

to his hearers a number of hints collected during his recent travels. Mr. B. H. Woodward, F.G.S., described "The Western Australian Museum and Art Gallery, Perth," of which he is the energetic curator. Mr. Jeffrey Bell advocated more attention to "Good Form in Natural History Museums," especially as regards harmonious arrangement of cases, colour of background, colour of labels, and the use of technical terms, which, in his opinion, should be avoided in exhibits intended for the public. Professor J. Arthur Thomson urged the need for a faunistic museum for the North of Scotland. Mr. S. S. Buckman, in a paper entitled "Neglect of Opportunities," indicated certain methods by which the relation of biological and geological science to human ideas and needs might be better brought out in the public galleries of natural history museums; in particular he showed how details of palæontology might be relieved of their dryness by being paralleled with the facts of man's individual and social life. These and the other papers which were read will appear *in extenso* and adequately illustrated in the third volume of *The Museums Journal*.

It was unfortunate that the week chosen for the meeting should have been that when the University authorities were inevitably engaged with the Degree examinations. In spite of much inconvenience to themselves, they kindly admitted members to their picture galleries and scientific museums. The Zoological Collection was described by Professor J. A. Thomson, and the Geological Collection by his assistant, Mr. A. Willard Gibb, M.A. The latter was arranged by the late Professor H. Alleyne Nicholson, LL.D., M.A., F.R.S., F.G.S., to whose memory a medallion portrait with a decorative design in selected Palæozoic fossils, accompanied by a suitable inscription worked out as a repoussé brass tablet, has been placed on the wall of the College Chapel, designed by Miss Alice B. Woodward, and executed by Messrs. Ramsden & Carr of London.

The next annual meeting is to be held in Norwich under the presidency of Dr. S. F. Harmer, F.R.S.

---

## CORRESPONDENCE.

---

### THE BUDLEIGH PEBBLES—MARINE OR FLUVIATILE?

SIR,—In his paper on the Triassic Pebbles of South Devon, Mr. Shrubsole makes a most important statement as to the action of waves on the Budleigh Salterton pebbles. He asserts that "the result [of wave action] is to produce a new deposit altogether, in which the pebbles are usually of a totally different shape. They now become as a rule symmetrical, and lose all trace of angularity" (Q.J.G.S., vol. lix, p. 316). This is diametrically opposed to the following categorical statement of the late Mr. W. Pengelly: "It is worthy of remark, that the pebbles which have performed the modern journey from Budleigh Salterton to Pinney Bay, and those which remain in the bed in the former locality, are identical in form. Re-denudation and a transportation by waves over eighteen miles of

rough coast have served only to reduce their dimensions, not to change their shapes; their earlier journey in the Triassic sea had given them the only form of which their structure is capable—a polished oblate spheroid” (Trans. Dev. Assoc., vol. i, pt. 3, p. 53).

The question is absolutely crucial as to whether the Budleigh pebbles are marine or fluvial.

Pengelly kept the Pebble-bed problem thoroughly in hand, and noticed it in the following papers, viz.: Trans. Dev. Assoc., vol. i, pt. 3, pp. 52–55; vol. ii, p. 37; vol. iv, pp. 197–200; vol. vi, p. 650; and vol. xi, p. 340. Then, in the same Transactions Mr. Ussher had a “Chapter on the Budleigh Pebbles,” in 1879, vol. ix, p. 222. This paper is subsequent to the one cited by Mr. Shrubsole.

Since Pengelly’s death geologists have nearly boxed the compass as to the derivation of the pebbles. The only bearings remaining unappropriated are those between N. by E. and S.E. by E.

Mr. Shrubsole’s observation noted above seems to be by far the most important one made on the Pebble-bed during a generation. If Pengelly is right the pebbles are of marine derivation; if Mr. Shrubsole is right they are not marine, whatever else they may be. But obviously the pebbles may be of marine origin without the present bed having been a beach. Pengelly does not seem to have contended for a beach, and both as a sailor in early life and having spent a long life on the seaboard he was quite familiar with beaches.

It may be noted that Pengelly’s interest lay in the quartzites, and it was of these he wrote as being oblate spheroids, and of these alone.

A. R. HUNT.

#### PRIORITY OF OBSERVATIONS.

SIR,—Mrs. Maria M. Ogilvie Gordon has published in the Trans. Edinb. Geol. Soc., vol. viii, special part—which, by the way, bears no date on the wrapper, but which was received at the British Museum (Nat. Hist.) 13th August, 1903,—a paper on “The Geological Structure of Monzoni and Fassa.” I do not propose to notice this paper, as I have not sufficient special knowledge of the district, but merely call attention to a singular statement in the “Prefatory Note.”

Mrs. Gordon there says: “I was told that the manuscript of my first paper on Monzoni would be kept in the archives of the Royal Society [the paper was apparently refused publication because an abstract had appeared elsewhere], the scientific priority of my observations dating from its formal *reading on June 19th, 1902.*” I beg to inform Mrs. Gordon that she has been entirely misled by her informant. A MS. remains a MS. whether in the hands of the Royal Society or in those of a private person, and the date of reading of a paper in no way constitutes publication. Her MS. on Monzoni, which the Royal Society has ‘conveyed,’ cannot be quoted, and is perfectly useless so far as geology is concerned. Such confiscation of manuscripts is a very serious injustice, not merely to authors, but also to others working on the subject, and is indefensible.

C. DAVIES SHERBORN.