

tion." This implication, which Prof. Lankester calls false, we do assuredly make in the most explicit way. We assert that the teaching is deserving of the title University teaching, and I am prepared to submit to Prof. Lankester overwhelming evidence in support of this assertion.

The definition which he gives to University teaching is one which includes all the good schools, and is in no sense diagnostic of University teaching. His first condition our lecturers completely satisfy, for they have, as a rule, been men of the highest academical position, in every way the equal of those who fill ordinary College Professorships and Lectureships.

We contend that the essential characteristic of University teaching is the *method* employed in dealing with a subject; that the teaching of the Universities is directed to the elucidation of the principles of the subject taught, and to the end of bringing all the mental faculties of the student into play, so that he may be placed on the high road to pursue his studies in their higher developments; and that an important factor in producing these results is the personal intercourse between teacher and student. We assert that the University Extension method possesses these characteristics.

Our idea is that Gresham College would best fulfil its founder's intention if it were enlarged into a great central College, with permanent Professorships and all the facilities for laboratory work; the Professors, however, teaching in the evening instead of the day, so as to provide for the needs of the class which Sir Thomas Gresham intended to benefit, and for which the London Society is, in a tentative way, attempting to make imperfect provision.

R. D. ROBERTS.

Charterhouse, E.C., November 5.

I CANNOT agree with Mr. Roberts that I have written under any important misapprehension of the nature and general objects of the organization of which he is secretary. I have expressed my conviction of the excellence of the courses of lectures given through its means. I object to its profession of bringing "University" teaching into London, and to its claim to represent either the University of the future or Gresham's University of the past. The fact that the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge and London have appointed members of a Committee to arrange lectures in London does not, in my opinion, constitute those lectures as parts of the teaching of those Universities, and the suggestion that this is the case—encouraged by the use of the term "University Extension"—is, in my opinion, greatly to be regretted. It is, perhaps, difficult to be sure as to the nature of the audiences contemplated by Gresham for his Professors. But supposing that his intentions could be realized in this special point by the delivery of lectures in the evening, I am at a loss to understand what public good can be served by the introduction of a new organization into London for the purpose of giving such lectures, when there are already two public institutions—viz. King's College and University College—which are not only ready to undertake such teaching if found desirable in the future, but have actually carried on such teaching in the past. The Professors of King's and University Colleges are University graduates, they are provided with laboratories and libraries and lecture-rooms, they have numbered among them some of the most distinguished scholars and *savants* of the day, and they have produced both trained investigators and large additions to existing knowledge. They only require additional endowment and public sympathy to fulfil in every respect the ideal of a true University in and for London. Yet a certain number of gentlemen connected with Oxford and Cambridge have persuaded those Universities to nominate a Committee called a Joint Board to kindly undertake the introduction of "University" teaching into London. I cannot believe myself that this new body, competing for the support of Londoners as representing the great educational want of London, viz. a real University, will fail to do harm by dividing the support which London can give to University institutions. I cannot suppose—after observation of their proceedings—that those who form the active body of the London Society for the Extension of University Teaching are as anxious to promote a true University in London as they are to find employment for their lecturers. This is quite natural, and, if admitted, is not otherwise than creditable; but the assertion of a claim to be representatives of University teaching in London on the part of these gentlemen is not so creditable.

November 6.

E. RAY LANKESTER.

The Barbary Ape in Algeria.

IT may interest your readers to know that monkeys are still to be found wild at a place within three days' journey of London, and easily accessible to the most unenterprising traveller. Yesterday, in company with my son, I drove up the gorge of the Chifa, on the excellent main road between this place and Mediah. We halted at the spot where the appropriately named "*Ruisseau des Singes*" falls into the Chifa on its left bank, and ascended the narrow side-valley on foot. Its steep slopes are densely covered with brushwood, intermixed with a few oaks and stunted junipers. We had not proceeded more than ten minutes from the main road before we heard the chatter of a Barbary ape on the bank above us, and saw him scrambling along the rocks. Shortly afterwards, a fine large male of the same species was kind enough to mount a juniper-tree on the opposite side of the gorge to that on which we were seated, and exhibited himself to our gaze for at least fifteen minutes. His various attitudes were distinctly observable through a pair of opera-glasses, and we calculated his distance from us as not more than 400 yards in a straight line. A third ape was subsequently met with farther up the gorge, at a much nearer distance, but did not wait to be looked at.

I had previously seen Barbary apes on the Rock of Gibraltar, but they are there in a semi-protected condition, and perhaps introduced. In the gorge of the Chifa they are quite in a "state of nature," and in their native wilds.

P. L. SCLATER.

Hôtel d'Orient, Blidah, Algeria, October 29.

Are there Negritos in Celebes?

PROF. FLOWER, in his interesting lecture on "The Pygmy Races of Men" (Journ. Anthr. Inst. vol. xviii. p. 82, 1888, and NATURE, vol. xxxviii. p. 67), after having spoken of the Negritos in the Philippines, says, apparently on the authority of Quatrefages: "As the islands of these eastern seas have become better known, further discoveries of the existence of a small Negroid population have been made in Formosa, in the interior of Borneo, Sandalwood Island (Sumba), Xulla, Bouron, Ceram, Flores, Solor, Lomblem, Pantar, Ombay, the eastern peninsula of Celebes, &c."

Without discussing here the foundation of this whole statement, I only beg to remark that in my opinion no Negritos or the like exist in the eastern peninsula of Celebes, or in the Island of Celebes at all.

Already in the year 1876, in a lecture, "Die Minahassa auf Celebes" (p. 29, note 11), I said:—"Prof. Gerland places Papuans, in the map of Waitz's 'Anthropologie der Naturvölker' (vol. v. part 1, Malays), in the eastern peninsula of Celebes, but I could not find in the letterpress of the work, on whose authority he makes this entry. It was this very note of Gerland, which induced me, when on the spot (in the year 1871), to search after them, but I did not succeed in discovering the slightest positive proof for such an assertion." And (l.c. p. 8) "In Celebes . . . no autochthonic Papuan element has been discovered." Neither has Dr. Riedel, the special and foremost investigator of the whole island, obtained any trace of Celebesian Negritos. I am therefore of opinion that Celebes at least (if not many more—perhaps all—of the quoted islands) ought to be omitted from the list.

As to the occurrence of Negritos in the Philippine Islands, I only spoke of them as existing in Luzon (as generally known), in Panay, Cebu, and Negros (see *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie*, 1873, p. 90, and "Ueber die Negritos oder Aëtas der Philippinen," Dresden, 1878, p. 25).

A. B. MEYER.

Royal Museum, Dresden, October 24.

Altaic Granites.

HUMBOLDT and Rose, when descending the Irtysh between Boohartinsk and Oostkamnogorsk, saw large masses of granite lying as if poured on the ends of metamorphosed slates (S. Rose, "Reise nach d. Ural," i. 610); an observation mentioned by Zirkel ("Petrogr.," i. 506, 1866) as a famous one in relation to the age of the Altaic granite. No subsequent traveller appears to have succeeded in repeating that observation, because nobody could rediscover the actual place, which Humboldt and Rose did not define with much precision. Ritter, however, in referring to the subject, indicates the place as lying between two rivulets—Baryshnikof and Kozlovskaya.

After some unsuccessful attempts, I at last succeeded in finding this interesting locality. It is situated some five or six miles