Prof. Flower and the able heads of departments, for all of whom I have the greatest respect; and I am further convinced that much credit is due to them for doing the very utmost that is possible under the circumstances of the case. My strictures on the Museum were intended to apply solely and exclusively to the fundamental *principle* underlying its arrangement, which principle is embodied in the new building as in the old one. I contrasted strongly the principle of moderate-sized rooms as compared with large galleries,—the principle of exhibiting, to the public, on the one hand, strictly limited typical collections; on the other, almost complete series of species,—the principle of making a geographical arrangement the main feature of a museum, as compared with that in which almost no provision at all is made for such an arrangement.

I had always understood that for this fundamental system of arrangement neither the present Director nor the heads of departments of the Museum were in any way responsible, and that in criticising it frankly I should not be considered to reflect on them. So clear was I in my own mind that I was discussing this general system only, that I used some expressions which I now see, with much regret, were capable of being misunderstood. After referring to some of the improvements in the New British Museum, I say, "but the great bulk of the collection still consists of the old specimens exhibited in the old way in an interminable series of overcrowded wall-cases, while all attempt at any effective presentation of the various aspects and problems of natural history as now understood is as far off as ever." To the latter part of this sentence, Prof. Flower objects, as not recognizing the many improvements recently made and still making; but I intended it to apply, as I think the whole context of my article shows, to the *system* and the *building*, which themselves, from the point of view I have taken throughout the article, render any attempt at an "effective" presentation of these aspects and problems impossible. Again, at the end of my article I speak of Prof. Agassiz having said that he intended his museum "to illustrate the history of creation as far as the present state of scientific knowledge reveals that history," and then go on: "It is surely an anomaly that the naturalist who was most opposed to the theory of evolution should be the first to arrange his museum in such a way as best to illustrate that theory, while in the land of Darwin no step has been taken to escape from the monotonous routine of one great systematic series of crowded specimens arranged in lofty halls and palatial galleries, which may excite wonder, but which are calculated to teach no definite lesson." Here I was referring to the fact that the new Museum at South Kensington was constructed and arranged substantially on the same lines as the old one at Bloomsbury, and regretting that the only effective step towards inaugurating a new system of arrangement was not then taken. Prof. Flower, I find, thinks that I imply that no steps are being taken now to render the Museum more instructive and generally interesting. This was very far from my meaning, and I am exceedingly sorry that such an interpretation of my words should have been possible. I visited the Museum several times last summer before leaving for America, and I noted many improvements that were being introduced in all departments; but I could not fail to see that the main principle of the arrangement, both of the building itself and of the collections in it, had not been changed, and it was to this that all my criticisms were directed.

Godalming, September 22. ALFRED R. WALLACE.

The Law of Error.

MR. F. Y. EDGEWORTH has, in NATURE of September 22 (p. 482), replied to Dr. Venn's letter from the mathematical standpoint; perhaps a few words from the meteorological side may not be out of place. The gist of Dr. Venn's remarks lies in his statement that the law of error applies to cases where there are "equal and opposite independent disturbing causes" (September 1, p. 412). Now, the excess and defect of barometrical pressure from the average, depend mainly on anticyclones and cyclones respectively, which though in many respects opposite in character are by no means equal, the latter being much more intense than the former; and there is no reason in the nature of the case why they should be equal, as many of their characteristics are so dissimilar.

As regards the second instance given by Dr. Venn, the chief factor in the variations of temperature at different times of the year is the varying declination of the sun, the rate of change of declination passing through two minima yearly—namely, at the solstices, so named for this very reason. One would naturally expect that about these times the temperature should remain more nearly the same than about the equinoxes; Dr. Venn's curve would consequently give two maxima. The deviations of the temperature of each *day* from the average would not be unlikely to conform to the law of error, but it is evident that a curve formed from the temperatures for the whole year would be of a totally different kind. T. W. BACKHOUSE.

Sunderland, September 26.

Lunar Rainbows.

ON Sunday night, August 28, a lunar rainbow was visible here. As the occurrence seems to be uncommon, some particulars may interest your readers.

