

tion for them. To invent names for the pound-foot-second units may be helpful to beginners; but it is a small matter compared with a notation which completely specifies the mode of dependence of each unit upon the pound, foot, and second; and it is still more so when compared with a general notation which will serve for any system of units.

The difference between names and notation is well seen in the case of chemistry. The notation for a substance expresses the manner in which the substance is made up of the elementary substances; while its name, however derived, serves merely as a distinguishing mark; and just as the chemical notation for a substance may be used as a name for the substance, so the notation for a physical unit may serve as a name for that unit.

In my work on "Physical Arithmetic," published by Macmillan and Co. in 1885, and reviewed in NATURE, vol. xxxi. p. 551, I have devised a notation which is the natural and legitimate extension of existing conventions both in language and in the mathematics; and I have made that notation the basis of a method for solving problems in applied arithmetic. If the Committee of the Association for the Improvement of Geometrical Teaching are considering the subject, I ask them to consider whether any notation more in harmony with existing conventions can be devised than the notation of that work.

As a specimen I append the general notation for the chief geometrical, kinematical, and dynamical units. The word *by* corresponds to \times , and the word *per* to \div , or $/$ as now frequently used by physicists. The same method of notation applies to the thermal and electrical units. The notation for any special system is obtained by substituting the special names of the fundamental units **L**, **M**, **T**. The test of the value of a notation is the amount of facility it offers in reasoning; by referring to "Physical Arithmetic," anyone may see how this notation stands the test.

NOTATION FOR GENERAL UNITS.

Quantity.	Notation.	Dimensions.
I. Geometrical.		
Length	L	l
Surface	L by L = S	l^2
Volume	L by L by L = V	l^3
Angle	L arc per L radius	l^0
Sine	L opposite per L along	l^0
Curvature	Radian per L arc	l^{-1}
II. Kinematical.		
Time	T	t
Velocity	L per T	lt^{-1}
Acceleration	L per T per T	lt^{-2}
Angular velocity	L arc per L radius per T	t^{-1}
III. Dynamical.		
Mass	M	m
Density	M per V	ml^{-3}
Mass-vector	M by L	ml
Momentum	M by L per T	mlt^{-1}
Force	M by L per T per T = F	mlt^{-2}
Pressure	F per S	$ml^{-1}t^{-2}$
Work	F by L = W	ml^2t^{-2}
Activity	W per T	ml^2t^{-3}

ALEXANDER MACFARLANE.

Austin, Texas, May 28.

The New Degrees at Cambridge.

A FEW years ago it pleased the dominant body in the University of Cambridge to institute a Doctorate of Science and of Letters. Candidates for these new degrees were required to be of a certain academical standing, and to submit the proofs of their qualifications to the respective Special Boards of Studies, who, after certain formalities, were empowered to forward their claims to the General Board of Studies for approval. By many well-meaning persons this step was thought to be a great encouragement to both letters and science. It was at the same time understood that the qualification for the Doctorate in Science was to be rather less than was required for admission to the Royal Society—a standard which all will admit is not too high. Whether any similar understanding was agreed

upon as regards the Doctorate in Literature is uncertain. At first there was no particular desire shown among the best men of science and literature to aspire to the new distinction, and it is rumoured that a considerable amount of persuasion and friendly pressure had to be used to induce such men to submit to the infliction. But in time a few leading lights underwent the ordeal and were duly invested. The way being cleared, a good many others have followed, and as the Boards have not been too severe in judging the claims of candidates, the outbreak of "scarletina" has become rather general. However, no particular harm has ensued, and the coffers of the University have reaped the benefit—for the fee is not small.

But now there is another aspect to this business. The new Doctorate is inferior in rank to that of the old Faculties. The senior Doctor in Science or Letters must always yield precedence to the youngest Doctor in Divinity, Law, or Physics. So far, those who have sought the new degrees have known what their position would be; but of late the Council of Senate has taken upon itself to determine that when an honorary degree should be given to any distinguished man of science or letters he is not to have the higher degree of LL.D., but to be content with the lower rank. As a rule honorary degrees are almost invariably given to strangers—foreigners or colonists. They are not aware of this fine though real distinction; and thus this very day the Senate House at Cambridge has witnessed the time honoured and highly valued distinction of LL.D. being conferred on a number of excellent gentlemen, beginning with the Lord Mayor of London, while the new and inferior rank of Sc.D. is bestowed on one of the most distinguished biologists of the United States, whom the sister University is this week to recognize as a D.C.L.

