We much regret to announce the death of the Right Honourable Thomas Henry Huxley, which took place at his residence, Hodeslea, Staveley-road, Eastbourne, on Saturday. In the beginning of March Mr. Huxley had an attack of influenza. Bronchitis supervened, and lung and kidney complaints soon manifested themselves. There was also cardiac affection of long standing.

Against his many ailments Mr. Huxley struggled with wonderful vitality and cheerfulness. His mental acuteness was not impaired, and he took pleasure in both reading and writing up to the last week of his illness. In fact he read up to the day before his death. Through all his sufferings he preserved that amiable and kindly disposition which made him so beloved in his own household. Dr. Burney Yeo and Mr. H. D. Rawnsley, of Eastbourne (the Professor's regular medical adviser, and Dr. Huxley (his son) had a consultation as late as Friday, and it was found that, owing to exhaustion from the profound depression, recovery was a possibility, however, of his lasting some time; but on Saturday morning the patient became so much worse that all hope was abandoned, and he passed away quietly on Saturday afternoon at half-past 3 o'clock. Mrs. Huxley and one of her daughters were present at the last, and other members of the family arrived shortly after death.

The funeral has been fixed to take place at Finchley Cemetery on Thursday afternoon, at 3 o'clock.

Thomas Henry Huxley was born on May 4, 1825, at what was then the village of Ealing, in the semi-public school of which his father was one of the masters. This school he attended for a few years, but his educational progress was largely due to his own private efforts. At an early period he became familiar enough with Greek to plunge into the Greek literature of that language, and he seems to have got some help from a brother-in-law who was a medical man. In 1842 he entered the medical school attached to Charing-cross Hospital, where at that time Mr. Wharton Jones, distinguished alike as an ophthalmic and physiological was lecturing on physiology. In 1845 he passed the first M.B. examination at the University of London, taking honours in Anatomy and Physiology. Shortly before this he had evidence that his mind was occupied with something more than the technical details of the medical profession, for, while yet a student at Charing-cross Hospital, he wrote a letter to the editor of the *Medical Times and Gazette* of that layer in the root-sheath of hair which has since borne the name of Huxley's Layer. After devoting himself for a short time to the practice of his profession among the poor of London, in 1846, joined the medical service of the Royal Navy and was sent to Haslar Hospital. Here he remain long, but, like so many other men who have made their mark in biological science, set out on a voyage round the world.

Through the influence of the distinguished naturalist Sir John Richardson, who had accompanied Franklin in his Arctic expeditions, young Huxley was given the post of assistant-surgeon on her Majesty's ship Rattlesnake, then about to proceed on a surveying voyage to the southern seas. The ship sailed from Portsmouth in the winter of 1846 and did not return until November, 1850. She was commanded by Captain Owen Stanley, whose name is attached to a well-known range of mountains in British New Guinea and during the greater part of the time the Rattlesnake was employed in surveying the eastern and northern coasts of Australia and the islands of the Pacific. The seas lying between the great barrier reef and the coast of the mainland were of special interest to the naturalist. Huxley took ample advantage of his opportunities for work in the seas he traversed, with the results known to all naturalists. The communications which he sent home during the voyage made his name well known to the scientific world before he reached his return. Several of these were published in the "Philosophical Transactions" of the Royal Society, and it is interesting to note that the first which appeared in the publication of the society by the then Bishop of Norwich, and read June 21, 1849. It bears the title "On the Anatomy and Affinities of the Medusæ." Huxley's unwavering faith to obtain his publication by the Government of a part of the work done during his voyage, and it was not until 1859 that his great work, entitled "Oceanic Hydrozoa, a Description of the Calycophoridæ and Physophoridæ observed during the voyage of her Majesty's ship Rattlesnake," was given to the world.

The reputation which he had already attained at the early age of 26 is evident from the fact that in the year after his return, 1851, he was elected a Fellow of the Royal Society, and in 1852 was awarded one of the society's Royal medals. In 1853 he left the Navy, and during the following year, on the removal of Edward Forbes from the Royal School of Mines to the chair of Natural History in Edinburgh, Huxley was appointed Professor of Natural History (including palæontology, in that institution, a post which he held until his retirement at the age of seven age at which he used to declare every scientific man ought to retire to make way for others). In the same year, 1854, he was appointed Fullerian Professor of Physiology to the Royal Institution and Examiner in Physiology and Comparative Anatomy to the University of London. These posts and honours crowded thick upon him. From 1863 to 1869 he held the post of Hunterian Professor at the Royal College of Surgeons. In 1869 he was President of the British Association, and eight years later held the Presidency of the Association at the Liverpool meeting. In 1869 and 1870 he was President of the Ethnological and Ethnological Societies. As might be expected, Professor Huxley held strong and well-defined views on the subject of education. He was a member of the Royal Commission on Scientific Instruction, and in 1870 he called attention to the Education Committee he did much to mould the scheme of education adopted in the Board schools.