We had a very heavy shower before 11 o'clock, with a south-west wind. The rain left off suddenly, as it began, a few minutes past 11; and as the heavy cloud moved away to the north-east it left a gloriously clear sky behind, with the moon, then a little past its first quarter, shining brightly a few degrees above a heavy bank of cloud which lay on the horizon. Looking out of a window on the opposite side of the house, I had the satisfaction of seeing a complete pale white bow in the black cloud to the north-east, which lasted very clear and distinct for about five minutes, when it quickly grew faint as the bank of clouds on the horizon began to rise and obscure the falling moon. The outer edge of the bow was well defined against the intense black of the cloud beyond; the inner edge was much less distinct, and the area within was covered with a slight suffused light, which, however, appeared to diminish as the distance from the bow increased.

The drops of rain were unusually large, and the downpour, while it lasted, was extraordinarily heavy.

A. F. GRIFFITH.

15 Buckingham Place, Brighton, September 22.

A LUNAR rainbow was visible here shortly after 11 o'clock last night. It extended without break through three-quarters of a semicircle, the top of the arch being about 60° high. In colour the bow resembled a moonbeam shining between two clouds, and its brightness was sufficient to cause it to be immediately detected by a casual glance, in spite of the presence of numerous white clouds occupying its centre. The sky just outside the bow appeared darkest, probably by contrast with these clouds. Ten minutes elapsed before the rainbow faded.

Rock Ferry, September 27. S. J. H.

The Perception of Colour.

IS Mr. Stromeyer sure that the observations he made (see NATURE, July 14, p. 246) prove any difference in the rapidity of perception of colour, and that they do not rather show a difference in perception of brightness? It is well known that faint objects are not so quickly perceived as bright ones (see Webb's "Celestial Objects," p. 368 of the 4th edition, under ϵ Pegasi); and as the violet end of the spectrum is much fainter than the rest, the effect described would be produced by the difference in brightness apart from the difference in colour. I have tried Mr. Stromeyer's experiment of rotating the spectrum, and it appears to me that the red as well as the violet end lags behind the middle; though as the red is so much shorter, this is more difficult to see. T. W. BACKHOUSE.

Sunderland, September 15.

Tertiary Outliers on the North Downs.

IN August of last year (NATURE, vol. xxxiv. p. 341), I ventured to draw a distinction between the *unfossiliferous sands* found at certain places on the North Downs and the fossiliferous deposits at Lenham. For reasons assigned, I suggested a certain degree of probability of their being of Bagshot age, and indicating a former extension by overlap of the higher beds of that important Eocene formation. This summer I have had opportunities of examining all the principal outliers referred to; and I must say that I am strongly impressed with the Bagshot character of these unfossiliferous sands, and of the well-rolled flint pebbles associated with them, in some cases (as at Headley) in great quantity. I speak only of those which can be identified with

some degree of certainty as Tertiary beds *in situ*. The sands at Netley Heath and at Chipstead have a remarkable *Upper* Bagshot facies. Those at Headley do not present such a strong character in this respect, but I have no hesitation in referring them on lithological grounds to the Bagshot series.

Wellington College, Berks, September 27. A. IRVING.

MODERN VIEWS OF ELECTRICITY.[1]

PART I.

I.

IT is often said that we do not know what electricity is, and there is a considerable amount of truth in the statement. It is not so true, however, as it was some twenty years ago. Some things are beginning to be known about it; and though modern views are tentative, and may well require modification, nevertheless some progress has been made. I shall endeavour in this lecture to set forth as best I may the position of thinkers on electrical subjects at the present time.

It will at once strike you that the whole subject of electricity as at present known is too gigantic for anyone to make an attempt to compass it in a single lecture, even though he assume on the part of his audience a perfect acquaintance with all the ordinary phenomena; and you will admit that it is much better to limit one's self definitely at the beginning to some one branch than by attempting too broad and discursive a survey to risk slurring the whole and becoming totally unintelligible.

I begin by saying that the whole subject of electricity is divisible for purposes of classification into four great branches.

(1) Electricity at rest, or static electricity: wherein are studied all the phenomena belonging to stresses and strains in insulating or dielectric media brought about by the neighbourhood of electric charges or electrified bodies at rest immersed therein; together with the modes of exciting such electric charges and the laws of their interactions.

(2) Electricity in locomotion, or current electricity: wherein are discussed all the phenomena set up in metallic conductors, in chemical compounds, and in dielectric media, by the passage of electricity through them; together with the modes of setting electricity in continuous motion and the laws of its flow.

