

## THE WATCH—ITS INVENTION AND HISTORY.

We propose, in this and following articles on the same subject, to give a sketch of the origin of the watch, and to do so shall refer slightly to its elder brother, the clock; but as the early history of clocks has often been given, we do not propose to go over the whole ground of time-keeping instruments, and shall therefore only hint at the successive steps in clockmaking that have led to the invention and introduction of watches.

The first artificial means of noting time was probably a rude species of sundial, to which succeeded the clepsydra and hour-glass. The clepsydra in its simplest form was merely an upright cylindrical vessel that was filled at sunrise with water, which escaped through an aperture in the bottom, its decrease in the cylinder noting the lapse of time. The water was afterwards made to turn a wheel which carried an index round a dial, and many curious automata were thus operated. About the eleventh century it is believed that weights were substituted for the falling water, and a "fly" similar to that still used on the "strike part" of a clock is supposed to have been the usual means of regulating their motion, until the introduction of the balance and escapement, the exact date of which is not known. The earliest balance and escapement of which the actual construction has been preserved is one that was built by Henry de Vick, or De Wick, a German, and set up in Paris, for Charles V., in 1379. It is supposed by some that Vick was the inventor of the escapement there shown, but of this there is no evidence, and for aught we know it was invented and used long before his time. It consisted of a crown wheel, the teeth of which operated on pallets set in a vertical shaft, carrying at its top a cross bar having notches to receive hanging weights. The action of the crown wheel upon the pallets caused a vibrating motion to be given to the bars and weights, in a similar manner to what is known as the verge or vertical escapement, but it was without the hair spring, as this was not introduced until about 300 years afterwards. The rate of going was changed by hanging the weights in different notches in the horizontal bar; and this form of regulating was improved by subsequent makers, who cut threads on the end of the bar and tapped the weights, by which means the latter could be screwed nearer to or farther from the center, and very nice adjustment thus obtained.

The earliest clocks were large machines designed to be set up in monasteries, churches, etc., but succeeding generations saw them gradually made smaller and smaller, until sufficiently portable to be carried from room to room; and near the latter part of the fifteenth century were made so small as to be carried in the pocket, and hence were called by the Germans, who originated this form of timekeeper, "pocket clocks"—a name which they still retain in the German language. They were first made in the city of Nuremberg, and being of oval shape were sometimes called "Nuremberg Animated Eggs."

The first name that has come down to us in this connection is that of Peter Hele, who, it is claimed, some time between 1470 and 1490 (the authorities differ on this point), introduced the mainspring instead of the weight before used, without which it would seem impossible to make a watch, and he should therefore be considered as the first inventor of watches.

The early watches were made entirely of steel and iron. No glasses were used until about 1615, the cases being wholly of metal, and to admit of readily seeing the time, the cover of the face was sometimes perforated in elegant designs. Instead of the form now universally adopted, various styles of casing were employed, such as globular, octangular, cruciform, skull, coffin, acorn, pear, melon, tulip, bird, and, in fact, nearly every imaginable shape that ingenuity could invent, or caprice suggest; and, as a consequence of this and the fact that many of those watches were provided with striking movements, they were so bulky that it was inconvenient to carry them in the pocket, and they were hung at the girdle with swivels so that their faces could be readily turned for observation without being removed from their position. Most watches required winding twice a day, and from their very imperfect escapements could not be depended on as time-keepers—a fault from which it is believed that many modern watches are not wholly exempt. This irregularity of movement in the ancient watches did not depend entirely on the poor escapements, but was due partly to the varying power of the mainspring driving the balance at different speeds, owing to the absence of the hairspring and fusee. This last device was not introduced until about 1525, and was a very important improvement and a great necessity to the early watches before the invention of the balance or hairspring, about 1658. Instead of the chain used in modern watches as the medium between the spring and the fusee, catgut was employed, which was not superseded until about 1660, when the chain was introduced by Gunt, of Geneva.

Both clocks and watches were originally made without minute hands. Many such clocks may be seen in church towers and old houses in Europe, and some may yet be found in the possession of the descendants of the early settlers in this country. When the minute hand was first introduced, it was set on one side of the hour hand, as the second hand is now; and it was not until about 1687 that Quare placed the minute hand concentric with the other, in the manner now universally employed.

The first balance and escapement used in watches were substantially the same as that in Vick's clock, the only essential difference being that the weights were screwed on to the

straight bar, instead of swinging in notches. This device retained its position as the only regulator for a watch movement for a long time; but about 1695, the cylinder escapement, in an imperfect form, was invented by Tompion, and was finally perfected by Graham in 1700.

