condensed tables for alkaloids and gases, which are, however, in themselves very good ones. It is to be feared that these practical books tend to make students mere analytical machines in a small way, without giving them much real practical notion of chemistry. It is questionable whether a student who has worked through the modern tabular system of practical chemistry would be able, for instance, to state the reason for the employment of bricks in preference to chalk for the back of an ordinary fireplace or some equally simple practical question.

Elementary Chemical Arithmetic. By Sidney Lupton· (London: Macmillan and Co., 1882.)

THIS little book with its modest preface will be recognised by all teachers of chemistry, especially in large laboratory classes, and also by students as a really useful adjunct.

Unfortunately in large public laboratories a considerable proportion of the students have been very much neglected in the matter of their elementary mathematical education, or it has been of such a nature that they are not able to apply it to the solution of ordinary chemical problems, thus entailing, in many cases, a large amount of extra work and loss of time on the part of the teacher in giving instruction in elementary arithmetic. This book fits into its place exactly. It is divided into two main portions: an introduction, consisting of short but very understandable explanations of arithmetical processes in common demand in chemistry and physical chemistry of a practical and elementary nature, the second portion being problems divided under the headings of the different elements. Regarding these it may perhaps be said that they do not err on the side of being too chemical, and in one or two cases more attention has been given to the question as a question than to its absolute chemical correctness, but these are mere details that in no way detract from the utility of the book for its purpose.

What is required of the mass of chemical students is that they should be able to apply methods of reasoning founded on experimental facts in the science to the solution of concrete and abstract problems; and working through this book will certainly conduce to bring about an improvement in that direction.

The Watch and Clockmaker's Handbook. By F. J. Britten. (London: Kent and Co., 1881.)

THIS little book has been written, we are informed, chiefly for the instruction of country watchmakers. It cannot fail to be agreeable to them: it contains a great deal of useful practical information, and some is given of a higher quality, such as workmen are, to their credit, eager for now-a-days. To another and wider circle there is also much of a character to be interesting. The book is a proper supplement to the more popular horological treatises. There are good descriptions and pleasing diagrams of the various watch escapements; there is a chapter upon the art of springing; the mechanism of chronographs, repeating watches, and calendars is shown, but almost too briefly. Lastly, we find pictures and a short reference to the various tools which watchmakers employ, and some serviceable memoranda are added. Upon the whole the author has and deserves our praise.

H. DENT GARDNER

Heroes of Science. Botanists, Zoologists, and Geologists. By Prof. P. Martin Duncan, F.R.S., F.L.S. (London: The Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1882.)

THIS little volume contains brief sketches of the lives of a few botanists, zoologists, and geologists, for the most part acknowledged compilations from well-known sources. No doubt the work will serve the purpose for which it is evidently intended—that of interesting young people in science.

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. No notice is taken of anonymous communications.*]

[*The Editor urgently requests correspondents to keep their letters as short as possible. The pressure on his space is so great that it is impossible otherwise to ensure the appearance even of communications containing interesting and novel facts.*]

Physics of the Earth's Crust

ON March 23 last Prof. Green sent to NATURE some remarks upon Mr. Hill's review of my "Physics of the Earth's Crust." More lately the third edition of his "Physical Geology" has appeared, in which he has repeated the substance of a part of what he then wrote. On account of the great weight which his authority will carry, I think I should offer some reply.

He truly says at p. 674, that I claim to have proved that the contraction of the earth through cooling cannot have caused the amount of squeezing and elevation which has taken place, and that the hypothesis is therefore insufficient to explain the facts which it professes to account for; but he then adds: "What Mr. Fisher has really done is this. His calculations go far to prove that, provided the earth cooled in the way assumed by Sir Wm. Thomson, contraction would not suffice to produce anything like the compression and elevation that has actually occurred. But this is quite another thing from disproving the contraction hypothesis. Mr. Fisher's investigations tend rather to establish a strong probability that the earth did not cool in the way supposed by Sir Wm. Thomson,"—that is, that it became solid throughout in a comparatively short space of time. But of course my calculations do not establish any probability against this way of cooling, unless we begin by assuming that contraction through cooling has been the cause of the elevations. And that seems to be begging the question. What they do prove is that the contraction hypothesis will not account for the elevations if the earth has cooled as a solid.

But there may have been another way of cooling which, on geological grounds, I believe to have beeen the true one. The earth may not have become solid throughout in a short space of time, and may not be solid even now. In that case the crust, whose corrugations we have to account for, must have floated on a denser liquid substratum. Under these circumstances every elevation above the mean level must have had a corresponding protuberance answering to it below. This is necessary, as was long ago pointed out by Sir G. B. Airy. I have, then, proved that, this being so, if the crust beneath the ocean is of the same density as beneath the continents, on what I conceive to be reasonable assumptions regarding the thickness and density of the crust and the density of the substratum, a shortening of the earth's radius by less than 700 miles would not have sufficed to produce the existing inequalities. I can imagine no theory of the constitution of the interior that would admit of so large an amount of contraction taking place, after the whole had become sufficiently cool for a crust to have begun to be formed, as to cause such an amount of shortening as this.

If, however, we suppose that the crust beneath the oceans is denser than that which forms the continents (and I have given several reasons for believing such to be the case), then a much smaller amount of radial shortening would suffice. I have estimated it at about forty-two miles. Still, anything near this shortening is far beyond what any reasonable amount of contraction from cooling could produce. For if there be a liquid substratum this must be of nearly equable temperature throughout, and that cannot be much above the temperature of solidification; so that it does not appear how a much greater contraction can be got out of the gradual solidification, and incorporation of the upper parts of the liquid layer with the crust, than could be obtained on the former supposition of a cooling solid globe; and I have shown that, in that case, the radial shortening would be less than two miles.

Thus, then, I claim to have disproved the contraction-hypothesis under the two alternative hypotheses (1) of a solid globe, and (2) of a liquid substratum.

Capt. Dutton, of the United States Geological Survey, has said of this part of my work, "First and foremost he has rendered most effectual service in utterly destroying the hypothesis, which attributes the deformations of the strata and earth's crust to interior contraction by secular cooling. No person, it seems to me, can sufficiently master the cardinal points of his