

PUBLIC NATURAL HISTORY COLLECTIONS.

THE following correspondence has just passed with the Chancellor of the Exchequer:—

"Sir,—As one of a body of working Naturalists deeply interested in the fate of the Natural History Collections now in the hands of the State, I am, in writing to you, expressing the opinion of the enclosed Memorial, which we believe to express the views of a large number of persons engaged in the pursuit of Science, and to contain suggestions which it is probable will find room for general signature. We also understand that it has the full concurrence of Sir William Hooker and others whose office the question of their representation in any locality is under consideration, the undersigned Zoologists and Botanists, professionally or otherwise engaged in the pursuit of Natural Science, feel it their duty to sign. If Her Majesty's Government the views they entertain as to the arrangements by which National Collections in Natural History can be best adapted to the twofold object of the advancement of Science, and its general diffusion among the Public—to show how far the Science of Zoology and Botany can be made available to the present condition, answer these purposes,—and to suggest such modifications or additional arrangements as appear requisite to the attainment of these objects, we are, Sir, your obedient servant,

"Should you desire to receive any personal explanation of our views we shall be happy to form a deputation to wait upon you at whatever time you may think fit."

"I have the honour, &c.
(Signed) JOHN LINDLEY.

To the Right Honourable the Chancellor of the Exchequer.
SIR,—The necessity of the removal of the Natural History Departments from the British Museum having been recently brought prominently before the Public, and it being understood that the question of their representation in any locality is under consideration, the undersigned Zoologists and Botanists, professionally or otherwise engaged in the pursuit of Natural Science, feel it their duty to sign. If Her Majesty's Government the views they entertain as to the arrangements by which National Collections in Natural History can be best adapted to the twofold object of the advancement of Science, and its general diffusion among the Public—to show how far the Science of Zoology and Botany can be made available to the present condition, answer these purposes,—and to suggest such modifications or additional arrangements as appear requisite to the attainment of these objects, we are, Sir, your obedient servant,

The Scientific Collections or Museums, whether Zoological or Botanical, required for the objects above stated, may be arranged under the following heads:—
1. A general and comprehensive *Typical or Popular Museum*, in which all prominent forms or types of Animals and Plants, respectively, should be displayed, so as to give a general view of the idea of the vast extent and variety of natural objects, to diffuse a general knowledge of the results obtained by Science in the investigation and classification of the objects, and to afford an introduction to the Student of Natural History.

2. A *Scientific Museum*, in which the Collections of all obtainable Animals and Plants, and their parts, whether recent or fossil, and of a sufficient number of specimens, should be deposited, and to be made available to the view of the student, exclusively attached an appropriate Library, or Collection of Books and Illustrations relating to Science, wholly independent of the Public Museum.

3. A comprehensive *Economic Museum*, in which Economic Products, whether Zoological or Botanical, with Illustrations of their uses, and the various Arts in which they are employed, should be deposited as well as to assist the progress of Commerce and the Arts.

4. Collections of living Animals and Plants, or Zoological and Botanical Gardens.

The *Typical or Popular Museum*, for the daily use of the public, should be situated in a convenient, airy, and accessible situation. The Collections should be displayed in a manner which would allow the student to select from the dirt and dust raised by the thousands who visit them; and sufficient room should be allowed within the cases to admit access to the specimens, without confusion, their names, and such illustrations as are necessary to render the Collections intelligible and instructive to the Student and the general Public.

The *Economic Museum* and *Living Collections* in Botany might be quite suitably situated in the same locality.

The *Scientific Museum*, in Zoology as in Botany, is the most important of all. It is indispensable for the study of Natural Science, and for the public instruction in the history of the world, the Naturalist cannot even name or arrange the materials for the *Typical*, *Economic*, or *Living Collections* as to convey any useful information to the student, unless he is enabled to use in need of the same conditions of light, airiness, &c., and, as far more numerous than, those exposed in the *Typical* and *Economic* Museums, they require a different arrangement, in order that the specimens might, without injury, be frequently taken from their respective cases, and exposed to the view of the student, and that the materials would be useless unless an appropriate Library were included in the same building.

