

about twenty-five years ago, being a very fine collection of many thousand ornithological specimens, with a quantity of interesting correspondence with Mr. J. Thompson, of Knowsley Aviary, Mr. Reid, of Doncaster, R. Dunn, of Hull, and many other naturalists of that period; these explain upon what terms he obtained the egg and a very fine specimen of the Great Auk.

ALBERT F. CALVERT.

63, Patshull Road, Kentish Town, March 19.

Superheated Steam.

LORD RAYLEIGH (p. 438) rebuts my objection to the statement regarding the efficiency of a vapour-engine in which pure water is replaced by a saline solution, pointing out "that Maxwell's exposition of Carnot's engine applies *without the change of a single word*, whether the substance in the cylinder be water, mercury, or an aqueous solution of chloride of calcium." The latter italics are mine. In the statement objected to by me the aqueous solution of chloride of calcium was *in the boiler*, and what was *in the cylinder* was *superheated steam*, which is not included in the above list, so that the application of Maxwell's exposition is somewhat difficult. The greater part of the fresh water supplied to passengers in steamships is now produced by condensing the *superheated vapour of a saline solution*, and the culinary experience is that the substance which was in solution has all been left in the boiler. My contention, therefore, still stands—the saline mixture is not the working substance, and Carnot's law refers to the working substance only, and not to anything left in the boiler.

"In each case there is a definite relation between pressure and temperature." This is evidently merely a slip of the pen, the writer having for the moment forgotten that he was dealing with *superheated steam*, for which there is not a definite relation between pressure and temperature. The condition of superheated steam is completely defined when *both* pressure and temperature are given; but pressure is here a function of temperature-and-something-else, and temperature is here a function of pressure-and-something-else. That something-else may be volume or it may be energy, or, preferably, it may be entropy, but it must be something which cannot be predicated from pressure alone or from temperature alone.

"(So far as the substance is concerned), all that is necessary for the reversible operation of the engine is that the various parts of the working substance should be in equilibrium with one another throughout." No; for, in addition, it is necessary that the working substance should have only one pressure consistent with any given temperature. For this reason, superheated steam, however it may have been produced, can never be the working substance in a Carnot's engine. In the reversed cycle, when the steam is raised from a saline solution, from the beginning of the higher isothermal, the pressure would go on increasing until it became that due to saturated steam at the temperature of the superheat. This might be double the maximum pressure in the original cycle.

"The various parts of the working substance should be in equilibrium with one another throughout." The writer seems to say that the steam of a saline solution is a stable saturated vapour. It is H_2O at a given pressure and temperature, and the condition of the substance is by this definition completely determined, and there is no alternative; but it is not stable. Say that the steam-space of the boiler is increased by adding a vertical cylinder alongside the boiler, open to it. On the bottom of that vessel the steam might condense—pure water—and the temperature of the steam immediately over this water would be that of saturated vapour at the same temperature, and from there all through the steam-space to the surface of the saline solution in the boiler the temperature would increase, and all would have the same pressure. There would be mechanical equilibrium, but not thermal equilibrium.

"At the upper limit, *all* the heat is received at the highest point of temperature,"—but just as it would be if the evaporation were from a film of water upon a nearly bare combustion chamber crown. The plate is left in the boiler, and so is the salt, and in neither case would the steam exhibit a "state of things strongly contrasted with that which obtains when vapour rising from pure water is afterwards superheated." I have stated in my previous letter that the heat of evaporation is all *received* at identically the same temperatures as when it is raised from pure water at the same pressure, and the contrast is only as strong as that between occult and obvious. I have now

shown that the vapours must be identical from either beginning; and unless each carried a certificate of birth, I do not now see how it would be possible to tell one from the other.

London, March 12.

J. MACFARLANE GRAY.

Phoronomy.

I THINK it will be admitted by all, that precision of language is of great importance in scientific terminology; and the letter of Dr. Besant, which appeared in your issue of last week (p. 462), certainly suggests strong reasons for employing the word *phoronomy* in the place of *kinematics*.

The word may at first sight appear strange to the present generation of mathematicians; but if it becomes acclimatized, its employment will appear as natural as the phrases *kinetic* and *potential energy*, in the place of such meaningless phrases as *vis-viva* and *force-function*.

When the medical profession require a new word, they almost always have recourse to the Greek language; and mathematicians and physicists would do well to follow their example, and in cases of doubt or difficulty to consult some eminent classical scholar. I must confess, that I have no sympathy with the attempts, which have occasionally been made, to introduce short words of Teutonic origin into scientific nomenclature, as such words have always appeared to me to be singularly deficient in point. A good example of this is furnished by the word *spin*, which Clifford attempted to introduce in the place of the phrase *molecular rotation*. The latter phrase, although a little long, exactly expresses the idea which it is intended to convey, viz. that the molecules of the fluid possess a motion of rotation as well as a motion of translation. The word *spin*, on the other hand, does not express any such idea, but is strongly suggestive of the juvenile, though not altogether unscientific, pastime of spinning peg-tops.

A. B. BASSET.

322 Oxford Street, W., March 18.

I HAVE before me the second edition of F. Redtenbacher's "Principien der Mechanik und des Maschinenbaues" (Mannheim, 1859), of which the first section is entitled "Die Bewegung als Erscheinung (Phoronomie)." Whether the term occurs already in the first edition (1852), I cannot affirm, but I remember very well that Redtenbacher, in his lectures in Carlsruhe, in 1858, insisted upon that term being distinct from "Dynamik" and "Kinematik." I conclude, therefore, that the majority of the 786 students of that year—among them many foreigners—*as also those of other years*, were conversant with the term.

M. AM ENDE.

Westminster Chambers, 5 Victoria Street,
London, S.W., March 19.

SOME other correspondent is pretty sure to be mentioning that Mr. W. H. Besant will find in Kant's *Metaph. Anfangsgründe der Naturwissenschaft* all the authority he could desire for his proposed use of the word "phoronomy." Kant regularly uses the word in the sense of the later "kinematic"; and he was man of science enough to justify anyone in following his lead.

G. C. R.

The Tudor Specimen of Eozoon.

IN reference to the remarks made by Sir J. W. Dawson (NATURE, March 17, p. 461) on my paper on the Tudor specimen of Eozoon (*Quart. Journ. Geol. Soc.*, vol. xlvii, pp. 348-55), I should like to say that the whole point of that paper was that it was based on Sir J. W. Dawson's original type. The figure of this specimen has been repeatedly republished by Sir J. W. Dawson, and, in the absence of illustrations or details of other specimens from Tudor, upon its evidence alone rests the asserted occurrence of Eozoon in the Tudor limestone, and the great claims based thereupon. The value of other specimens from this locality was not rated very highly by Sir J. W. Dawson so recently as September 1888, when he remarked, "Without additional specimens,¹ and in the case of creatures so variable as the Foraminifera, it would be rash to decide whether

¹ And he previously refers only to "the specimen," "this very interesting specimen," "the fine specimen from Tudor," &c.