

The first of these stories is related in very circumstantial terms, but without any authority being given for it. It is said that a Fellow of the Geological Society offered a certain paper, which the authorities of the Society refused; and it is asserted that the reason of their refusal was that the paper "was not orthodox," and "they probably smelt heresy." Now the Duke of Argyll is well aware that every Fellow of the Geological Society has the right to present papers for reading, and that the responsibility for accepting or refusing papers rests in the first instance with the President; but he, in the case of exercising his veto, is bound to report the fact, and the reasons for his action, at the next meeting of the Council. The records of the Society show that no such paper was ever offered to it; that the President never exercised his right of veto; and that the Council never discussed the grounds of the supposed refusal. The Duke of Argyll has been informed of these facts, but he has not yet retracted the very serious charge which he has made affecting the honour and good faith of the President and the other twenty-two members of the Council of the Geological Society.

In the case of the second story circulated by the Duke of Argyll, the authority is given. The complaint is made that since 1862 "advanced geologists" have "ignored" views which "tend to dethrone" their own "pet theories." Anyone who chooses to refer to the *Philosophical Magazine* for 1862 will see that the "pet theories" in question are those relating to the antiquity of man; that the "advanced geologists" implicated in the charge must have been the late Sir Charles Lyell, Prof. Prestwich, and those who have followed up their researches and arguments; and that the "views" which they "ignored" were the suggestions which I described in my last letter!

JOHN W. JUDD.

The Total Eclipse of the Moon of 1888 January 28, as observed at Birr Castle Observatory, Parsonstown.

THE total eclipse of the moon on Saturday last was, like its predecessor in 1884 (see *NATURE*, vol. xxx. p. 589, and *Trans. Royal Dublin Society* for October 1885), favoured by a very clear sky during the whole time of its progress, so that very extensive observations of the changes of the moon's heat in consequence of the passing over of the earth shadow could be made. The apparatus used was essentially the same as that used before; yet the two old thermopiles had been replaced by two new ones especially made for this occasion by the Earl of Rosse.

The observations began at 7h. 19m. M.T. Greenwich, and were, as much as possible, uninterruptedly continued till 15h. 45m.

During this time 638 distinct readings of the galvanometer were obtained, which, when fully reduced, will enable a very satisfactory heat-curve to be drawn. A few preliminary results, reduced to zenith, I communicate at once.

Galvanometer.

739.4	...	1h. 10m. before first contact with penumbra.
663.4	...	24m. " " "
624.1	...	First contact with penumbra.
252.1	...	" shadow.
34.9	...	22m. before beginning of total phase.
30.2	...	22m. after " "
231.9	...	Last contact with shadow.
545.6	...	" penumbra.
540.8	...	1h. 34m. after last contact with penumbra.

From these figures it will be seen—

(1) That the heat radiated by the moon begins to decrease a considerable time before the first contact with the penumbra.

(2) That 22m. before the beginning of totality the heat is only 4.7 per cent. of the value obtained 1h. 10m. before the first contact with the penumbra. Unfortunately an unforeseen stoppage of the driving-clock prevented the observations from being carried on closer up to and during the total phase.

(3) That in spite of the rapid fall on approach to totality, the heat, after the last contact with the penumbra, does not at once increase to anything like the value observed at corresponding times before the first contact.

It is worth remarking that points 2 and 3 are confirmatory of the results arrived at in 1884.

OTTO BOEDICKER.

Birr Castle Observatory, Parsonstown, January 30.

"Elementary Chemistry," and "Practical Chemistry."

I CRAVE leave from the Editor for space in which to reply, on my own behalf and on that of my fellow-authors Messrs. Slater and Carnegie, to the charges brought by "H. E. A." in *NATURE* of January 19 (p. 265) against our method of teaching chemistry. At the outset I thank "H. E. A." for the patience which, as he publicly announces, he has shown in waiting for the publication of these books, and I condole with him in his disappointment. Like him, I too am waiting patiently; I trust my disappointment will be less bitter.

One of the important points in our plan of chemical teaching is the connection of the work in the laboratory with the student's reading and lecture-work. To emphasize this connection, and to make our course run fairly smoothly, we have published two books, one to be used in the laboratory, the other to be used in the lecture-room and in reading in connection with the whole work of the student. "H. E. A." acknowledges the advantages of this division, but throughout his review he ignores the statement distinctly made by us, that one book is complementary to the other and that both must be used together. He confines his remarks almost wholly to one of our books, viz. the "Practical Chemistry"; and yet he condemns our system of teaching. On this ground alone I claim that his review is misleading and unfair. I go further, and assert that "H. E. A." has condemned our system without acquainting himself with its essential features. He says that "in the earlier part of the 'Practical Chemistry' Messrs. Muir and Carnegie do not sufficiently bear in mind their own intention, and that much of the matter would find a more fitting place in the companion volume." No one reading this would suppose that almost every experiment used in Chaps. I. to VIII. of the "Practical Chemistry" is also used in Chaps. I. to IX. of the "Elementary Chemistry." Yet this is the case. In one book the experiments are described, along with others, in such terms as allow attention to be concentrated on their results and on the reasoning on these results; in the other book the experiments are described in detail in order that the student may repeat them in the laboratory. In another part of his review "H. E. A." says that most of the subjects dealt with in the third part of the "Elementary Chemistry" "ought never to have been introduced into an 'Elementary Chemistry.'" He has here made a slip: it is the third part of the "Practical Chemistry" which includes subjects not touched on in the other book. This correction involves a point of some importance. Although the preface to our "Practical Chemistry" states that the book forms part of a course of elementary chemistry, yet the student who uses both books will see that the course of work laid down in the practical book carries him much beyond the limits of treatment adopted in the other volume. There are numerous direct and indirect indications of this in the book itself, which those for whom the work is intended will not fail to notice. One cannot put the whole of one's book into the preface. I admit that it would have been better had we indicated in the preface to the "Practical Chemistry" that many experiments in Parts II. and III. are difficult to perform, and require skill and training; but I assert that the nature of the experiments themselves, the references to the original papers to be read before conducting these experiments, and the suggestions as to other work to be done preparatory to Parts II. and III. respectively, suffice to indicate to the student, although not necessarily to the reviewer, the character of the work described in the later chapters of the "Practical Chemistry."

Chapter I. of Part III. of the "Practical Chemistry" involves a repetition of some of Stas's determinations of the atomic weight of silver. "H. E. A." says that this chapter should have been included in Part I., and he adds, "the remaining chapters ought never to have been introduced into an 'Elementary Chemistry,'" kindly informing his readers that these chapters are included "because of the senior author's well-known tendency to worship physical constants." I venture to remind "H. E. A." that no election has taken place to the office of supreme pontiff of chemistry. Were that official in existence, I feel inclined to think he would admit that accurate determinations of atomic weights—and "H. E. A." allows these in the most elementary part of the course—are determinations of constants which have physical as well as chemical meanings.

"H. E. A." says that in the "Practical Chemistry" there is an "entire absence of anything approaching to a systematic arrangement." The boldness and baldness of the assertions made by the reviewer encourage me to meet this statement with