The union of the *Zoological and Botanical Scientific Museums* in one locality is of no importance. The juxtaposition of each in its proper locality is of no importance. It is of no importance, although, in the case of Botany, an extensive Herbarium and Library are indispensable appendages to the Garden and Economic Museums.

The existing Natural History Collections accessible to Men of Science and to the Public, in or near the Metropolis, are the following:—

IN BOTANY.—The Kew Herbarium, as a Scientific Collection, is the finest in the world; and its importance is universally acknowledged. It is situated in a healthy, airy, and accessible situation. It is admirably situated; and being in proximity with, and under the immediate control of the Herbarium, it is well adapted for the purpose of the study of Botany. The Herbarium for the use of that Garden and Museum. But it is not the property of the State; there is no provision for its permanent preservation for the benefit of the public, and it does not include any Collection of Fossil Plants.

The *Botanical Garden* at Kew, is a valuable Collection, consisting chiefly of the Banksian Herbarium, is important, but very imperfect. It is badly situated, on account of the dust and vapour arising from the adjacent buildings, and the existing buildings of the British Museum would prevent its extension, even were there an adequate advantage in maintaining it. The State has no provision for its preservation, and the Botanical Museums so near together as those of London and Kew. The British Museum also contains a valuable Collection of Fossil Plants, but no provision is made for Science than its Zoological Collections.

There exists no *Typical or Popular Botanical Museum* for the public.

The efficiency of the Botanical Gardens and Museum of Economic Botany at Kew, as now organised, and the consequent advantages to the public, are so generally recognised to need any comment on the part of your obedient servant.

IN ZOOLOGY.—The British Museum contains a magnificent Collection of Recent and Fossil Animals, the property of the State, and intended both for public exhibition and for scientific study. There is no provision for the necessary accommodation for its study—still less for the separation of a *Popular Typical* series for public use, and for the separation of a *Scientific* series for the use of the opportunity of real study; and the specimens themselves suffer severely from the dust and dirt of the locality, its crowded condition, and the consequent want of access to the galleries on Public Days,—the necessity of access to the

specimens on other days preventing their being arranged in hermetically closed cases.

The *Zoological Museum* has been commenced at South Kensington.

There is an unutilised Zoological Garden or Living Collection at the Regent's Park, but not the property of the State, nor receiving any other indirect assistance, in the terms on which its site is granted.

The measures which your Memorialists would respectfully recommend to Her Majesty's Government, in order to give a view to rendering the Collections really available for the purposes for which they are intended, are the following:—
1. That the Zoological Collections be separated into two distinct Collections, the one to form a *Typical or Popular Museum*, the other to constitute a *Scientific Museum*, and to be placed in separate buildings.

These Museums might be lodged in one and the same building, and be under one direction, provided they were arranged in such a manner as to be accessible to the public, so that the one would always be open to the Public, the other to the man of science, or any person seeking for special information. This arrangement would involve no more increase of expense, and a little expense as any other which could answer its double purpose, as the *Typical or Popular Museum*, might be placed in the same building, and would require, by very slight, if any, additions.

The plan proposed is only a further development of the system according to which the Entomological, Conchological, and Osteological Collections in the British Museum are at present arranged.

That an appropriate Zoological Library be attached to the *Typical Museum*, totally independent of the Zoological portion of the British Museum, and accessible to the public, and that your Memorialists, is inseparable from the General Library. That the *Scientific Zoological Museum* and Library be placed in a separate building, accessible to one of Her Majesty's Ministers, or under an organisation similar to that which is practically found so efficient in regard to Botany.

That the Zoological Collections be placed in a building to be erected at a desirable locality in South Kensington, be further improved. That the Herbarium be the property of, and be maintained by, the State, as is now the case with a portion of it,—that the Banksian Herbarium be placed in a separate building, and that it from the British Museum—and that a permanent building be provided for the accommodation at Kew of the Scientific Collections of Botany.

This consolidation of the Herbaria of Kew with those of the British Museum would afford the means of including in the *Scientific Museum*, and to be made available to the view of the student, for the illustration of the Colonial Vegetation of the British Empire, which, considering the extreme importance of vegetation in the history of the world, and the importance of the study of the Herbarium, would be of great advantage.

