

with curly, not really woolly, hair are occasionally to be seen; but I venture to think that such occasional freaks are casual, and wholly without significance; although they were regarded as evidence of a Negroid element in the population by the late Sir George Campbell.

As, in consequence of the statements and theories of M. Quatrefages, the idea is already spreading that traces of pygmy Negrito races are to be found in these parts of India, I contemplate on a suitable occasion, ere long, publishing some notes, made at the time, on the tribes I met with in my travels in the wild regions referred to. I shall therefore say no more at present, save that the evidence culled by M. Quatrefages out of General Dalton's lithographed groups—one of a girl with her hair *cropped* short, and another of two somewhat curly-headed Sonthals—in support of his theory, is not merely feeble, but is liable to mislead.

Sir Wm. Flower has referred to the use by M. Quatrefages of the term Mincopie for the Andamanese. As he points out, there is in reality no such term. How it originated, though long unknown, has been suggested by Mr. Man. Its derivation foiled even the acute research of Sir Henry Yule. Its first use was by Lieut. Colebrooke in the year 1795, but it has not been recognised in any Indian dialect, and does not seem to have ever been in use among Anglo-Indians, any more than is the name Zebu, which is used in some European languages for the humped cattle of India. Such names, and there are a few others, not being current in the country itself, have to be forgotten by those who visit India. I well remember being not understood when I used the term Zebu on my first arrival in Calcutta some thirty years ago.

V. BALL.

Dublin, May 13.

#### Epping Forest: an Explanation.

SOME years ago you were good enough to publish a paper of mine on the conservation of the Forest from the naturalists' point of view (vol. xxvii. p. 447). That paper was written soon after the Forest was taken over by the Corporation of London, when some unpleasant signs of artificial treatment had become manifest, and more especially with reference to certain railway schemes which, in the interest of naturalists, we of the Essex Field Club felt it our duty to oppose. It is a matter of ancient history that our opposition was successful. My object in entering the lists again is to assure your readers, as representing the scientific public, that the controversy which is now going on concerning the management of the Forest has nothing whatever to do with the agitation about the railway scheme of 1883. This statement may appear superfluous, but I am compelled to trespass upon your space because certain unscrupulous critics are in the habit of misleading the public by quoting from that paper published twelve years ago, without giving date or context, and without a single word of explanation as to its object. Moreover, the critics in question have endeavoured, by a method which in other controversial spheres would be called by a very strong name, to make it appear that some of the views put forward in 1883 are opposed to the attitude which, it is well known, I now hold in the present controversies. So far as naturalists are concerned, they may rest assured that nothing that is now being done is in the way of injury to the Forest; far from this, there are signs of marked improvement. The policy of the Conservators is to restore the Forest to a natural condition by thinning out overcrowded pollards which are now beginning to injure one another, and to kill off the varied undergrowth which is such a relief to the gloomy barrenness of an unnaturally dense growth of trees. I may point out that the overcrowding is due to two opposite causes, viz. to entire neglect in some parts, and to too much attention in others. The latter cases refer to those parts in which in past times the rights of lopping were severely exercised. Here of course, now that the Conservators have extinguished these rights, the pollards are throwing up straight and lanky branches of a most unsightly character. In those very limited parts which were not formerly pollarded, and which consist of groves of spear trees, no attempt at systematic thinning had been made before the present Conservancy, and here also there is an overcrowding necessitating woodcraft. Within the last few years all that has been done has been done with care, skill, and forethought. I rejoice to be able to bear testimony on this point, and to reassure those who may have been misled from a want of personal knowledge of the nature and history of the district, into giving credence to the intemperate correspondence in the newspapers.

R. MELDOLA.

May 21.

NO. 1334, VOL. 52]

#### PROFESSOR LOTHAR MEYER.

Gestern Abend 11 Uhr entschlief plötzlich sanft und schmerzlos im 65. Lebensjahre mein lieber Mann

DR. LOTHAR MEYER

ord. Professor der Chemie an der Universität Tübingen.

JOHANNA MEYER geb. Volkmann  
mit ihren Kindern.

Tübingen, den 12. April 1895.

WE were thankful his "falling on sleep" was "sudden, gentle, and without pain"; but we grieved he should have left us so soon.

Julius Lothar Meyer was born at Varel in Oldenburg, on August 19, 1830. After completing his school course in the Gymnasium, he studied in the University of Zürich from 1851 to 1853, then at Würzburg from 1853 to 1854; from Würzburg he went to Heidelberg, where he remained till the autumn of 1856, and from thence he migrated to Königsberg, where he remained until Easter 1858. Meyer's original intention was to devote himself to medicine, and he graduated as Doctor in Medicine at Würzburg on February 24, 1854. At Heidelberg he came under the influence of Bunsen, and his work became more and more chemical. At Königsberg his studies were devoted mainly to mathematical physics, under the guidance of F. Neumann. In 1858 he took the degree of Ph.D. at Breslau; and on February 21, 1859, he received leave to teach chemistry and physics. From 1859 to 1866 Meyer was in charge of the chemical laboratory of the Physiological Institute at Breslau. In 1866 he was called to the Royal Prussian *Forstakademie* at Eberswalde, where he remained until 1868, when he went to the *Polytechnikum* at Karlsruhe. In 1876 Prof. Fittig was called from Tübingen to the University of Strassburg, and Lothar Meyer was appointed to fill the vacancy at Tübingen.

He had nearly completed twenty years' work at Tübingen when the summons came. Cerebral apoplexy stopped his labours, on April 11 of this year; and, *plötzlich, sanft, und schmerzlos*, he passed.

It was while teaching chemistry and physics at Breslau that Meyer published the first edition of the work on which his reputation as a philosophical chemist chiefly rests. "Die Modernen Theorien der Chemie" appeared in 1864. A second edition was published in 1872; and since that time have appeared a third, fourth, and fifth edition. At the time of his death Meyer was engaged in the preparation of a sixth edition, which he intended to publish in three, more or less independent, parts. An English translation of the fifth edition, by Messrs. Bedson and Williams, appeared in 1888. In 1883 Profs. Meyer and Seubert recalculated the atomic weights of the elements from the original data, and laid all chemists under a debt of gratitude by publishing their results, under the title "Die Atomgewichte der Elemente aus den Originalzahlen neu berechnet."

Lothar Meyer was one of the earliest investigators of the relations between the properties and the atomic weights of the elements. In the first edition of his "Modernen Theorien" (published in 1864) he traced relations between the atomic weights and the chemical values of the elements; and in December 1869 appeared a memoir by him entitled "Die Natur der chemischen Elemente als Funktion ihrer Atomgewichte," wherein he arranged the elements in order of atomic weights, in a single table, and indicated the periodic character of the dependence of properties on atomic weights.

The clear enunciation, and the application in detail, of the most far-reaching generalisation that has been made in chemistry since the work of Dalton, must, undoubtedly, be credited to that great chemist Mendeléeff