He was elected secretary of the Royal Society in 1873, and ten years later he called to the highest honorary position which an English scientific man can fill, the presidency of that society. During the absence of the late Professor Sir Wyville Thomson on the Challenger Expedition, Huxley, in 1875 and 1876, took his place as Professor of Natural History in the University of Edinburgh. From 1881 to 1885 he acted as Inspector of Fisheries. Huxley's work, and all his other official posts he resigned in 1885, shortly after which he removed to Eastbourne.

During the 34 years that elapsed between his return from the Rattlesnake and his retirement from his various official posts, Huxley's activity as an investigator, as a writer, as a lecturer, as a citizen of London and of England, and as a man of high social influence was incessant. There is hardly a department in the wide field of zoology, in its most comprehensive sense, in which he has not done original work Huxley's investigations have explained many difficult problems in the mechanism of man and animals. So far as the character of his work is concerned, he is to be compared rather with Owen than with Darwin; though not only was the quality of his work more solid and enduring, but in many ways his type of mind was essentially different from that of Owen, more liberal, more open, free from what may perhaps be called the pettiness which hampered Owen's investigations. Huxley's investigations, it may fairly be said, especially after the publication of the "Origin of Species," were to a large extent guided by the Darwinian theory, and the work he did was in many cases the most substantial confirmations and illustrations of the doctrine of evolution as propounded by Darwin. In order to illustrate the condition of Huxley's own mind and the stage which biological investigation had reached at the time of the "Origin of Species," we cannot do better than give an extract from the interesting chapter contributed by him to the "Life of Darwin" on "The Reception of the Origin of Species." —

I think I must have read the "Vestiges" before I left England in 1846, but if I did the book made very little impression upon me, and I was not brought into serious contact with the question in question until after 1850. At that time I had long down with the Pentateuchal cosmogony which I had learnt upon my childish understanding as Divine truth with all the authority of parents and instructors, and from which I had not yet emancipated myself to the full. My mind was unbiased in respect of any doctrine which presented itself if it professed to be based on verifiable facts, and I had been reasoning, as I had not then and I have not now the smallest *a priori* objection to raise to the account of the creation of animals and plants given in Genesis, "in which Hilton so vividly embodies the natural sense of Genesis. I ask, Is it true? and if it is not, why not? because it is impossible. I confine myself to what must be regarded as a modest and reasonable request for some particle of evidence that the existing species of animals and plants did originate in that way as a condition of my belief in a statement which appears to me to be highly improbable.

I had read Darwin pretty fairly, I had exactly the same answer to give to him as I had given to Sedgwick. Within a few days of the biologists of that time I met with nobody, except Dr. Grant, of University College, who was ready to pay for evolution, and his advocacy was not calculated to advance the cause. Outside these ranks the only person known to me who was not a professed Darwinian expressed respect, and who was at the same time a thoroughgoing evolutionist, was Mr. Herbert Spencer, whose acquaintance I made, I think, in 1852, and this was the first bond of a friendship which I am happy to think has known no interruption. Many and prolonged were our talks we brought on this topic, and even my friend's rare dialectic skill and copious stores of illustration failed to make me even an agnostic position. I took my stand upon two grounds: firstly, that up to that time the evidence in favour of transmutation was of the slightest kind, and, secondly, that no suggestion respecting the causes of the transmutation assumed which had been made was in any way satisfactory to the phenomena. Looking back at the state of knowledge at that time, I really do not see that I could have been otherwise than I was.

