NOTE.

The Presidential Address and Papers contributed during this session were not printed, but the following Lecture, quoted from the proceedings of the Royal Institution of Great Britain, gives the substance of a part of those communications.

An excerpt from the Proceedings of The Royal Society is appended at the end of this volume, in case the experiments there described are of interest to the Members of the Liverpool Physical Society.

OLIVER LODGE.

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, LIVERPOOL,
December, 1892.

WEEKLY EVENING MEETING,

Friday, April 1, 1892.

WILLIAM HUGGINS, Esq. D.C.L. LL.D. Ph.D. F.R.S. Vice-President, in the Chair.

PROFESSOR OLIVER LODGE, D.Sc. LL.D. F.R.S. F.R.A.S.

The Motion of the Ether near the Earth.

EVERYBODY knows that to shoot a bird on the wing you must aim in front of it. Every one will readily admit that to hit a squatting rabbit from a moving train you must aim behind it.

These are examples of what may be called "aberration" from the sender's point of view, from the point of view of the source. And the aberration, or needful divergence between the point aimed at and the thing hit has opposite sign in the two cases—the case when receiver is moving, and the case when source is moving. Hence, if both be moving, it is possible for the two aberrations to neutralise each other. So to hit a rabbit running alongside the train you must aim straight at it.

If there were no air that is all simple enough. But every rifleman knows to his cost that though he fixes both himself and his target tightly to the ground, so as to destroy all aberration proper, yet a current of air is very competent to introduce a kind of spurious aberration of its own, which may be called windage; and that he must not aim at the target if he wants to hit it, but must aim a little in the eye of the wind.

So much from the shooter's point of view. Now attend to the point of view of the target.

Consider it made of soft enough material to be completely penetrated by the bullet, leaving a longish hole wherever struck. A person behind the target, whom we may call a marker, by applying his eye to the hole immediately after the hit, may be able to look through it at the shooter, and thereby to spot the successful man. I know that this is not precisely the function of an ordinary marker, but it is more complete than his ordinary function. All he does usually is to signal an impersonal hit; some one else has to record the identity of the shooter. I am rather assuming a volley of shots, and that the marker has to allocate the hits to their respective sources by means of the holes made in the target.

Well, will he do it correctly? assuming, of course, that he can do so if everything is stationary, and ignoring all curvature of path,

whether vertical or horizontal curvature. If you think it over you will perceive that a wind will not prevent his doing it correctly; the line of hole will point to the shooter along the path of his bullet, though it will not point along his line of aim. Also, if the shots are fired from a moving ship, the line of hole in a stationary target will point to the position the gun occupied at the instant the shot was fired, though it may have moved since then. In neither of these cases (moving medium and moving source) will there be any aberration error.

But if the *target* is in motion, on an armoured train for instance, then the marker will be at fault. The hole will not point to the man who fired the shot, but to an individual ahead of him. The source will appear to be displaced in the direction of the observer's motion. This is common aberration. It is the simplest thing in the world. The easiest illustration of it is that when you run through a vertical shower, you tilt your umbrella forward; or, if you have not got one, the drops hit you in the face; more accurately, your face as you run forward hits the drops. So the shower appears to come from a cloud ahead of you, instead of from one overhead.

We have thus three motions to consider, that of the source, of the receiver, and of the medium; and of these only motion of receiver is able to cause an aberrational error in fixing the position of the source.

So far we have attented to the case of projectiles, with the object of leading up to light. But light does not consist of projectiles, it consists of waves; and with waves matters are a little different. Waves crawl through a medium at their own definite pace; they cannot be *flung* forwards or sideways by a moving source; they do not move by reason of an initial momentum which they are gradually expending, as shots do; their motion is more analogous to that of a bird or other self-propelling animal than it is to that of a shot. The motion of a wave in a moving medium may be likened to that of a rowing boat on a river. It crawls forward with the water, and it drifts with the water; its resultant motion is compounded of the two, but it has nothing to do with the motion of its source. A shot from a passing steamer retains the motion of the steamer as well as that given it by the powder. It is projected therefore in a slant direction. A boat lowered from the side of a passing steamer, and rowing off, retains none of the motion of its source; it is not projected, it is self-propelled. That is like the case of a wave.

The diagram illustrates the difference. Fig. 1 shows a moving cannon or machine-gun, moving with the arrow, and firing a succession of shots which share the motion of the cannon as well as their own, and so travel slant. The shot fired from position 1 has reached A, that fired from the position 2 has reached B, and that fired from position 3 has reached C by the time the fourth shot is fired at D. The line A B C D is a prolongation of the axis of the gun; it is the line of aim, but it is not the line of fire; all the shots are travelling aslant