

that he has not been entrapped by the advertisement of a new patent remedy. Mr. Horner appears to be entitled to the credit of having arrived twenty-five years ago at the now fashionable doctrine that man is essentially a behaving animal—or, as he expresses it, that “man’s life is made up simply of a series of acts”—and of having anticipated the Pragmatists in the deduction “that acts form the only proper basis of philosophy.” Unfortunately, he has shown in these pages no competence to construct upon this basis anything with which, even in these hard times, philosophy should be asked to allow her name to be connected.

The More Important Insects Injurious to Indian Agriculture. Memoirs of the Department of Agriculture in India, vol. 1., No. 2, Ento. Ser. Pp. 139+v; 80 figures. By H. Maxwell-Jeffrey. (Pusa: Agricultural Research Institute, 1907.) Price Rs. 3.

THE above-named paper is a very excellent foundation for the young entomologist in India to work upon. The chief insects known to be injurious to crops in India are briefly described in systematic order.

The method of treatment of this subject is novel, and might well be copied by others compiling similar lists.

The technical name of each pest is given, and then one or two references of interest and a short, concise description of the insect follows. Short notes of the distribution, biology and food plants are appended, and finally the writer’s opinion as to the status of the insect as a pest. A large number of the adults are figured, and in a few instances the larvæ also.

Showing the backward state of economic entomology in India is the fact that only four aphides are placed in this list. A sound foundation is, however, being laid, and we are glad to learn that a supplementary list is to follow when the material is available. In all 131 pests are dealt with, some of which are well known in Europe, such as the diamond-back moth, the turnip moth (*Agrotis segetis*), the large cabbage white, convolvulus hawk moth, the corn aphid, cabbage aphid, and thistle aphid. F. V. T.

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.]

The “Friar’s Heel” or “Sun Stone.”

In an old number of *Notes and Queries* (4, v. 598) E. Dunkin asks “why the ‘Friar’s Heel’ at Stonehenge is so named,” and the only answer I can find in the bibliography of Stonehenge (*Wilts Archaeological Magazine*, vol. xxxii.) is as follows:—“It may have been called the Heel stone,” observes Prof. Flinders Petrie, “from A.S. *helan*, to hide or conceal, just as a cromlech at Portisham, Dorset, is called the ‘Hel-stone.’”

The word *Heal* or *Hele* is used in N. Wiltshire in this sense. “When the ground is dry and hard and the wheat when sown does not sink in and get covered up at once, it is said not to *heal well*” (Dartnell and Goddard, “Glossary of Wiltshire Words,” 1893), but this meaning is more applicable to the cromlech than to the upright stone at Stonehenge.

Modern researches as to the date of the erection at Stonehenge point to a time when a Celtic word rather than an A.S. word would have been in use, and it has occurred to me that the word *Heol*, which is the Breton word for the Sun, may be an explanation of the name of the stone in question, as it is the stone used for the observation of the rising sun at Midsummer. It would be

interesting to learn from Celtic scholars what equivalent Celtic word was in use in Britain when *Heol* was the word used in Brittany, and whether *Heol* or *Hel* would be the Cornish form of the Welsh word for the sun. The Rev. J. Griffith tells me “that *houl* is the oldest Welsh form of the word—then *heil*, and now in literary Welsh *haul*.”

The foolish mediæval legend of the devil flinging the stone at a mocking friar and hitting him on the heel is evidently of very late date, but it is singular that a similar legend is attached to the “Hel Stone” in Dorsetshire, where the story is that the devil, playing at quoits in the island of Portland, flung the Hel Stone across to Portisham (see Hutchings’ “Dorset,” i., 554).

There is another Hel Stone near, so called in common with the cromlech at Portisham, and it stands in a smallcombe to the north of Long Bredy hut; it is a rude mass about 7 feet high and 7 feet wide, whilst the capstone of the cromlech at Portisham is 10 feet by 7 feet by 2½ feet (Warne’s “Ancient Dorset,” pp. 111–135).

By the time the legends of the “Friar’s Heel” and Hel Stone were invented, the old language would have been a thing of the past, but possibly the old name lingered in the memory of men wholly ignorant of its significance, giving rise to the traditions.

October 4.

T. STORY MASKELYNE.

The Double Drift Theory of Star Motions.

PROF. J. C. CHAMBERLIN’S planetesimal hypothesis has given geologists a great deal of matter for thought, and on the whole the phenomena with which they are acquainted appear to fall into line when the earth is considered as a body that has always been solid. The cosmical aspect of the question, which Prof. Chamberlin introduced in advancing his hypothesis, geologists are unable to judge, and they are waiting until astronomers give them an opinion before adopting the hypothesis on the larger scale. On the planetesimal hypothesis our stellar system is a disc the edge of which is the Milky Way; beyond lies another stellar system, the so-called nebula in Andromeda; for all the most distant stars in the neighbourhood of the nebula appear to be this side of the luminous disc. If our stellar system is of the same nature as that of the nebula in Andromeda, then it must be a spiral nebula with two equivalent arms originating from a central core and winding spirally round the centre in approximately the same plane. Suppose our sun had experienced a gravitational drag and was moving at a less rate than the general average of the other stars, or suppose its spiral course was steeper than the general average, and hence its angular velocity less, then an observer regarding the rest of our stellar system from our planet would see the stars near the centre of the spiral travelling in two directions, those on this side of the centre travelling from right to left, and those on the other side in the reverse direction. Is this not a possible explanation of Prof. J. C. Kapteyn’s double-drift theory of star motions? It explains why the two systems travelling in opposite directions should be of equal composition and proportions, but it necessitates that in the region of the sky opposite to that in which the double drift has been observed the drift should be simple.

The explanation also presupposes that our stellar system was once more closely aggregated, and because there is no central core to our system it must be of less bulk than that of the nebula of Andromeda. The two stellar systems, once consisting of closely packed stars and more or less spherical, travelling in opposite directions and approaching each other within reach of the action of gravitation, would have experienced disruption, each throwing out equal equatorial prominences on the same principle as that which produces the tidal bulges. On the nearer approach of the two systems to each other, the smaller of the two, our stellar system, would have experienced the entire disruption which has reduced it to the tenuity which it exhibits, whereas the larger stellar system, the nebula in Andromeda, would have been enabled to keep its central core. ERNEST H. L. SCHWARZ.

Rhodes University College, Grahamstown, Cape of Good Hope, September 12.