excitation of one brain centre may possibly act in the same way as a direct inhibitory impulse by partially paralysing an adjacent centre.

The Forms of Leaves

THERE are several points in Sir John Lubbock's lecture (NATURE, February 26, p. 398) which seem to invite some little criticism. That "the size of the leaf . . . is regulated mainly with reference to the thickness of the stem" seems somewhat self-evident, as a large leaf must have a large stem to carry it, as, *e.g.*, may be seen by comparing the slender shoot of a *Decodar* with a cabbage-stalk; but he adds: "The size once determined exercises much influence on the form." This is a *deduction* which seems to require *verification*. Sir John gives the area of a beech-leaf as about 3 square inches, but the form remains the same whatever the size. Size rather depends on vigorous growth, as in the following instances: *Populus alba* leaves on a vigorous basal shoot were $6\frac{1}{2} \times 3\frac{1}{2}$ inches, the diameter of the shoot being $\frac{1}{2}$ inch; on the upper branches of the same tree many leaves were only $1\frac{1}{2}$ to $2\frac{1}{2}$ inches long, the diameter of the shoot being also $\frac{1}{2}$ inch. Similarly growing oak leaves of the same shape were 6×3 inches and $2 \times \frac{3}{4}$ inches respectively. An *Aucuba japonica* bore rounded leaves on a basal shoot $4 \times \frac{3}{4}$ inches, but those on the stem were 4×1 inch. In this case, as in other plants with (normally) dimorphic leaves, as ivy, it is difficult to see what connection there is between size and form. Indeed leaves of every degree of superficial area can be found amongst the lobed ones on the climbing stem of ivy, and the entire ones of the flowering branch. Sir John adds that "the form of the inner edge [of the beech] . . . decides that of the outer one." He does not seem to have verified this deduction. The two edges are symmetrical in this leaf, but they are not so in the elm and lime. How will the inner edge explain the cause of their obliquity? If, however, the *buds* of the lime be examined, a more probable cause (as it seems to me) will be discovered in the conditions of development. He describes the *Eucalyptus*, when young, as having "horizontal leaves, which in older ones are replaced by scimitar-shaped phyllodes." Bentham and Hooker say of *Eucalyptus*: "Folia in arbore juniore saepe opposita, in adulto plerumque alterna," but makes no mention of phyllodes. Speaking of evergreen leaves, he says: "Glossy leaves have a tendency to throw [snow] off, and thus escape, hence evergreen leaves are very generally smooth and glossy." This sentence appears to imply that such leaves are glossy in anticipation of snow! a deduction which certainly requires verification. Again: "Evergreen leaves often have special protection . . . by thorns and spines. Of this the holly is a familiar illustration; and it was pointed out that in old plants above the range of browsing quadrupeds, the leaves tend to lose their spines and become unarmed." The inference the reader draws from this is that when the holly grows out of reach of browsing animals it has no necessity to produce prickly leaves, and so changes them accordingly, thereby implying that unarmed leaves were in some way preferable. This is another instance of deductive reasoning which requires verification, for it seems to be attributing to the holly a very unexpected process of ratiocination! But it is not at all usual for hollies to do this. I have several from six to nearly twenty feet high, and not one has borne an unarmed leaf. Though my cows do not touch a holly hedge, yet one young bush lately planted has taken their fancy, and they have bitten it all to pieces. On the other hand one bush (in the garden), a variety with unarmed foliage, occasionally throws out a branch with prickly leaves, though the cows are not admitted where it grows.

"Fleshy leaves were principally found in hot and dry countries, where this peculiarity [*sic*] had the advantage of offering a smaller surface, and therefore exposing the plant less to the loss of water by evaporation." Surely the usual explanation, that it is the thick cuticle which prevents rapid exhalation is a better reason than Sir John's deduction from the small size of the leaves? Speaking of aquatic plants, he says that the submerged "cut up" leaves of such plants presents a greater extent of surface; and adds that "such leaves would be unable to support even their own weight, much less to resist any force, such as that of the wind." I should be glad to know if he has verified the first statement by actual measurements; for an *à priori* assumption leads one to fancy that a complete leaf would have a greater surface than one represented by its ribs

and veins only. With regard to the second and third statements a "natural experiment" completely refutes his deduction, for I know a place where a small pond dried up last summer, and a large portion of the ground was covered with a dense velvet-like carpet, composed of the erect filiform branchlets of the "cut-up" leaves of *Ranunculus aquatilis*, which had become modified by their new medium, and perfectly adapted to enjoy an aerial existence.

In offering these few criticisms for Sir John Lubbock's consideration, I would venture to remark that he seems to have followed too closely in the deductive methods of another writer on leaves, and which called forth the following remark from Prof. Lankester:—[He] "gives us hypotheses, suppositions with insufficient evidence, and deductions from the generalisation of Evolution, but he is relatively deficient in 'verification'" (NATURE, vol. xxviii. p. 171).

GEORGE HENSLOW

Drayton House, Ealing

The Fall of Autumnal Foliage

MR. FRASER alludes to "the unpursued inquiry into the cause of leaves falling in autumn" (NATURE, February 26, p. 388), and I do not find it mentioned in Sach's "Text Book"; but Dr. Masters, in Hensley's "Elementary Course of Botany," fourth edition, p. 515, speaks of "a layer of thin-walled cells being formed across the petiole," but does not say whence this layer is derived. Duchartre, however, gives a pretty full account of opinions up to 1877 ("El. de Bot.," deux. éd. p. 443), which he reduces to two, viz. Schacht's, who attributes it to a growth of periderm, and that of Mohls, who recognises a special layer which he calls *couche séparatrice*, considering the peridermic layer as being often, but not always formed. Subsequently, M. Ledgeganck

examined different plants and corroborated Schacht in regarding the periderm as the *cause prédisposante*, and cold to be the *cause efficiente*, which contracts "le tissu de la base du pétiole, spongieux, aéré, élastique à un degré beaucoup plus considérable que celui du coussinet." From my own observations on the horse-chestnut, ash, &c., it appears to be in these clearly a continuation of periderm produced by the phellogen of the branch, which invades the base of the petiole, till it meets in the middle, cutting right through the fibro-vascular bundles of the petiole. As this suberous layer dies, the leaf necessarily falls off. But as long as a leaf is in vigorous health it would seem to resist this invasion, and last longer, as do evergreens. I inclose a figure I possess of a slide showing the process in the horse-chestnut.

Drayton House, Ealing

GEORGE HENSLOW

Forest-Trees in Orkney

IN NATURE of February 26 (p. 388) Mr. A. T. Fraser says that "a peculiarity of Caithness and the Orkney and Shetland Islands is that no forest-trees can be got to grow," and he proceeds to explain this by the preponderance of polarised light. As far, at least, as Orkney is concerned, I am prepared to rebut this calumny. It is true that forest-trees are not the striking feature of the Islands, but they do occur. At Binscarth, between Kirkwall and Stromness, there are willow, ash, sycamore, and Scotch fir. They require to be protected—from the wind, I presume, and not from the light—by hedges of bour-tree (elder). In the street at Kirkwall itself there is a fair-sized sycamore.

Trinity College, Cambridge

JAMES CURRIE

YOUR Indian correspondent, Mr. A. T. Fraser, can hardly be acquainted with the primitive jungles of Southern India, or he would have observed that there, at one and the same time, the aspect of all the four seasons is displayed in the vegetation.