

added a very complete index in two parts. The first part gives a list of the stations at which observations have been made, arranged alphabetically under the names of the countries of Europe in which they are situated; the total number of such stations is 1926. The second part consists of the names of these 1926 stations arranged alphabetically, with the years in which observations have been taken, and references to the works in which these observations are recorded. Some very curious facts may be obtained from this index. Whilst there are 315 stations in Great Britain, there are no less than 918 in Germany and Austria, and consequently 693 for the rest of Europe. But a more critical examination of the list reveals the fact that, of these 1926 stations, only 334 were taking observations in 1882, the date of the compilation of the work, and at only 97 of these 334 stations had observations been continued for ten years or more. Even this small number requires modification, for out of the 97 only 60 had observations for ten *consecutive* years, thus showing how spasmodically the subject had been treated till quite a recent date. Of the 1592 stations at which observations have ceased, there are only 210 with records of ten years and over. Considering the nature of the subject, ten years' work must be considered as the very least from which anything reliable may be deduced; whence, small as the number is compared with the large number of stations at which phenological work has been done, it is yet satisfactory to find that there is some good material to be obtained. Of late years the subject has been much more attended to, especially in England, since the Royal Meteorological Society took the matter in hand, and of the 334 stations at which observations are now taken, no less than 94 are in Great Britain and 112 in Germany.

Dr. Ihne regrets that the observations as taken for the Royal Meteorological Society refer to herbaceous rather than woody plants, and are exclusively confined to wild flowers and not to cultivated ones. His own list, which has been very generally distributed throughout Europe, has been drawn up on a different principle, and without entering into definite reasons, he condemns the Meteorological Society's list. Certainly in England, in the only case besides that of the Meteorological Society where a comparison of flowering throughout England has been tried, cultivated plants have been entirely excluded, being found by actual experience to yield no reliable results.

The second part of the work is taken up with an enumeration of the notices on the plants in the list issued by the Professors taken during the years 1879 to 1882. It would have been perhaps more convenient if they had been exhibited in a tabular form; at present it would be a work of some labour to extract the notices for the purposes of comparison.

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.]

The Younger School of Botanists

A COMMUNICATION from the Rev. George Henslow to last week's NATURE (p. 537) concludes with the following passage:—

“There are not wanting signs elsewhere of the evil effects of the younger school of botanists not recognising the importance of first training students in a thorough course of practical and systematic botany before proceeding to laboratory work. In an examination lately held for a post at Kew, I am informed that two gentlemen who had been trained at Cambridge competed with a gardener for the post. The gardener secured it. *Verb. sap.*”

The last sentence is no doubt intended as a sort of *argumentum ad hominem*, which it may be admitted is not without a certain apparent force. Assuming for the moment the statement to be true, it must be pointed out that the only scientific posts at Kew which are open to public competition are those of assistants in the herbarium. These posts demand qualifications of a somewhat technical character, for which a general training in botany would by no means necessarily fit the candidates. I can imagine that a senior wrangler might fail in a competition for a post of computer in an observatory where arithmetical dexterity was the main thing required; a senior classic might cut an equally poor figure in seeking an appointment of library assistant if he were tested in the art of writing catalogue slips. I apprehend that in neither case would failure prove anything as regards either mathematical or classical education.

The examination to which Mr. Henslow alludes can only be one which was held by the Civil Service Commission during the past summer. There were, I believe, some dozen candidates; whether any Cambridge men were amongst them I am unable to say. But the successful candidate was not a gardener, but the laboratory assistant of the late Professor of Botany at Oxford—a gentleman whose services the present Professor is in despair at losing.

On a former occasion it is true that one of our garden staff did obtain one of these appointments in an open competition. It is not very remarkable that it should be so. Men of ability on the spot have, of course, great facilities for seeing the nature of the duties required and for qualifying themselves accordingly; furthermore they have the advantage of the lectures of my colleague Mr. Baker, which are especially directed to the branch of botany which principally occupies us at Kew.

As to the larger question raised by Mr. Henslow, I am afraid I am not wholly free from some responsibility for the proceedings of “the younger school of botanists,” the effects of which he regards as evil. In the face of the successful revival in this country of many branches of botanical study which the younger school has effected, I am emphatically of the opinion that these effects are the reverse of evil. I believe I was one of the first to organise a course of so-called laboratory work in botany on lines which it is only right to say were borrowed and extended from the teaching and example of Prof. Huxley. In what I attempted I had the generous aid of many now distinguished members of the younger school. I do not doubt that they have immensely improved on the beginning that was in the first instance somewhat tentatively made. But the principle, I believe, has always remained the same, namely, to give the students a thorough and practical insight into the organisation and structure of the leading types of the vegetable kingdom. When, therefore, Mr. Henslow, himself a teacher, asserts that such laboratory teaching as this should be preceded by a thorough course of practical and systematic botany, it appears to me that he is bound to explain what he precisely means by this very dark saying. For, if botanical laboratory work in this country is not thorough, is not practical, and, in dealing with types drawn from every important group, is not systematic, it is important to know in what respects it falls short of these requirements.

W. T. THISELTON DYER

Royal Gardens, Kew, October 4

The Solar (Dust?) Halo

THE reddish halo to which Mr. Backhouse draws attention in his letter of September 20 in NATURE (p. 511) has of late been noticed by several observers, and this I think is because, while the sunrisc and sunset glows have exhibited a marked decline in their duration and brilliancy since last winter, the halo has shown no similar diminution of intensity, and thus attracts more attention relatively than it did at first, when it remained for some time almost entirely unnoticed in this country. In reply to Mr. Backhouse's question as to whether this halo has been seen in England previous to last November, I have a very strong impression that it made its first appearance here coincidentally with