a time when they undergo such rapid extensions, should form the crowning part of chemical studies, and the interdependence of the two branches of science can only be established upon a sound basis when a thorough knowledge of either science has been acquired.

The main portion of the book comprising the chemistry of the non-metallic and metallic elements, arranged under the usual headings Preparation and Properties of the different elements and their compounds, contains much that will highly recommend itself. The more important compounds are dealt with in a manner which will help the student over most of the difficulties he encounters at first, and will enable him to lay a good foundation for more extensive chemical studies. The classification of the metals according to their atomicity—open to objections as it stands—is not always reconcilable with the analytical summaries or tests given after each group of metals, nor are the analytical explanations always accurate. On p. 393, *e.g.* we notice: "Calcic sulphate cannot produce a precipitate in a salt of calcium, because there is more than enough of water present to retain dissolved all the sulphate that can possibly be formed."

There can be little doubt that the new edition of Wilson's Chemistry will be welcomed by all who desire to get a general insight into the science, and that it may be studied with advantage in preference to many larger and more ambitious text-books.

OUR BOOK SHELF

Verhandlungen der k. k. geologischen Reichsanstalt. Nos. 11 to 18. (Vienna.)

THESE numbers of the Proceedings of the Geological Society contain many useful papers, chiefly, however, of local interest. Felix Karrer notes the occurrence of mammoth remains at Vienna. They were obtained during the sinking of a well in a "diluvial" (glacial) deposit at a depth of 9 fath. 3 ft. from the surface. Dr. Lenz also has a short reference to a similar discovery of the teeth of a young mammoth in a brown laminated loam near Nowakmühle. Dr. Stur gives an interesting account of his own and Baron Petrino's observations on the superficial deposits in the basin of the Dniester in Galicia and Bukowina. A great accumulation of loess covers a wide area in that district, the land shells and mammalian remains in which enable these geologists to correlate it with the loess of the Rhine and other regions. We observe, in No. 11, an important table showing Dr. C. E. Weis's systematic arrangement of the carboniferous formation and the rothliegendes formation of the Saar-Rhine district, which is well worth the attention of English geologists. The usual admirable literary notices, and other miscellaneous matter, are appended to each number of the Proceedings.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

[*The Editor does not hold himself responsible for opinions expressed by his correspondents. No notice is taken of anonymous communications.*]

Leaf-Arrangement

THE chief part of the Rev. G. Henslow's objections (NATURE, vol. vii., p. 403) to my condensation-theory of leaf-arrangement are due to a double oversight on his part. First, he has overlooked the condition of *contact* among the balls which I use to represent embryo leaves. Second, he has overlooked the fundamental position, that leaf-order exists for, and is determined in, the *bud.*

The bud requires economy of space. This involves contact among the embryo leaves; and if we experiment with balls attached (as described in my paper) in two rows alternately on either side of a contractile axis, we shall see that when the axis is allowed to contract with a twist, that twist is necessarily limited by the conditions of contact which arise, and that we cannot "cause it to make a complete rotation if we choose." Given the size of the balls and their distance from the axis, the position which they will assume (under contraction with a twist) is necessarily determined by the geometrical conditions of mutual contact. This consideration furnishes the answer to Mr. Henslow's italicised query, and also to his two previous questions (1) and (2). It also gives back a "really explanatory meaning" to my expression "*maxima* of stability," for if we have one sphere standing almost vertically on another and supported by a third and a fourth to right and left, we have therein some statical conditions which admit of maxima and minima of stability. The same consideration also removes the objection that "the positions taken up by the balls must be arbitrary, or at least in proportion to the twist given by the hand—a perfectly arbitrary force." The twist given by the hand in my experiment serves only to determine the direction of the real twist; the subsequent real availing twist is insisted upon by the two ranks of balls-in-contact as the sole condition of obedience to the contractile force of the indiarubber axis; and this twist is limited by the conditions of contact above described. Let the direction of the twist be given, and there is nothing arbitrary in the result.

The objection that "if an axis becomes twisted the *fibres* will be twisted also" loses force if we bear in mind that the leaf-order is imposed upon the embryo leaves in the very earliest stage of their bud-life; and that the formation of fibres, taking place at a subsequent stage, must find itself compromised by an already existing arrangement of the embryo leaves. The elastic band in my experiment, "if it were a pliant shoot," would certainly "contort the vessels and wood-fibres;" but it was not meant to represent a "pliant shoot" except in its earliest embryonic bud-stage, and that at some very remote period in the past.

I must ask Mr. Henslow to bear in mind that he has before him only the abstract of my paper, and that necessary brevity has left some points too bare, and has wholly suppressed others of small importance. Among the latter is some mention of the "secondary series" $\frac{1}{3}$, $\frac{1}{4}$, $\frac{2}{7}$, &c., which, though it may be found in the abnormal variations exhibited by a cultivated plant like the Jerusalem Artichoke, yet cannot be reckoned with examples of normal leaf-order.

Let me take this opportunity of insisting again on the astonishing agreement between the facts of nature and the results which the condensation-theory leads us to expect. Taking one member to start from as 0, we find in nature that the members in contact with 0 belong to the following series, 1, 2, 3, 5, 8, 13, 21, 34, 55, 89, 144, &c, and these are the very same members which would necessarily be brought into contact with 0 under successive degrees of condensation with twist from an original order $\frac{1}{2}$.

I have lately met with a striking confirmation of the truth of the condensation-theory. The simplest order of the whorled type is that in which the leaves stand in pairs, decussate. Now if we consider what would be the result of condensation with twist applied to this arrangement, we can see that it would produce a new series of orders, in which the following members would successively come into contact with 0,—2, 4, 6, 10, 16, 26, 42, &c., and would present the phenomenon of 2, 4, 6, 10, &c., spirals alternately to right and left. This result is exemplified in nature. The teazle (*Dipsacus silvestris*) has the decussate order in its leaves; and in its head (where we might expect to find its leaf-order condensed) we count sixteen conspicuous spirals in one direction and twenty-six in the other:—that is to say, we have 0 in contact with No. 16 on one side and No. 26 on the other. No. 42 stands higher between 16 and 26, but inclined towards the former. No. 10 stands next below 26, and No. 6 next below 16. These numbers belong to the new series above mentioned.

This close parallel between fact and theory appears to me to give a value to the latter which it will not lightly lose.

March 30 HUBERT AIRY

The Hegelian Calculus

AS Dr. J. H. Stirling has enjoyed the exceptional privilege of replying contemporaneously to my paper on Hegel in the