As I have already said, I imagine that most of those of my contemporaries who thought seriously about the matter were in much the same state of mind, inclined to say to both Monasists and Evolutionists "A plague on both your houses!" and disposed to turn aside from the unprofitable and apparently fruitless discussion to labour in the fertile fields of ascertainable fact. In my case, however, I must suppose that the publication of the Darwin and Wallace papers in 1858, and still more that of the "Origin" in 1859, had no effect upon my state of mind. I was then, in a man who has lost himself in a dark night suddenly reveals a road which, whether it takes him straight home or not, assuredly takes his way. I had not the faintest idea that there could not find was a hypothesis respecting the origin of known organic forms which assumed the operation of no causes but such as could be proved to be actually at work. I had not the faintest idea that this or any other speculation, but to get hold of clear and definite conceptions which could be brought face to face with the facts of Nature. Reading the "Origin" "Origin" provided us with the working hypothesis we sought. Moreover, it did the immense service of freeing us from the bugbear of teleological speculation, except the creation hypothesis, and what have you to propose that is not equally open to that? I remember that in 1857 I had no answer ready, and I do not think that any one else had. A year later we reproached our selves for our blindness. Our minds were in a state of inquiry. My reflection, when I first made myself master of the central idea of the "Origin" was: "How extremely stupid not to have thought of this!" I suppose that Columbus' companions said much the same when he made the egg stand on end. The facts of variability, of the struggle for existence, of adaptation to conditions, were notorious enough, but none of us had grasped that the problem of the origin of species problem lay through them, until Darwin and Wallace dispelled the darkness, and the beacon-fire of the "Origin" first illuminated it.

It was, then, in the searching rays of this new light that Huxley, like so many others during the last 36 years, carried on his many-sided work. Here, space permitted, it would be inappropriate to deal in detail with his many investigations in both vertebrate and invertebrate life. While his work in the latter field is of high importance, his work on the structure and physiology of vertebrate animals that he devoted most of his energy. In the year before the publication of the "Origin" he chose as the subject of his address to the Royal Society Croonian Lecture "The Theory of the Vertebrate Skull," in which, so high an authority as Professor Hæckelasures us, he first opened out the right track to a solution of the problem. Huxley's work in the Huxley's technical work was published through the Royal Society, the Geological Society, and other media familiar to scientific men, and was appreciated mainly by the educated general public. To give a mere list of these many memoirs would serve no purpose. Such important subjects are dealt with as the Classification of Mammalia, the Classification of Birds, the Dinosauria, Fossil Fishes, Glyptodon, the Affinity between Reptiles and Birds, Ceratodus, the Cranial and Dental Structures of Birds, the Classification of Reptiles, Structure of Aphis, the Development of Pyrosoma. These few from among the titles of many memoirs will suffice to show that Huxley's special researches in the field of vertebrate zoology were carried on in many types, and that by themselves they would justify the verdict of Ernest Hæckel that Huxley was the first zoologist among his countrymen. In this connection we may mention his "Lectures on the Invertebrata," his "Lessons in Elementary Physiology," and other text books. When we consider the long series of distinguished memoirs with which, to quote Hæckel, "Professor Huxley has enriched zoological literature, we find that each of the larger divisions of the animal kingdom, we are indebted to him for important discoveries. . . . More important than any of the individual discoveries which are contained in Huxley's numerous memoirs, is the profound and truly philosophical conceptions which have guided him in his inquiries, have always enabled him to distinguish the essential from the unessential, and to value special empirical facts chiefly as a means of arriving at general ideas."

Huxley had a power of popular exposition almost unequaled. He could make plain, even to the ordinary workman, the bearings of the most recondite researches of the zoologist and botanist; witness his famous Norwich lecture "On a Piece of Chalk," and the remarkable popular lecture he gave on a Sunday evening a quarter of a century ago in the midst of shocked Edinburgh. But it is not only to the ordinary intelligent reader that Huxley's lectures and popular writings and popular articles appeal. It is to these in their collected form that the special inquirer must go to find the broad results of Huxley's arduous scientific investigations. He was fond of saying that he assumed his post in the School of Mines to give a course of lectures every alternate year to working men; and it was through this channel that he first gave to the world his remarkable discussion on "Man's Place in Nature." This was one of the earliest and one of the most strikingresults of the publication of the Darwinian theory, for it was given to the world some ten years before the publication of Darwin's "Descent of Man." Even by those who maintain that influences have been at work in the development of man additional to those which have been considered by Darwin, it cannot be denied that it is said that Huxley's conclusions as to the intimate relations between humanity and the higher apes have been generally accepted. It was in the same year that he read before the Royal Society the result of his work on the Hippocampus Minor. Thus his three addresses as President of the Geological Society on "Geological Contemporaneity and Persistent Types of Life," on "Geological Climates and Cosmical Physics," and on "The Doctrine of Evolution," he dealt in characteristically clear and masterly manner with problems that still agitate evolutionists—the imperfection of the record, the duration of geological time, the uniformity of life on the face of the earth, and other matters of profound interest to geologists and biologists. In his papers on "The Methods and Results of Ethnology," and on "Ethnology and Prehistoric Ethnology" he introduced into the somewhat chaotic branch of investigation that deals with man a simplicity of treatment and a scientific method which enabled students to raise it above a mere collection of unrelated facts. The lectures delivered in America in 1876 brought together the *data* as to the evolution of the horse with a cogency that could not be gainsaid. Many arguments in favour of the Darwinian hypothesis.