Your Memorialists would recommend that the place of the Banksian Herbarium and other miscellaneous Botanical Collections now in the British Museum and closed to the Public, at the Regent's Park, be placed in a separate building, and that a building as that proposed for the *Typical or Popular Museum* of Zoology, and, like it, be open daily to the Public.

That the Zoological Collections be placed in a building, it would be inexpensive, besides being in the highest degree instructive; and, like the *Typical or Popular Zoological Collection*, it would be the greatest value to the public, and to the Teachers and Students of the Metropolitan Colleges.

That the *Botanical Scientific Museum* and its Library, the *Botanical Garden*, and the *Botanical Library*, be placed, as at present, under one hand, directly responsible to one of Her Majesty's Ministers.

The undersigned Memorialists, consisting wholly of Zoologists and Botanists, have offered no suggestions respecting the disposal of the Zoological Collections in the British Museum, although aware that, in case it should be resolved that the Zoological Collections be placed in a separate building, and that, on another locality, the disposal of the Minerals also will probably come under consideration.

NOTED AND FORWARDED BY THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER.

GEORGE BENTHAM, V.P.L.S.
GEORGE DUFF, F.R.S. and Z.S., Professor of Comparative Zoology and Physiology in the Royal College of Surgeons of England.

WILLIAM B. CARPENTER, F.R.S., Z.S., and Z.S., Regius Professor of Zoology in the University of London.

CHARLES DARWIN, F.R.S., L.S., and G.S., Esq., Professor of Zoology in the University of Cambridge.

ARTHUR HENFREY, F.R.S., L.S., &c., Esq., Professor of Botany in the University of Cambridge.

J. S. HENSLOW, V.L.S. and G.S., Professor of Botany in the University of Cambridge.

THOMAS STORAX, F.R.S., Professor of Natural History, Government School of Mines, Jermyn Street.

JOHN LINDLEY, F.R.S. and L.S., Professor of Botany in the University of London.

Home Correspondence.

Planting Wall Trees.—We have a border here about 200 feet in length and 27 in width, with a wall facing south-west, on which are growing Pear trees, which I doubt not are very old; they have evidently been planted in the last century, and their limbs are young while their trunks are old; they are unfruitful, at least, what little they produce is very inferior both as regards size and quality. The roots are probably deep in the subsoil, which is something between a stiff brackish loam and a heavy clay. My employer has been desirous to remove the whole or replant, but instead of that I have adopted the following plan, first cutting away the lowest branches from the growing trees sufficiently so as not to interfere with newly planted ones for a year or two (upon the principle that a half-inch is better than a foot), and then, by the aid of a long ladder, to cut the side of the old trees 9 feet by 7 feet, 18 inches deep on the side next the wall, by 24 inches deep on that further from it; I placed a layer of bricks and stones over the bottom, breaking them moderately small with a hammer. After that I rammed them down fairly with a brickbat, and then, by the aid of a ladder, I put in with hot lime, sand, and fine gravel, and poured over the broken rubble a quantity sufficient to form a hard concrete surface. Along the front of the border a row of circular holes, 16 feet apart from centre to centre and 6 feet in diameter, has been dug in the same way. In this I intend planting Pear trees to form pyramids. All the holes I have filled with pure turfy loam of a somewhat sandy nature, viz. the top spit and shovellings from old pasture land. should have stated that the mould

taken out of the holes was spread over the border, except the rank soil from the bottom which was carted away. [We advise you to burn this.] By this means the whole border has been really raised, and the roots and roots of these preparations should fall to good roots of Pears well? Of course as the roots extend it may be necessary to enlarge the size of the holes. Will the soil I have used prove suitable of soil for Pears? or would it have been better to have mixed with it a considerable quantity of fine sand? I am, Sir, your obedient servant. Would it have been better to have introduced well rotted manure with the loam in so confined a space? or to have mixed in rubbish for drainage? Will the plan just described suit Peach trees? And lastly, what sorts of Pears are likely to yield a moderate supply in autumn, and so on? I am, Sir, your obedient servant, viz., about two dozen. We have also to cover a high wall about 150 feet in length, with a north aspect, the half of which I purpose to plant with Morello Cherries. What kind of trees and what sorts would succeed best on the remaining half? If any of your correspondents deem the questions worth notice I shall be glad to receive through your columns any good practical suggestions on the subject, as I have other kinds of wall trees to plant, and I am desirous of doing so with every possible chance of success, having available means at hand for any reasonable amount of labour.

