but remember that, with Thurmann, Mandelslohe, Gressly, Quenstedt, Römer, d'Orbigny and Oppel, Marcou is one of the geologists who knows the Jurassic formation best; that he has published a masterly paper upon the Jura Salinois in the Transactions of the Geological Society of France; and that it seems hardly credible to me that he should have been so completely mistaken in his identification of Oolitic beds in the west. I have myself, in my collection, a large number of specimens of the Cretaceous fossils of Texas and of New Jersey, among which is a beautiful series of the Exogyra, characteristic of the Cretaceous period, and I have seen the Exogyra and the Ostrea which Marcou brought from his excursion across the continent, and I distinctly remember that I could not identify them with the Cretaceous species, but rather thought them allied to Jurassic species.

Whoever has read Marcou's paper on the Jura must have seen that he knows, as well as any geologist living, that lithological characters are of no value in identifying geological horizons. But after having presented the general evidence, as far as it goes, for the presence of Triassic and Oolitic beds in the middle tract of our continent, I cannot find that there is any reason for blame, with his familiarity with the Triassic and Oolitic rocks of Europe, in his pointing out the lithological resemblance there may be between them, any more than there is ground for blaming the American geologists who, after identifying certain beds in New Jersey as Cretaceous, have also alluded to their mineralogical resemblance with the Green Sand of Europe; for this is, after all, a remarkable fact which runs over immense tracts of geological deposits belonging to the same horizon.

Reply to Prof. Agassiz on Marcou's Geology of North America, by JAMES D. DANA.

I regret in such a case as this to have to differ from Professor Agassiz. The amount of difference is however not as great as at the first reading may appear; for an important part of the positions in my paper are untouched, and an explicit dissent from some of the views of Mr. Marcou is expressed.

The statements in Professor Agassiz's remarks to be especially noted are the following:

1. That Professor Agassiz had not read the work reviewed, but had seen the earlier papers by Mr. Marcou and examined his geological map.

2. That while, as regards the geology of the East from Iowa to the Atlantic coast, "to Mr. Hall is due unquestionably the credit of having settled by extensive comparisons and by personal examinations the true geological horizon of the vastest extent of our continent, not only by examination of the superposition of the rocks, but also by the most minute and most extensive study of the fossils;" and that while the "Professors Rogers have done much to elucidate the physical geography, the orography, and the order of succession of the formations of Pennsylvania and Virginia, and have thrown much light upon the general geology of the eastern part of the Continent,"—west of the meridian of Iowa their observations have not extended, and Marcou has thence the advantage of them.

3. That the maps of the region west of the Mississippi by Rogers, Hall, and Marcou are mainly compilations from the results of various surveys, and that Marcou in extending the colors of the Triassic formation over the 500,000 square miles of the Rocky mountains, and laying down also the Permian and Jurassic over the same region, was no more culpable than Hall or Rogers in covering it with Cretaceous.

4. That Marcou is mistaken in regarding the Lake Superior Sandstone as Triassic.

5. That it is hardly credible that Mr. Marcou should have been so completely mistaken in his identification of Oolitic beds in the west; and that the two species collected by Marcou from the beds are most allied, in Professor Agassiz's opinion, to Jurassic species.

6. That Mr. Marcou knows that lithological characters are of no value in identifying geological horizons; and that adding these characters to other general evidence for the Triassic and Oolitic rocks is not blameable.

The claims which Mr. Marcou has put forward in his work are: (1) the correct determination of the Red Sandstone of the Lake Superior region; (2) the identification, for the first time, of the Permian over the Rocky Mountain region; (3) the same, of the Triassic; (4) the same, of the Jurassic. I have presented evidence proving, as I believe, that he was wrong in each case; and hence, that the claims of prediscovery which he is now urging over Europe are groundless. Besides this, I have pronounced the work abusive of such men as the Rogerses, Hall, Whitney, Logan, Hunt, and many others, and grossly unjust to American science and geological history, while full also of groundless personal claims. I review some of these points.

