

agree to the author's statement that the "Ram's head is clearly modelled". Except for what the author calls "the curling horns", I fail to find anything to warrant the conclusion that the object is a clear model of a ram's head. On the other hand, the slightly curving and tapering facial portion and the omission of the ears (especially when the artist has taken pains to mark the position of the comparatively smaller eyes and the nasal holes) seem to suggest that the maker intended this removable head portion of the sarcophagus to represent a hovering bird (perhaps a Vulture) and not the head of a ram. If it represents a hovering bird, then the "curling horns" may be taken to represent a pair of sturdy wings. Again this part of the sarcophagus is so small and suits so ill the rest of it from the point of view of proportion, that it raises in my mind the doubt, whether the person who made the object ever meant this sarcophagus to represent a ram. The presence of the six legs adds colour to this doubt.

Composite objects are not uncommon in pre-historic archæology. It seems to me to be more reasonable to call this sarcophagus a composite object than to christen it a "ram sarcophagus". It may be a fantastic representation of some mythological figure associated with death that loomed large in the minds of those pastoral people. One must remember that the big, the unnatural, the grotesque and the unknown appealed to the primitive mind more than anything else and the primitive man made attempts whenever he had opportunities to represent his imaginary pictures of these in his handicrafts.

Further on in the article the author makes mention that this sarcophagus is the second "funerary vessel in animal form known from South India". This is incorrect. The Superintendent of Archæology, Cochin State, in his annual report of the Archæological Department of the Cochin State for the year 1109 M. E. (1933-34 A.D.) mentions that a sarcophagus which has "the appearance of a cow in a lying posture" was discovered at Kattakampal in the year 1933-1934. This report was published a few months before or very shortly after this supposed "Ram Sarcophagus" was unearthed.

K. GOVINDA MENON.

Madras,
February 5, 1936.

The Mineral Bababudanite—An Explanation.

IN my reply to Mr. M. B. Ramachandra Rao's letter entitled "The Kaldurga Conglomerates and the Iron Ore Series of the Bababudans, Kadur District, Mysore," published in this *Journal* (Dec. 1935), I am afraid I have not made myself quite clear in my remarks regarding the origin of the mineral bababudanite when I said "my colleague, M. R. Srinivasa Rao, and I were the first to point out that the mineral was developed as a result of thermal metamorphism." The intention at the time of writing this was not what this statement would literally imply, for I was aware that Jayaram had suggested the secondary nature of bababudanite and I have myself referred to it in one of my papers.¹ What was intended to be claimed was, that the exact nature of the rocks involved in the process of metamorphism giving rise to bababudanite, was elucidated for the first time in the course of my work.

CHARLES S. PICHAMUTHU.

Central College,
Bangalore,
February 5, 1936.

¹ C. S. Pichamuthu, *Curr. Sci.*, 1935, 3, 608.

Mathematics and the Sciences.

THE review of *Descriptive Mathematics* on page 556 of the January number of *Current Science* demands comment. The book reviewed is *not* a companion volume to *Graphs and Statistics*, though a contrast to it. Nor is it a book for "statisticians whose background of mathematics is negligible"; if it were so, why the title *Descriptive Mathematics*? Your reviewer seems to have got nowhere near the standpoint of the book. One difficulty seems to be that the unique situation we enjoy here in Bombay is not appreciated—it is possible for us to act in making striking departures from the ordinary courses in elementary College mathematics without taking the whole body of teachers with us immediately. *Descriptive Mathematics* is an endeavour to define such a departure, not to popularise it; but the standards your reviewer appears to have applied in valuing the book are quite conventional. He merely thinks of students as they are, and not as they might be were they successfully led through such a course as is proposed. He seems, so far as his ideas are clear, to differ in no essential respect from