V.—*A New Locality for Triassic Reptiles, with Notes on the Trias found in the Parishes of Urquhart and Lhanbryde, Morayshire.* (With Map.) By WILLIAM TAYLOR.

(Read 15th November, 1916.)

LAST year, while workmen were breaking hard sandstone from a rocky field about a mile north of the village of Urquhart, and about five miles east of Elgin, they found a nearly complete specimen of *Telerpeton*.

I secured the fossil for my collection and compared it with *Telerpeton* casts from the Trias of Lossiemouth.

The skeleton is well exposed from nose to tail, and shows casts of bones and teeth very clearly. The head and body is about 6 inches long, and the tail about 3 inches. It is somewhat smaller than the *Telerpeton* described by Huxley¹ in 1866.

Twenty-three years ago the late Rev. Dr Gordon of Birnie asked me to examine some fossil scutes in pieces of sandstone at Urquhart. I did so, and identified them as belonging to *Stagonolepis*, a crocodile-like reptile found in the Trias of Lossiemouth, Spynie and Findrassie. I had no idea at that time where these fossils came from, but now think they may have come from a small quarry, worked last century, near the place where my new *Telerpeton* was found. I considered long ago that all the solid rock between Elgin and Urquhart was of Triassic age, not Old Red Sandstone as often marked in geological maps. I could match rocks found at Bear's Head, Stonewells, Meft and Lhanbryde with fragments from Lossiemouth, Spynie and Findrassie, where reptiles have been found. I believe with Murchison, Judd and Gordon, that the cherty rock in this district overlies the Triassic Sandstone, as I generally find the two close together or mixed up in the same quarry. I have never seen an Old Red Sandstone fossil in or near any of the places marked on the accompanying map. In the twenty square miles there shown, not one is underlaid by Old Red Sandstone, unless the red rocks below the Trias at Lossiemouth be of that age. I have never got a fossil from them, except an obscure cast which has not been determined. I come to the conclusion that the Trias in Morayshire is much more extensive than formerly supposed. There is no appearance of rocks characteristic of the

¹ "On a new Specimen of *Telerpeton* Elginense," *Quart. Jour. Geol. Soc.*, vol. xxiii. p. 77.

Fig. 1. Map showing occurrences of Triassic rocks.

NEW LOCALITY FOR TRIASSIC REPTILES, MORAYSHIRE. 13

Old Red Sandstone for over three miles south or east of the village of Urquhart.

I formerly called the Upper Trias "Stagonolepis beds." What I called "Gordonias beds" may be lower Trias or Upper Permian, and are not shown in this map.

In 1892, when Dr Gordon¹ wrote his paper on "The Reptiliferous Sandstones of Elgin," only four genera of reptiles were described, *Stagonolepis*, *Telerpeton*, *Hyperodapedon* and *Dasygnathus*. Since then six new genera have been figured and described from Lossiemouth and Spynie.² They are *Ornithosuchus*, *Erpetosuchus*, *Stenometopon*, *Scleromochlus*, *Brachyrhinodon* and *Saltopus*. The types of these six genera are in the British Museum. Five of them were supplied from my collection.

In one way the fauna of the Trias and the fauna of the Old Red Sandstone remain the same as fifty years ago. No vertebrates, other than reptiles, have been found in the Trias, and only fishes in the Old Red Sandstone. I proved that the cast of a fish tooth, that Huxley noted as coming from the Trias of Spynie, really came from an Old Red Sandstone quarry at New Spynie, where I had found *Holoptychius* scales. Dr Traquair and Dr Mackie confirmed my identification of the stone.

The rock is found at or near the surface in all the places marked on the map³ with vertical lines. It was found at Calcotts about 20 feet below the surface. Q stands for quarry, but some old quarries are now concealed. The generic names of reptiles are marked at places where they have been found.

¹ *Trans. Edin. Geol. Soc.*, vol. vi. (1892), p. 241.

² Three other genera, *Gordonias*, *Geikia* and *Elginia* have been described by E. T. Newton from Cuttie's Hillock Quarry. *Phil. Trans. Roy. Soc.*, vol. clxxxiv. (1893), B, pp. 431-503.

³ The scale of the map (Fig. 1) is 1 inch = $\frac{1}{16}$ mile—not 1 inch = 1 mile as indicated in the figure.