The lever escapement has several claimants, but the earliest style of this device appears to have been invented by the Abbe Hautefeuille, in 1722, and has since been improved by various inventors—Mudge, Litherland, Breguet, Roskell and Savage—until it assumed its present form.

The duplex escapement, in a crude state, is said to have originated with Dr. Hooke about 1658, but its present construction is believed to have been invented by Tyrer, or Dyrer, in 1767.

None of these escapements, however, would have been of much use as isochronous regulators without the balance spring, introduced in 1658, which is claimed as Dr. Hooke's invention. His priority in this matter is disputed by some who claim it for Huyghens, but the weight of authority appears to be in favor of Hooke, who first showed that the vibrations of such a spring are nearly isochronous, although their lengths may be varied with the power of the mainspring. The adoption of this spring marked an era in watchmaking equivalent to that of the introduction of the pendulum into clocks, for without it an accurate-going watch would seem to be an impossibility. It was first made nearly straight, but in 1660, it was improved by making it in the form of a coil.

Shortly after this, in 1676, repeating watches were introduced. This invention, like many others relating to watches, was claimed by two inventors and is interesting to patent attorneys, if not to others, as forming the basis of the interference case of Barlow vs. Quare, heard by King James II. in person, March 2, 1687, who decided in favor of Quare. It seems, however, as if Barlow was really the first inventor and that Quare was merely an improver who had succeeded in doing with one push-pin what Barlow had previously accomplished by two. As an example of the ornamental work of that period, the following description of the identical watch made by Quare for the king, furnished by its present owner to the *London Chronicle*, December 11, 1833, may be interesting:

"The outer case, which is of very pure gold, is embossed with the king's head in a medallion, under which on the right is Fame, in the clouds, with a trumpet at her mouth, which is held in her left hand; in her right is a wreath she is raising, as if to crown him. On the left are winged boys supporting the royal crown; under them a tower and fortifications on which a flag is flying; under all is the sea running close up to a fort, and on the sea is a ship under full sail. This case is also beautifully engraved and pierced with scroll work, ornamented with cannon, mortars, shot, flags, etc. The face is of gold, with Roman letters for the hours and figures for the minutes. In the center is a piece of pierced work in gold upon blue steel, showing the letters J. R. R. J., combined so as to form an ornamental scroll, above which is the royal crown. The box is exquisitely pierced with scroll work intermixed with birds and flowers; about the hinge is engraved a landscape with a shepherd sitting under a tree, playing upon a pipe, with a dog at his feet, and houses, trees, etc., in the distance. On the back of the box is the following inscription: 'James II. *Gloria Deo in excelsis sine pretio redimi mini mala lege ablatum tno. Regi restituitur.*' Within the inner circle is engraved a figure of Justice in the clouds, having in one hand scales and in the other a scepter with which she points to three bishops with an altar before them. On one side of the alter is the tower of London with a group of twenty-six men carrying bags (presumed to represent money); on the other side is a view of the city of London in perspective and a group of twenty-seven men carrying similar bags, of which there are several more lying in the foreground; under all a lion and a lamb lying together.

"The watch is considerably thicker than, but otherwise not much above the common size, and every part of the engraving is beautiful and distinct. It goes accurately, and is in a perfect state of preservation."

In this connection we may state that in 1764 Mr. John Arnold presented to George III. what is believed to be the smallest repeating watch ever made. It is said to have been smaller than an English silver two-penny piece (rather smaller than our silver half dime) and only weighed 5 dwts. 7½ grains, case and all—the movement itself only weighing 2 dwts. 2½ grs. It was necessary to make a set of minute tools on purpose for its construction. For this watch he received a present from the king of 500 guineas (about \$2,500), and it is reported that he was afterwards offered a thousand guineas to duplicate it for the Emperor of Russia, but he refused it, so that his gift to the king might remain unique. A smaller watch than this, however, formed a part of the Swiss exhibit in the World's Fair of 1851, but this was not a repeater. It was only ⅓ of an inch in diameter and was set in the end of a pencil case. It not only gave the hours, minutes, and seconds, but the days of the month also.