Supposed Triassic of Lake Superior.—Prof. Agassiz admits that he believes Mr. Marcou to be wrong with respect to the Triassic ("New Red") character of the Lake Superior Sandstone, and thus we do not differ as to this one of the claims.

Now this question of the Lake Superior Sandstone is the one that especially calls out Mr. Marcou's opinions of American geologists. Making these rocks, and the Connecticut river and Virginia beds, as well as 500,000 square miles of territory over the Rocky Mountains, "New Red," he is indignant that Hall, Whitney, Logan, Prof. Rogers, etc., do not follow in his track. After giving a one-sided view of opinions on the different rocks which he classes together as *undoubted* "New Red" he says:

"It is difficult to present an age of strata in a manner more ambiguous and *empatée*. *The brothers Rogers and James Hall try their best to suppress* the New Red Sandstone formation in North America; but they do not know exactly what to do with these five or six thousand feet of strata. On the Geological Map of H. D. Rogers, the New Red Sandstone is unknown in the Magdalen Islands; on the northeast of the Baie des Chaleurs it is colored as Jurassic Red Sandstone, though the *Honorable Sir William E. Logan, Chevalier of the Legion of Honor*, calls it Carboniferous Sandstone. In Prince Edward Island, Connecticut valley, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virginia and North Carolina, the New Red is colored as older Mesozoic (Jurassic coal and Jurassic red sandstone). In Lake Superior it grows older, and the New Red is colored Cambrian, (Primal, Auroral and Matinal). In the Praries, Texas, Rocky Mountains, New Mexico, etc., the "New Red," that seems to change its age with Protean facility, has once more renewed its youth and is colored as Cretaceous, and sometimes also as umbral and vespertine, or in ordinary language as Lower Carboniferous.

"*They have not thought of putting the New Red in the Upper Silurian or the Tertiary. I would advise these honorable savants to consider if one of these determinations would not be preferable.*"

The *jumble* here is of Mr. Marcou's making, and it comes of his own errors about the "New Red." We let the style of criticism go without remark, satisfied for the present with italicizing only some of the more characteristic parts.

While on this topic, Mr. Marcou, noticing that Dr. D. D. Owen had within a few years taken the same ground with Prof. Hall and other geologists, says, "why Owen changed his views is quite a mystery." He will now regard the case of Dr. Owen not the only mystery.

Permian of the Rocky Mountain Region.—I pointed out in my review that Mr. Marcou had distinguished as Permian, rocks that contained fossils which he set down in his *Field notes* and *Resumé* with a query as a *Belemnite* and a *Pteroceras* (the latter word changed in the recent work to *Gasteropod*), although no Belemnite or Pteroceras is

known to occur below the lower Jurassic (Lias). Disregarding or defying the hints from the imperfect fossils, he made the beds Permian on *lithological characters* and superposition alone.

On the Permian of Mr. Marcou, Professor Agassiz says nothing. The use made of lithological characters in its determination is far from sustaining the opinion cited above in paragraph 6.

Triassic of the Rocky Mountains.—My review states that Mr. Marcou established the existence of the Triassic on one fossil, and that an uncertain species of pine wood: this one doubtful fossil wood, and the *lithological characters* make up the evidence in favor of the discovery: and on *lithological characters* and superposition alone he based his queried subdivision of it, into *Bunter*, *Muschelkalk*, and *Keuper*—thus again badly misusing lithological evidence. He mentions also the discovery of a *Cardinia*, but says that Cardiniæ occur in rocks from the Jurassic to the Carboniferous.

Professor Agassiz brings forward nothing against my conclusion that the Triassic was not identified in the Rocky Mountains by Mr. Marcou.