It may be urged that proceedings like this are necessary to reflect the proper amount of dignity on the new "honour," and that in time it will be regarded as highly as the old one has been. But I submit that this is not fair to the innocent recipients, and, moreover, that the University should recognize the fact that its highest honours are not to be bestowed upon successful merchants, politicians, and persons of eminent social standing, while the greatest men of letters and science have to take up with the lower grade.

June 20.

"After-Glows" at Helensburgh.

I BEG to inclose a letter from Mr. L. P. Muirhead, with reference to the "after-glows" recently seen at Helensburgh, which you may think worthy of a place in NATURE.

ROBERT H. SCOTT.

Meteorological Office, 116 Victoria Street, London, S.W.,
June 8.

Rosemount, Helensburgh, June 4, 1887, 21h.

DEAR SIR,—I do not notice any remarks in any of the weather reports or in the press concerning the after-glows, and as they may be local only, I drop you a line. All have lasted about 45m.; the first of any note, on the 17th, commencing well down on the eastern, and finally fading away on the western, horizon, all through of a deep rosy red reflected from the under and western side of cirro-stratus. Again, on May 21, 23, 29, 30, 31, and June 1. The last was peculiar, not only as being the most lurid, the cloudscape being marvellously fantastic, but, dying away at 21h., it revived faintly at 21h. 18m. to 21h. 30m., and again from 22h. to 22h. 20m., of a decided rose-colour on western side of roll-cumulus coming up from east-north-east. Thursday, Friday, and to-night there is no glow; overcast and oppressive just now; a little rain fell in forenoon. The glow reminds me, on a more intense scale, of that previous to January 26, 1884, and again on December 8 last year.

From May 21, until to day, the weather has been genial and fine.

Faithfully yours,

LEWIS P. MUIRHEAD.

R. H. Scott, Esq., Meteorological Office, London.

Zirconia.

SOMEHOW I overlooked for a few days the letter of Messrs. Hopkin and Williams, which necessitates a brief reply, since they have confused (I am sure from mere haste) two samples, one of which I never had, and a correspondence most of which took place after what I had recorded.

Briefly, these are the facts. I was informed by Mr. T. Bolas that I could obtain "pure zirconia" of Messrs. Hopkin and

Williams at a certain price. This seemed to me so low that I asked them about it, when they did inform me that the reason was its occurring as a by-product. Nothing whatever was then said, however, about being "impure"; on the contrary, they inclosed two small fragments, one of which they said they sold as "pure," and the other (at half price) as "impure." The last was a light yellow-brown colour, and I never meddled with it; of the other I purchased an ounce for trial. On finding so much silica and soda I wrote them reporting, and asking if the sample was reduced by the hyposulphite process, as Dr. Draper had mentioned the difficulty of getting a pure product in that way. They replied that hyposulphite was used, and that the "pure" sample might possibly contain soda, but they thought not silica; the other sample might contain soda, silica, and probably iron. I wrote again pointing out that oxyhydrogen illumination was the most likely use for the product, and asking if they could not purify it further at an enhanced price, when they declined, as they state.

The difference is, that all this took place *after* I had purchased and tested the sample, and reported to them upon it. I inclose you copy of their price list of 1886, still later, in which you will see that "zirconium oxide" still appears without qualification; and I also forward the original bottle and label which I received from them—the latter you will perceive is "pure zirconia." The correspondence, if sent you in full, will bear out all the details above.

At the same time I would say that I had not the least idea of impugning in any way Messrs. Hopkin and Williams. I simply pointed out, as reference will show, the *generally* unsatisfactory character of samples considered commercially "pure" (one never expects ordinary purchased articles "pure" in any other sense) for one special purpose, and I much regret that their letter necessitates this correction.

LEWIS WRIGHT.

P.S.—I am sorry to add that my previous letter has not elicited any very satisfactory information, or real aid towards the desired object. I learn from Mr. Cottrell that Du Motay's cylinders were unquestionably more durable than any prepared since, even with the aid of Prof. Maskelyne. But I am as unable as ever to come across one, or to find exactly how the material was prepared, or what light it gave in comparison with limes.

