Bristow and Charles Moore, and in May of the same year by Ralph Tate. The publication of Moore's paper was delayed until the end of the year, whereas Bristow's paper was issued in the August number of the Quarterly Journal. The postponement of his paper was a cause of much chagrin to Moore; nevertheless it was an elaborate essay of 120 pages, with four plates of fossils, the most important of his contributions to the Journal, and according to an editorial note it was 'unavoidably deferred.' Unfortunately Moore misapprehended the cause of delay, and complained that his paper had been deferred until one of the Geological Survey staff 'had been sent down to examine and report.' ${ }^{1}$ As a matter of fact, Bristow's fieldwork in the district was carried out in the summer of 1866, at least six months before Moore's paper was read before the Society.

In connection with Murchison's visit to Penarth, it is interesting to note that in 1870 Sedgwick paid a visit to Bath, and was keenly interested in seeing the fine Rhætic section on the Midland Railway at Weston, under the guidance of the Rev. H. H. Winwood. ${ }^{2}$

The present form of Abstracts of the Proceedings of the Geological Society dates from May 20, 1857, when No. I was issued. The gratuitous circulation of monthly Abstracts both to resident and non-resident Fellows was at first undertaken, but some modifications in the method of publication and distribution have been made from time to time. In 1882 the Council announced that the Abstracts were to be paged continuously, and furnished with titlepage and index, so that when complete they might be sold to the public. Nevertheless, the separate numbers were not regarded strictly as publications. Now and again they contained abstracts of papers that were subsequently withdrawn by the author, so that the title only
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[^0]:    1 'Charles Moore, F.G.S., and his Work,' by the Rev. H. H. Winwood. Proc. Bath Nat. Hist. Soc. vii. 1892, p. 247.
    ${ }^{2} \mathrm{Op}$. cit. p. 3 I.

