

with black crystals attached, and grinding it with a polished sapphire, it readily scratched the same. If a larger quantity of material comes to hand, the writer will have polished a diamond with the powder of the meteorite, using a new wheel for the purpose. The writer has not seen the paper of MM. Latchinoff and Jorefeif, but there seems to be every reason to substantiate their conclusions.

These facts are of especial interest, since on Jan. 15, 1887, Prof. L. Fletcher, curator of the Mineralogical Department of the British Museum, read before the Mineralogical Society of England a paper on a meteorite which was found in the sub-district of Youndegin, Australia, in 1884, and in which he stated he had found a new form of graphite of cubic form, with the hardness of 2.5 and a specific gravity of 2.12. To this he gave the name of 'cliftonite,' calling attention, also, to the fact that Haidinger, in 1846, had found what he described as graphite pseudomorph after iron pyrites (*Poggendorf Annalen*, 1846, lxvii. p. 437), obtained by him from a nodule of graphite which had dropped out of the Arva meteorite. Gustav Rose (*Beschreibung und Enttheilung der Meteoriten*, 1864, p. 40; *Poggendorf Annalen*, 1873) expressed an opinion that this mode of replacement of the cube edges on these crystals was suggestive of holo-symmetry rather than hemi-symmetry, and that this interpretation would exclude iron pyrites as a possible antecedent mineral.

The cliftonite was readily examined with a $\frac{1}{4}$ -inch objective; and from its structure Professor Fletcher concluded, that, while it is different from native graphite, the sharpness, separateness, and completeness of the crystal, the brightness of the faces, the delicacy of the acicular projections, and especially of the obtuse, almost flat, square pyramids, or some of the faces, are quite sufficient to prove that the form has never had any other than its present tenants; in other words, that it is not a pseudomorph. When in cubes, the diamond has faces not very unlike those of the Youndegin crystals, and shows a similar bevelling of its edges by the rounded tetrahedra. Again: Professor Fletcher says it might be argued, that, during a hurried crystallization of the carbon, circumstances initially favorable to the formation of the diamond had finally permitted the existence of carbon in a graphitic form only. He had also found distinct graphitic crystals, cube octahedrous in form, in the Cocke and Sevier County (Tenn.) meteorites.

When we consider that only a few meteorites have been examined for this mineral, we have reason to expect some interesting results in the future.

GEORGE F. KUNZ.

New York, March 6.

A Pseudo-Meteorite.

THROUGH the kindness of Dr. DeWitt Webb of St. Augustine, Fla., I have been able to examine a portion of the so-called 'meteoric stone,' weighing over two hundred pounds, which was said to have been seen to fall in an old cultivated field near Middleburgh, Clay County, Fla., and which was exhibited at the Subtropical Exposition at Jacksonville, Fla. It is a concretionary limonite, and not of meteoric origin.

GEORGE F. KUNZ.

New York, March 6.

Monocular vs. Binocular Vision.

As a constant student of binocular phenomena, I have been much interested in Mr. Hyslop's letter in *Science* of Feb. 10. I have repeated the experiment illustrated by his Fig. 1, and confirmed his results. But I do not think they are to be explained by any supposed struggle between monocular and binocular vision, but in a far more obvious way, which, in fact, he himself suggests.

In binocular combination of such simple figures as circles, where the means of estimating distance is reduced to ocular convergence alone, the estimate is very imperfect and uncertain. Our knowledge so interferes with our visual judgment that we are apt to over-estimate the distance. In fact, many persons even find a difficulty in seeing the combined binocular image any nearer than the two monocular images. As long as attention is fixed on the combined circle, the homogeneous image of the needle will seem beyond, as it ought. This will be much more distinct if we range the point of sight back and forth, combining successively the needle-points and the circles. But when we transfer attention wholly to the double images of the needle, these latter will sometimes appear nearer

than the circle; not, however, because the needle seems nearer than before, but because the circle drops to the plane of the paper, where it tends to go, anyhow.

The experiment illustrated by his second figure I cannot confirm. It is true that experiment with his figures as drawn in *Science* confirms his results, but this is only because the figures are badly drawn. The positions of the two small circles *b* and *c* are not symmetrical. When accurately drawn, I find, on combining, that the small circle and the large circle appear exactly on the same plane. My son, aged eighteen, and well practised in binocular experiments, confirms my results perfectly. Whether Mr. Hyslop's original figures were imperfect, or have been only badly copied, I know not; but the wonderful distinctness with which binocular combination will bring out and exaggerate the smallest differences in apparently similar figures, is well known.

JOSEPH LECONTE.

Berkeley, Cal., Feb. 22.

The Scientific Swindler Again.

THE following from the *Indianapolis Journal* of Feb. 24 may be of interest to those who have been the victims of the swindler so extensively advertised by your own and other journals: "The book-thief who has, under the names of W. R. Taggart, Professor Cameron, Professor Douglass, and various aliases, travelled over the country, representing himself as a scientific student, and borrowing valuable books, has been arrested in Cincinnati, where he gave the name of Otto Syrski. He was recognized yesterday by Professor Collett of this city, who was one of his victims. Professor Collett learned where his books had been sold, and will probably recover them." It is to be hoped that this will stop his operations, at least for a time.

A. W. BUTLER.

Brookville, Ind., March 1.

A Critique of Psycho-Physic Methods.

DR. JOSEPH JASTROW, in the second number of the *Journal of Psychology*, discusses the principal psycho-physic methods now in use, and advocates a thorough reform of the science of psychophysics. One of the principal conclusions at which he arrives is that no such thing as a differential threshold exists; that is to say, that there is no definite point at which the difference of two sensations ceases to be perceptible. Dr. Jastrow's arguments fail to convince us. He says, "The threshold is described as a point not exactly constant, but nearly so: above it all differences can be felt, below it all differences vanish into unconsciousness. No matter whether little or much below this point, they are utterly lost. It is idle to say, as Fechner at times does, that they differ in the amount of additional stimulation necessary to bring them up into consciousness, unless you mean that the series below the so-called threshold is an exact continuation of the series above it; and, if you do mean this, then the threshold loses all its distinguishing peculiarities, and ceases to exist." Further on, in discussing the theory of the right and wrong cases, he says, "It has been proved that the ratio of wrong answers increases as the difference between the stimuli decreases; but the 'threshold theory' claims that this last fails to hold after this difference has been diminished below a certain ratio."

In considering these objections, I may be allowed to treat two classes of sensations separately: first, the judgment that a difference exists is based on a sudden change in the character of the sensation either in space or time; second, the judgment refers to sensations separate in space or time or in both. As an example of the former, we may assume two adjoining fields of various colors or various intensities of light, or a sound suddenly increasing in intensity or height. The threshold theory says there is a certain difference between these adjoining sensations below which no difference will be perceived. Practically this is admitted by Jastrow. In trying to meet such an argument, he first says that there exists only an average threshold; i.e., the average smallest perceptible proportion of intensity or wave-length of the two sensations on which the observer is able to form a judgment. He continues, "Here you either (1) tacitly assume that not many observations are to be taken, or that (2) no matter how many observations were made, no mistake would ever occur."

The arguments of the advocates of the threshold theory are