In an equally "popular" form Huxley dealt with matters of profound human interest and of the widest bearings. Much of what he has written, for example, on the relations of science to religion, and especially to Christianity, has appeared in the form of magazine articles. In these writings, as in his more purely scientific work, he has shown a remarkable power of seeing to be erroneous views and misinterpretation of facts, his candour and openmindedness are ever evident. He never hesitates to expose the sophistries, misconceptions, and inaccurate statements of his opponents, even at the risk of weakening his own position. Take, for example, the short paper in the "Lay Sermons," on "Emancipation—Black and White." Among other things he deals with and advocates the emancipation and higher education of women, but he does not for a moment allow it to be inferred that he believes in the equality of the sexes. In these sketches of "Lady Fullerton" he becomes so rampant the whole paper is well worth reprinting if only to let the "new woman" see what a man of Huxley's keenness of intelligent thought of gas the subject of woman's emancipation.

And the result? For our parts, though both to prophesy, we believe it to be that of other emancipations. Women will find their place, and it will neither be that in which they have hitherto been, nor that to which some of them aspire. Nature's old Salique law will be respected and no change of dynasty will be effected. The big cheeks, the massive brains, the vigorous muscles and stout frames of the best men will carry the day whenever it would their wills to contest the prizes of life with the best women. And the hardship of it is that the very improvement of the women will be their disadvantage. Even some Darwinian of theorists will not venture to propound the doctrine that the physical disabilities under which women are hitherto labouring are the results of exercise which men are likely to be removed by even the most skilfully contrived system of female education. . . . The duty of man is to see that not a grain is piled upon her load beyond what nature imposes. Let her alone and she will do well.

It was the robust sense which marks this passage that prevented Huxley from being carried beyond bounds in applying the doctrine of evolution either to scientific investigation or to practical life. He was, perhaps, not quite so sample of the wide field of his interests. Both metaphysics and theology seem to have had a sort of fascination for him; in the former case shown in his contribution to Mind, in the latter in his paper on Bishop Berkeley, and in the latter by his many divagations in magazine and review articles on subjects more or less connected with Christian doctrine and belief. However early in these essays he may have dealt with his opponent's position, he rarely, if ever, went beyond the bounds of courtesy, or exhibited the irascibility and intemperance of language of his friend Tyndall.

That he did sometimes allow his Darwinian enthusiasm to run away with him must be admitted even by his warmest admirers. In any review of the course of Huxley's life, he unpardonable to omit some mention of the famous *Bathybius* incident. The slimy mass which Huxley in 1868 conceived to be a transitory form of animal life and had after Hæckel *Bathybius* Haeckelii, and which was hailed by extreme Darwinists as a triumphant proof of the great theory turned out to be merely a calcareous precipitate. Huxley was honest enough to withdraw his hypothesis when it and naturally there was a great outcry among anti-Darwinists, an outcry wholly unreasonable. But the great biologist made very few mistakes. Huxley was, perhaps, not the best medium to act as the sworn champion of the newly-launched "Origin of Species." It is interesting here to recall the fact that probably the first review of the "Origin" was that by Huxley in the *Professor Huxley for the Times*, under what circumstances will be found narrated in "The Life of Charles Darwin." One notable instance of his championship occurred in the meeting of the British Association in June, 1860. Bishop Wilberforce defended the orthodox views and "ridiculed Darwin badly and unfairly, strongly." He so far forgot himself as to ask Huxley whether he was related by his grandfather's or grandmother's side to an ape. One who was present states that "Huxley replied to the scientific argument of his opponent in a speech of the utmost power, and made no allusion with a self-restraint that gave dignity to his crushing rejoinder." The exciting incident was a triumph for the new-born doctrine. A contrast to this scene occurred in the same Association in Oxford 34 years later (August, 1894), when again the Darwinian theory was, if not exactly attacked, at least somewhat keenly criticised. The chairman of the meeting was Huxley, who is also entitled to respect for his practical acquaintance with science, Lord Salisbury. Not less dignified were the words used by Professor Huxley on the occasion in question. He said to the Hisworks may be regarded as a declaration of his scientific faith at the end of his long and busy career.

