

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.