

gentlemen cannot be charged with committing themselves to an hypothesis "the most distant from the phenomena it attempts to explain."

Now if it can be shown that the germs of disease are subject to the same laws as other living things and exhibit similar phenomena, and further, that without the inference that they are endowed with vital properties, it is impossible to unravel the most striking character which they present to us for consideration, viz., the fact that they reproduce their kind, then I think there is more reason for following up, in all its intricacies, the germ theory, than to start with an assumed catalysis, molecular motion, and a glandular matrix, as suggested by Dr. Richardson.

Starting, then, from the indisputable fact that the *materias morbi* of every communicable disease reproduces its kind, I have considered this a primary law, and have tabulated other laws which are associated with living beings by which it will, I think, be found that there is a parallelism of a kind to attract and rivet attention, especially, too, when many otherwise inexplicable circumstances bend to this hypothesis.

Primary Law of Reproduction, by which all living things reproduce their kind.

SECONDARY LAWS.

<i>Objective Laws.</i>	<i>Subjective Laws.</i>
1. The diffusion or dispersion of germs.	1. Seasons of activity.
2. Their static existence.	2. Climatic influence.
3. Limited duration of active existence.	3. Relation to latitude.
4. Period of development, maturity, and decay.	4. Subjection to physical forces.
5. Intermittent reproduction.	5. Influence of locality.

Without amplifying this subject, which would carry me far beyond the limits of an ordinary communication, I will only add that though the above tabulation is very imperfect, there is quite sufficient for any one who will follow out the ideas conveyed by it to trace the intimate relation that exists between living beings and the germs of disease. I would refer finally to the fact that many diseases in men and animals have yielded up living germs as their cause, chiefly, I may add, skin diseases it is true; but *aphtha*,¹ closely associated with diphtheria, is, I think, acknowledged by all unprejudiced persons to have its origin in an unmistakable and demonstrable germ. JOHN GROVE

The Zoological Relations of Madagascar and Africa

WITHOUT entering into the details of this very difficult question I wish to be allowed to state some of the general reasons which have led me to a different conclusion from Dr. Hartlaub,² and also to point out where he has not quoted my opinions with perfect accuracy. Instead of saying that "the fauna of Madagascar is manifestly of African origin," my actual statement is as follows:—"We have the extraordinary fauna of Madagascar to account for, with its evident main derivation from Africa, yet wanting all the larger and higher African forms; its resemblances to Malaya and to South America; and its wonderful assemblage of altogether peculiar types" ("Geog. Dist. of Animals," vol. i. p. 286). My reasons for believing in the "main derivation" of the fauna from Africa can only be understood by considering the theory, now generally admitted, of the origin of the fauna of Africa itself. All the higher mammalia are believed to have entered it from the northern continent during the middle or latter part of the tertiary period, and the occurrence of *Psittacus* and of forms supposed to be allied to plantain-eaters and to *Leptosomus* in the miocene of France, render it probable that many of the peculiar groups of African birds had their origin in the old Palaearctic region. Now Madagascar presents many cases of special affinity with South Africa, especially in insects, land-shells, and plants; and if we suppose it to have formed part of a South African land before the irruption of the higher mammals and birds from the north, we shall I think account for many of its peculiarities. Such facts as its possessing *Potamocharus* and the recently extinct *Hippopotamus*, while it has thirteen or fourteen peculiarly African genera of birds against four or five that are peculiarly Oriental; of its having many African genera of lizards and tortoises; of its butterflies being decidedly African; of its numerous African genera of Carabidæ, Lucanidæ, and Laniidæ; while the specially Oriental affinities of its mammals, reptiles,

and insects are hardly if at all more pronounced than the South American affinities of the same groups,—all seem to me to warrant the general conclusion that the "main derivation" of the Madagascar fauna is from Africa.

Dr. Hartlaub speaks of my "attempted parallel between Madagascar and Africa, and the Antilles and South America" in such a way that his readers must think I had dwelt upon this parallel in some detail as being special and peculiar. The fact is, however, that I have always referred to it in a very general way. At p. 75 vol. i. I say: "The peculiarities it (the Malagasy sub-region) exhibits, beings of exactly the same kind as those presented by the Antilles, by New Zealand, and even by Celebes and Ceylon, but in a much greater degree." And again, at p. 272, vol. i., I speak of it as "bearing a similar relation to Africa as the Antilles to Tropical America, or New Zealand to Australia, but possessing a much richer fauna than either of these, and in some respects a more remarkable one even than New Zealand." This general comparison with the two other great insular sub-regions is, I think, justifiable, notwithstanding great differences of detail. There is in all a rich and highly peculiar fauna, a great poverty of mammalia, and a total absence of many large families of birds characterising the adjacent continent, together with special points of resemblance to distant continents or to remote geological periods.

It seems to me that such a problem as this cannot well be solved by means of a group which, like birds, do not require an actual land-connection in order to reach a given country; and, if all land animals are taken into account, the evidence does not appear to warrant the supposition of a recent land-connection of Madagascar with India or Malaya. At a very remote epoch such a connection may have taken place, but if we are to give any weight to the general facts of distribution as opposed to those presented by birds only, the union of Madagascar with South Africa is more recent and has had more influence on the character of the Malagasy fauna. The numerous and very remarkable points of affinity between Madagascar and South America in almost every group except birds, are not alluded to by Dr. Hartlaub, yet they would equally well support the notion of a former union of those two countries independently of Africa. It seems, however, more consonant with our general knowledge of distribution to consider these as cases of survival of ancient and once wide-spread types in suitable areas; and this is a principle that must never be lost sight of in attempting to solve the problems presented by such anomalous countries as Madagascar. ALFRED R. WALLACE

Selective Discrimination in Insects

YOUR correspondent S.B., in his letter NATURE of yesterday's date, must be referring to some short abstract only of my lecture on flowers and insects. I quite agree with him that odour is very important in attracting insects, and dwelt upon it in my lecture, as well as in my little book on "Flowers and Insects." A striking illustration is afforded by night flowers, which often become peculiarly odoriferous towards evening, as has been already pointed out by various observers.

S.B. attributes, I think, too little importance to the colouring of flowers, but his letter shows him to be a careful observer, and I hope he will continue to devote his attention to the subject.

He would find H. Müller's "Blumen und Insekten" a mine of most interesting and accurate observation.

London, October 19

JOHN LUBBOCK

Protective Colouring in Birds

WITH reference to the statement in my "Naturalist in Nicaragua," p. 196, that the macaw "fears no foe," &c., the well-known geologist, Prof. Gabb, sends me the following information:—"I willingly comply with your request to repeat the statement about the *Kukong pung* or macaw hawk of Costa Rica. Not having your book by me now I cannot refer to page nor quote your statement exactly. But as I recall it, you speak of the great red and blue macaw as being so well defended as to need no protective colouring, and that no hawk dares attack it. In this you are mistaken. Not only have I seen on several occasions heaps of the unmistakable feathers of the bird in the woods, left in the manner that all woodsmen recognise as hawk's work, but I have the statements of various Indians, not in collusion, confirming each other, and finally I have had the bird pointed out to me (I am not sure but that it may occur in the collection I sent to the Smithsonian). It is a fair-sized hawk of dark

¹ See *Medical Times*, 1851, vol. ii. p. 95.

² NATURE, vol. xvi. p. 498, and the *Ibis* for July, 1847, p. 334.