(3) Electricity in rotation, or magnetism: wherein are discussed the phenomena belonging to electricity in whirling or vortex motion, the modes of exciting such whirls, the stresses and strains produced by them, and the laws of their interaction.

(4) Electricity in vibration, or radiation: wherein are discussed the propagation of periodic or undulatory disturbances through various kinds of media, the laws regulating wave velocity, wave-length, reflection, interference, dispersion, polarization, and a multitude of phenomena studied for a long time under the heading "Light." Although this is the most abstruse and difficult portion of electrical science, a certain fraction of it has been known to us longer than any other branch, and has been studied under special advantages, because of our happening to possess a special sense-organ for its appreciation.

Now, with some qualms of regret I have decided to refrain from speaking to you about any one of these great and comprehensive groups except the first. It is hopeless to attempt more; and even the small portion of that on which I shall touch will tax the time at our disposal to the utmost, and I must assume acquaintance with the elementary facts in order to proceed to their elucidation.

The great names in connexion with our progress in knowledge as to the real nature of electricity, irrespective of a mere study and extension of its known facts, are

FRANKLIN, CAVENDISH, FARADAY, MAXWELL.

To these, indeed, you may feel impelled to add the tremendous name of THOMSON; but one has some delicacy in attempting to estimate the work of living philosophers, and as Maxwell has been very explicit in acknowledging his indebtedness to his illustrious contemporary, whose work will in the course of nature have to be criticised and appraised by far abler hands than mine and by the philosophers of generations yet unborn, we may well afford to abstain from minute considerations and accept for the present the name of Maxwell as representative of the great English school of mathematical physicists, under whose influence, Cambridge, in the pride of having reared them, is awaking to new and energetic scientific life, and whose splendid achievements will shine out in the future as the glory of this century.

The views concerning electrification which I shall try to explain are in some sense a development of those originally propounded by that most remarkable man, Benjamin Franklin. The accurate and acute experimenting of Cavendish laid the foundation for the modern theory of electricity; but, as he worked for himself rather than for the race, and as moreover he was in this matter far in advance of his time, Faraday had to go over the same ground again, with extensions and additions peculiar to himself and corresponding to the greater field of information at his disposal three-quarters of a century later. Both these men, and especially Faraday, so lived among phenomena that they yielded up their hidden secrets to them in a way unintelligible to ordinary workers; but while they themselves arrived at truth by processes that savour of intuition, they were unable always to express themselves intelligibly to their contemporaries and to make the inner meaning of their facts and speculations understood. Then comes Maxwell, with his keen penetration and great grasp of thought combined with mathematical subtlety and power of expression; he assimilates the facts, sympathizes with the philosophic but untutored modes of expression invented by Faraday, links the theorems of Green and Stokes and Thomson to the facts of Faraday, and from the union there arises the young modern science of electricity, whose infancy at the present time is so vigorous and so promising that we are all looking forward to the near future in eager hope and expectation of some greater and still more magnificent generalization.

You know well that there have been fluid or material theories of electricity for the past century; you know, moreover, that there has been a reaction against them. There was even a tendency a few years back to deny the material nature of electricity and assert its position as a form of energy. This was doubtless due to an analogical and natural, though unjustifiable, feeling that just as sound and heat and light had shown themselves to be forms of energy so in due time would electricity also. If such were the expectation, it has not been justified by the event. Electricity may possibly be a form of matter—it is not a form of energy. It is quite true that electricity *under pressure* or *in motion* represents energy, but the same thing is true of water or air, and we do not therefore deny them to be forms of matter. Understand the sense in which I use the word electricity. *Electrification* is a result of work done, and is most certainly a form of energy; it can be created and destroyed by an act of work. But electricity—none is ever created or destroyed, it is simply moved and strained like matter. No one ever exhibited a trace of positive electricity without there being somewhere in its immediate neighbourhood an equal quantity of negative.

This is the first great law, expressible in a variety of ways: as, for instance, by saying that total algebraic pro-

[1] Expansion of a lecture delivered by Dr. Oliver Lodge, partly at the London Institution on January 1, 1885, and partly at the Midland Institute, Birmingham, November 15, 1886, but not hitherto published.