different effects of iridectomy in cases of acute and chronic glaucoma. Dr. Johnson then proceeds to describe an operation which he terms scleral paracentesis, and describes as new, but which we have seen performed both by Mr. Hancock and by Mr. Power many years ago. In point of fact, Mr. Hancock's operation was a scleral paracentesis, and his view, which is not altogether incorrect, and was based on observation, was that in glaucoma a circumcorneal depression could be seen which he imagined to be due to the ciliary muscle, and his section, made with the same instrument recommended by Dr. Johnson, namely, a Wenzel's double-edged knife, was made through the sclera with the object of dividing the ciliary muscle; and the excellent results obtained in some cases show clearly that the escape of the vitreous which followed the incision, accompanied, when the anterior chamber was opened, by the aqueous humour, was quite enough to afford relief to all the symptoms and to restore vision, even if the spasm of the ciliary muscle was quite imaginary. We do not, however, wish to deprive Dr. Johnson of the credit of having thought out this method of procedure, though he may rest assured that he will meet with many cases of chronic glaucoma that will derive no benefit from scleral paracentesis, and that he will have to be careful in promising success from his operation in such cases.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

[*The Editor does not hold himself responsible for opinions expressed by his correspondents. Neither can he undertake to return, or to correspond with the writers of, rejected manuscripts. No notice is taken of anonymous communications.*

[*The Editor urgently requests correspondents to keep their letters as short as possible. The pressure on his space is so great that it is impossible otherwise to insure the appearance even of communications containing interesting and novel facts.*]

An Unnoticed Factor in Evolution

Two observed biological facts seem to oppose great difficulties to any explanation on evolution principles; difficulties admitted by evolutionists as well as their opponents. I mean—

(1) The fact that varieties produced by artificial selection, however divergent, are always fertile among themselves, while species supposed to have been produced naturally by an analogous process are often not mutually fertile even when very slightly divergent; and

(2) The fact that species evidently derived from a common ancestor, and differing only in small points of marking, though not fertile with one another, are often found side by side in places where it would seem that cross-breeding must prevent any division of the ancestral species into divergent branches.

The first seems to require that a period much greater than that of artificial selection should be necessary to produce sterility between descendants from the same ancestor; a supposition which would require an almost incredible period for evolution as a whole. The second seems to require that many species now intermixed should once have been geographically separated, sometimes in cases where this is very difficult to imagine. Both these difficulties are completely removed if we suppose mutual sterility to be not the *result* but the *cause* of divergence.

As far as can be judged, "sports" are as likely to occur in the generative elements (ova and spermatozoa) as in other parts of the body, and from their similarity in widely unlike groups it seems certain that a very slight variation in these elements would render their owner infertile with the rest of its species. Such a variation occurring in a small group (say the offspring of one pair) would render them as completely separate from the rest of their species as they would be on an island, and divergence (as Wallace has sufficiently shown) would begin. This divergence might progress to a great or a small extent, or even be imperceptible, but in any case the new species would be infertile with the species it sprang from.

If this theory be admitted, we must distinguish between varieties and species by saying that the former arise by spontaneous variations in various parts of the body, and only gradually become mutually infertile (thus becoming species), while the latter arise sometimes in this way, but sometimes by spontaneous variations in the generative elements, and are in this case originally mutually infertile, but only gradually become otherwise divergent.

I would suggest the following tests, and should be glad of any facts, from experience or from books, which can help in applying them:—

(1) If this theory is true we ought to find species (incipient) mutually infertile, but not otherwise distinguishable; and

(2) We ought to find that island and other isolated species which have arisen not by limited fertility but by geographical instead of physiological separation are often mutually fertile even when as widely divergent as the artificial varieties of dogs or pigeons.

EDMUND CATCHPOOL

The Grove, Totley, Sheffield, October 23

Earthquake Measurement

IN an article on "Earthquakes" in last week's NATURE (p. 608), Dr. H. J. Johnston-Lavis takes exception to the records of earthquake motion which I have published, on the ground of their complexity, and pronounces the Plain of Yedo unsuitable for earthquake observations.

Now this seems to me to be a very eclectic way of treating earthquakes. We can measure earthquakes only where we find them, and I suppose the first qualification in a site for an earthquake observatory is that there should be plenty of earthquakes. The Plain of Yedo possesses this qualification in a very high degree; and if the disturbances which occur in it are of a very much more complex character than our *a priori* notions about earthquakes may have led us to expect, it is not the Plain of Yedo that is to blame.

I fully agree that on a rocky formation the results will be different from those I found on an alluvial plain, but the instruments and methods which have been successful on the one are just as applicable to the other. The seismometers which have been used in Japan will serve to measure, with equal accuracy, earthquakes of a similar degree of destructiveness in other places, whatever be the nature of the ground. And several of the types already employed need little more than a change of scale in their construction to suit them for such formidable convulsions as the Ischian earthquake, to which your correspondent refers.

In describing and figuring a number of proposed seismographs, Dr. Johnston-Lavis has very frankly disclaimed a technical knowledge of mechanical construction, and for that reason all minute criticism of his suggestions may be withheld. If however he will refer to the *Transactions* of the Seismological Society of Japan, or to my "Memoir on Earthquake Measurement," he will see that some of the devices he suggests are not new. The plan of registering the amplitude of a pendulum's motion relatively to the earth by making the bob draw up a thread through a hole in a plate fixed below it was used some years ago by Dr. G. Wagener; and a massive slab free to roll on spherical balls formed in 1876 the seismometer of Dr. G. F. Verbeck. It was reinvented a year or two ago by Mr. C. A. Stevenson, and described by him before the Royal Scottish Society of Arts. The theory of the apparatus is discussed in §§ 31-32 of my memoir. Dr. Johnston-Lavis's plan of recording the azimuth of a movement by means of numerous electric contacts and "a pile of electromagnets" is a very retrograde step from the perfectly successful method, used in Japan, of resolving all horizontal movements into components along two fixed directions, these components being independently recorded in conjunction with the time.

Speaking of the use of the common pendulum as a seismometer, the author says that by using a short pendulum we may measure oscillations of short period, and by using a long pendulum we may measure slow earth-tiltings. Almost the reverse of this is the case. A short pendulum acquires, by earth movements of short period, a swing which cannot be distinguished from the movements we wish to measure, and whose extent depends on the accidental agreement of its period with theirs; but a short pendulum can be properly used to record slow earth-tiltings, with respect to which it is sensibly deadbeat. A long pendulum can be used to measure short-period movements; it can also be used (and its only advantage over a short pendulum is greater sensitiveness) to measure slow tiltings.

For vertical motion Dr. Johnston-Lavis condemns (but without giving any reason) my own and another vertical-motion seismograph—which theory and experience agree in proving