stars, and measurement of the mean wave-length of the blend is greatly complicated by the effects of radial velocity, and of the "K term." The latter unfortunately indicates a shift in the opposite direction.

Even in the sun, radial velocity may greatly complicate the investigation. Could the $H\alpha$ line be observed double in the prominences—or show to appear single when a pair of separation 0·15 Å would certainly be resolved—the question might be settled.

K. T. COMPTON.
H. N. RUSSELL.

Princeton University,
June 21.

Leaf-mould.

IT must be a matter of common knowledge to persons interested in woodlands that some woods and copses have a more or less thick deposit of leaf-mould, whilst in others this covering is absent. It is not a question of the presence or absence of particular trees, *e.g.* oak or beech, and it often happens that within the limits of a single wood considerable differences exist, in respect of leaf-mould formation, in different parts of it.

I have noticed that its presence or absence is very commonly correlated with the character of the surface soil. Sand or gravel promotes, whilst heavy, and especially calcareous, soils seem to inhibit its formation. In a small wood that I have had under observation for a number of years the surface varies from chalk to heavy clay, with a good deal of intermediate calcareous loam. Leaf-mould never forms naturally in this wood, although the conditions would seem to be generally favourable. The trees are reasonably thick, consisting mainly of beech and some oak. The ground is well drained and dry for the most part, whilst in other spots it is damp and even boggy. There are large hollows where leaves collect, and from which the winds never move them, even in winter. But no real leaf-mould ever forms. The mass of dead leaves and twigs rot down and evaporate, so to speak, next year. This is to be attributed to bacterial action, and I believe that for the most part the result is due to the bacteria being able to carry on the disintegration process, mainly to carbon dioxide and water, in the presence of the available calcium carbonate of the surface soil. In another wood near by there are deposits of sand and gravel overlying the loams and chalk, and there the abundance of leaf-mould is very striking.

It occurred to me that the presence of the "acid" silicious top soil might be the decisive factor in the situation. Such an acid soil, by not neutralising the products of bacterial action, would conduce to the arrest of bacterial activity and so might provide in the first-named wood the requisite condition for leaf-mould formation which had, up to that time, been lacking. This hypothesis received confirmation. A covering of sandy gravel spread over the surface of one of the hollows was followed by the formation of an excellent leaf-mould, though this had not occurred in this hollow before, nor did it take place at all in those hollows adjacent to it which had not received a coat of gravel.

I do not suppose that the whole story of leaf-mould formation is contained in the foregoing, and it may well be that in other situations additional or other factors are concerned. Indeed it seems certain that soil drainage also influences the process, perhaps through its affecting conditions of suitable aeration. At any rate it happens that when pans of clay occur near the surface of a gravel or sandy soil in woods, with the result that the ground is water-logged for a part of the year—in such places one looks in vain for leaf-mould, though a black peaty deposit may occur in its place. These peaty deposits are very different from genuine leaf-mould, though both owe their origin to the disintegration of vegetable matter.

Leaf-mould, regarded from the point of view of the succession of organisms that are concerned in its production, and of the complex chemical changes therein involved, offers an attractive field for research. It is perhaps scarcely necessary to emphasise the fact that in addition to problems of more purely scientific interest, there are others connected with it which are of industrial importance as well. J. B. FARMER.

Imperial College of Science and Technology,
South Kensington, S.W.7.

The Theory of Hearing.

REFERRING to Prof. Scripture's letter in NATURE, June 28, the following observations on the vowel response of piano strings, which differ from those described, may be worth recording.

Using a small Broadwood upright piano with the lid open, and singing or speaking well into the instrument, I have found, (1) That a recognisable vowel response is given to *all* the English vowel sounds, though those to *i* (as in eat) and I (as in it) are relatively faint, owing to the poor response of the strings to frequencies of 2000 and more.

(2) That the response *is* given almost equally well, whether the vowels be intoned as prolonged or as relatively instantaneous sounds.

(3) That quite a good response is given to vowels sung "portamento" (with a variation of pitch of about an octave) or spoken as short sounds of varying laryngeal pitch. In some cases, especially in that of *u* (who), the "portamento" response is quite as good as that for the same vowel when intoned at constant pitch.

Experiment shows that a vibrating rubber strip "larynx," attached to a double resonator, will produce a constant vowel sound while the frequency of the larynx note is varied over an octave or more, by variation of the air pressure supplied to the larynx.

It seems reasonable to suppose that, in the production of a "portamento" vowel sound in the human mouth, the same thing applies—*i.e.* that the resonance frequencies of the vocal cavity remain substantially constant, though the frequency of the laryngeal puffs which evoke them is progressively changing. R. A. S. PAGET.

74 Strand, London, W.C.2.

IN reply to Prof. Scripture's letter in NATURE of June 28, I am not able to discuss the more recondite points he raises as to the nature of vowel sounds, or the mathematical formulæ by which alone, as he states, they can be subjected to analysis. I cannot, however, accept his statement that the undamped piano strings fail to respond to short spoken vowels. The facts can be tested in a moment by any one who has access to a piano. The fuller the tone of the instrument the clearer will be the response.

My own observation is that one gets a recognisable and distinguishable vowel however short the utterance, and that the quality of the resonated vowel is not noticeably changed by shortening or lengthening the vocalisation of the vowel sound; and further, that the characteristics of the vowels are as clearly distinguishable in the sharply uttered as in the sung vowel: ă, ā, i, oe, oo, all seem to come out fairly clearly and distinguishably. As Helmholtz says, the