Water Lilies.—In answer to "Novice" (see p. 734). I beg to say that the best means of getting rid of these is to cut them with a scythe twice in a season; the first cutting is not always sufficient to kill them, but the second cutting opens the pores, lets in the water, and they die generally by the end of the first year's cutting is sufficient. W. Henderson, *Inventor of the Patent Improved Broadhead, Duxford*.

Musical Mouse.—We hear now and then of things so unlikely or rather so unlike what have at any time come within the grasp of our experience as to be almost incredible, that it is not till we have seen them ourselves, faithless than believing, still the following is quite true, however unlikely. There is now in the possession of Henry Brockhurst, 36, Clinger Street, Hoxton, a mouse gifted with a marvellous power of song. It appears to have been born of the sale of visiting cards, and is, in order, of eating of their food, and drinking of their drink, of listening to their strains, and enjoying them, until it begeth itself of the propriety of repaying its entertainers in notes current among them. It made the attempt and succeeded; timely at first, more so as it grew, and, as it grew, its song grew richer, its notes of melody being poured forth in the cages of the birds. Caught at last, it now occupies its own cage, and still at morn, noon, and quiet eve, are its pleasant melodies performed. Nor would any one not pre-informed to the contrary, be disposed to doubt that the mouse is undeniably a four-footed wonder. It makes no secret of its abilities. Doubtless its sweet music is the result of lessons received from the canaries, and there is only about as much difference between its notes and those of the birds as there is between the notes of a canary and those of a mouse. I am, Sir, your obedient servant. We once heard of these melodious mice, but its music appeared to our ears very like squeaking.

Mistle on the Oak.—Mistletoe is mentioned as growing upon an Oak on my estate here in your volume for 1850, p. 518, and that bunch of mistletoe in the foreground of the illustration, this, because there is an error in your recent notice of this Oak with Mistletoe in it (see Nov. 20, 1858, p. 848) which obviously arises from a misprint of Ledbury for Selbury in the notice of it given in 1850. *Ge. Ormerod, Selbury Park, Wiltshire*. Nov. 22. The place near Ledbury where the Canaries carries the Mistletoe is the park at Eastnor Castle, the seat of the family of Somers Coates; and is I believe one of very few instances of that parasite growing on the Oak. *J. B.*—I notice in the *Gardeners' Chronicle* of Nov. 20 an answer to an inquiry on this subject, in which it is stated that Mistletoe may be inferred from the fact that it is absolutely stated to conclude that the author of this answer meant that it does not and will not grow on resinous trees, though I do not see why it should be impossible to make it grow upon every tree, and every tree may be resinous. I have experienced the contrary. That it does grow upon resinous trees naturally I have ascertained from personal observation. I have seen it upon the Silver Fir in extreme profusion; and also abundantly upon a Fir in the valley of the Rhone, which I could not distinguish from the Fir of the valley of the Eastern Pyrenees to the south of Pau, either that of the Eaux Chaudes or the western valley above Cauterets, in 1852 I saw Mistletoe growing on the Silver Fir in such abundance as absolutely to smother and kill the natural growth of the tree—from 30 to 50 plants on a single tree; and a forest of some extent was thus affected. In 1856 I saw a tree growing abundantly, but not so profusely on a true Pinus, I believe *Pinus sylvestris*, in the Valais, in the neighbourhood of Tourmaigne; and in this present autumn, 1858, I saw it growing on Firs in the valley of the Inn—between Siles and Im. I believe it lect the exact same tree. I am, Sir, your obedient servant. I believe it grows upon true Pinus, allied to *P. sylvestris*, but having previously seen it growing upon one of that highly resinous section, I did not remark the fact as a novelty with so much accuracy as in 1856. At all events Mistletoe grows naturally upon several species of Pine tribes, and I see no reason why it should not grow

RETURN to an Address of the Honourable The House of Commons,
dated 6 July 1858 ;—for,

A "COPY of a MEMORIAL addressed to Her Majesty's Government by the
Promoters and Cultivators of Science on the Subject of the proposed
Severance from the BRITISH MUSEUM of its NATURAL HISTORY COL-
LECTIONS, together with the Signatures attached thereto."