The next great improvement in the watch, after the invention of the hair or balance spring, was the compensation feature, and this is believed to have been first applied to watches by F. Berthoud, of Paris, who sold one with this improvement in 1776 through Pinchbeck the London watchmaker, to George III.; but the compensation effected by means of the combinations of bars of metals of different rates of expansion, as applied to timekeepers, was without doubt invented by John Harrison, of Foulby, England, who

devoted himself for a long series of years—from 1728 to 1761—to the discovery of a mode of overcoming the change of rate due to the varying temperature changing the proportions of the pendulum in clocks, and the balance wheel, springs, etc., in chronometers.

The compensation pendulum requires but one adjustment to maintain the center of gravity at an equal distance at all times from the axis of oscillation, but the compensation balance is subject to two variations—one owing to the expansion and contraction of the balance itself, and the other due to the varying length of the balance spring, both caused by the changes of temperature. To overcome the change in the length of the ordinary pendulum rod, Harrison invented the gridiron pendulum, but a second invention was necessary to overcome the variation in the hair spring and balance of chronometers, and this he accomplished by combining with the curb which governs the acting length of the spring a compound bar, composed of two metals of varying degrees of expansion, so that the curving of the bar by heat would move the curb and so shorten the spring sufficient to compensate for its own increased length and the expansion of the balance. For these improvements Harrison received the award of £20,000, (nearly \$100,000) offered by the British government.

The earliest compensation devices, of which there were several, were applied to increasing or diminishing the active length of the hair spring, but Arnold and Earnshaw invented compensation balance wheels about 1790, and the latter improved them to substantially their present form in 1802.

Jewelling of watches was patented in England May 11, 1704, by N. Facio, of Geneva, who invented a machine for drilling jewels, but it is claimed that Ignatius Huggerford of London had used jewels in one movement only as far back as 1660.

The above is believed to be as correct an account as can be given of the principal inventions that have brought watches to their present state of perfection, but it should be stated that the authorities differ as to the names of the inventors—the same invention being claimed for different men in several instances. We have not attempted to give any of the minor improvements, because a synopsis of these, however condensed, would fill a volume, as there are not less than 450 United States patents relating to watches, to say nothing of foreign inventions in the same line.

The introduction and manufacture of watches, with a description of some remarkable specimens, will form an interesting article, which we shall reserve for our next number.

## The Formation of Fat.

It was pointed out by Liebig that the view, once generally held, that the fat of the herbivora was derived exclusively from ready formed fat in their vegetable food, was untenable; he attributed much of the fat of the animal body to the carbohydrates of the food. His explanation was combated by Dumas, Boussingault and others, but subsequently adopted by them; and the very numerous feeding experiments of Lawes and Gilbert, commenced about thirty years ago, have afforded strong confirmation of the accuracy of Liebig's conclusions. Voit, in 1865, and still more recently in 1869, and conjointly with Pettenkofer, have maintained that fat is the result of the transformation of nitrogenous substances. They state that they never found fat to be formed from starch or sugar, nor was the carbon stored up more than that in the fat of the food, plus that which could be derived from the breaking-up of the albumen. Their experiments, made on the body of the dog, led them to believe that the same must occur with the herbivora; and they contend that, to establish the formation of fat from carbohydrates, experiments must be brought forward in which the fat deposited is in excess of that supplied by the food, plus that which could be derived from the transformed albumen. Lawes and Gilbert, in a recent paper, refer to the results of feeding experiments with pigs which they published eleven years ago, which experiments clearly show such to be the case. Voit, however, cannot allow himself to consider a transformation of carbohydrates into fat to have been conclusively proved by the English experimenters, and suggests several possible sources of error, his reference to some of which, as these gentlemen have found, showing that he has in fact misunderstood them. A careful review, instituted by Lawes and Gilbert, of their feeding experiments with oxen, sheep, and pigs, in order to satisfy themselves whether any doubt could be entertained of the views they had previously advocated, has shown that, as regards the ruminant animals, no absolute proof of the derivation of fat from carbohydrates can be obtained; it was quite otherwise, however, in the case of their experiments with pigs, in many of which much more fat was produced than could possibly have been derived from transformed albumen of the food. Instead, therefore, of experimenting further in this field, they have decided, says the *Academy*, to again direct attention to the results given in the paper on the subject, which appeared in the *Philosophical Magazine* in 1866. In the cases to which they refer, where the nitrogenous substance was not so very excessive, but still more than is the most appropriate, there was a considerable proportion of the total fat produced which could not possibly have been derived from the nitrogenous substance of the food. When the proportion of the nitrogenous to the non-nitrogenous substance in the food was the most appropriate for fattening, there was a much larger proportion (about 40 per cent) of the total fat produced which could not possibly have had its source in the nitrogenous substance consumed.

