

but by means of them he is able to discuss the evolution of the atom, the relations of the elements, heat, light, electricity, dissociation. The "mystery of life" even is not excluded from the discussion.

The treatise, as the author himself frankly acknowledges, is a purely imaginative one, and we do not agree with him in thinking that the diverse and tentative views held just now by our leading investigators as to the ultimate constitution of matter afford a sufficient justification for the present attempt to explain matter and electricity by an effort of the imagination. Views and theories based on mathematical and experimental investigations are to us certainly more convincing.

The Fossil Fishes of the Hawkesbury Series at St. Peter's. By A. Smith Woodward, Mem. Geol. Surv. N. South Wales. (Sydney, 1908.)

DR. SMITH WOODWARD describes a series of Permian-Carboniferous fishes from St. Peter's, one of the Illawarra suburbs of Sydney. The greater number of the specimens, including genera new to the Hawkesbury formation, were obtained from a dark indurated shale. The discovery of *Sagenodus* is interesting in connection with recent discoveries of dipnoan fishes in Australia, from the fact that we have evidence of the forerunners of the surviving *Ceratodus* in various formations from the Devonian to the Jurassic, and it is suggested that *Ceratodus* may have evolved in the Australian region. A new palaeoniscid genus, *Elpisopholis*, allied to *Phanerosteon* and *Sceletophorus*, is described, in addition to several new species of fishes. A few specimens, somewhat newer in age, were obtained from a soft grey shale resembling that at Gosford. The work is well illustrated by four plates and a restoration of the new genus.

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 intended for this or any other part of NATURE. No notice is taken of anonymous communications.]

Lamarck's "Système des Animaux sans Vertèbres."

This work, as is well known, was first published in the ninth year of the Republic, or 1801 A.D. (i.e. the last nine months thereof). But, to judge from the usual bibliographies and library catalogues, it does not appear to be generally known that the original sheets were re-issued with a fresh title-page in the following year. The differences between the two title-pages are quite unimportant until the imprint is reached. This in the first issue reads as follows:—

A PARIS

Chez { L'AUTEUR, au Muséum d'Hist. Naturelle;
DETERVILLE, Libraire, rue du Battoir,
n° 16, quartier de l'Odéon.

AN IX—1801.

In the second issue the imprint is:—

A PARIS

Chez { Maillard, Libraire, rue du Pont de Lodi, N° 1.
Deterville, Libraire, rue du Battoir, N° 16,
quartier de l'Odéon.
Mouillardier, Imprimeur-Libraire, quai des
Augustins, N° 28.

AN X—1802.

That this was a re-issue and not a new edition is proved by a copy in the possession of my friend Mr. Victor W. Lyon, city engineer of Jeffersonville, Indiana. The text and tables present absolutely no difference from those of the first issue, and the new title-page, instead of forming a part of the first section, has been printed on a wide fly-leaf, the inner margin of which is folded round the adjoining leaves of the first section.

NO. 2029, VOL. 78]

This new title-page has some interest as suggesting that the work was taken up by the booksellers more warmly than had been anticipated, and that it was no longer necessary for the author to be at the trouble of selling his own copies.

Since the writings of many naturalists show that a confusion already exists in their minds between the "Système," 1801, and the "Histoire," 1815-22, it has seemed advisable to help them out of any fresh difficulty that might be presented by the existence of two dates for the "Système." Just now, when Lamarck is being specially commemorated, it may be thought worth while to publish this detail, which otherwise might be overlooked.

F. A. BATHER.

September 5.

The Hong Kong Typhoon of July 27-28.

THIS typhoon appears to have been very similar in size, direction, and intensity to that which caused such destruction in Hong Kong on September 18, 1906.

It was notified by both the Hong Kong and Manila observatories on July 26. It was then said to be in the Balintang Channel, which runs between Luzon, the northern island of the Philippines, and Formosa, and is about 500 (nautical) miles E.S.E. of Hong Kong; the observations available at that date showed it to be moving westwards, but were not sufficient to indicate that it was a storm of any great intensity. From the Balintang Channel it crossed some 500 miles of open sea without an observing station, and it was not until 6 p.m. on July 27 that the local indications were such as to cause the observatory officials in Hong Kong to hoist the signals indicating a typhoon within 300 miles of the colony. At 9.30 p.m. it was notified that the typhoon was moving towards the coast in the neighbourhood of Hong Kong. At 11.15 p.m. the signal was hoisted indicating that a typhoon was imminent. The barometer commenced to fall sharply at 10 p.m., and reached its minimum at 1 a.m. on July 28; the fall varied from half an inch to an inch in these three hours in different parts of the colony, the variation in the fall indicating that the typhoon centre passed close to the south of the island. The speed would seem to have been about normal. The typhoon was in the Balintang Channel on the morning of July 26, and the centre passed Hong Kong at 1 a.m. on July 28—500 miles in forty hours, or 12½ miles an hour.

Owing to the timely warning, and to the gale coming from the east, in which direction the harbour is well sheltered, the damage to the shipping in it was comparatively small; four large steamers were driven ashore, a steel four-masted barque lost two of her masts, and many of the smaller craft suffered, with some loss of life, but the majority had acted on the warning given, and sought such shelter as was available. Outside the harbour the most serious disaster was the loss of a river steamer bound from Canton to Hong Kong, and with it some 400 lives. H.M. destroyer *Whiting* was also driven ashore and badly damaged. On shore the damage far exceeded that done by the typhoon of 1906. The damage to trees, most of which are evergreens, such as banyans, was such as almost entirely to deprive the roads and gardens on the lower levels of much needed shade. The roads were covered with broken branches, which will take weeks to remove. Even such hard-leaved plants as bamboos are, in exposed situations, now nothing but masses of stalks and withered yellow leaves.

The houses suffered mainly in their roofs and windows; the roofing used consists of the pantiles and mortar rolls common to China and the East, and is very liable to slip with the vibration caused by a hurricane. Several of the lower-class houses were demolished, with some loss of life. The gale commenced about 10 p.m. on July 27, and ended about 4 a.m. on July 28. Unfortunately, both the Kowloon Observatory anemometer and that at Victoria Peak, 1800 feet above sea-level, were damaged during the gale, and records are not available. It is thought that the force of the wind far exceeded that of the typhoon of 1906, and was very near to, if it did not exceed, the highest previous record of 108 miles per hour, in 1806.

Hong Kong, August 11.

L. GIBBS.