

the reference will be complete. This method, followed by all who have dealt with the subject in an extensive and practical way, is found to be the only one that will work satisfactorily.

C. DAVIES SHEBORN.

UNIFORMITY IN SCIENTIFIC BIBLIOGRAPHY.

SIR,—Concerning the manner of quoting works of reference, I also have to make complaint, namely, that authors sometimes quote, as if it were a complete work, a paper which may be part of some larger publication.

Authors, however, are not always to blame in this matter, because it arises from the cause upon which I have another complaint, namely, that some of the Societies who issue Proceedings, etc., often fail to state on the "Authors' copies" anything at all concerning the fact that the papers are extracts from their publications.

Some of our County Field Clubs are adepts at withholding information. Sometimes they append no date at all to their publications; while their authors' copies suffer, in addition to the omission mentioned, from absence of date, absence of number of volume, and changed paging. I notice that even the Geological Society omits to give the volume number upon its "authors' copies."

I would suggest that the Council of the Geological Society first rectify this matter, and then issue a strongly-worded circular to every Secretary or Editor of every scientific society in the kingdom drawing attention to these omissions, and stating what is required.

Since it is the habit of some booksellers and private individuals to break up odd volumes of Proceedings into their different papers, I would suggest that it is also recommended that these data be printed at the heading of every paper in every volume of Proceedings; at present such information is lost if one happens to buy the parts of volumes so treated.

Date of papers.—I cannot agree with Mr. Davison (*GEOL. MAG.* Dec. III. Vol. VI. No. I. p. 48) that the date of reading be taken as the date of a paper. A new species must date from the time when it is figured, and this cannot happen until the publication of the volume. If authors' copies be printed in advance, they should be so dated, both themselves and in the volume.

S. S. BUCKMAN.

STONEHOUSE, Jan. 7, 1889.

PROFESSOR BLAKE'S "MONIAN SYSTEM."

SIR,—Professor Blake's reply to my "Notes" on his "Monian System" requires a few brief comments.

Prof. Blake now admits the presence of true schists as derived fragments in the Upper Archæan of Anglesey; but he attempts to neutralize their effect by alleging examples where such fragments occur in the upper part of the formation from which they are derived. He says, "The conglomerate of Bull Bay is made of the underlying quartz rock." But he has to prove that the quartz rock was not of contemporaneous origin, if the cases are to be parallel.