Treasury Chambers, }
19 July 1858. }

GEO. A. HAMILTON.

(*Sir Philip Grey Egerton.*)

Ordered, by The House of Commons, to be Printed,
23 July 1858.

MEMORIAL of the PROMOTERS and CULTIVATORS of SCIENCE on the Subject of the proposed Severance from the BRITISH MUSEUM of its Natural History Collections, addressed to Her Majesty's Government.

THE Report of the Royal Commission appointed to inquire into the best site for a National Gallery, and recent discussions in Parliament having led to the contemplation of breaking up the British Museum, by severing from it the Natural History Collections, we, the undersigned, promoters and cultivators of natural knowledge, beg to record our strong objections to such removal, and for the following reasons :—

1st. The British Museum, when established by Act of Parliament in 1755, was essentially a Natural History Collection, the enlightened views of its founder, Sir Hans Sloane, being that it should “be rendered as useful as possible, as well towards satisfying the desire of the curious as for the improvement, knowledge and information of all persons.”

2d. This object of Sir Hans Sloane has been so satisfactorily carried out, that according to the Report of the last Royal Commission, which inquired into the whole state of the Museum (1849), “the evidence of men of the highest authority in science was referred to with great satisfaction, to show that the Natural History Collections were, as a whole, equal if not superior to any in the world.”

3d. Whilst we are aware that much greater space is required to provide for the reception of antiquities and ancient sculpture (chiefly on the ground floor) it has been ascertained by the Trustees, that when additional buildings shall be called for, they can be extended northwards in halls requiring little embellishment, and, according to a plan laid before the Trustees by Mr. Smirke, involving a considerably less expenditure than that which must be incurred by a transference of those collections to any other spot, and the consequent erection of an entirely new edifice. On this point we beg to quote the following resolutions adopted by the Trustees of the British Museum, composing the Standing Committee, as printed in a Return to the House of Commons, dated 4th February 1858.

“The Committee having had under their consideration the report of the principal librarian, dated 10th November 1857,

“RESOLVED,—

“1. That it appears from such report that there is a great deficiency of space at present for the proper exhibition of the different collections in the different departments of the Museum, and that there is no vacant space now belonging to the Trustees which will be sufficient to provide for such deficiency.

“2. That in providing an adequate space for that purpose, it is very desirable to contemplate the future and progressive, as well as the actual and immediate requirements of the British Museum.

“3. That it appears to the Trustees that the best mode of providing for such present and future requirements will be by adopting the plan submitted by Mr. Smirke for the purchase of land to the north of the Museum, as contained in the report of the principal librarian.

“4. That, in the opinion of the Trustees, even if the increase of the collections which are under their care should at some future time make it necessary

necessary to transfer any of those collections to some other place, the land of which the purchase is now recommended must always be of great and peculiar value to the Museum.

"5. That such plan, together with the present resolutions, shall be laid before Her Majesty's Ministers, with the view of requesting their concurrence therein, and their recommendation thereof to the consideration of Parliament."

4th. Presuming that few persons will be found to advocate the removal of the grand masses of ancient art from their present position, so it is manifest that, if all the Natural History Collections be taken away, their transference will afford no place for the classical works, which now temporarily encumber the principal façade, or crowd the crypts below. For, as such massive objects must be placed on the ground floor, so an extension of the basement is inevitable, if the antiquities remain part of the Museum, and all that the Natural History Collections can require for their future development will be an allotment of space above such extension of the ground floor.

We would also observe that the prolongation of the present building northwards on the above-mentioned plan, besides being much less costly than the formation of an entirely new building, will put a stop to all controversies respecting the appropriate site, and the style of architecture to be applied to a new building.

5th. In reference to other suggestions that have been vaguely thrown out, of a breaking up of the Natural History Collections of the nation into several parts, by transferring, *e.g.* the minerals to the Government School of Mines; the stuffed animals to the Zoological Society; the insects and shells to the Linnean Society, &c., we have first to observe, that not any of the above institutions, two of which are only voluntary associations of individuals, possesses the space or means for the reception and display of such constituent parts of the great national series of illustrations of nature; and, further, that as the chief end and aim of natural history is to demonstrate the harmony which pervades the whole, and the unity of principle which bespeaks the unity of the Creative Cause, it is essential that the different classes of natural objects should be preserved in juxtaposition under the roof of one great building.