Jurassic rocks in the Rocky Mountains.—The evidence which I cited that Mr. Marcou's Jurassic is really Cretaceous, was based on the determination by Hall, Conrad, Shumard, and others, that his supposed Jurassic fossils are Cretaceous, and that they occur at localities in the west along with known Cretaceous species. Morton's figure of the *Gryphea Pitcheri* (Morton) I understand was made by Conrad, so that Conrad is certainly good authority as to the identity between it and Mr. Marcou's species. Dr. Newberry, who has recently returned from the Rocky Mountains confirms these conclusions; for he says (see this volume page 33):

"I may say in confirmation of the assertion that your fossil plants [species of Alder, Beach, Credneria, Ettingshausinia, &c.] are Cretaceous, that I found near the base of the yellow sandstone series in New Mexico, considered Jurassic by Mr. Marcou,—a very similar flora to that represented by your specimens, one species at least being identical with yours, associated with *Gryphæa*, *Inoceramus*, and *Ammonites* of lower Cretaceous species."

With such evidence, even the exact identification of the two fossil shells is of little importance. The Cretaceous is the lowest formation in which leaves of any dicotyledons have been found.

Professor Agassiz states that Mr. Marcou is a good Jurassic geologist. But this does not affect the case in hand. For he had but two or three fossils about which to use his Jurassic judgment; and if this judgment has pronounced fossils to be Jurassic that really occur in the west associated with Cretaceous species, or if his knowledge of rocks in Europe has led him to think he can tell Permian, Triassic, or Jurassic rocks by their lithological characters, when he sees them in America, it has served him badly.

We regard it therefore as still true that Mr. Marcou's Triassic of Lake Superior, is not Triassic; and in the Rocky Mountain region, his Permian is not proved to be Permian, his Triassic not Triassic, and his Jurassic not Jurassic. Where are then his discoveries?

Map.—As regards the geological map-making, there is little resemblance between the cases of Rogers and Hall and Mr. Marcou. The former do not claim to be discoverers over the Rocky Mountain region, and Mr. Marcou does. Mr. Marcou, while remarking that the colors t-

the north and south of the course he followed are only approximative, says, "*I am sure of the limits of the formations on the line I have explored near the 35th parallel of latitude;*" and guided by this *sure* determination, he marked the Triassic on his map, and then, at a hazard, influenced by his views of earlier explorations, he spread the Triassic color far north over the 500,000 square miles. Now if his identification of the Permian and Triassic was in each case an error, what shall we say of the 500,000 square miles? and what of his map, if this is all wrong, and in addition his identification of Triassic in the Lake Superior region? He cannot rightly shield himself behind any geologist, or the common usage of following the best compiled results for fixing the lines.

Theoretical inferences may be good by way of suggestion; but too eagerly followed they lead to just the errors Mr. Marcou has made. But his system for the West has not even the show of probability in its favor. It is well known, and Mr. Marcou admits it, that Cretaceous fossils and rocks occur about the very summit plains of the Rocky Mountains. The natural inference is, therefore, that when in Cretaceous times these summits were under water, the sea also extended over what are now the eastern slopes of the mountains, and might have covered them with Cretaceous beds: and that thus the Cretaceous should be expected to be the surface formation, (it is understood that the question relates to the *surface* formation, as the colors refer in all cases to this,) and that any Jurassic, Triassic, and Permian, if they exist, should be covered up by it. This, I say, is what should naturally be expected. Moreover, this is what all researches since Mr. Marcou was over the region are tending to prove; they sustain Hall and others in coloring the greater part of the Rocky Mountain slope Cretaceous. The inferior beds, as the Palæontologist quoted from in my paper states, may be looked for as outcropping beds about the base of the ridges or crests of the mountains. Mr. Marcou's map is hence not only at variance with recent researches, but also with reasonable views of western geology.

We cannot see therefore that Mr. Marcou's claims as a discoverer are in any one case sustained, or that his merits are in any respect enhanced by his American researches. And we certainly should not go to him for an exposition of American geology.

Professor Agassiz knows well our American geologists and appreciates their labors; and he writes about them in a different style from Mr. Marcou. But on this point it is not necessary to dwell.