The evolution and the Darwinian attempt to explain it have been confounded, so Huxley's agnosticism has often been rashly identified with materialism, positivism, and even atheism. At the conclusion of his famous sermon in the Physical Basis of Life he repudiated the first with vehemence. He certainly did not believe that matter was the only thing in the universe. He was a theist, and, if he was dogmatic, he was not, and nothing could be more unjust to a man of so absolutely sceptical a mind as Huxley than to charge him with anything so rashly positive as atheism. Huxley's agnostic position has been adequately describe his attitude to what lies beyond the cognizance of our five senses. He is gone, but his work, as well as his teaching, remains. The latter may be a bewildering generation become antiquated and unreadable, but the influence of the former upon the thought of the last 35 years has been deep and lasting. It is, in fact, the reckoning up of any attempt to estimate the forces which have been at work to mould the intellectual, moral, and social life of the century. Whatever the verdict may be as to the ultimate Huxley's influence, it cannot but be admitted that he exercised a great powers with a seriousness of responsibility and with an unwavering loyalty to what he conceived to be the truth. What were the aims and objectives of the man we cannot be better conveyed than in a passage which occurs in the brief autobiographical introduction to his collected essays:—

The main thing that it would be proper for me to do would be to speak of the work of my life or to say at the end of the day whether I think I have earned my wages or not.

But if I may speak of the objects I have had more or less definitely in view since I began the ascent of my hillside, I should say that they have been, first, the increase of natural knowledge and to forward the application of scientific methods of investigation to all the problems of life to the best of my ability, in the conviction, which has grown with my growth and strengthened with my strength, that there is no alleviation for the sufferings of humanity except through the strength and of action, and the resolute facing of the world as it is when it has been stripped of the pious lies with which pious hands have hidden its uglier features is stripped off.

Honours were showered upon Huxley by learned societies and Universities both at home and abroad. On his retirement in 1885 he retained his position at the Royal School of Mines and the Normal School of Science as Dean and Honorary Professor of Biology, at the request of the Lord President. Queen Victoria offered the Presidency of Biology on leaving office in 1892 was to confer upon Professor Huxley the dignity of Privy Councillor. It was understood that he had been offered a peerage, which, as might have been expected, he declined.

One of Huxley's latest tasks was to superintend a complete edition of all his non-technical writings in nine volumes. It is by these, no doubt, he would wish to be judged by posterity in a less future. Reference has been made to Huxley's wonderful power of clear exposition. Apart from that, his skill in the use of our language entitles his writings to be ranked as literary masterpieces. He himself was familiar with the masterpieces of German, French, and Italian, as well as English, literature, and in this respect he stood in marked contrast to Darwin. Mr. Huxley leaved a widow and a numerous family.

ROYAL BOTANIC SOCIETY.—The Duke of Teck presided on Saturday afternoon at a council meeting of the Royal Botanic Society, Regent's-park, on the occasion of the grand evening *fête* on Wednesday, July 10. At a meeting of Fellows, previously held in the museum at the Gardens, Mr. Ernest Hodgkin, Mr. Thomas Hayward was nominated for fellowship, and the following new Fellows were elected:—Sir Gerald C. Robinson, Dr. George Dutfield Hobson, Mr. Thomas Mrs. E. Owen, Mrs. G. Yorke, Mrs. Grant Thorold, Mrs. Waterfield, Miss Yorke, Mr. Beck, Mr. H. C. Lescombe, Mr. John Walmesley, Mr. R. C. Griffith, and Mr. Dorrien Smith. Up to the present time 53 new Fellows have been elected in this year, as against 45 in the first the whole of last year. Among the latest additions to the society's collection are a number of orchids from Kew, amongst which are Cypripedium Sedenii and the rhododendron ciliatum presented by Mr. J. Rashleigh, of Menabilly, Cornwall. Mr. Hurst, of Hatfield, Mr. Hurst, of Hatfield, Mr. Hurst, of Hatfield,