6th. We further strongly object to the proposed transference, because those engaged in the study of natural history have in the British Museum the paramount advantage of consulting every work which can aid their researches; whilst a removal of the collections would either involve a conjoint transference of a very large portion of the National Library, or necessitate a very expensive purchase of a special Natural History Library.

7th. Whilst such are among the prominent reasons against the removal of the Natural History Collections from the site where they have been established, for upwards of a century, in the centre of London, we beg to add the expression of our opinion that such removal, particularly if to any situation distant from that centre, would be viewed by the mass of the inhabitants with extreme disfavour; it being a well-known fact that by far the greater number of visitors to the Museum consists of those who frequent the halls containing the Natural History Collections; whilst it is obvious that many of those persons who come from the densely peopled districts of the eastern, northern, and southern parts of London would feel it very inconvenient to resort to any distant locality.

For these reasons, as based on scientific advantages, the convenience and instruction of the people, and the saving of a large sum to the nation, we earnestly hope that the Natural History Collections may not be interfered with, but be allowed to remain associated with the many other branches of human knowledge which are so admirably represented in this great national establishment.

Her Majesty's Government, we trust, will never yield to the argument that, because in some countries the products of Nature and Art are exhibited in distinct establishments, therefore the like separation should be copied here. Let us, on the contrary, rejoice in the fact, that we have realised what no other kingdom can boast of, and that such vast and harmoniously related accumulation of knowledge is gathered together around a library, illustrating each department of this noble Museum.

Wrottesley, President Royal Society.

Rod. I. Murchison, F.R.S., D.C.L.;
President Royal Geographical Society.

P. M. Grey Egerton, M.P., F.R.S.

J. E. Portlock, Major-General R.E.,
F.R.S., &c.

Rosse, F.R.S.

C. Wheatstone, F.R.S.

G. G. Stokes, Secretary Royal Society.

Thomas H. Huxley, F.R.S.

James Paget, F.R.S.

W. Sharpey, M.D., Secretary Royal Society.

John P. Gassiot, F.R.S.

W. Bowman, F.R.S.

Jos. G. Hooper, F.R.S.

William B. Carpenter, F.R.S.

W. R. Grove, V.P.R.S.

Leonard Horner, V.P.R.S. and V.P.G.S.

Thomas Bell, F.R.S., President of the
Linnean Society.

Wm. J. Burchell, F.L.S.

S. James A. Salter, F.L.S., F.G.S.

Wilfred D. Speer, F.L.S.

John Lindley, F.R.S.

Richard Owen, V.P.R.S.

John Barlow, Vice-President and Secretary Royal Society.

Robert M'Andrew, F.R.S., F.L.S.

George Rennie, F.R.S., A.G.S., &c.

William Hopkins, F.R.S., F.G.S. & M.A.

J. G. Bowerbank, F.R.S., F.L.S., &c.

Thomas Graham, F.R.S., Master of the
Mint.

John Marshall, F.O.S.

B. C. Revoirc, F.R.S., D.C.E.

A. W. Rofmann, L.S.D., F.R.S.

T. Mayo, F.R.S., President of the Royal
College of Physicians.

Charles Lyell, F.R.S., D.C.L., F.G.S.

Andrew C. Ramsay, F.R.S., F.G.S.

William Henry Fitton, F.R.S., F.G.S.

H. Falconer, M.D., F.R.S., L.S., & G.S.

J. Crawford, F.R.S., R.G.S.

John Forbes, M.D., F.R.D.C.P.

John Tyndell, F.R.S., &c., &c.

John Phillips, M.A., L.L.D., President
of the Geological Society, F.R.S.

John Prestwick, F.R.S., F.G.S.

Thomas Davidson, F.R.S., G.S.

Robert G. Anstey, F.R.S., G.S.

Alfred Tylor, F.G.S.

Robert Wm. M'lyne, F.G.S.

