

abridged account was printed.¹ Nevertheless, the paper was mentioned by Buckland, in his Address for that year, as 'full of elaborate detail of facts, and of ingenious speculations respecting the Boulder formation.' Perhaps the speculations were regarded as too ingenious: the only record in the Council Minute Book of February 5, 1840, is to the effect that a letter was read from Mr. Lyell, requesting to withdraw his paper on the Mud Cliffs of Norfolk. In describing the Drift he remarked that it was strictly analogous in character with that which has been called in Denmark and Sweden the Boulder Formation. He believed that the boulder fragments or erratics were accumulated on ground permanently submerged, and not by one or many transient rushes of water over land previously emerged. Therefore he preferred the term Drift to that of Diluvium.

In a previous paper Lyell had described the disturbed Chalk in the Danish island of Møen, and compared the dislocations with those seen near Trimmingham, in Norfolk.² He had referred the disturbances at Møen to subterranean movements; but in his later paper he noticed the possible effects of landslips, and of the lateral pressure of drift ice. History repeats itself; and the relations of Chalk and Drift in these regions remain a topic of animated discussion.

The year 1840 is memorable in the history of the Geological Society, inasmuch as it was marked by the inception of the Glacial Period as a chapter in the geological record.

On November 4, Agassiz (1807-73) read a paper on 'Glaciers, and the Evidence of their having once existed in Scotland, Ireland, and England.'³ After referring to the views of Venetz and De Charpentier on the former great extent of the Swiss glaciers, he remarked that a

¹ *Proc. Geol. Soc.* iii. pp. 171-179; in a footnote it was stated that 'This memoir is published in the London and Edinburgh *Phil. Mag.* for May 1840.'

² *Ibid.* ii. 192; and *Phil. Mag.* ser. 3, xvi. p. 379.

Ibid. iii. p. 327.