

exist in the published statements as to the amount of caffeine in raw coffee:—

Robiquet.....	0.32 to 0.64 per cent.
Liebig.....	0.23 to 0.46 “
Zenneck.....	0.75 “
Graham, Stenhouse & Campbell.....	0.86 to 1.00 “
Dragendorf.....	0.99 to 1.22 “
Squibb.....	1.00 to 1.03 “
Bell.....	1.08 to 1.11 “
Allen.....	0.50 to 2.00 “

The discrepancy between the data given as applying to roasted coffee is still greater, and in the *Allgemeiner Kaffee Zeitung* for 1884, the amount of caffeine in roasted coffee is stated to range from 2.00 to 3.64 per cent. The first striking result obtained by Dr. Paul and Mr. Cownley on carrying out a number of experiments with several different samples of raw beans, was the very narrow range within which the amount of caffeine appeared to vary. Instead of being a varying amount, it was more nearly a constant quantity, as follows:—

Coorg.....	1.10 per cent.
Guatemala.....	1.18 “
Travancore.....	1.16 “
Liberian.....	1.20 “
Liberian.....	1.28 “

The above determinations were all made with undried, raw coffee, taken just as it came to hand and powdered. A difference in the amount of water might therefore alter, to some extent, the percentage of caffeine in the dry material, and a new set of determinations were made, with 14 different berries, all carefully dried at 212°, when the amount obtained varied from 1.20 per cent. in Coorg to 1.39 in Liberian; average for the 14 samples 1.26 per cent. It is evident from these results that the discordant statements hitherto published in reference to the amount of caffeine in coffee must be ascribed to defective methods of analysis, and that, in reality, the determination of the amount of caffeine in a sample of coffee would be one of the most conclusive data to rely upon in any question of adulteration, as, in experimenting with roasted coffee, a similar uniformity was found.

Dr. Paul stated that there was no loss of caffeine in roasting coffee. Roasters had stated that there was a considerable percentage of loss, and, if printed authority was to be taken, the loss was 18 per cent. In his experiments he had failed to detect any loss.

PH. S. J.