Warrington W. Smyth, Secretary Geological Society, F.P.S.

Thomas Sopwith, M.A., F.R.S.

Selkirk, M.A., F.R.S.

J. J. Bigsley, M.D., F.G.S.

Robert Kane, Kt., M.D., F.R.S.,
Director of the Museum of Irish Industry.

Cawdor, F.R.S.

Ducie, F.R.S., F.G.S.

John Morris, F.G.S., and Professor of
Geology at University College, London.

Edward Sabine, Treasurer and Vice-
President Royal Society.

William Whewell, D.D., F.R.S., Master
of Trinity College.

G. W. Featherstonhaugh, F.R.S., F.G.S.

Robert Hunt, F.R.S.

Enniskillen, F.R.S., &c.

R. G. Latham, M.D., F.R.S.

W. J. Broderip, F.R.S., F.G.S., F.L.S.

J. E. Gray, F.R.S., V.P.Z.S., President
of the Entomological and Botanical
Societies of London, &c., Keeper of
Zoology, British Museum.

Geo. R. Waterhouse, Keeper of Geology,
British Museum.

Nevil Story Maskelyne, F.G.S., Keeper
of Mineralogy, British Museum.

J. Gwyn Jeffreys, F.R.S.

John Miers, F.R.S.

John Hogg, F.R.S., F.L.S., &c.

Samuel Stevens, Treasurer Entomo-
logical Society.

John S. Gaskoin, F.L.S.

D. W. Mitchell, Secretary to the
Zoological Society of London, F.L.S.,
&c. &c. &c.

Philip Luttrely Selater, M.A., Fellow of
Christ Church College, Oxford.

George Bush, F.R.S., F.R.C.S.E., &c.

W. Macdonald, M.D.

E. W. H. Holdsworth, F.L.S., F.Z.S.

John J. Bennett, F.R.S.-L.S.

John Perry, M.D., F.R.S.

M. Henderson, M.D., F.H.S.

John Carrick Moore, M.A., F.R.S.

John Gould, F.R.S.

Robert Stephenson, M.P., F.R.S.

George Peacock, Dean of Ely, F.R.S.

Charles Darwin, F.R.S., &c.

J. F. W. Herschel, M.A., D.C.L., F.R.S.,
London and Edinburgh, Colling-
wood, Hawkhurst, Kent, June 23d,
1858.

Adam Sedgwick, M.A., F.R.S., Wood-
ward Professor, Cambridge.

W. H. Miller, M.A., F.R.S., Professor
of Mineralogy in the University of
Cambridge.

Charles C. Babington, M.A., F.R.S.,
Cambridge.

G. D. Living, M.A., Lecturer on
Natural Sciences, St. John's College,
Cambridge.

William Clark, M.A., Professor of
Anatomy, Cambridge.

Charles Daubeny, M.D., F.R.S., Profes-
sor of Botany, Oxford.

Henry W. Acland, M.D., F.R.S., Regius
Professor of Medicine, Oxford.

- Baden Powell*, F.R.S., Professor of
 Geometry, Oxford.
Charles Frederick White, M.M.S.
James Glaisher, F.R.S., &c. &c.
M. Marshall, F.Z.S., Bank of England.
Robert Warington, F.C.S., M.M.S.
J. George Appold, F.R.S.
John Birkett, F.R.E.G., England,
 F.L.S., &c.
John Quekett, F.L.S., M.R.C.S.E., &c.
Courad Loddiges, F.H.S.
Henry Christy, F.S.S.
J. Claude Webster, F.S.A., Middle
 Temple.
E. W. Cooke, A.R.A., F.L.S.
- John R. Munnery*, F.L.S.
Nathaniel Ward, F.R.C.S.E.
Stephen H. Ward, M.D., London,
 L.R.C.P.
Richard King, M.D., M.R.C.S.
Redford Pim, R.S., F.R.G.S.
R. Hannah.
M. J. Lewcisi.
Samuel Hanson, M.R.S., &c.
Francis Walker, F.C.S. & L.S.
Edward Newman, F.L.S.
John A. Power, M.D., F.R.G.S.
John Douglas, M.E.S.
H. T. Staunton, F.L.S., M.E.S.
-