THE JUBILEE.

II.

WE have already referred to some aspects of the Jubilee which have a special relation to science, and we shall soon have occasion to return to the subject. In the meantime we reprint from the *Times* an admirable passage which presents a striking confirmation of the opinions we have expressed as to the true place of science in the history of the past fifty years. The passage is from the "Jubilee Retrospect" which appeared in the *Times* on Tuesday last:—

"The keynote of the Victorian era is the development of scientific research, the concomitant growth of practical invention, and the expansion of industry which these have brought about. Other ages have been fruitful of profound scientific conceptions, or have been illustrated by great inventions and discoveries, but it would be difficult to point to any half-century in the history of the world in which equal progress in speculative science has been combined with anything approaching to the magnitude, variety, and importance of the applications of science to practical ends which distinguish the present reign. It is as true to-day as at any former period that nothing great can be done in pure science save by men who make the discovery of truth the sole aim of their efforts, and who prize no other reward. But it is no less true that abstract and applied science go hand in hand as they never did before, and that each owns enormous obligations to the other. For if the triumphs of the workshop have been achieved by means of the discoveries made in the laboratory, on the other hand the laboratory depends for every step of its advance upon the technical skill and hitherto unrivalled precision of the workshop. Physical science has reached a stage at which the verification of its hypotheses and the supply of new data for its specula-

tions demand appliances of extraordinary excellence, and in many cases a collation of experience and experiment which nothing but the practical inventions of the age could render possible. It is doubtless to the co-ordination of the two forms of intellectual activity that we owe the rapidity of recent advance. An unprecedentedly large army of inquirers has simultaneously pushed the interrogation of nature in a thousand directions, and has attained unprecedented results. But beside them has been working an army larger, and equally keen, of men eagerly seeking to utilize for practical ends every crumb of available information, and giving to scientific ideas a concrete application which often forms the starting-point for new processes of scientific induction.

"The fundamental conceptions of the material universe entertained by educated men have been revolutionized during the last fifty years. The simple atomic theory of the older chemistry has given place to a molecular theory, which itself has undergone considerable development. The outlines of the elements which the older chemistry accepted as an ultimate analysis are melting under the gaze of the spectroscopist, who across the haze of their wavering figures catches glimpses of a simple primal matter. The evolution of matter is, however, like the evolution of living forms, a philosophical conception which must always rest rather upon the general necessities of thought than upon actual experiment. The immutability of certain forms of matter in all the conditions that we can devise or have any experience of is as absolute as the persistence of specific types in the animal or vegetable kingdom. The most refractory substances have been vaporized in the electric arc, and the most attenuated gases have assumed the solid form under the combined influence of intense cold and enormous pressure. But we have made no nearer approach to actual evidence either of material evolution or of the complexity of the so-called elements than may be inferred from certain spectroscopic observations of the sun and some experiments tending to show that in some cases we have confounded two or more very similar elements under one name. Apart, however, from these abstruse speculations, the whole tendency of physical and chemical investigation has been to bridge the gulf formerly fixed between molar and molecular motion and between chemical and mechanical force. There is an obvious interdependence between this scientific movement and the doctrine of the conservation of energy, which is one of the main philosophical achievements of the epoch under discussion. According to that doctrine, the total energy of any body or system of bodies is a quantity as absolutely fixed and as incapable of suffering either increase or diminution as the matter of which these bodies are composed. Energy, like matter, may assume an endless variety of forms; but the force put forth by the locomotive is as indestructible as the particles which compose its framework or its fuel. But to balance our account we have to take cognizance not only of the forces of impact or pressure of which we have direct experience, and conceive ourselves to have tolerably full understanding, but also of the forces of attraction and repulsion in their various forms, concerning which we as yet know absolutely nothing beyond the fact of their existence as inferred from their effects. To refer the whole complex sum of these energies to a general law, and to deal with them on fundamental physical and mathematical principles, is the aim of the physical science of to-day. Notwithstanding all superficial resemblances, it stands differentiated from the science of all past ages by the clearness with which it apprehends the nature of this quest and the unrivalled range of the analytical methods it has brought to bear. In the domain of biology the theory of evolution, first placed upon a scientific basis by the genius of Darwin, is a product of the same great movement of philosophic thought which brought forth the molecular theory of matter and the doctrine of the conservation of